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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Research

What do chief student affairs officers\(^1\) do? How do they spend their time? What activities, functions, contracts, and concerns comprise their day? What are the distinguishing features of their work?

The questions take on even greater meaning when considered in the context of mixed scenarios provided by the 1980 report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. This report recognizes that higher education adds greatly to the quality of life through higher incomes, but beyond incomes, to the better use of time. At the same time, the report paints a gloomy picture of higher education over the next twenty years during which enrollments may drop despite continued increases in the total population and the real resources available to colleges and universities may

\(^1\)The terms chief student affairs officer, vice president for student affairs, dean of students, and the like are used interchangeably in this paper to denote the chief administrative officer of a student personnel division who exercises managerial, fiscal, personnel, and programmatic leadership as a cabinet-level administrator charged with the overall responsibility for student life.
decline even as the total G.N.P. keeps increasing. The report calls for specific courses of action including the more effective use of resources and their better allocation internally and the creation of conditions that encourage effective leadership and management of these resources.²

Therefore, the significance of the questions raised above is two-fold:

(1) From a pragmatic standpoint, higher education is frequently characterized by increasing accountability, tighter budgets, and declining enrollments—concerns linked to student affairs. These practical issues call into question the nature and quality of leadership in student personnel administration. A study which effectively addresses the question of how student affairs administrators allocate their time would provide more complete data to begin to respond to these problems posed by our society.

(2) From a more scholarly perspective, research which focuses on the aforementioned concerns would seem to have value in bridging student personnel theory and practice, in exploring the meaning of student personnel work, and in developing creative methodologies and process models to apply to practice on an ongoing basis.

These are fundamental issues which may have significant implications for student personnel work.

Paradoxically, the initial questions are not addressed in the literature which consists largely of highly

prescriptive treatments or anecdotal folklore. Representative of this dichotomous literature are the work of Robert Brown and, more recently an attempt to capture the roles and styles of the past presidents of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (N.A.S.P.A.) by James Appleton and his colleagues.

In the first instance, Brown defines several roles for student personnel workers:

(1) diagnostician
(2) consultant
(3) programmer
(4) technologist
(5) college professor
(6) administrator
(7) behavioral scientist
(8) researcher

Yet, the above normative categories simply represent alternative roles for student affairs administrators without providing any insights regarding what they actually do.

---


5 Brown, Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education, pp. 38-41.
The primary emphasis of anecdotal accounts such as *Pieces of Eight* seems to be upon not only the roles but also the style of "deaning." Appleton *et al.* seem more concerned with personal demeanor than with the quality and substance of work and speak of style as "... denoting how we behave in our work as distinguished from what we do ..."6

Both past and future accounts of student personnel work add credibility to this two-pronged argument that: (1) we know little about what student affairs administrators do; and (2) what we do know is highly prescriptive or anecdotal.

As early as 1928, Dean Stanley Coulter of Purdue University in attempting to refine the nature of the deanship remarked:

> When the Board of Trustees elected me Dean of Men I wrote them very respectfully and asked them to give me the duties of the deanship. They wrote me back that they did not know what they were but when I found out to let them know.7

Although definitions of deaning began to take shape as administrators started to examine their roles in the period from 1910 to 1930, according to Appleton *et al.*, their activities remained largely uncatalogued—a practice


which seemingly persists today even in our age of accountability.

An article published more recently thrusts one forward to a campus scenario in the year 1999. In providing a projection of a day in the life of a dean of students approaching the twenty-first century, Frederick Brodzinski begins to predict how a dean will spend their day, the various roles and functions they will assume, and the contacts involved. Nevertheless, he too fails to avoid the pitfall of prescribing certain roles related to computer technology and the campus environment.

It is intriguing that although Brodzinski's work is merely a projection, he is able to trace a scenario in great detail. He does so, however, based more on the premise that the role of student affairs will remain unchanged than on empirical data related to the day-to-day activities associated with dean.

Returning to the original line of inquiry posited earlier, should such questions be posed to a variety of constituents both within and outside of higher education--faculty, administrators, students, parents, legislators, chief student affairs officers themselves or significant

---


9At the same time, Brodzinski in his commentary is highly skeptical regarding the likelihood or the desirability of maintaining the traditional student affairs role.
others in their lives—the result, in all likelihood, would be incomplete accounts or distortions of the work of the vice president or dean based upon limited contacts, perceptions, observations, or systematic means of inquiry. Regarding the scope of student personnel work, Appleton and his colleagues admit with some reticence that "... educational leaders and presidents look askance at ... the work of student affairs colleagues."10

If one were to turn to other sources for assistance in answering these questions concerning the nature of chief student affairs officers' work, it is furthermore unlikely that the inquirer would be aided by either: (1) broad sweeping job descriptions; or (2) statutory provisions.

Regarding the latter point, it seems logical that since the vice presidents' authority is formally derived from state laws or university by-laws approved by the board of trustees that such statutes would define with some precision what it is that chief student affairs administrators do. The statutory provisions of the Ohio Administrative Code serve as an example, but provide little insight:

(A) The vice president for student services shall be the executive head of the office of student services.

---

(B) The major area of responsibility and authority of the vice president for student services shall be that of student services at the university. Without limiting the foregoing, the vice president for student services shall, under the direction of the president and with the approval of the board of trustees, be responsible and have the requisite authority for: The promulgation of rules governing student conduct both on and off campus; the coordination of student extra-curricular activities both on and off campus; the coordination of student extra-curricular activities including all student (or student-connected) organizations; and the administration of all residence and dining hall facilities; non-academic student discipline; the student health service including primary responsibility for university-wide environmental health and safety; university union facilities and programs; student athletic programs including intercollegiate athletics, recreation and intramural programs; counseling; student financial aids and scholarships; off-campus student housing; and international student programs.

(C) The principal administrative officials of the office of student services shall be the director of the counseling center, the director of student health service, the director of student unions, the director of student financial aids, the director of athletics, the assistant vice president for residence and dining hall facilities, and such other associates as may be authorized from time to time.\footnote{Faculty Rule 3335-3-09, "Vice president for student services," Statutes, By-laws, and Rules of The Ohio State University (May, 1979), pp. 12-4 and 12-5.}

Taken in a broader since, the issue of what educational administrators do has proven to be equally perplexing. Only recently (1978), two doctoral dissertations...
by Nancy Pitner\textsuperscript{12} and Jane Hannaway\textsuperscript{13} have addressed this question as it relates to the superintendency in the greater Columbus area and to officials in the central office of the San Jose school district.

Turning to higher education, in their book devoted entirely to the study of the American college presidency, \textit{Leadership and Ambiguity}, Michael Cohen and James March entertain a set of questions similar to the initial concerns of this paper:

\begin{enumerate}
\item What is a president doing?
\item How is his time organized?
\item Where is he during the day?
\item Whom does he see?
\item At whose initiative?\textsuperscript{14}
\end{enumerate}

Cohen and March capture presidential work as ambiguous, yet orderly, cyclical, mundane, and unexceptional—a series of unspectacular daily and hourly judgments guided by certain norms governing how long, where, in what size group, and with whom. From self-reports and

\begin{quotation}


\end{quotation}
assessments of others, presidential work is characterized as demanding in terms of time and energy; the image that is conveyed is one of presidents' being overworked and "misworked."

Although Cohen and March studied presidential leadership at some forty-two institutions, the aggregate picture that emerges tells us more about some proposed roles and temporal pacing than about the nature of their work. They assert that the data suggest a collective portrait of a president who is "basically reacting to others, who leads a busy, verbal life, and who divides his time relatively equally among the administrative, entrepreneurial, and political roles of his job."15

In considering further the significance of the questions posed, outside the realm of education Henry Mintzberg echoes many of the thoughts of Cohen and March as he notes the fact that managers seem compelled not only by the quantity of work, but also by the unrelenting pace of work marked by brevity, variety, and fragmentation.16

Reflecting upon his experiences and research at M.I.T.'s Sloan School of Management, Mintzberg maintains that little is said or taught about the job of managing. Lack of systematic research and the inapplicability of

---

15Ibid., p. 135.

analytical procedures to work processes that are not well understood have been accompanied by a literature inundated with prescriptions for managerial success. Mintzberg maintains that we must go beyond what people think and say about supervisors or themselves (anecdotes, folklore, and self-reports); the burden is on the researcher to study, analyze, and understand what it is that managers do—that is, the day-to-day work of practitioners.

The question of what managers do is typically posed by many workers as well as staff or administrators themselves. A typical response to such a question calls upon the classical notions of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling as promulgated by Fayol\(^1\) and later refined by Strong.\(^2\) Yet, the question of what managers or college administrators do remains largely unanswered. Managerial or educational personnel are seldom observed. The nature and the meaning of their work is unclear.

Studs Terkel in his search for daily meaning in the work of Americans concentrated on:

\[ \ldots \] those happy few who find a savor in their daily job: the Indian stonemason; the Chicago


fireman—all of whom have a common attribute—a meaning to their work well beyond the reward of a paycheck. . . . a singular preoccupation with work that may affect one's attitude toward all of life.19

In his travels interviewing hundreds of workers from lawyers to gravediggers, Terkel did not visit the student affairs administrator. Rather, he concentrated his efforts on persons such as the fireman and the bricklayer—individuals whose labors could be observed in terms of production and outcomes. It is far easier to respond to the question of what it is that firemen and bricklayers do when tangible evidence of saved lives and structures and brick and mortar are evident. Remarked one of Terkel's subjects, the stonemason:

I can't imagine a job where you go home and maybe go by a year later and you don't know what you've done. My work, I can see what I did the first day I started. All of my work is right out there in the open and I can look at it as I go by. It's something I can see the rest of my life—a kind of immortality.20

Therefore, there hangs in abeyance not only the troublesome question of what is it that chief student affairs officers do, but also the issue of the meaning of their work.

Are graduate programs of any assistance in addressing these matters? Within M.A. and Ph.D. programs in student personnel work and higher education the focus is typically

20C. M. Bates in Terkel's Working, pp. 21-22.
on counseling, student development, administration, and organization theory and the application of theory to practice. Occasionally, case studies are used to more closely examine what college presidents or deans do in crisis situations, but not what they do in day-to-day activities. Practicum, internship, and assistantship experiences designed to provide hands-on experience more closely approximate the opportunity to observe and participate in the fundamental activities of counselors, directors, deans and vice presidents. However, even the opportunity of the researcher to understudy two vice presidents at a major university has left open the question of the nature of vice presidential work in student affairs to more systematic, scholarly inquiry.21

E. H. Litchfield maintains that educators have, indeed, been remiss in failing to study the work of university administrators:

In a generation which has isolated the administrative process in society and subjected it to careful appraisal, we university administrators have done little to study it, are self-conscious in our performance of it, and have been almost systematic in our neglect of the necessity of training for it, but, on the

21Involvement in search processes for a vice president, a director of residence and dining halls, a dean of student life, and an assistant dean of students have proven equally fruitless in terms of addressing head-on the question of what is it that student personnel administrators do.
other hand, we complain when business administrators are called upon to do it for us.\textsuperscript{22}

Research Problem

In view of the apparent failure of educators, researchers, and literature in the field to address the critical questions related to the nature of student personnel administrators' work and the lack of an integrated account of the activities of those who occupy the chief administrative positions in student affairs, an innovative research design utilizing both an empirical data collection methodology\textsuperscript{23} and an inductive approach\textsuperscript{24} was designed to address the following research problem:

(1) To investigate the notion of time through an examination of the literature focusing on time management and through the collection and analysis of data related to chief student affairs officers' use of time.

(2) To attempt to better understand the nature and meaning of the work of chief student affairs


\textsuperscript{23}The research methodology is detailed in Chapter III.

\textsuperscript{24}For a rigorous argument on behalf of inductive theorists the reader is referred to J. Bronowski, "The Creative Process," \textit{Scientific American} (September 1958), pp. 59-65.
officers at selected C.I.C. institutions through systematic, intensive observations and interviews.

(3) To explore the notion of incentive systems both through the literature and as it applies to chief student affairs officers at specific C.I.C. institutions.

(4) To consider possible relationships between the allocation of time and the operation of incentive systems at C.I.C. institutions.

(5) To consider the implications of the time allocations and managerial work of a select group of chief student affairs officers to practice and research.

Research Questions

In order to address the above research problem, specific questions were entertained during the course of the investigation:

(1) What is it that student personnel administrators do? More precisely, what is it that chief student affairs officers do? How do they allocate their time?

(2) With whom do chief student affairs officers spend their time? At whose initiative?

(3) What kinds of managerial and educational functions do chief student affairs officers perform? For what organization purpose?

(4) How do chief student affairs officers assess their work? What are their priorities? Should their performance of certain tasks be improved? What is their level of satisfaction?

(5) Are there any patterns or commonalities that emerge from an analysis of those occupying the top positions in student personnel? What are the distinguishing features of their work?

(6) What similarities or variations exist in the time usage patterns among C.I.C. deans and vice presidents? What explanations may be offered?

(7) Is it possible to develop an aggregate picture or job description of C.I.C. chief student affairs administrators based on the time allocation data?

(8) Does the time allocation data suggest the existence of an incentive system operating for vice presidents at those C.I.C. institutions?

(9) What implications would an understanding of how deans and vice presidents allocate their time have for the theory and practice of student personnel administration?

**Description of the Research and Definition of Dimensions**

The research conducted reflects an attempt to study and understand the various dimensions of chief student affairs officers' work, specifically:

(1) The instrumental activity dimension—that is, what they do; a description of the physical or kinetic activities of vice presidents of student affairs.

26The researcher is partially indebted to Cohen, March, and Mintzberg for the conceptualization of a number of these questions in revised form which were applied to college presidents and others occupying managerial positions. The questions represent the collective efforts of these individuals as well as the researcher's own imagination and curiosity.
(2) The function dimension—that is, what about or for what organizational purpose do they engage in such activities.

(3) The contact dimension—that is, with whom the chief student affairs officers spend their time.

(4) The work assessment dimension—that is, the importance of the work in which they are engaged and whether or not the performance of such work should be improved.

(5) The initiative/satisfaction dimension—that is, whether the work was initiated by the chief student affairs officer (proactive) or someone else (reactive) and the level of satisfaction derived from the activity, the function, and the contact.

The research problem and questions as delineated earlier were pursued through a four-week study of chief student affairs officers at C.I.C. institutions. A field study utilizing the Extensor System was designed to randomly collect data related to the five dimensions described above.

The Extensor System consisting of a random impulse generator and pre-coded cards enabled the researcher to gather data quantitatively and multi-dimensionally without the use of obtrusive observers or cumbersome time logs. The system, in effect, performed the "interviewing" by providing data related to the activities, functions, and contacts of the vice presidents and deans. This data collection methodology—grounded in the day-to-day work of vice presidents—was supplemented by follow-up interviews utilizing Lewis Dexter's technique as
described in *Elite and Specialized Interviewing.*\(^{27}\)

The results of the study are reported in the following manner:

Chapter II: Review of the Literature including student personnel work, institutional contexts and multiversities, incentive systems in higher education, leadership, managerial work, and time management.

Chapter III: Methodology and Procedures detailing the selection of the sample and the process of observing and interviewing subjects through the Extensor System and the elite interviewing technique.

Chapter IV: Presentation and Analysis of the Data reporting, displaying, and analyzing the data gathered.

Chapter V: Implications and Conclusions including basic findings of the research and a discussion of the implications for student personnel work and further research.

Limitations of the Study

An investigation that would comprehensively treat the problems and questions stated previously would require an extensive effort involving a team of researchers and a wide range of methodological approaches. There are, no doubt, limitations in the study which has been outlined—both methodological and theoretical.

As Bernard Phillips has remarked, the nature of research demands balancing strategies and tactics in light of one's overall purpose, both practical and theoretical.28

Regarding the methodological question, Dexter advocates using the "... most promising and least costly technique for obtaining the desired information."29 The Extensor System, although monetarily expensive, far outweighs the cost of direct observation and the costs related to the researcher's own time over an extended period of time. Interviews simply supplemented the Extensor data gathering.

It is also clear that there are severe limitations governing the extent to which the findings can be generalized to the universe of deans and vice presidents. In designing the study it was decided that the research would concentrate on the activities, contacts, and managerial work of those who have attained well-regarded leadership positions in the profession. This decision rests on the assumption that an investigation of those in significant vice presidencies in student affairs may increase our knowledge of student personnel work in general. The study was further delimited to those vice presidents...


29Dexter, Elite and Specialized Interviewing, p. 12.
presidents and deans at a particular type of institution—that is, large, comprehensive research universities.

Finally, accessibility to these administrators and the subjects' willingness to participate in a study grounded in their daily activities were key factors. Geographically, the C.I.C. institutions were reasonably accessible. In addition, the vice presidents seemed truly interested in such an analysis. It is postulated that these factors may have increased the likelihood of cooperation in the study, the level of commitment to the task, and the reliability of self-reports. Finally, regarding sample size, contrary to Cohen and March who studied forty-two administrators, yet consistent with Mintzberg who investigated the work of five managers, it was assumed that a more intensive study of a limited group would provide: (1) a more complete and meaningful picture of what chief student personnel administrators do; and (2) greater insights into the meaning of their work. In effect, a trade-off was made to study fewer subjects, but to extend the research over a longer period of time.

The data which emerged may be generalized only to chief student affairs officers at a specific type of institution. Nevertheless, the meaning derived from the data may have more widespread applicability to the field. Therefore, the conclusions and implications drawn are
placed in the context of propositions or hypotheses.

Theoretically, this research deals with the notions of time, the meaning of work, and the concept of incentive systems as they relate to chief student affairs administrators.

Regarding time management, theoretical constructs are lacking. Darrell Lewis and Tor Dahl assert "... unfortunately, the field of time management currently does not have a highly developed body of literature, systematic lines of inquiry or sets of principles."

To fully investigate the proposed research questions requires more than a simplistic time and motion study.

F. D. Barrett maintains:

... time management should not be approached merely as just another how-to-do-it technique. It must be approached with insight, understanding, judgment, and imagination ... the management of time is a new frontier which invites exploration, experimentation, and action."

Since it has already been asserted that we know little of what it is that chief student personnel administrators do except in a prescriptive or anecdotal sense, it follows that it is a formidable task to address the question of the meaning of this work. Literature

---


ranging from student development theory\textsuperscript{32} to Terkel's journalistic approach provide few, if any, clues. In order to investigate the matter of meaning, the allocation data are couched in the theoretical construct related to incentive systems.\textsuperscript{33} Are the various dimensions of chief student affairs administrators behaviors a function of an incentive system operating implicitly or explicitly at the C.I.C. institutions? Do the time allocation data suggest the existence of an incentive system for student personnel administrators? It is the incentive system literature which hopefully provides the theoretical construct to inform the meaning of the time allocation data collected—a contextual basis for better understanding the data.

\textsuperscript{32}Aside from the prescriptive nature of the student personnel literature, student development theory and instrumentation aid the researcher more in terms of questions related to the impact of the collegiate environment along several developmental dimensions—personal, behavioral, attitudinal, moral, ethical, and so on. In short, student development constructs contribute more to an understanding of how students develop and what they do than to an understanding of what administrators do.

\textsuperscript{33}The conceptual framework of the incentive system construct stresses the centrality of individuals to the functioning and behavior of organizations. For a complete treatment of this premise the reader is referred to C. I. Barnard's \textit{The Functions of the Executive} (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1938).
A word of caution is in order, however. In The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Thomas Kuhn suggests that all scientists adapt analytic models from which they can view their problems—that is, they mentally construct models or paradigms that reconstruct reality. Ultimately, the model chosen influences problems and roles looked at, one's theoretical perspective, and conclusions made. This, and only this, is the value of employing paradigms advanced by the educational or organizational literature: To provide a conceptual framework to look at the world, to highlight organizational functions, activities, and roles within higher education, and to generate further hypotheses or models.

Research Objectives

With the above caution in mind, the researcher engaged in the time allocation study of chief student affairs officers guided by the following objectives:

(1) To close the gap related to the incomplete knowledge surrounding the time allocations, activities, functions, and contacts of chief student affairs officers; in short, to provide a "slice of life" of chief student affairs officers at selected institutions.

(2) To consider the implications of these data to those in student personnel work who occupy positions other than that of chief student administrator—practitioners, educators, and researchers.

(3) To not only increase the level of awareness of what chief student affairs officers do, but also translate this information in such a way that it is easily understood by a wide range of constituents.

(4) To enable those outside of the field of student personnel to make informed choices pertaining to careers in student affairs on the basis of data reflecting what it is that chief student affairs officers do.

(5) To stimulate further research in the field focusing on the nature and meaning of student personnel work.

Restatement of the Importance of the Problem

Thus far the researcher has attempted to outline the parameters of the problem and indicate its significance both from the standpoint of the field as well as from a more personal posture. The motivation for this research extended beyond the researcher's own attempts to manage the academic, professional, and personal dimensions of his life. The lack of available data—and understanding—surrounding the position of chief student affairs officer confirms the fact that a study was needed which concerns itself with the everyday activities of deanng. It is the character and content of the chief student affairs officers' work—what they do, with whom, for what purpose—and the unique features and incentives underlying their work which were of
interest.35

The incomplete knowledge or picture of what chief student affairs officers do is best addressed by a descriptive study with attention given to the patterns, differences, and commonalities which emerge.

A greater awareness of what chief student affairs officers do will assist in the designing of graduate and staff development programs, the evaluation of staff, requests for budgetary support, and the process of making informed career decisions related to student affairs.

Most importantly, however, this study was undertaken to enhance our understanding of the nature of student personnel work by providing a fuller picture of the way in which chief student affairs officers function—and why.

35Both Mintzberg and Pitner make the distinction between the "character" and the "content" of managerial work. The first refers to descriptive accounts of where, with whom, how long, and with what media; the latter refers to the actual activities carried out and why. This dissertation concerns itself with both dimensions.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Student Personnel Literature: Historical and Contemporary

Thus far a number of important research questions have been outlined and compelling reasons for their significance—both in theory and in practice—have been articulated. Through a comprehensive review of several literature bases, it is asserted that greater meaning and direction will be given to the inquiry.

The student personnel literature, although consisting predominately of anecdotal accounts and highly prescriptive treatments related to chief student affairs officers, indirectly focuses on what they do by functions performed and issues addressed. However, there seems to be a preoccupation with either the past or the future of student affairs as opposed to the present nature of student personnel work. Nevertheless, an examination of some of the student personnel literature may provide some insights into the nature of chief student affairs officers' work.

Historically, the student personnel profession emerged with the appointment of LeBaron Briggs as the
first dean of student relations at Harvard in 1890,\(^1\) and has moved through various stages of philosophical and professional development.\(^2\)

In general, the higher education literature reflects the historical development of student personnel administration and the student life movement and seminal student personnel works such as those by C. Gilbert Wrenn\(^3\) and E. G. Williamson\(^4\) as well as more broadly based accounts by Rudolph, Brubacher and Rudy\(^5\) have traced the development of student life within the historical context of higher education.

One may also obtain a sense of the history of student personnel work and the profession of "deaning" by perusing many of the association journals, the first

\(^1\)Actually, there were a number of deans and presidents who attended to the student personnel functions prior to LeBaron Briggs; however, he was the first to hold the "dean of students" title. For an excellent treatment of the early deans see JoAnn Fley's sketches of eight early deans which appeared in the Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, XLI (1977-1978).


fifty years of The Journal of Higher Education, or the Secretarial Notes for the Annual Conference of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men (N.A.D.A.M.).

However, despite the character of this historical literature base, neither authors nor practitioners have been able to respond directly and in a scholarly fashion to the research questions outlined in the previous chapter. For example, in speaking to his colleagues at the Eleventh Annual Conference of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, Dean Culver of Stanford University remarked:

I hope that no one considers me so presumptuous as to assume that I can tell him anything about his own work or how it should be best performed . . . . It was quite apparent, however, from many of the replies which came in response to my circular letter that there was a widespread desire for possible information concerning the duties of a Dean . . . . speaking very frankly, I do not see how anyone can define or set forth such duties.

---


7 Although N.A.D.A.M. began meeting informally in the Spring of 1919 at the initiative of the Big Ten deans, the association's proceedings were first recorded at the Third Annual Conference in Iowa in 1921 as Secretarial Notes.

From a college president's perspective, there was concern regarding the nature and duties of the dean:

The position of Dean . . . has been defined in many ways . . . . No other single individual . . . in any institution has the opportunity of understanding and moulding student life as has the Dean who is free to help students in the many and varied problems that come outside of the academic order of things. The very freedom of the office is its danger.\(^9\)

Later, N.A.D.A.M.'s proceedings in the early thirties noted with greater frequency questions related to the "nature of deaning."\(^10\) At the 1931 Annual Conference, in addressing the issue of policy formation for N.A.D.A.M., Dean Armstrong of Northwestern University asserted that:

The work of the deans . . . is no longer an untried project. It has existed now for over a quarter of a century, and has become an integral part of the organization of most of the outstanding universities and colleges of America. This work has, however, been approached from many different standpoints, and under many different forms of organization. It has varied to some extent with the personality of the dean, and with the local conditions under which he was working. Slowly, from these varied approaches, has come a greater understanding of the functions of a dean . . . .\(^11\)


\(^10\) See, in particular, Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1931).

At that same annual meeting, Armstrong called for the association to undertake the task of recording the history and development of the dean's position in American universities by collecting the memoirs of certain deans and by complementing this information with survey procedures. He noted that certain benefits could be derived from such a study, namely:

(1) We can trace out the various approaches which our leading personalities have taken, note the differences in their situations, the problems they met, and the manner of meeting them.

(2) We shall be able to point to the contributions made to American university life by our deans of men.

(3) We shall be able to educate others on the nature of the work.

(4) We possibly can be able to extract certain principles, concepts, and attitudes around which the work is organized.

(5) We can preserve an intimate record of the inspiring personalities who have pioneered in this field.12

It is particularly noteworthy that the benefits enumerated above which speak to educating others and extracting certain principles and concepts resemble those which are derived from the present research.

In addition, by raising the following questions, Armstrong advocated a survey of the present work of deans as a prerequisite for the formulation of association

12Ibid., p. 115.
policies:

(1) In order to formulate our policies would it not be wise to get a comprehensive survey of the dean's position throughout the United States?

(2) How can we determine how to exert our influence and how to conduct our future policies without thoroughly understanding the needs of the various deans.13

Provided with this challenge, N.A.D.A.M.'s newly formed Executive Committee, under the direction of D. H. Gardner of Akron University, embarked upon a national survey of student personnel administrators in October 1931. This research, as reported in the 1932 Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M., had a two-fold purpose:

First, the obtaining of those individuals actually bearing the title of Dean or Adviser of Men or Dean of Students, etc. and, second, a study of the functions and duties performed by them.14

In efforts to address the first purpose, Gardner reported that letters were sent to the presidents of 995 institutions requesting the name and title of the officer charged with the duties ordinarily considered as functions of a dean. In order to "erect a thesis of what deans and advisers of men are doing" a follow-up questionnaire was sent to 644 institutions in January, 1932 resulting in a 62 per cent return rate.15

13Ibid., p. 116.
15Ibid., p. 77.
The returns for the 1932 questionnaire were separated into eight groups on the basis of institutional enrollments and reported as part of the proceedings for the 1932 N.A.D.A.M. Conference. Summary results for some 54 functions are presented in Table 1.

Although the 1932 survey helped to clarify the myriad of functions performed by those assuming the position of dean, by Gardner's own admission, the techniques were

far from perfect . . . the formation of the list is open to attack . . . and many things which deans are called upon to do cannot be clarified or placed in definite categories.  

Garner proceeded to urge the association "to formulate for its members certain functional theories and precepts" and recommended that additional data be collected and included in a report that "should embody certain fundamental theories of the work of Deans . . . to serve as guidelines to all of us in better serving the students in our institutions." 

16See Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1932), pp. 87-101  
17Gardner, Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1932), p. 79.  
18Ibid.
### TABLE 1

**FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Functions</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>A &amp; B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A, B, C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Analyze and adjust student's social problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean or a direct assistant</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Analyze and adjust student's moral problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean or another officer or agency</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Analyze and adjust student's emotional difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean in some capacity</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Advise with interfraternity government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervise fraternities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean or another agency</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supervise housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Advise with student government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conduct research in student problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Penalize for infractions of housing regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Aid students in making academic adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Administer social regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Conduct &quot;Freshman Week&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Penalize for infractions of social regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Enforce payment of student's private bills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Regulate student participation in other non-athletic extracurricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Penalize students for moral delinquencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Enforce automobile regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Supervise vocational counselling program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% performed by Dean</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1932), p. 103.]
TABLE 1\(^a\) (Continued)

FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommend students for remedial psychiatric treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Keep copies of record of students' personal history</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Supervise social calendar</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Interview entering students for personal history records</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Officially administer educational counselling program</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Keep official record of students' personal history</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Supervise orientation courses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Supervise placement of part-time workers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Penalize students for chapel or assembly absences</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Administer student loans</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Administer penalties imposed for unsatisfactory work</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Grant excuses for class absences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Penalize students for infraction of student organization regulations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Regulate student participation in athletics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Keep copies of academic records of students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Approve chaperons for parties</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Penalize students for class absences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Recommend students for remedial medical treatment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Supervise vocational &quot;followup&quot; program</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Administer student scholarships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Supervise mental health clinic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Supervise health service</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Audit student organization accounts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Recommend students for remedial physical education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Supervise institutional dining halls</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Determine admissions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1932), pp. 103-105.
TABLE 1a (Continued)

FUNCTIONS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enforce payment of students' institutional bills</th>
<th>Make up students' class schedules</th>
<th>Supervise graduate placement</th>
<th>Supervise catalogue</th>
<th>Supervise physical examinations</th>
<th>Formulate curricula</th>
<th>Keep official academic records of students</th>
<th>Approve selection of faculty members</th>
<th>Select members of faculty</th>
<th>Conduct faculty meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Supervise graduate placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Supervise catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Supervise physical examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Formulate curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Keep official academic records of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Approve selection of faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Select members of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Secretarial Notes of N.A.S.A.M. (1932), pp. 104-105.*
Unfortunately, the 1933 proceedings convey no information regarding follow-up efforts; however, the conference did include papers such as "Why is a Dean of Men?" and "Extending the Functions of the Dean of Men."\textsuperscript{19}

Through speakers and papers at subsequent annual meetings, N.A.D.A.M. continued to explore the nature of the dean. By 1937 the field of student affairs had acquired its own "Student Personnel Point of View"\textsuperscript{20} which has served as ". . . a descriptive statement of the philosophy and goals of the profession for over 40 years."\textsuperscript{21} Yet, this philosophy--despite enumerating some 23 services in the original version and adding 17 conditions to enhance growth and development in 1949\textsuperscript{22}--has failed to address fundamentally the question of what it is that student affairs administrators do.

Despite the establishment of a set of principles and a guiding philosophy, the field of student personnel work has come under sharp criticism in the literature as it

\textsuperscript{19}Secretarial Notes of N.A.D.A.M. (1933), pp. 109-125.


\textsuperscript{21}P. A. Tripp, Excerpts from a doctoral seminar, The Ohio State University, June 30, 1977.

\textsuperscript{22}The Student Personnel Point of View (Washington, D.C.: A.C.E. Series, rev. ser. 6, XIII, 13, 1949).
has progressed through various phases ranging from in loco parentis to student development. 23

Some of these criticisms have come from outside the student personnel profession; yet others have come from those holding significant leadership positions within the field such as Ralph Berdie, former President of the American College Personnel Association. 24

One of the strongest indictments of student personnel work occurred in the late sixties when James Penney labeled the profession as "stillborn" and attacked ongoing efforts to define and examine the field. 25 It is the opinion of some researchers, 26 however, that Penney forced scholars and practitioners into a period of introspection by his forceful words:

Few occupational entities have devoted as much energy to self-examination and attempts

23 For a complete description of four phases of student personnel work see the interview with Terry O'Banion, "Issues in Higher Education," N.A.S.P.A. Field Reports, II, No. 2 (Spring, 1978), pp. 1-3.


at self-definition as has the amorphous body calling itself student personnel work. This specialty is roughly half a century old—surely enough time to achieve whatever degree of recognition and maturity the academic community is likely to allow. It is certainly enough time for it to establish itself as a profession among professions if ever it is to do so.27

Penney goes on to assert that student personnel workers have failed to establish recognition in educational communities and efforts to achieve credibility among the dominant power centers in university governance—faculty, administration, and students—have failed. In short, concludes Penney, "Student personnel workers, their philosophy and their goals, are not among the major influences in colleges and universities today."28

It may be worthwhile to delineate several of the major premises promulgated by Penney—premises which ironically may have served to stimulate a greater interest in the field, to further research, and to produce a plethora of literature:

(1) Penney claims that the scarcity of student affairs literature up until the late sixties supports the contention that student personnel work has not risen to a professional level in the academic world and may never do so.

27Ibid., p. 958.
28Ibid.
(2) He contends that a review of the literature illustrates the possible causes for the demise of student personnel work—that is, much of the literature is borrowed from the social sciences and the goals and philosophy of student affairs are not seen as dominant on college campuses.

(3) The diversity of tasks performed under the rubric of student personnel gives the impression of deans as generalists; yet, they operate as multi-specialists. Students who value expertise, according to Penney, will turn to fully qualified specialists rather than generalists or multi-specialists whose roles and qualifications are less clear.

(4) Student personnel practitioners whose duties are seen as nonessential have been relegated to peripheral and subordinate positions.

(5) The definition of student personnel work by its point of view rather than by its content or type of service has not helped the profession.

(6) Therefore, student personnel work, claims Penney, has not been, is not, and will not be recognized as a "vital aspect" of the academic community.

Therefore, it may be hypothesized that greater attention was focused on student personnel work shortly after

---

29 There is a considerable body of literature devoted to peripheral, boundary, or linking agents in organizations. For an application of this notion to student personnel work, see R. J. Silverman, "The Student Personnel Worker on the Boundary," Journal of College Student Personnel, XII, No. 1 (January 1971), pp. 3-6.

30 Thus, the researcher has attempted in this paper to explore central questions related to the content of deanin as opposed to the style or the philosophy.
such criticism in the late-sixties and earlier seventies. In fact, some authors have held that Penney's indictment was instrumental in leading to a resurgence in the literature and to a clarification of functions of student personnel workers.

Indictments have not been restricted to the field as a whole, however, as educators have scrutinized the roles and goals of chief student affairs administrators as well. One example emerged from the Campus Governance Project in which 19 colleges and universities were studied intensively over a 2-year period. As a follow-up to this study, Harold Hodgkinson reports that "a high level of animosity toward deans of students" emerged from over 900 interviews.

Hodgkins postulates that such animosity stems primarily from confusion regarding deans' basic roles and the perception of not being sufficiently strong and

31 It could be argued that the greater visibility of deans, changing rates and patterns of mobility, and the emergence of student development during, and shortly after, the period of student unrest were contributing factors to this heightened interest in student personnel work. Such theses are left to further research.


powerful and overly paternalistic. Hodgkinson also traces resentment toward student life deans to their involvement in students' minor problems (as opposed to institutional policy), a lack of commitment in fighting for programs, failure to control student unrest, leniency in disciplinary matters, and their closeness to students. At only two of the nineteen institutions did deans of students seem to attain the respect of staff members and faculty for their problem-solving capabilities and their reputation for openness. However, at no institution did the president reveal a vital relationship with his dean of students.  

In a companion article, T. R. McConnell supports Hodgkinson's claim that university presidents' attitude toward deans of students has always been ambiguous and McConnell states that student personnel workers are responsible for their peripheral status and are "missing the action" since they are not considered to be educationally necessary or useful. He goes on to challenge chief student personnel administrators:

34 See footnote No. 9, Chapter I.

Somehow, student personnel work must be conceived of and accepted as an integral part of the university, not something tacked on, not something incidental to the main course of a student's education, not something concerned only with social and emotional problems, and not something identified with relief from the intellectuality of the classroom . . .

McConnell continues while turning to the critical notion of institutional governance:

No one can predict just how institutions will be governed, organized, and administered in the future. However . . . student personnel workers will be far more peripheral than they are now if they play no part in redesigning the goals, structure, and processes of institutional governance.

As one considers the issue of roles for chief student affairs officers further and reviews the work of Thomas Dutton, et al., it is discovered that the perceptions of the dean of students' role by deans and presidents are generally in agreement. Deans, however, were found to be more likely than presidents to view the dean's primary responsibility to students rather than to the institution, and to favor student involvement in institutional governance.

---

36 Ibid., p. 57.
37 Ibid., p. 63.
In a follow-up study of 72 presidents and 128 chief student affairs administrators, Patrick Terenzini attempted to contribute to the reconceptualization of student personnel work by examining their programmatic goals and measuring the extent of congruency. Terezini's findings suggest that presidents and chief student affairs officers agree far more frequently than they disagree on the goals for student affairs programs. The two groups disagreed sharply, however, on the question of the extent to which student affairs administrators should be involved in the academic or intellectual development of students.39

In 1979, Karen Rigg reported on her investigation of the relationship between certain organizational variables—role perceptions, communication patterns, and the degree of influence on decision making—and the success of chief student affairs officers.40

The dynamic role dimensions she studied included: role clarity (understanding of their role); role congruence (degree of agreement between their expectations and those of their presidents); and role perception (their ability to understand and resolve their presidents' problems).


40K. T. Rigg, "The Role of the Chief Student Affairs Office as a Function of His Relationship with the President," N.A.S.P.A. Field Report, IV, No. 1 (Fall 1979), p. 3.
Rigg maintains that the communication patterns between vice presidents for student affairs and presidents serve as an indicator of the president's view of the chief student affairs officer and eventually impact upon this view as well as upon the relationship between these educators. In turn, these perceptions of the chief student affairs administrator shape the degree of influence which vice presidents for student affairs have on their presidents and the amount of information shared by the presidents.

Data gathered through questionnaires and structured interviews with five "successful" (defined as serving the same institution for at least five years) and five "unsuccessful" (terminated) chief student affairs administrators and their respective presidents suggest the following:

1. Successful chief student affairs officers demonstrate a significantly higher degree of role clarity, role projection, and role congruence than their unsuccessful counterparts;

2. Their communication patterns with their presidents differ significantly from those between unsuccessful chief student affairs administrators and their former presidents; and,

3. Their influence on decision-making is significantly higher than that of unsuccessful chief student affairs administrators.\(^\text{41}\)

\(^{41}\text{Ibid.}\)
Rigg, in conclusion, emphasizes the dynamic, interactional nature of the organizational variables and calls for further research including time-data studies.

In more future-oriented literature, Robert Brown portrays student affairs as a house of mirrors—a full of distortions, contrasting and grotesque images, and unable to distinguish its major features. Given this metaphor, Brown suggests a number of alternative roles for student affairs administrators to become more directly involved in the mainstream of academic life. Yet, these roles are largely normative, not descriptive or grounded in the day-to-day work of chief student affairs administrators. Brown concludes with a series of recommendations and comments that "change is in the air" as student personnel suffers through "Climacteric I" characterized by uncertainty, conflict, and the potential for growth and change.

In The Future of Student Affairs, Theodore Miller and Judith Prince advance a position similar to Brown's that student development is the responsibility of the entire

---


43 Ibid., pp. 38-41. These roles are outlined in Chapter I, p. 3.

academic community; therefore, they urge student personnel workers to achieve equal status with their academic colleagues as collaborators in the educational process. They add that it is the role of the student development educator to provide theories, principles, research, and expertise to integrate human development concepts into higher education and to share specific strategies with academicians. A variety of organizational models and strategies for student development centering around goal setting, assessment, instruction, consultation, milieu management, and evaluation are shared by Miller and Prince. Yet, the emphasis is upon programmatic goals in the areas of educational, career, emotional-social, and physical development as depicted in Figure 1. The student affairs officer—or student development educator as Miller and Prince would say—is portrayed as an integrator or coordinator of programs and strategies along the four developmental dimensions. Again, this model seems to be normative in nature rather than descriptive. The authors fail to catalog what student affairs administrators actually do.
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INTEGRATED STUDENT DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Another result of an attempt to discover and describe the roles and styles of student affairs administrators is Pieces of Eight by James Appleton, et al. Although the book is descriptive in the sense that some significant leadership experiences are shared with the reader, in another sense it is a normative treatment of what "deaning" should be all about by "eight who have been there"—namely, the past presidents of N.A.S.P.A.

From hours of interviews conducted by the Executive Director of N.A.S.P.A., the authors provide a listing of "summary characteristics" for the eight deans: similar work rhythms; higher energy levels; innovativeness; initiative; an ability to cope with daily pressures, uncertainties, and ambiguity; capable of bringing successful closure to complex tasks; good relationships with students, staff, and faculty; guided by administrative principles; able to analyze information; integrity; and competence.47

However, the primary emphasis of Pieces of Eight seems to be upon roles and styles of the chief student affairs administrator. Roles such as participation in the development and refinement of institutional policies, collaboration with students and colleagues to assess student needs, "just plain deaning," and others are

enumerated. Yet, no mention is made of the time devoted to policy-making, collaboration with others, and "just plain deaning." The authors, moreover, did not address the questions: With whom? Doing what? Spending how much administrative time?

In the chapter most related to the researcher's present concerns, Appleton et al., admit that:

Success and effectiveness in student personnel administration are elusive concepts, often measured or claimed in terms only indirectly related to, if not far removed from, the responsibilities, standards, and principles of the profession.49

In the absence of clear criteria or "hallmarks of success," Appleton and his colleagues single out obstacles to effective leadership and list some eighteen "kisses of death"—at least half of which are related to the more effective use of time.50 Examples include avoidance of decisions, bad judgment or timing, lack of contacts, procrastinating, misapplying important strategies, shortage of energy, and under and over-delegation.

Such anecdotal accounts are not uncharacteristic of the somewhat limited body of literature which surrounds the chief student affairs administrator. In order to more closely examine and more fully understand the research questions which were posited earlier, to address in a

---

48 Ibid., p. 51.
49 Ibid., p. 129.
50 Ibid., pp. 68, 124.
scholarly fashion the managerial work of chief student affairs officers, and to give greater meaning to this study, an exploration of additional knowledge bases related to the research questions is advocated.

A brief review of each of the following areas, with an emphasis upon the latter body of literature related to time allocations, comprises the duration of this chapter:

1. Institutional Context and Incentive Systems
2. Leadership
3. Managerial Work and Time Management

Institutional Context: From Multiversities to Incentive Systems

As one reviews the literature related to institutional contexts or observes the myriad of college campuses in the United States, two divergent conclusions emerge:

(1) American higher education is becoming more homogeneous; or (2) Institutions of higher education vary widely in their goals, organizational structure, size, demographic characteristics, governance patterns, and decision-making processes.

Following the Stanford Project on Academic Governance, J. Victor Baldridge et al., report that contrary to the views of several contemporary observers—Jencks and

---

Riesman, the Newman Report, Pace—an analysis of governance patterns shows a wide diversity among institutional types.

Baldridge and his colleagues synthesize the debate regarding homogeneity—institutional imitation, the shift from private to public institutions, and the movement of distinctive types of institutions into the academic mainstream—and admit that such arguments may seem pervasive.

Yet, in considering the principal notions of academic governance and professional autonomy, these researchers entertain the question: "Is the American higher education system more or less diverse, compared to what?" Baldridge et al. conclude that compared to both historical periods and systems elsewhere in the world, the current higher education system is "... more complex, diverse, and fragmented..." and argue that there are significant differences among higher education institutions based upon


54R. C. Pace, The Demise of Diversity: A Comparative Profile of Eight Types of Institutions (Berkeley: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1974).


56Ibid.
the key factors of environmental relations, professional task, and institutional size and complexity."

Given this view of educational diversity and the scope of this study, it may, then be worthwhile to explore the historical emergence of one major type of institutional type, the multiversity, as promulgated by Clark Kerr.

In *The Uses of the University*, Clark Kerr traces the growth of American universities from the academic cloisters of Cardinal Newman—"the high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and principle, of inquiry and discovery, of experiment and speculation"—to the modern research organisms of Abraham Flexner, "... an expression of the age as well as an influence operating upon both present and future." Kerr concludes that the large American university of today, just one dimension of institutional diversity which he labels the multiversity, is not a single community, but "... a whole series of communities and activities held together by a common governing board and related purposes." The notion of a multiversity, claims Kerr,

---

extends beyond a singular purpose, aim, and unity of spirit.

Historically, multiversities have grown out of "... the fragments, experiments, and conflicts characteristic of American higher education ... and have drawn on many strands of history." In tracing these historical strands, Kerr notes that the elitist German model gave academic respectability and content to the democratic, land grant idea created by the Morrill Act of 1862 and led to the melding of "pure intellect and raw pragmatism—an unlikely but successful alliance." 

Kerr also describes the emergence of the "federal grant" university over the past thirty years and highlights two phases of development marked by: (1) intuitive imbalance; and (2) bureaucratic balance. The latter phase, according to Kerr, calls for the development of a larger number of outstanding centers of graduate study and research and has gained impetus through the National Defense Education Act (1958), the National Educational Improvement Act (1963), and the National Science Foundation.

It is also significant to note that Kerr highlights three distinct academic peaks or mountain ranges where the dislike for scholarly isolation has led to clusters of intellectual colleagues near scientific, industrial, intellectual communities.

---

61 Ibid., pp. 15-17.
62 Ibid., p. 48.
and governmental enterprises—a kind of "ideopolis" to match the great "metropolis." These clusters located from Boston to Washington, on the California coast from Berkeley to Stanford to Pasadena, and in the midwest at the Big Ten institutions and Chicago, are characterized by a disproportionate number of Nobel laureates and members of the National Academy of Science and produce over three quarters of the doctorates conferred in the United States.

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (C.I.C.), Robin Wilson and Roger Wyman describe in greater detail the rich resources of the Big Ten institutions and the University of Chicago:

Each year these eleven universities with an aggregate physical plant worth some $5 billion, an academic community as populous as the State of Delaware working on 42 campuses in an area twice the size of the District of Columbia, and comprised of 33,000 faculty and half a million students, teach eight per cent of all Americans enrolled in four-year institutions, and graduate seven per cent of those holding the baccalaureate, nine per cent of all physicians, dentists, and lawyers, ten per cent

---

63 Ibid., p. 92.
64 Ibid.
of those awarded master's degrees, and twenty per cent of all doctorates. 65

Wilson further traces the development of this rather unique, eleven-member consortium which is sometimes described as an "intellectual common market guided by an intangible sense of collegiality, shared aspirations, and insights" 66 from early discussions between Indiana University President Herman Wells and James Perkins of the Carnegie Corporation through the current leadership of Frederick Jackson marked by ten-fold increases in outside funding sources during the period from 1970 to 1978. In addition, he addresses the question of how fiercely competitive independent research universities known for their athletic prowess and rival academic programs came to establish a tradition of inter-institutional cooperation.

Returning to Kerr, he too notes the collaborative efforts of C.I.C. institutions in merging library resources, creating a "common market" for graduate students, diversifying their research activities, and cooperating in foreign language ventures and programs in the arts.


66R. Wilson, "The Committee on Institutional Cooperation Celebrates its Twentieth Anniversary," The Ohio State University Monthly, (June, 1978), p. 5.
The C.I.C., in short, represents a unique consortium comprised of eleven complex universities which Kerr calls multiversities.

Although not all multiversities have combined in a cooperative fashion to attain a greater sense of purpose, Kerr maintains that multiversities are not directionless. In fact,

... they have been moving in clear directions with considerable speed; however, their direction has not been determined so much by the vision of universities as by their external environment.67

Finally, Kerr leaves the reader with three distinct images of the multiversity. First, he captures the multiversity as a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money68 rather than a organism whose parts and the whole are inextricably bound together. Much like the imagery of Karl Weick, the multiversity is seen as "loosely coupled;"69 that is, its many parts can be added or subtracted with little effect on the whole.

Secondly, if the "Idea of a University" was a village with its priests and the "Idea of a Modern University" was a one-industry town with its intellectual oligarchy,

67 Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 122.
68 Ibid., p. 20.
then, asserts Kerr in continuing the metaphor, the "Idea of a Multiversity" is a city of infinite variety characterized by less sense of community, less sense of confinement, less sense of purpose, but more ways to excel.70

Third, Kerr envisions the multiversity as a conservative institution within a dynamic environment. Given its turbulent surroundings,71 he advocates that the multiversity create an environment that gives to its members:

(1) A sense of stability
(2) A sense of security
(3) A sense of equity72

In order to fully understand the multiversity, James Perkins in The University in Transition, advocates a closer examination and balance of the three interconnected missions of research, teaching, and service—or the acquisition, transmission, and application of knowledge. First, however, warns Perkins, universities must overcome two primary concerns of external relations and internal cohesion—loss of identity and loss of capacity to manage their own affairs—as illustrated by four common fears of

70 Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 41.


72 Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 95.
the multiversity:

(1) Fear of uncontrolled growth;
(2) Fear of loss of direction;
(3) Fear of loss of principle;
(4) Fear of rigidity in an era of rapid change.\(^7\)

Perkins acknowledges an interest in theory, but cautions the reader that discussions of the university have come to a point where one must confront the problems of management and direction, that is, face some of the administrative challenges posed by the modern university. "We must," adds Perkins, "after all find a way to run this extraordinary institution."\(^7\)

Institutional management, according to Perkins, is the business of students, faculty, and administrators and,

... is not just a matter of deciding what would be good to do... Most importantly, it involves what is timely, what is possible, ... and what is wise. And wisdom requires an understanding of the spirit of a particular institution, the interests of its campus leaders, its financial prospects ... its priorities. There is no substitute for careful observation of people and events over time.\(^7\)

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 5.
\(^7\)Ibid., p. 51.
Perkins maintains that it is the administrator who is charged with managing the integration of these different and contrasting priorities and who is expected to be an agent for both stability and change. Furthermore, he claims, "it is the combination of institutional management and educational leadership that makes administration in higher education a unique and vital business."\(^{76}\)

Perkins conveys a picture of an emerging educational pyramid extending from departments through colleges, universities, states, regional consortia, national associations, and international lobbying bodies. Within this pyramid, he too, notes the existence of the C.I.C. bonded together through institutional initiative rather than by state governing boards. The C.I.C., in Perkins' view, has some distinct advantages over state compacts in terms of encouraging partnerships rather than adversarial relationships between public and private institutions and in having more zest and imagination.

With implications for leadership, Perkins concludes that the multiversity is just one level in this vast hierarchy of higher education. Nevertheless,

\[\text{76 I} \text{bid., p. 57.}\]
system of higher education . . . for the health of the system turns largely on the vitality of the university located in the middle of the entire scheme. And in order to maintain the university's vitality, those who work in the university must increasingly conduct themselves as members of a much larger community and as participants in activities at all levels of the system. 77

Another vantage point from which to view institutional contexts is through the curriculum. Content and Context, a series of essays written under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and edited by Carl Kaysen, traces the origins, substance, characteristics, and development of the college curriculum and looks at the question, what should college students learn? 78

In addition, its contributing authors make the distinction between liberal education and professional training and take a close look at the four major divisions of the undergraduate curriculum—the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the arts.

Taken as a whole, six of the eleven essays deal directly with the issue of the substantive content of the curriculum; the remaining five are concerned with the institutional context within which the curriculum is presented. Given the nature of this study, however, the chapters written by James Coleman and Norman Birnbaum

77Ibid., p. 88.

seem to have the greatest relevance.

In looking at society's growing demands upon the university, James Coleman notes a fundamental "structural defect" brought about by the transition from medieval universities characterized by a dense set of relations and maintained norms directed inward toward the community to the modern university. The latter, in the absence of this "inward force," has nothing to prevent the replacement of time previously devoted to teaching and community activities by scholarly research, consulting, or more externally oriented activities.79

To counterbalance this structural defect, claims Coleman, one needs a structural solution imbedded in the notion of time. In the medieval university, masters retained control over their time, however, their use of time was guided by community norms and formal rules. When these norms vanished as the community subsided, members of the university still retained control over their time; yet, the modern university is not organized in such a way to require regular time commitments, particularly from faculty members. The result of this disparity between regular salaries and no fixed time commitments, concludes Coleman, is a continuous erosion of time devoted to the university's primary activities, particularly teaching.

To correct this structural defect, Coleman offers three alternatives:  

(1) Changing the university's structure in the direction of a modern, purposive corporated organization and assuming more control over its members' time;  

(2) Abolishing the regular salaries of its members, allowing them to retain control over their time but to sell their services to the university as independent professionals; or,  

(3) Reconstructing the dense structure of informal community relations that provides the normative reinforcement of the community's central activities of teaching—that is, the collegial model as expounded upon by Paul Goodman and John Millett.

Norman Birnbaum also looks at institutional contexts in terms of the teaching role of the university, but in relation to its role as institutionalized social critic. In his essay "Students, Professors, and Philosopher Kings," Birnbaum traces the rise of the technocratic university, developed on liberal foundations, but organized to administer knowledge-producing units. According to

---

80 Ibid., pp. 384-385.


Birnbaum, the notion of self-governing academic units is consistent with liberal education; what has changed is the relationship of the university to its public constituency. Birnbaum's technocratic university produces knowledge for specific social agencies, markets, groups, and clients rather than addressing an educated public and transmitting a culture. In Birnbaum's words,

The technocratic university imparts specialized knowledge, but has no specific conception of the place of knowledge in a larger context. The technocratic university, in other words, has activities but not purposes . . . and is likely to lack clarity as to its functions.84

Despite the plethora of essays on institutional context and historical accounts of the growth of universities, until recently little research has focused on universities as organizations. In their volume Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971, Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch acknowledge that the distinctive features of American institutions of higher learning have gained increased research attention in recent years and that such institutions encompass a broad range of types. "Only recently, however, has there been both the interest and the methodology with which to study universities empirically."85

84Ibid., p. 480.
Gross and Grambsch attribute the increased interest in research to: (1) Greater attention given to universities following their war-time effort in producing weaponry; (2) the growth in student enrollments following the wars; (3) the outbreak of student unrest after 1964; and (4) the increased ability of social scientists to study the development of organizations.

Gross and Grambsch dismiss Goodman and Millett's image of universities as "communities of scholars" and treat such institutions as complex organizations. Given this premise, in formal organizations, as opposed to communities,

... the problem of goals and goal attainment has priority over all other problems. ... that is, the organization does not exist to provide persons with intrinsically satisfying interpersonal relationships. Rather, its existence is justified primarily by its orientation to a set of goals and it is continually judged by how successfully it attains those goals.\footnote{Ibid., p. 8.}

they claim that two kinds of evidence are necessary for one to claim that a goal is present:

(1) intentions—that is, what participants see the organization as trying to do and what direction they perceive it is taking;

(2) activities—refers to what participants are in fact observed to be doing; how they spend their time; how their resources are allotted.\(^90\)

It is somewhat ironic, given the emphasis of this study, that Gross and Grambsch dismiss the second form of evidence by maintaining that,

. . . to get data on how people spend their time on campus would demand extensive and very expensive contacts requiring diaries or personal interviews . . prohibitive in both time and money.\(^91\)

Therefore, they concentrate their 1960 and 1971 studies involving 68 universities and several thousand administrators \((n=7,200, 1964; n=4,500, 1971)\) on what they call goal congruence—that is, the degree of agreement between perceived and preferred goals—based upon a questionnaire concentrating on "is" and "should be" statements.

Almost concurrently, Richard Peterson and Norman Uhl were developing the Institutional Goals Inventory (I.G.I.) for the Educational Testing Service. This instrument, consisting of 90 statements referring to both outcome and

\(^{90}\) Gross and Grambsch, *University Organization*, p. 16.

\(^{91}\) Ibid., p. 18.
process goals in twenty areas, is an elaboration of the Gross and Grambsch questionnaire and has been used at some 300 colleges since it was first introduced in 1972.

In analyzing their data, Gross and Grambsch conclude that the rank ordering of actual goals and goals preferences remained largely unchanged over the period from 1964-1971. They do, however, note that there has been an increased emphasis on goal attainment reflecting a better understanding of institutional functions and a reshaping of universities' identities. Furthermore, a greater degree of internal coherence and congruency in the goals seems to provide insights into the underlying stability of educational institutions.

Much as Baldridge and his associates conclude, John Smart notes that "American colleges and universities have cherished a tradition of diversity in their myriad patterns of organizational goals, structures, and governance processes."^92

Yet, at the same time, Smart is not convinced of the value of the goal paradigm and is alarmed by the fragmented state of the art of literature in higher education due to

... the failure of higher education researchers to base their inquiries upon theoretical or conceptual models that could

---

provide greater consistency and continuity in the substantive areas selected for investigation and the subsequent results that emerge.93

Even prior to Smart, Petro Georgiou recognized the difficulties in conceptualizing organizational goals and understanding organizational behavior through them and asserted that a commitment to a particular goal paradigm has, in fact, retarded analyses of organizations.94

Therefore, Georgiou and Smart along with Clark and Wilson95 postulate that the incentive system is the critical variable affecting organizational behavior and suggest the use of the incentive system as a conceptual framework.

Drawing upon the earlier work of Chester Barnard and the notion that "the individual is the basic strategic factor in the organization,"96 the above authors provide the basis for what Georgiou calls a counter

93Ibid., p. 404.


paradigm. This model, stressing the centrality of the individual to the functioning and behavior of complex organizations, views organizations not as distinct social units given meaning by their goals but, much like Birnbaum's conceptualization, as marketplaces. According to these theorists "organizations can best be understood as outcomes of the complex exchanges between individuals pursuing a diversity of goals."\(^{97}\)

Returning to the work of Barnard which forms the foundation for these subsequent constructs, it is enlightening to note that he catalogs specific inducements and general incentives as follows:

(a) Material inducements are money, things, or physical conditions that are offered to the individual as inducements to accepting employment, compensation for service, reward for contribution . . .

(b) Inducements of a personal, non-materialistic character are of great importance to secure cooperative effort above the minimum material rewards essential to subsistence. The opportunities for distinction, prestige, personal power, and the attainment of dominating position are much more important than material rewards . . .

(c) Desirable physical conditions of work are often more important conscious, and more important unconscious, inducements to cooperation.

\(^{97}\)Georgiou, "Counter Pardigm," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, p. 308.
(d) Ideal benefactions—the capacity to satisfy personal ideals relating to non-material, future, or altruistic relations—are among the most powerful and neglected. They include pride of workmanship, sense of adequacy, altruistic service for family or others, loyalty to organization, etc. . . .

Barnard continues to explain his method of incentives as follows:

(e) By associational attractiveness I mean social compatibility in terms of social status, education, morals, ambition, etc. . . .

(f) Another incentive is that of customary working conditions and conformity to habitual practices and attitudes.

(g) Another is the opportunity for the feeling of enlarged participation in the course of events . . . the realization of the importance of the cooperative effort as a whole.

(h) The most intangible and subtle of incentives is called the condition of communion. . . . It is the feeling of personal comfort in social relations that is sometimes called solidarity, social integration, the gregarious instinct, or social security. It is the opportunity for comradeship, for mutual support . . .

Rather than conceiving of organizations as goal attainment instruments as do Gross and Grambsch, Barnard, Georgiou, Smart, Clark and Wilson transcend this image to construct a model of organizations as cooperative, incentive distributing devices.

98Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, pp. 142-148. The reader should note that Barnard devotes an entire chapter of his book to "The Economy of Incentives" from which this typology was abstracted.
Accepting this view, Clark and Wilson maintain that organizations exchange incentives—both tangible and intangible—for activities which individuals contribute to organizations. It is the function of executives or administrators to maintain a free exchange of activities and incentives. Therefore, the activities of individuals and organizations may be explained largely by understanding their incentive systems.

Toward this end, Clark and Wilson synthesize Barnard's work and postulate three categories of incentives:

(1) material incentives—tangible or monetary rewards such as wages or fringe benefits.

(2) purposive—intangible rewards derived from stated goals of an organization.

(3) solidary—intangible rewards derived from association and socializing.99

In turn, Clark and Wilson assign each of the above incentive categories to three corresponding, distinctive types of organizations based upon the principal type of incentive used to elicit cooperation and induce activities from their members. "Utilitarian organizations," for example, business firms and trade unions, rely on material incentives and monetary rewards. "Purposive organizations" such as social reform or protest groups are based upon their stated goals as ends to themselves. Finally, "solidary organizations," as illustrated by colleges and

universities, depend upon incentives related to associating and socializing such as a sense of congeniality, group membership, or identity.¹⁰⁰

Despite the specific applicability of this third typology to educational institutions, Smart admits that the concept of incentive systems has received little attention in the higher education research literature. A notable exception is a recent study by R. M. Fenker in which he developed a model to assess the similarity between the preferred incentives of faculty and faculty perceptions of the actual incentive structure operating in a given institution.¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, maintains Smart, the small sample for Fenker's study restricts the generalization of his findings.

In order to fill this apparent research void, Smart obtained data from A. E. Bayer's survey of over 53,000 faculty members in which they indicated on a 4-point scale the amount of importance they would attach to 17 personal and career opportunities.¹⁰²

In the Smart study, the institutional affiliation of each respondent was coded according to the Carnegie

¹⁰⁰Ibid.
Commission typology\textsuperscript{103} which is summarized in Figure 2.

The Carnegie typology is based upon the clustering of similar institutional characteristics such as degree offerings, financial support, student body, size, and research and runs the gamut from elite research-oriented multiversities to small liberal arts colleges with an emphasis on teaching.

Although Smart acknowledges that the Carnegie Commission typology is the most widely accepted, frequently used, and comprehensive classification scheme to date, he warns that this typology has not been subjected to rigorous assessment and concludes that its widespread usage is a result of its convenience and the prestige of the commission. He, therefore, calls for a refinement in the Carnegie typology for those committed to a further exploration of diversity in higher education.\textsuperscript{104}


\textsuperscript{104}Indeed, Smart reduces the number of specific institutional types from nine (he begins by using only four categories) to five without any appreciable loss in discriminatory or explanatory power. Also, see Baldridge, "Diversity in Higher Education" pp. 376-378. In the Stanford Project on Academic Governance, Baldridge and his associates collapsed the twelve Carnegie categories down to eight maintaining the overall outline of the Carnegie typology while reducing its categories to a more manageable number.
Category I: Doctoral-Granting Institutions

1. Research Universities I—included among the fifty leading universities receiving federal financial support for academic science and awarding at least fifty Ph.D.s annually

2. Research Universities II—included among the 100 leading institutions receiving federal financial support and awarding at least fifty Ph.D.s annually

3. Doctoral-Granting Universities I—receiving at least $3 million in total federal financial support and awarding at least forty Ph.D.s annually

4. Doctoral-Granting Universities II—awarding at least ten Ph.D.s annually;

Category II: Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

1. Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I—enrolling at least 2,000 students and offering comprehensive academic programs with at least two professional or occupational programs

2. Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II—enrolling between 1,000 (for public institutions) or 1,500 (for private institutions) and 2,000 students and offering comprehensive academic programs with at least one professional or occupational program (primarily former teachers colleges);

Category III: Liberal Arts Colleges

1. Liberal Arts Colleges I—included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions whose graduates received Ph.D.s at forty leading doctoral-granting institutions from 1920 to 1960 and scored five or above on Astin's selectivity index

2. Liberal Arts Colleges II—all other liberal arts colleges not included in the preceding category;

Category IV: Two-Year Colleges and Institutes

1. Two-Year Colleges and Institutes—postsecondary institutions awarding less than the baccalaureate degree;

Category V: Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions

1. Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions—instututions enrolling students in special purpose programs such as theology, art, and music design.

Carnegie Commission Typology

Figure 2

*This research concentrating on chief student affairs officers in C.I.C. institutions is concerned with this particular type.

In the Smart study, responses to 17 personal and career opportunities from 300 randomly selected faculty members from 9 institutional types were correlated and factor analyzed in order to determine the salient dimensions of faculty incentives. The result of the factor analysis indicate that there are six basic kinds of primary incentives which are summarized below:

(1) **Family Incentives**—An expression of interest in the quality of family life (for example, high quality schools and housing); these conditions are not directly associated with the immediate work environment and may be regarded as beyond the control of colleges and universities.

(2) **Research Incentives**—An interest in greater opportunities for expanded research activities as expressed by a desire for more time for research activities, smaller teaching loads, and better research facilities.

(3) **Administrative Advancement Incentives**—A preference for career opportunities that provide a better chance for professional advancement; that is, a desire for higher rank and more administrative responsibilities.

(5) **Interpersonal Incentives**—A desire to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships in the work environment as expressed by a preference for associating with better colleagues and students and an orientation toward social relationships within the profession.

(5) **Academic Rank Incentives**—An interest in career opportunities that provide a better chance for scholarly recognition and status within the academic community as reflected in greater desire for tenure, higher salaries, and higher academic rank.

(6) **Teaching Incentives**—A strong interest in teaching is expressed through a desire for
more opportunities to teach, less pressure to publish, and fewer administrative responsibilities.\textsuperscript{105}

In summary, Smart indicates that the six personal and career incentives reflect the range of professional responsibilities and the three primary kinds of activities—teaching, research, and service—traditionally associated with higher education. In addition, he adds the dimension of administration plus measures of interpersonal needs within the organization, personal and family comforts, and professional recognition and suggests that these six incentives are consistent with the three-fold Clark and Wilson typology.

In a final analysis, Smart attempts to link the notion of incentive systems to organizational diversity by suggesting that variations in the incentive system are related to the institutional affiliation of faculty members. He does so by citing three statistically significant discriminant functions which emerge from the data: (1) research stature; (2) family comfort; and (3) administrative stature. Smart also visually represents the association among institutional and incentive typologies by clustering academic organizations around preferred incentives of faculty in a graphic format. For example, the organizational cluster of large research universities

\textsuperscript{105}Smart, "Faculty Incentives," pp. 408-409. Again, the typology is summarized for the convenience of the reader.
indicates a basic interest in family comfort and academic recognition incentives, a more moderate interest in research incentives, and a lack of interest in teaching incentives.\textsuperscript{106}

Although Smart alludes primarily to the theoretical constructs proposed by Barnard, Clark and Wilson, he also comments that his incentive model appears to have much in common with the research literature regarding job satisfaction.

One such study is an investigation by Lewis Solmon and Michael Tierney of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational role congruence at twenty-two liberal arts colleges. Their findings support the fact that "satisfaction is an important part of organizational policy as well as a fundamental part of the quality of working life for the individual."\textsuperscript{107}

In addition, Solmon and Tierney provide nineteen aspects of job satisfaction, depicted in Table 2, as well as a four-part questionnaire focusing on behaviors. However, the pattern of responses indicates that presidents and academic deans are much more satisfied with the various aspects of their jobs than their student affairs

\textsuperscript{106}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 411-413.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT OF JOB</th>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Fiscal Affairs</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>87.5(14)</td>
<td>62.5(15)</td>
<td>44.9(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>100.0(16)</td>
<td>50.0(12)</td>
<td>63.3(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Status</td>
<td>93.8(15)</td>
<td>85.7(18)</td>
<td>66.7(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Status</td>
<td>43.8(7)</td>
<td>37.5(9)</td>
<td>57.1(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>75.0(12)</td>
<td>80.0(16)</td>
<td>56.3(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>100.0(16)</td>
<td>75.0(18)</td>
<td>85.7(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>76.9(10)</td>
<td>80.0(16)</td>
<td>58.7(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>81.3(13)</td>
<td>76.2(16)</td>
<td>64.6(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenial Relationships</td>
<td>87.5(14)</td>
<td>76.2(16)</td>
<td>70.8(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>50.8(8)</td>
<td>50.0(12)</td>
<td>53.1(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>31.3(5)</td>
<td>33.3(8)</td>
<td>30.6(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>62.5(10)</td>
<td>41.7(10)</td>
<td>34.7(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>100.0(16)</td>
<td>85.7(18)</td>
<td>85.4(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>100.0(16)</td>
<td>90.5(19)</td>
<td>81.3(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Relations</td>
<td>87.5(14)</td>
<td>37.5(9)</td>
<td>34.7(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>87.5(14)</td>
<td>66.7(14)</td>
<td>58.7(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Pursuit</td>
<td>6.3(1)</td>
<td>12.5(3)</td>
<td>18.4(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Time</td>
<td>18.8(3)</td>
<td>16.7(4)</td>
<td>14.3(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Time</td>
<td>6.3(1)</td>
<td>4.2(1)</td>
<td>12.2(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

counterparts. Such a finding would indicate a need for further research regarding what it is that student affairs officers do that leads to their lower level of job satisfaction.

Before turning to the literature related to leadership, it is important to emphasize once again in light of Kuhn's caution regarding paradigms that the incentive merely provides a construct—a filter through which one can view complex organizations and, perhaps, the leadership activities and time allocations of chief student affairs officers in this instance. It is maintained that the literature surrounding institutional contexts and incentives gives greater meaning to the questions explored and provides a contextual base for better understanding the data. Likewise, the leadership literature is turned to in order to enhance the meaning of this study.

The Leadership Literature:
Focus on Educational Leadership

As one reviews the leadership literature it is apparent that the monumental work of Ralph Stogdill not only stands out, but also summarizes much of the earlier treatment of this subject through the mid-seventies. Stogdill's Handbook on Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research begins with nine definitions of leadership ranging from "leadership as a focus of group processes" to "leadership as the initiation of structure." In short,
there is little agreement as to the meaning of leadership; nor is there agreement upon a theory of leadership.

Stogdill provides a brief overview of the following five theoretical orientations:

1. Great Man Theories
2. Personal-Situational Theories
3. Interaction-Expectation Theories
4. Humanistic Theories
5. Exchange Theories

Stogdill proceeds to identify several dominant leadership types—authoritative, persuasive, intellectual, executive, and representative—recognized by sixteen authors over the span of 1915 to 1951.

In addition, he concludes that the classical theories of management have suggested three primary functions of the executive—planning, organizing, and controlling—while other theorists have added coordinating, motivating, and supervising. Stogdill adds that behaviorists and researchers have further identified functions such as defining objectives, obtaining means for goal attainment, providing and maintaining group structure, and facilitating group performance.

Admittedly, the list of functions

---


109 Ibid., p. 27.

110 Ibid., p. 30.
could be infinite; however, in terms of this study related to time allocations, the classical notions of planning, organizing, and controlling may be quite helpful.

Stogdill goes on to consider leadership traits and a factor analysis of 26 leadership characteristics from 52 studies published since 1946. None of the factors speaks directly to time management skills, although such a skill may be embedded in characteristics such as administrative skills or leadership effectiveness.

Later chapters focusing on the values and satisfaction of leaders, leader behavior, and scales for describing leadership behavior fail to touch on time management. It is only in Chapter 13, "The Work Performance of Leaders," that Stogdill begins to analyze leadership in terms of time utilization. He cites the work of Wallace and Gallagher\(^\text{111}\) as an outstanding contribution in their analysis of job activities and behaviors of production supervisors. In this study of over 170 foreman, close to 3800 incidents were recorded and analyzed in terms of topic, location, contact persons, and behavior and classified under 41 major topics. Stogdill indicates that "no similar analysis of high-level

\(^{111}\)W. L. Wallace and J. V. Gallagher, Activities and Behaviors of Production Supervisors (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1952).
administrative behavior has been reported."\textsuperscript{112}

However, Stogdill and Shartle compared administrative and military work by studying the time allocations of executives and navy officers. Both profiles suggested that more time is spent with subordinates (34\%) than with superiors or peers and fifteen to twenty per cent of their time was devoted to inspections and reports.\textsuperscript{113}

Although according to Stogdill some later studies extended profiles to industrial organizations as well as to the military, no mention is made of such job analysis studies in education. He does acknowledge a number of research efforts involving business executives including Carlson's study alluded to later in this chapter. Carlson's is one of the few studies, however, that focused on time management \textit{per se} rather than leader behavior, job performance, or task/maintenance functions in general.

Stogdill reports that in the 1960's, Mahoney analyzed three earlier studies and found that the higher the level of the manager's position, the more hours per week he devotes to his job and the more time he spends planning and organizing rather than with the technical work of the organization. Much management time was spent, however,

\textsuperscript{112}Stogdill, \textit{Handbook of Leadership}, p. 156

both in personal contacts (meetings, one to one encounters, telephone conversations, and conferences) and in paperwork.\textsuperscript{114}

Despite the fact that Stodgill's work is considered a classic—and rightfully so as a comprehensive contribution to the field of leadership behavior—it is clear that minimal recognition (some seven pages) is given to time management under the rubric of time utilization, the major focus of this study.

However, another of the primary proponents of administrative leadership, Peter Drucker, has given greater attention to the critical notion of time in a number of publications pertaining to management practices. As early as 1954, he summarized the demands or tasks required of tomorrow's managers such as the need to view business as a whole, integrating the manager's function within it, the need to communicate information fast and clearly, the ability to take risks and delegate decision making, and the value of planning. Stated Drucker:

Managers who know how to use time will achieve results by planning. They are willing to think before they act. They spend a great deal of time on thinking through the areas in which objectives should be set, a great deal more on thinking through systematically what to do with recurrent problems.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} T. A. Mahoney, Building the Executive Team (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961).

In a later work, Drucker cites the particular characteristics of time—that is, that management alone has to live in both the present and the future. "The time dimension endows the managerial decision with its special characteristics. It is the act in which the manager integrates present and future."\textsuperscript{116}

From the classical works of Drucker it may be logical to take a quick glimpse of some of the recent ideas regarding the development and evaluation of administrative leadership in higher education.

In a recent work by Robert Lahti, critical questions are raised such as: What performance should be appraised? How should the appraisal be conducted?

"Even more important," states Lahti, "the demand for more humanistic assessment processes emphasizes that evaluation must consider not only the results of behavior but also how individuals get things done—that is, the behavior itself."\textsuperscript{117}

Lahti also provides his ideas on the purpose of administrative appraisal, goal setting, guidelines for conducting interviews, and conditions for a successful performance appraisal system. His insistence upon the


"how and "what" we do as administrators seems most appropriate, however, to the concerns of this research.

In his treatment of evaluating academic deans, G. R. Rasmusen proposes an instrument to evaluate twenty-two functions or personal traits which he believes are of critical importance for effective academic deans. Each of the items is described in behavioral terms and consists of four parts including a statement concerning the dean's function, a continuum built on this statement, an estimate of where the "ideal" dean should be on the continuum, and an assessment of the dean's actual performance. Although Rasmusen has done an excellent job of extracting twenty-two separate leadership functions ranging from administrative management and executive judgment to planning ability and handling conflict, the instrument still calls for subjective judgments rather than actual observations. At best, admits Rasmusen, it provides an identification of the values of the raters and some sense of how well the academic dean is meeting the expectations of others. The instrument tells us little about what the dean actually does.

One of the most elusive concepts linked to leadership, evaluation, and job performance is that of effectiveness. One of the best treatments of organizational

---

effectiveness is written by Kim Cameron. Initially, Cameron acknowledges difficulties in determining criteria for effectiveness, the problems related to normative versus descriptive criteria, and the contrasting views regarding personal perceptions versus organizational records.  

In reviewing some of the problems in assessing effectiveness in higher education, Cameron refers to an interview with Robert Maynard Hutchins:

The only way you can criticize a university, the only way you can appraise it, the only way you can determine whether it's good or bad or medium or indifferent, is to know what it's about, what it's supposed to be doing. If you don't know these things, you haven't any standard of criticism... [Universities] haven't any clear ideas of what they're doing or why. They don't know what they are.

The same criticism may hold true for our appraisals of individual administrators and their effectiveness. Researchers simply do not know what administrators do!

A further pitfall of higher education research as outlined by Cameron is the fact that the financial concerns of colleges and universities have led to research on efficiency rather than on effectiveness. Cost-output

---


and faculty-student ratios have outweighed measurements of effectiveness. The distinction between effectiveness and efficiency must be confronted in further research.

Finally, some of the interview questions generated by Cameron might be revised as follows to fit studies of individual effectiveness if perceptual data are called for:

(1) What individual characteristics do effective college administrators possess?

(2) What is it at this institution that makes a difference in terms of the effectiveness of student affairs administrators?

(3) What would have to change to make the dean of students more effective?

(4) Think of an administrator that you judge to be effective. What is it that this person does that makes this person effective?

Thus far, the area of educational leadership has been touched upon as it relates to humanistic assessment, appraisals of academic deans, and organizations' effectiveness. It may be appropriate at this point to turn to some of the body of literature focusing on the college president as an educational leader. Perhaps, in this way, some extrapolations can be inferred regarding vice presidents—that is, similar questions might be raised as they relate to the leadership of chief student affairs officers.

---

121 Cameron, "Organizational Effectiveness," p. 613.
One excellent treatment of this subject is published by the Association of American Colleges (A.A.C.) entitled, *The President as Educational Leader*. In the preface of this monograph, Frederic Ness, A.A.C. President, points out the paradox that exists in higher education: There is a strong need for educational leadership; yet, the task of providing it is extremely difficult. According to Ness, institutions of higher learning reflect the tensions and strains of other contemporary institutions. He concurs with W. Patrick Dolan that educational leaders, caught up by the demands of crisis management, are often ill-equipped to handle a complex set of new management problems.

In yet another chapter of this same monograph, John David Maguire cites five reasons for what he calls "enfeebled educational leadership" while concurring that "... the educational context in which we work often prevents our exercising educational leadership."  

---


(1) Disequilibrium of institutions caused by confusion over, or absence of, shared goals; 125

(2) A profound fragmentation of policy and curriculum;

(3) Ambivalence about authority;

(4) Differences in perceptions and expectations of the president's role by trustees, administrators, faculty, and students; and

(5) An absence of coherent educational vision and a consistent academic program.

In the spirit of Cohen, March, and Olsen, Maguire advocates the elimination of energies wasted on attempts to state shared goals noting that such efforts are unlikely to succeed. Instead, college administrators should concentrate on what he calls "agendas for action;" that is, primary attention should be on what tasks should be accomplished. Maguire also recognizes that educational leadership is increasingly exercised indirectly through tacit exchanges rather than through formal statements and written correspondence.

Finally, Maguire concludes that:

. . . a more socially productive understanding of leadership . . . is the energizing rather than the controlling of people. . . . This perspective clearly speaks more toward challenging, facilitating, enabling than

controlling, directing, and manipulating.\textsuperscript{126}

Returning to the work of Kerr, he characterizes the American College president as

\begin{quote}
... one of the marginal men in a democratic society ... on the margin of many groups, many ideas, many endeavors, and many characteristics ... but at the center of the total process.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

Drawing from the writings of Flexner, Hutchins, Dodds, Rudolph, Morrill, Millett, Wriston, Ashby, and Nevins,\textsuperscript{128} Kerr characterizes the university president as: hero-figure, creative leader, office-holder, educator, caretaker, creator, inheritor, initiator, consensus-seeker, wielder of power, persuader, pump, bottleneck, coordinator, expert executive, and tactful mediator.

In citing the requisite virtues of judgment, courage, and fortitude, Kerr cautions that:

\begin{quote}
The president of the multiversity must be content to hold its constituent elements loosely together and to move the whole enterprise another foot ahead in what often seems an unequal race with history.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

In short, Kerr agrees with Rudolph's assessment that the presidency is "... an office fraught with so many

\textsuperscript{126}Maguire, "The President as Educational Leader," p. 7.

\textsuperscript{127}Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 30.

\textsuperscript{128}Ibid., pp. 30-36.

\textsuperscript{129}Ibid., pp. 40-41.
perils, shot through with so many ambiguities, an office that is many things to many men."\textsuperscript{130}

In their book \textit{Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President}, Cohen and March\textsuperscript{131} capture the ambiguous, mundane, unspectacular nature of the college presidency and consistent with Mintzberg's\textsuperscript{132} thinking, note that their managerial work is marked by brevity, variety, and fragmentation—a series of daily and hourly judgments.

In their study of college presidents at some 42 institutions, Cohen and March looked at variables such as location of work, group size, initiation, contact patterns, and time allocations. Data gathering for their time allocation study occurred on two randomly selected days in the spring of 1970. Each president's activities were recorded by a personal secretary on both a daily schedule and a telephone log. Samples of these forms may be found in the appendix of this paper.

Cohen and March infer from their data that American college presidents divide their time among three major roles as reflected in their contact patterns and

\textsuperscript{130} Rudolph, \textit{The American College and University}, p. 423.


activities:

(1) administrator
(2) political leader
(3) entrepreneur

Furthermore, the data on the ways in which college presidents spend their time suggest that the allocation of time on the job is regulated by six major factors:

(1) Institutional size
(2) Daily and weekly cycles
(3) Expectations within the culture
(4) Role expectations
(4) Ambiguity
(6) Pleasures of the president

In discussing the above factors, Cohen and March note that presidents in larger institutions are: more authoritarian, less personal; more locally oriented, less external; more academically oriented and less mediating than their small college counterparts. Their daily and weekly cycles progress from administrative to political roles. Although their expectations are ironically much like those of faculty, the structure of their work is largely determined by the initiation of others. Role expectations are represented by the three types mentioned previously as well as the more regal figurehead role.

\[133^1\text{Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, p. 146.}\]
\[134^1\text{Ibid., pp. 147-148.}\]
The ambiguity, according to Cohen and March, results from little being known about the relationship between presidential success and leadership behavior. Finally, college presidents seek out emotional and personal perquisites and acknowledgements of their office. These needs, state Cohen and March, directly affect the overall pattern of time allocations and appear to be closely related to the notion of incentives as explored earlier in this chapter.

In short, the work of Cohen and March brings together strands from the literature related to institutional context, incentives, leadership, and time allocations. The latter is the subject of the final segment of this chapter.

Managerial Work and Time Allocations

Prior to addressing the issue of how time is allocated and reviewing the literature related to time management, an examination of the more general subject of the nature of managerial work is appropriate. Although a number of the critical questions were raised in Chapter I, a return to a concern for the meaning of work seems in order.

Studs Terkel provides, perhaps, the best layman's expose of work through his hundreds of interviews with a diversity of American workers. Yet, although his
vignettes bring alive the ambiguity of feelings of persons toward their work, Terkel's major contribution is the recognition that Americans are in search

... of daily meaning in their work ... a secure place in reality ... a meaning beyond the reward of a paycheck ... yet a happy few find a savor in their daily jobs.135

Thomas Green makes the distinction between job and work, however. A job is defined as what most people do to make a living, while work, as Green describes it, is quite different. It encompasses the production of products which sustain or enrich life and in which the worker's purposes and meanings are involved.136

In one of a series of essays relating work and education, Green builds on the above distinction as being essential for understanding the problems of modern work life. According to Green,

... work is basically the way that people seek to redeem their lives from futility ... a human necessity for leisure ... and a place where competence is displayed.137

Henry Mintzberg takes the reader beyond the general notion of work to the nature of managerial work by


focusing on the question: "What is it that managers do?" Mintzberg characterizes the current state of the art as follows: Very little is said or taught about the work of managers; little is known about what is involved in being a boss. Mintzberg advocates going beyond the various prescriptions for managerial success (which focus largely on attitudes) and a reliance on what people think and say about their supervisors and themselves (which constitutes folklore). In short, he calls for systematic research involving observational studies in order to identify the range of relationships, functions, and roles in the manager's universe.

In reviewing the broader literature concerned with executive behavior, Mintzberg concurs with Sune Carlson and Mason Haire that the literature is largely concerned with general speculation about the functions of executives rather than with actual descriptions of managerial work.

Furthermore, Mintzberg provides an excellent overview of eight schools of thought related to the manager's

---

138 Mintzberg, Managerial Work.

139 S. Carlson, Executive Behavior (Stockholm: Strombergs, 1951).

job:

(1) Classical School
(2) Great Man School
(3) Entrepreneurship School
(4) Decision Theory School
(5) Leader Effectiveness School
(6) Leader Behavior School
(7) Leader Power School
(8) Work Activity School\textsuperscript{141}

Much like Cohen and March, Mintzberg notes the distinguishing characteristics of managerial work and identifies ten roles which are summarized in Table 3.

Mintzberg also develops a contingency theory of managerial work based upon environmental, job, person, and situational variables interacting with basic managerial role requirements and the basic characteristics of managerial work. This view is depicted in Figure 3.

In addition, he identifies five time-related factors influencing the manager's work:

(1) Periodic Patterns
(2) The Change-Stability Cycle
(3) The Period of Threat

\textsuperscript{141} Mintzberg, Managerial Work, pp. 8-16. Note that the latter school, work activity, most closely resembles the approach taken in this study. It involves inductive reasoning, the systematic sampling and observation of work, and the emergence of propositions supported by empirical data.
# TABLE 3

**SUMMARY OF MANAGERIAL ROLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Identifiable Activities from Study of Chief Executives</th>
<th>Recognition in the Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figurehead</td>
<td>Symbolic head; obliged to perform a number of routine duties of a legal nature</td>
<td>Ceremony, status requests, solicitations</td>
<td>Sometimes recognized, but usually only at highest organizational levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Responsible for the motivation and activation of subordinates; responsible for staffing, training, and associated duties</td>
<td>Virtually all managerial activities involving subordinates</td>
<td>Most widely recognized of all managerial roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Maintains self-developed network of outside contacts and informers who provide favors and information</td>
<td>Acknowledgments of mail; external board work; other activities involving outsiders</td>
<td>Largely ignored, except for particular empirical studies (Sayles on lower- and middle-level managers, Neustadt on U.S. Presidents, Whyte and Homans on informal leaders)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informational**

| Monitor    | Seeks and receives wide variety of special information (much of it current) to develop thorough understanding of organization and environment; emerges as nerve center of internal and external information of the organization | Handling all mail and contacts categorized as concerned primarily with receiving information (e.g., periodical news, observational tours) | Recognized in the work of Sayles, Neustadt, Wrapp, and especially Aguilar |

---

### TABLE 3a (Continued)

#### SUMMARY OF MANAGERIAL ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Function Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disseminator</strong></td>
<td>Transmits information received from outsiders or from other subordinates to members of the organization; some information factual, some involving interpretation and integration of diverse value positions of organizational influencers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Forwarding mail into organization for informational purposes, verbal contacts involving information flow to subordinates (e.g., review sessions, instant communication flows) |

| **Spokesman** | Transmits information to outsiders on organization's plans, policies, actions, results, etc.; serves as expert on organization's industry |

|       | Board meetings; handling mail and contacts involving transmission of information to outsiders |

| **Decisional** | Searches organization and its environment for opportunities and initiates "improvement projects" to bring about change; supervises design of certain projects as well |

|       | Strategy and review sessions involving initiation or design of improvement projects |

|       | Implicitly acknowledged, but usually not analyzed except for economists (who were concerned largely with the establishment of new organizations) and Sayles, who probes into this role |

---

TABLE 3a (Continued)

SUMMARY OF MANAGERIAL ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance Handler</th>
<th>Resource Allocator</th>
<th>Negotiator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible for corrective action when organization faces important, unexpected disturbances</td>
<td>Scheduling; requests for authorization; any activity involving budgeting and the programming of subordinates' work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and review sessions involving disturbances and crises</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed in abstract way by many writers (e.g., management by exception) but analyzed carefully only by Sayles</td>
<td>Little explicit recognition as a role, although implicitly recognized by the many who analyze organizational resource-allocation activities</td>
<td>Largely unrecognized (or recognized but claimed to be nonmanagerial work) except for Sayles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Variables: Characteristics of the milieu, the industry, the organization

Job Variables: The level of the job and the function supervised

Person Variables: Personality and style characteristics of the incumbent in the job

Situational Variables: Temporal features of an individual job

Basic Managerial Role Requirements

Basic Characteristics of Managerial Work

One Manager's Work

A CONTINGENCY VIEW OF MANAGERIAL WORK

FIGURE 3a

Although Mintzberg acknowledges that there are a vast array of findings about variations in managers' jobs, eight natural groupings are suggested by his analysis. These job types are represented below in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

**EIGHT MANAGERIAL JOB TYPES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Job Type</th>
<th>Key Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact man</td>
<td>Liaison, figurehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political manager</td>
<td>Spokesman, negotiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Entrepreneur, negotiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Resource allocator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time manager</td>
<td>Disturbance handler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team manager</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert manager</td>
<td>Monitor, spokesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Manager</td>
<td>Liaison, monitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 127.

Mintzberg concludes that "so-called" management science has done little to help managers to manage--or, more importantly, to understand their work. Yet, he acknowledges the difficulties in using analytical procedures to study work processes that are not well understood. Nevertheless, he calls for the movement of managerial studies from an art form to a science by

*142* Ibid., pp. 122-126.
closely observing and analyzing the nature of managerial work.\textsuperscript{143}

As a prelude to the time management literature and as a means of looking at the state of the art historically, it may be appropriate to mention the scientific management school of Frederick Taylor\textsuperscript{144} whose work provided the foundation for later time and motion studies.

More recently, but in the same vernacular, Owen Gilbert outlines two primary aspects of "work study"—concerned with all of the resources with which a manager must deal:

(1) Method study—The "how" of work; concerned with how work is done and how it can be done better. There is a preoccupation with eliminating wasted time, materials, movements, skills, capacities, and other resources.

(2) Work measurement—Concerned with the measurement of time, the duration of work, and its frequency.\textsuperscript{145}

Gilbert also addresses the subject of systematic or random sampling and the number of observations required

\textsuperscript{143}For an excellent example of an application of Mintzberg's framework to managerial positions in education, see N. Pitner, "Descriptive Study of the Everyday Activities of Suburban School Superintendents: The Management of Information. (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1978)

\textsuperscript{144}F. W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Row, 1911).

for "work study." He characterizes the emphasis on random sampling as an administrative nightmare that is often unnecessary.

Thus far, the work of Sune Carlson has been referred to on several occasions. Carlson's work may be considered as a cornerstone study for subsequent observational research pertaining to executives. In addition, Carlson provides an excellent portrayal of the early state of the art and serves as a reference for some of the literature of the time.

Carlson tells us that the purpose of the study which grew out of the Administrative Problems Study Group founded in the mid-1940's was not prescriptive, nor was it intended to merely describe typical management behavior. Instead, it was designed "... as a detailed case study approach to find common patterns of behavior by means of scientific, empirical research."\textsuperscript{146}

In Executive Behaviour, Carlson is seemingly critical of the general state of the art in the social sciences--namely the emphasis of research reports upon results and generalizations rather than attention given to data gathering, methodology, and theoretical assumptions. He calls for a more scientific, imaginative approach to administrative studies.

\textsuperscript{146} Carlson, S., Executive Behavior, (Stockholm: Stromberg, 1951.) p. 10.
In this light, Carlson's research is planned and reported in such a way to encourage further testing of findings and conclusions. He concurs with Warner and Lunt that:

Research is fundamentally a learning process for the scientist who does it; if what he learns is to be successfully transmitted to others, he must be able to communicate how and why he did it. Those who understand are then able to test his methods and conclusions by repeating what he did. 147

In reviewing earlier studies, Carlson notes that much of the literature dealing with chief executives has focused on general principles governing the way in which management should be performed. Studies of an observational or descriptive nature have been much more limited. He does, however, highlight a 1941 study of the working patterns of city managers and their reported time allotments. Mention is also made of a self-observational study of a Washington bureau chief in 1947 and attempts to measure executive work load in a government office by means of a daily report card of activities that same year. In the latter study by Glasser 148—which Carlson admits has striking similarities to his own work—an investigative technique is developed to determine how much time could be saved by delegation to subordinates, direct


contacts, and other methods.

Given the minimal number of observational studies, the primary task of Carlson's work was to devise and test a technique for observing, describing, and diagramming the work of executives.

His actual method of classification—borrowed from Barnard's system of specialization—included: (1) place of work; (2) contacts with persons and institutions; (3) techniques of communication; (4) the nature of questions handled; and (5) the kind of action involved. Therefore, for every executive action observed, attempts were made to collect data related to each of the above categories. Furthermore, the fifth category was broken down into nine subheadings to give greater refinement to the kind of work being performed—getting information, systematizing information, making decisions, confirming or correcting decisions of others, giving orders, advising and explaining, inspecting and reviewing, executing, and personal development. 149.

Carlson's data gathering techniques varied with the nature of the data and the executive being studied. Some data were recorded by private secretaries or telephone operators while other recordings were made directly by the chief executive or personal assistants. Carlson

149 Carlson, Executive Behaviour, p. 38.
notes that attention was given to being as unobtrusive as possible, attempting to not interfere with or influence usual work patterns and behaviors. He claims that the research was quite successful in this respect.

A special form was devised for registering working time, location, and personal contacts. Yet, much of the responsibility for data collection rested with secretarial personnel or self-reports. In addition to this shortcoming, Carlson indicated that it was extremely difficult to obtain exact measurements of time outside of the firm, time working alone in the office undisturbed by calls or appointments, and therefore, total working time. Although he was somewhat more successful in gathering data regarding contact persons and communications techniques, the classification of "kinds of action" proved to be problematic despite the development of a standardized questionnaire to be filled out by the chief executives. Rather than asking the subjects to register actual behaviors (doing what, where or with whom), this last category required more of an opinion. As an illustration, respondents were asked to decide between questions of "policy" or "application" or matters of "finance" or "development." This subjective weakness led to tentative conclusions and acknowledgement that

both the concepts and the recording techniques needed further refinement.

The actual findings are not reported in detail here due to the diversity of firms and executives involved as well as the fact that the results may only be meaningful taken in the context of the Swedish economy. Briefly, it was found that these executives spend about twenty percent of their time in internal and external inspections, about forty percent of their time acquiring new information, and the duration of their time divided equally among advising and explaining, making decisions, and giving orders. Statistical diagrams and contact charts are supplied by Carlson reflecting the place and time of work and communications patterns.

Beyond these data, Carlon's analysis reveals a number of problematic areas for chief executives which may be of more general interest. These "administrative deficiencies" include: activities outside of the firm; the lack of time for inspecting and visiting production works and other offices; the lack of time for reading and contemplation; and the excessive nature of the total working load. 151

Carlson concludes that he "... succeeded as an investigator, not as a doctor--that is, in observing and interpreting behaviours rather than in diagnosing and
By helping the chief executive in the task of self-observation and by developing a method to record activities in a systematic manner, Carlson provided the underpinnings for further observational research. Perhaps, more importantly, Carlson admits the shortcomings of his research and exposed some of the difficulties in making observational studies of non-manual professional work in an applied field. Finally, much like Mintzberg, Carlson urges the development of a theory of executive action based on systematic empirical research.

Unfortunately, calls by Carlson and Mintzberg for more empirical research generally have not been followed by substantive efforts. A notable exception is the work of John Robinson. In the mid-sixties, Robinson completed a study of over 2000 Americans between the ages of 18 and 65 who kept diaries of their activities for a single day between November 1 and December 15, 1965 in addition to data collection in the winter and spring of 1966.\footnote{J. P. Robinson, How Americans Used Time in 1965 (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1977).}

In a follow-up volume which Robinson labels a social-psychological analysis, he stresses:

\begin{quote}
In addition to providing accurate and detailed quantitative estimates of where our time goes, considerable attention is devoted
\end{quote}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 112.}
to interpreting what these time allocations mean to people. Time periods vary, both across activities and across people, in the gratifications they provide, in the degree of psychological constraint involved, in the human energy expended and in their connection with larger life purposes.\footnote{154}

Robinson raises a number of interesting methodological questions and suggests a social-psychological conceptual framework, closely resembling Mintzberg's contingency view, in which time use is portrayed as being determined by four sets of factors:

1. personal
2. role
3. resource
4. environment\footnote{155}

Robinson concludes by stating that time use data give us insights into the values of society, individuals in it, their places of work, and their goals. Furthermore, what people do with their time is of ultimate concern to every society. Even if it only enters indirectly or unconsciously into policy deliberations, the matter of whether time is wisely or unwisely spent bears heavily on the quality of societal life... there seems little question that increasingly reliance will be placed on time-use data for social policy purposes.\footnote{156}


\footnote{155} Ibid., p. 28.

\footnote{156} Ibid., pp. 3, 195.
In stark contrast to the scholarly work of Stogdill and Drucker and the empirical studies of Carlson and Robinson is the bulk of the literature which is popularly referred to as time management literature.

Much of the literature focuses on the need for effective time management and offers advice for prioritizing tasks. One of the leading contemporary authors is Alan Lakein who offers a variety of hints on how to gain control of one's life. Life is represented as a never ending stream of activities constantly replenished by the environment. Rather than feeling at the mercy of the environment, Lakein advocates a form of life planning to bring the future into the present allowing one to do something about their future. Using the metaphor of a professional photographer, he makes it clear that given certain skills and techniques, anyone can bring their life into focus and deal with the "fuzzy nature" of the future.

Through a series of techniques—lifetime goal statements, "to do lists," the application of the 80/20 rule (Pareto's Principle), A-B-C prioritizing—one can effectively "make time" for the most important tasks, according to Lakein. Finally, the constant application of Lakein's question—"What is the best use of my time right now?"—may allow one to gain greater control and

create more freedom in their life.

It is quite likely that the reader of time management literature will encounter a myriad of variations and elaborations of Lakein's work. Edwin Bliss\textsuperscript{158} utilizes a similar A-B-C prioritizing system and makes the basic distinction between efficiency and effectiveness.

In a workbook format similar to Bliss' publication, Jim Davidson offers a two-part volume. The first section is devoted to the practical techniques of structuring time; the second, deviating slightly from other time management approaches, concentrates on human behavior and poses two critical questions:

(1) Why do individuals fail to manage time effectively even when they know how to do so?

(2) How do you create a working environment which stimulates time-saving attitudes, communication, and cooperation.\textsuperscript{159}

Davidson also includes techniques for goal setting, daily and weekly planning, and structuring meetings as well as a concluding section listing forty ways to save time.

\textsuperscript{158} E. C. Bliss, Getting Things Done: The ABCs of Time Management (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976).

\textsuperscript{159} J. Davidson, Effective Time Management: A Practical Workbook (New York: Human Services Press, 1978).
A perusal of the popular literature may also lead one to conclude that by and large it is written for the male executive. Therefore, Donna Goldfein\textsuperscript{160} provides Everywoman's Guide to Time Management. Although distinct in its language and, to a lesser degree its content, the approach is similar to the aforementioned technique books. Unfortunately, Goldfein's attempt also falls short in terms of theory.

One book which approximates the development of a theory through the delineation of a set of some fifteen principles is written by Sidney Love.\textsuperscript{161} Each chapter is built around a basic time principle, explained and illustrated by case studies. However, Love reverts to the much utilized approach of providing practical techniques; each chapter also includes several guidelines to time mastery.

In a refreshing break from the technique-oriented literature, Ross Webber refutes the value of how-to texts and provides more of a philosophical treatment of the notion of time. Asserts Webber,

\begin{quote}
Fostering organizational flexibility, creativity, and concern for the future involves more than just the efficient use of
\end{quote}


time today. It requires a philosophical approach to time and management: an understanding of how managers think and behave and how attitudes about time affect decision-making and planning.162

Webber proceeds to outline four goals for his publication--objectives which are consistent with the above:

(1) To give managers greater insight into self, perspectives on time, and behavior at work;
(2) To provide practical methods for saving time and managing it more effectively;
(3) To increase one's understanding of time's effect on managerial behavior and decision-making;
(4) To develop a personal philosophy of time and management that will reconcile past, present, and future tensions.163

Prior to concluding with a series of analytical insights164, Webber considers the rich imagery and mythology which surround time--the hourglass, the scythe and Father Time, Chronos devouring his children, winged creatures--with the emphasis upon symbols of consumption, disappearance, and decay. In short, a number of metaphors and quotations enhance Webber's treatment of time.

---

163 Ibid.
164 For example, the need for a certain sense of attachment. Webber asserts that attachment is often found in persons who accomplish greatness while refusing to be consumed by current events and present time demands.
F. D. Barrett, too, amplifies the reader's awareness of time by reviewing the plethora of time metaphors and contrasting these images with practical characteristics and observations about time.

Barrett captures time as a "neglected dimension in both theory and practice . . . representing a wide-open new management frontier needing new concepts, practices, and research;" yet, he cautions the reader that "the conquest of time takes analysis, thought and imagination."\textsuperscript{165}

It is Barrett's contention that increasing managerial time pressures have arisen from the complexity of our society and the faster moving pace of our environment. In spite of growing concern over time in the business world as reflected in newly emerging literature, empirical studies, and the inclusion of time management as a subject in executive development programs, attempts to master time are just beginning.

Not to be outdone by his colleagues who list time wasters and how-to techniques, Barrett cites ten common sources of time management problems. "Fire-fighting" is one such problem which stands out among other problems such as procrastination, meetings, and reports--major dilemmas faced by executives and student personnel

Another implicit reference to higher education may be Barrett's observation that a high degree of time consciousness exists in certain industries such as life insurance; on the other hand, he notes, one could spend years in other occupations without ever encountering reference to the idea of time management.

In the researcher's opinion, one of the best contemporary books on time management is R. Alec Mackenzie's *The Time Trap*. According to Mackenzie, time is characterized as a critical, unique resource which cannot be accumulated like money or stockpiled, is irretrievable, and inelastic. In Mackenzie's view everyone is forced to spend time at a fixed rate and to continually fight internally generated time wasters.

Although educators tend to feel that their problems with time are unique, Mackenzie contends that there is a certain universality, at least among what he calls time wasters. To illustrate his point he generates a list of time wasters for four distinct groups of top managers—Canadian military officers, black religious leaders, German managers, and college presidents. It should be pointed out that there were a number of common elements under each executive type. However, given the purview of this study, only those sixteen items identified by college presidents are listed in Table 5.
### TABLE 5a

**TIME WASTERS OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled meetings</th>
<th>Poor filing system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled meetings</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of priorities</td>
<td>Procrastination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to delegate</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of people</td>
<td>Junk mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of planning</td>
<td>Outside (civic) demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of procedure for routine matters</td>
<td>Enhancing the democratic process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mackenzie goes on to quote an anonymous participant following a management institute for college presidents who concluded:

Perhaps one of the most significant concepts I gained is that it is not a sin or a poor use of time for an administrator to sit, think, and plan rather than be an activist. The one concept has transformed my whole outlook.\(^{166}\)

Also in the realm of college presidents, Mackenzie shares a profile of these executive educators using Kostick's Perception and Preference Inventory.\(^{167}\)

Later in his treatment of self-managing techniques, Mackenzie reproduces a time profile of six college presidents and their cabinets developed in 1972. In particular, the profile of the dean of students reflects the following time allocations:

1. Counseling—forty per cent
2. Co-curricular activities—twenty-five per cent
3. Administration—fifteen per cent
4. Services—ten per cent
5. Governance—ten per cent\(^{168}\)

It should be pointed out, however, that these data were derived from averaging estimates of individual deans.


\(^{168}\)Mackenzie, *The Time Trap*, p. 20.
and those of their presidents.

Much like the work of earlier authors cited, Mackenzie develops an executive time inventory as a means of performance self-evaluation, to reveal work patterns, to expose time wasters, to establish priorities, to reveal discretionary time, to require planned allocation of time, and to provide for a daily estimate of effectiveness. Along with the inventory form, Mackenzie provides a form for daily time analysis and instructions for the analysis process.

Latter portions of *The Time Trap* are devoted to techniques related to planning and organizing work, blocking interruptions and time wasters, decision-making, delegating, managing subordinates' time, and working with secretarial and support personnel. Finally, rather than leaving the solution-minded reader hanging, Mackenzie's appendix is devoted not only to his most frequently encountered time wasters, but to their possible causes and solutions.

In an excellent companion piece entitled *New Time Management Methods for You and Your Staff*, Mackenzie compiles a highly readable workbook enhanced by attention to the meaning and importance of time, time management principles, administrators' profiles, time wasting categories presented in schematic diagrams, intervention techniques, and a special section on time management
Nevertheless, the topic of time management has been relatively neglected in the realm of education, particularly higher education. In one of the few articles discovered in professional association journals, W.C. Price deals with the topic of "Time Management for Admissions Officers and Registrars." Basically, Price borrows heavily from the work of Drucker and Mackenzie. Within the context of declining enrollments, diminishing budget support, and renewed interest in accountability and efficiency in higher education, Price builds a case for time as the most critical resource for admissions counselors and registrars. Despite the unscholarly treatment of the topic, he does raise the basic question of what registrars and admissions officers do with their time, while enumerating a variety of time wasters for college administrators and citing Mackenzie's six imperatives of time management.

In "The Time Management Ladder," M. J. Sexton and K. D. D. Switzer address their remarks not to


colleagues in higher education, but to secondary school principals, supervisors, and teachers. Their key notion seems to be the distinction between educational leaders and educational managers based on their utilization of time. The authors combine a number of rules of time management with a series of diagrams of a time management ladder, weekly logs, a time management-administrative style continuum, and a checklist to avoid the pitfalls of time wasting. Basically, the ladder concept is a visual adaptation of the A-B-C system proposed by Lakein and Bliss.

Much in the same light, a publication by Donald Halverson of the San Mateo Board of Education lists eight rules of effective time management ranging from determining goals and objectives in all major aspects of life to not allowing one's time to be consumed by the demands of others.172 This rule-oriented, normative approach is apparently quite characteristic of a majority of the literature written for secondary school educators.

Yet another example is provided in the Phi Delta Kappan under the rubric of "Time is Money."173 Although put in the form of "suggestions," the author succinctly


lists seventeen "do's" and "don't's" for the school administrator interested in making more effective use of time allocations.

Another treatment of the monetary nature of time is presented by Curtis Jones in the Harvard Business Review. Jones claims that the minimization of demands on executive time deserves as much attention as we now devote to profit maximization.¹⁷⁴

The popular literature of the association and trade journals is complemented by a monograph for school administrators published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (N.A.S.S.P.). Gilbert Weldy enumerates the following purposes of his booklet to enable administrators to:

1. Understand their own attitudes and behaviors regarding their use of time;
2. Recognize the practices which most effectively use time;
3. Incorporate sound principles of time management into their administrative strategies; and,
4. Provide a personal philosophy for managing their own responsibilities in the best interest of time.¹⁷⁵

Weldy cites a 1965 N.A.S.S.P. study in which administrative planning was found to be the most time consuming activity of principles. The greatest time waster was "too many meetings" as registered by almost three-quarters of the administrators who responded. Requests for information, uncontrollable interruptions, conflict resolution situations, drop-in appointments, and the over-involvement of staff and parents constituted major aggravations and time wasters for the 42 administrators surveyed. In all, Weldy enumerates 25 time wasters as reported by principals in the 1965 study and makes reference to what Mackenzie calls the "paralysis of analysis"--the myriad of channels and flow charts for decision-making that constitute a time consuming maze as depicted in *The Time Trap*.

Weldy does offer some suggestions for managing time beginning with a time log to reconstruct conversations, telephone calls, conferences and other commitments. He stipulates that recording should be accurate to the minute and include descriptive notes on the "who" and "what" of each event in order for educators to self-analyze their time allocations. Attention is given to this first step in learning to use time productively and wisely to avoid the pitfalls of procrastination.

Weldy suggests a task list as a means of better understanding how time is used as well as a means of
establishing priorities—the second step in managing time. Follow-up chapters deal with budgeting time by balancing availability and keeping appointments, the art of delegating authority, setting deadlines, developing a positive attitude, the importance of concentrating on administrative tasks, controlling "other imposed" time, recognizing and responding to fatigue, time allocations for meetings, reading with discrimination, using clerical personnel wisely, the significance of advanced planning, and using time to build interpersonal skills and personal resources.

Weldy concludes his monograph by calling upon educators to control the various aspects of their administrative role, to condition colleagues, and to "exercise the highest form of self-discipline—that is, to manage time effectively and treat it as a valuable resource."  

In a more scholarly approach to what educational administrators do, Jane Hannaway's dissertation focuses on the effects of uncertainty upon managerial behavior.

The specific questions addressed are:

(1) How does uncertainty affect the amount of interaction a manager initiates?

(2) Do managers in positions of greater uncertainty exert more or less control over their work?

176 Ibid., p. 51.
(3) Is there a relationship between the degree of uncertainty in a job and the types of tasks that managers initiate? 177

Hannaway explores these questions using a sophisticated theoretical framework and six weeks of data collection through questionnaires, the random sampling of work activities, and unstructured observation. Her sample included fifty-two administrators in a California school district.

Hannaway's findings suggest that all managers, regardless of level, tend to work in a reactive rather than in a proactive or initiating mode. However, upper level educators in positions of greater uncertainty seem to be more initiating. As reported by Hannaway, the findings also show that managers seem to fall into two somewhat distinct groups differentiated by either routine or non-routine tasks. Finally, Hannaway conveys a picture of upper level managers as administrators with heavy demands, working under highly uncertain conditions—a picture very much in keeping with Cohen and March's portrayal of college presidents and Mintzberg's image of managerial work as elaborated upon earlier.

Despite the contributions of Hannaway, Cohen and March, Mintzberg and a select group of time management

proponents, one could easily conclude, as two researchers at the University of Minnesota do, that:

Unfortunately, the field of time management currently does not have a highly developed body of literature, systematic lines of inquiry, or sets of principles. Although authors of articles and books in the field tend to focus on the need for effective time management, the identification of time wastage, common sense advice on restructuring and reorganizing work, and procedures for analyzing the work process in a time context, little of a systematic or empirical nature has been undertaken. This has been particularly true in the field of educational administration.178

Recognizing the limited state of the art of time management and the need for systematic, empirical research, Lewis and Dahl adapted the design of an earlier study of hospital administrators179 to the educational environment. What emerges is the Extensor methodology180—an exciting, innovative way of approaching time allocation studies later used by Hannaway.

Given limitations of traditional work measurement and work sampling (observer bias, observer reliability, complex forms which interrupt the work process, cyclical sampling bias based on known intervals), the researchers


179 S. Davis, et al., Time Management in a Hospital Environment (Minneapolis: Extensor Corporation, 1974).

180 The Extensor methodology is outlined in detail in Chapter III.
make use of a new technique in the field of random sampling called the Extensor Unit. This device consists of a random impulse generator which emits thirty signals per eight hour day, a code list for classifying data pertaining to activity, function, attitude and judgment, and a punch card for storing data in a computer readable format.

Lewis and Dahl apply the Extensor system to academic administrators at the University of Minnesota and outline ten objectives for their study. In turn, these objectives are translated into code lists developed through interviews with individual administrators prior to the actual time study.

As a result, ten dimensions of the study emerge:

(1) Instrumental Activity Dimension
(2) Functional Dimension
(3) Administration Role Dimension
(4) Contact Dimension
(5) Initiative Dimension
(6) Planning Dimension
(7) Delegation Dimension
(8) Productivity Dimension
(9) Enjoyment Dimension
(10) Stress Dimension

---

181 Lewis and Dahl, "Time Management in Higher Education Administration," pp. 52-54.
The actual data gathering process entailed 5 weeks of measurement resulting in a total of 6,855 observations in 10 dimensions—a total of 68,550 randomly collected bits of information. The data base generated was made possible by the use of the Extensor units and exceeded the exceptional amount of data generated in the Wallace and Gallagher analysis cited previously.

The findings indicate interesting contrasts between estimated time allotments and real time distributions—what the authors call "time illusions"—indicating that participants did not have a clear picture of how their time was being spent. The inordinate amount of time spent in meetings (68.6%) contrasted with the relatively small amount of time consumed by telephone calls (3.9%). Other interesting findings include the fact that the use of time was largely planned (78.8%) and 82.9 per cent of administrative work was seen as non-delegable. In addition, a high level of productivity (86%) was perceived by the administrators.

Feelings of stress and enjoyment varied widely. Stress was further identified as a dependent variable and subjected to greater statistical treatment, a multivariate linear regression analysis. Again, meetings were

---

182Ibid., p. 55.
183Ibid., pp. 56-57.
seen as the single most stressful event, while the greatest stress reducer was the number of hours worked per week. "Paradoxically, the more hours and time voluntarily devoted to the administrator's role assignment, the less stressed were the participants."\textsuperscript{184}

Finally, an evaluation phase was instituted by having each participant review their personal profiles to determine how time allotments could be distributed to achieve professional goals and personal priorities.

Summary

As one reviews the literature of student personnel work, institutional contexts, incentives, leadership, and managerial work, a number of trends are apparent:

(1) The student personnel literature is inundated with attempts to prescribe certain roles for student personnel administrators.

(2) Indictments of the student personnel profession have been followed by a proliferation of the literature; yet, little attention has been given to the roles and functions of chief student affairs officers. What roles that have been suggested are based upon a certain defensiveness—or at least uncertainty—regarding student personnel work. There is a tendency to either arbitrarily create new functions or borrow them from other fields without benefit of grounding in theory and practice. Furthermore, attention to style and demeanor seems to outweigh a concern for substance.

(3) There is an obsession in student personnel work to be concerned about either the historical roots of the profession or the future of student affairs.

\textsuperscript{184}ibid., p. 62.
Subsequently, very little attention is given to the present—that is, what student affairs administrators do. Therefore, the distinctive features are unknown.

(4) The literature surrounding institutional contexts is highly fragmented and provides contrasting images of diversity and homogeneity in higher education—a topic for ongoing debate and research. Multiversities seem to be emerging as a dominant type of institution and are prevalent in three clusters or prominent peaks, geographical areas marked by a concentration of comprehensive research universities. Those institutions which combine to make the C.I.C. consortium in the midwest are just one example of these clusters of higher learning.

(5) In contrast to an emphasis upon goal attainment, incentive systems may be seen as a counter paradigm through which to view and better understand some of the complexities of higher education related to both organizational and individual activities. Kuhn's caution regarding paradigms should be kept in mind, however, as one considers the incentive construct which emerges from the early work of Barnard. Most of the recent literature on incentives has been restricted to studies involving faculty members.

(6) The leadership literature as summarized by Stogdill's monumental work and illustrated by Drucker is comprehensive, yet deals primarily with executive behavior.

(7) The concept of educational leadership, especially that of the college president, is highly ambiguous as captured and documented by Cohen and March. Contributors to the A.C.C. leadership studies comment on the paradox of academic institutions: "that while our academic institutions need educational leadership perhaps more than any time in this century, the task of providing it has become more complex."185

(8) The notion of work has been explored through a variety of means ranging from Terkel's streetcorner interviews to Mintzberg's empirical studies.

185 Ness, Ed., The President as Educational Leader, p.5
Managerial work seems more perplexing than that of the laborer. More attention is needed to study the distinguishing characteristics of managerial work despite recent substantive efforts by Pitner and Hannaway.

(9) Only recently has time been recognized as a valuable resource—a resource which can be studied, analyzed, and managed. Consultants armed with how-to approaches seem to outnumber serious researchers.

(10) The allocation of time, as applied to higher education, is an area that invites further exploration. The few studies that exist in education generally seem to be limited to secondary school principals, superintendents, academic deans, and college presidents. The dean of students and the vice president for student affairs have been omitted from past research.

In conclusion, the above-mentioned trends and observations, taken in total, seem to provide sound reasoning for this descriptive study related to the time allocations of chief student affairs administrators. Furthermore, it seems justified that such research be grounded in the day-to-day activities of deans and vice presidents within a particular institutional context and be given greater meaning by the incentive construct.

Therefore, given the current adolescent state of the art of time management, challenges from authors such as Barrett and Mintzberg who call for more exploration, imagination, and research, a superb research design and methodology provided by Lewis and Dahl, and the implications for engaging in a time allocation study focusing on chief student affairs officers, a descriptive study involving vice presidents and deans for student affairs at
key midwestern universities was designed and implemented to contribute to the literature and to the field of student personnel.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Time as a Unit of Analysis

Thus far, the importance of the study, a series of research questions and objectives, and a review of the literature focusing on student personnel work, institutional context, incentive systems, leadership, managerial work, and time management have been presented. The problem of how to measure the time allocations of chief student affairs officers as well as an action approach merit attention.

One of the common features of the time management literature is its focus on the unique properties of time—it is inelastic, irrecoverable, and irreplaceable; it a quantifiable resource which constitutes approximately 100,000 hours in a manager's work life.¹

Time is a variable marked by neutrality, ease of definition, and equal distribution across all populations and cultures. Inequalities arise, however, from

differences in perception, life expectancy, the energy levels people invest, and the productivity derived from their constant use of time.\textsuperscript{2}

These properties, according to Robinson, make time a rather unique and fascinating unit of analysis. Yet, there is also a sort of mundaneness about time:

Unlike most measures in the social sciences, there is little debate over what one is basically measuring. The unit of analysis is as familiar to the public as it is to the researcher.\textsuperscript{3}

This mundane quality may also be problematic and misleading when one considers measuring time:

It might be supposed that the measurement of time is a relatively simple process since time is a measure that people use so often and so readily in planning their everyday lives . . . however, there are many sources of bias inherent in time use measures available to policy-makers in government, business, industry, and education.\textsuperscript{4}

Despite much attention in the literature to time as a valuable resource and calls from the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education for educational institutions to contemplate ways of more effectively using and allocating resources such as time which contribute


\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.
to the quality of life,$^5$ research studies and the literature offer few clues for the effective measurement of time.

Indeed, as Lewis and Dahl remarked, the field of time management currently lacks both a highly developed body of literature and systematic means of measurement.$^6$

In order to address the research questions outlined in Chapter I focusing on the time allocations of chief student affairs officers, it was incumbent upon the researcher to design reliable and valid ways of gathering time usage data. Moreover, the utilization of a creative methodology superior to techniques used in the past was a priority.

Therefore, an action research design utilizing both an empirical data collection technique and an intensive interviewing approach was used to explore the time allocations of chief student affairs officers at C.I.C. institutions.

---


A Framework for Observation: Toward Intimate Familiarity

Prior to discussing the methodology used to study the time allocations and managerial work of a select group of deans and vice presidents, one should devote some attention to a frame of reference which provides a foundation for the research problems, the methods, and the analysis and interpretation of data.

John Lofland describes a logic of social science research consisting of four guidelines that should orient researchers as they engage in the observation and scrutiny of people interacting in real settings:

1. The necessity to acquire personal, direct, and first-hand intimate familiarity.

2. The need to delineate generic features of the situation in which the action is being developed.

3. The requirements for deciphering the strategies participants use in dealing with situations.

4. The desirability of developing and interrelating emergent concepts and themes and accumulating data in a disciplined and grounded fashion.7

For the purposes of considering methodology, the notion of "intimate familiarity" may have some applicability in this study. Attempts at focusing on the time dimensions of social situations and at deciphering

strategies which participants use to deal with situations as well as some attention to emergent themes will occupy subsequent portions of this paper.

The social science literature indicates that in order for researchers to achieve intimate familiarity they must form a "detailed, dense acquaintanceship based on prolonged immersion . . . ideally in the form of direct, bodily presence in the physical surroundings of those being observed." 8

However, social scientists such as Bogdan and Taylor, 9 Schatzman, 10 and Lofland acknowledge that there are alternatives to participant observation. A practical degree of intimate familiarity may be obtained through unhurried, free-flowing discussions. The focus of such semi-structured, intensive interviews is on collecting instances of behavior or episodes of problems and how participants dealt with them. The goal is to reconstruct

---


the activities and interactions of the participants
and to identify certain themes which emerge from their
work.

Another useful means of developing intimate
familiarity is through immersion in the myriad of written
materials which are a part of the manager's world.
Mintzberg\textsuperscript{11} and Pitner\textsuperscript{12} among others have used this
approach in lieu of, or to complement, direct observation
techniques.

Why is this kind of intimate familiarity and its
resultant data important? Why should researchers attempt
to obtain such data through direct observation or alter­
native means of immersion?

Lofland addresses these quesitons in the following
manner:

(1) First it is implicit in the definition
of social science. If social science is, in
fact, the study of what people actually do,
of social action and interaction, then an
empirical study must observe or collect data
in some direct fashion that which it purports
to study. To propose to study something entails
a commitment to look at it, to get close to it,
and to scrutinize it.

(2) Secondly, there are risks in not achieving
a degree of intimate familiarity. The conse­
quence of not observing that which one is studying

\textsuperscript{11}H. Mintzberg, The Nature of Managerial Work

\textsuperscript{12}N. Pitner, "Descriptive Study of the Everyday
Activities of Suburban School Superintendents: The
Management of Information." (unpublished Ph.D.
is the likelihood of developing characterizations or explanations of phenomena that are unduly abstract or empirically untrue.

(3) Third, in the absence of intimate familiarity, the researcher may bring into play preconceived notions, images, and stereotypes not based on observation or knowledge of one's work. Meanings, actions and consequences may be constructed on the basis of imagination and fantasies.

(4) Finally, concepts developed in the absence of intimate familiarity may be empty or meaningless. They are not grounded in the world of experience and observation.13

It is incumbent upon the social scientist, given this view, to strive to achieve intimate familiarity and to delineate features of situations—that is, to observe and collect data "up close" and give attention to the context in which people work. Regarding the latter, Lofland cautions that it is not enough to merely observe subjects first-hand or collect data through interviews or other techniques. One must also be concerned with what he calls "situation"—the overall array of contacts, objects, physical space, and time periods that give meaning to human activity and interaction. The result, claims Lofland, will be a greater likelihood of deciphering social patterns and developing emergent themes.

In short,

. . . disciplined abstractions develop out of an observer's own intense, good faith, intimate

familiarity with a sector of social life. . . .
data are collected, that is, by means of
attending to and recording the running episodes
of everyday life. 14

Alternatives to Participant Observation

What social scientists have described as intimate
familiarity in the literature also has been characterized
as the role of the participant observer or reporter. 15

Critical to this reporting role and consistent with
the rubric of intimate familiarity is the notion of
 closeness of proximity and its importance to social
science research. Lofland uses the term "reporter" in
the general sense of one who makes a report and describes
the role as follows:

. . . it can be said, first, that the reporter
should have himself been close to the people
he reports on. By the term 'close' I refer to
four types of proximity. (1) He should have
been close in the physical sense of conducting
his own life in face-to-face proximity to the
person he tells about. (2) This physical prox­
imity should have extended over some significant
period of time and variety of circumstances.
(3) The reporter should have developed closeness
in the social sense of intimacy and confiden­
tiality. . . . (4) He should have conducted his
recording activities in such a way that his
reportage can give close and searching attention
to minute matters.

Second, the report should be truthful. It should
describe what the reporter in good faith believes
actually went on; it should be factual.

14 Ibid., p. 64.

15 See Bogdan and Taylor, Introduction to Qualitative
Research Methods and Schatzman, Field Research.
Third, the report should contain a significant amount of pure description of action, people, activities, and the like.

Fourth, fully to capture the reality of a place, the report should contain direct quotations from the participants as they speak and/or from whatever they might write down.  

It is, then, the paradoxical role of the researcher or reporter to somehow become involved in the everyday world of the participants while maintaining enough distance or detachment to enable a clear accounting of activities and experiences. The dual methodology as alluded to in Chapter I and detailed in later sections of this chapter may provide a means of resolving this dilemma by combining the positive properties of observation and interviewing to ascertain the activities of chief student affairs officers.

Although the Extensor methodology fails to satisfy some of Lofland's criteria such as close proximity to subjects and attention to minute details which are central to his notion of "doing social life," the system does have the capability of recording a variety of activities over a substantial length of time--an important factor in the design of this study. It is argued that by using the Extensor methodology one can obtain a broader mapping of the activities which are part of educators'  

everyday lives and do so over an extended length of
time. The factors of expense and personal observation
were weighed carefully and the Extensor System selected
as more appropriate than direct observation for describing
an aggregate picture of chief student affairs officers' 
managerial work and time allocations.

Robinson and Sanday seem to agree that attaining
intimate familiarity has its liabilities:

While some sort of direct observation would
seem to be the ideal method of gathering time-
use data, systematic observation becomes
prohibitively expensive and unwieldy. More
importantly, direct observation is apt to change
the observed person's behavior, making it
inaccurate as well as expensive.

Indeed, researchers have noted a number of sources
of error or possible dangers of participant-observer
techniques. Webb, Campbell, et al. have inventoried
twenty-one systematic sources of error that apply to
human observation and have stressed that,

The prime danger of participant observation
is that the human observer will be variable over

17 In his treatment of qualitative research, J. Van
Maanen stresses that it is the researcher's responsibility
to construct "idiographic maps" and delimit the territory.
See J. Van Maanen, "Reclaiming Qualitative Methods for
Organizational Research," Administrative Science Quarterly,
XXIV (December, 1979), p. 520.

18 Robinson, How Americans Use Time, p. 9. Also see
P. R. Sanday, "The Ethnographic Paradigm," Administrative
Science Quarterly, XXIV (December, 1979), pp. 527-538 in
which she warns of the emotional drain inherent in partici-
cipant observation.
the course of his observations . . . all of the finesse of a skillful investigator will not solve the limitations and sources of error.19

Sources of invalid measures which were cited include an awareness of being tested, role selection, the measurement process as a change agent, response sets, interviewer effects, population restrictions, and changes in the research instrument.20

In order to avoid the effects of the measurement process becoming a change agent or the dangers of an observer selectively perceiving data, Riley advocates detached observation as an alternative to studies using participant observation.21

Lutz and Iannaccone acknowledge that there are three roles which are meaningful in the study of educational organizations: (1) the participant as an observer; (2) the observer as a limited participant; and (3) the observer as a non-participant.22


20Ibid., p.12. Regarding the latter point, the authors use the analogy of a spring scale fatigued over extensive use.


Participant observers, in their view, have a legitimate, inherent role in the system they intend to study. The limited observer, in contrast, does not naturally occupy a role. The researcher creates a role. Finally, the non-participant is more detached and "... makes every effort not to impinge upon the social system."23

In this study, the researcher has adopted the role of a non-participant for the following reasons: (1) no natural role existed in the organizations of the subjects; (2) the research was not conducive to creating a special role for the purpose of limited participation; and (3) an unobtrusive data gathering technique allowing for the collection of information related to contacts, activities, and functions over an extended period of time was valued.

The challenge faced by the researcher, therefore, was to design a set of methods and procedures which would: (1) achieve some of the desirable outcomes of social science research characterized by intimate familiarity and be grounded in the real work settings of chief student affairs officers; (2) ensure repeated, detailed observations of day-to-day episodes of a number of participants and allow some flexibility as data collection progressed; and (3) avoid some of the sources of error inherent in participant observation studies.

23Ibid., p. 111.
The Potential for Action Research

Ultimately, the researcher was faced with the responsibility of employing an approach grounded in the actual work of chief student affairs officers. An attractive methodology described by Susman and Evered is that of "action research" requiring collaboration between the researcher and practitioner.  

Briefly, it is Susman and Evered's position that there is a crisis in organizational science and epistemology caused by adherence to a positivist model. Action research, claim the authors, has its own legitimate philosophical foundations and, therefore, contributes to research and knowledge by:

(1) The emergence of action principles for dealing with different situations;

(2) Contributing to the development of action competencies such as problem-defining, interpretation and judgment, establishing problem-solving procedures, and generating new constructs from experiences;

(3) Facilitating the development of techniques called 'practics' which aid in the creation of new organizational settings and in the generation of self-help guidelines;

---


25 Ibid., pp. 594-595. The authors cite praxis, hermeneutics, existentialism, and phenomenology.
(4) Establishing conditions for the development networks to enable respondents to plan, organize, and help themselves.

(5) By creating models for further research.

Action research, then, is seen as a means of generating theory and knowledge and changing the social system through the researcher acting upon it. Action research, according to Rapoport, also contributes to the practical concerns of people in problematic situations, to social science goals, and to the development of self-help competencies in clients.

Susman and Evered, moreover, view action research as a cyclical process consisting of five phases: diagnosis, action planning, action taking, evaluation, and the specification of learning.

Finally, six characteristics of action or "direct" research make it an appropriate methodological model for this study. Action research:

(1) Is future-oriented and deals with practical concerns [for example, the management of time];

(2) Is collaborative depending upon the interaction of the researcher and the client group;

26 Ibid., p. 59.


(3) Implies systems development to generate new structures, competencies, means of communication, and problem-solving procedures;

(4) Generates theory grounded in action;

(5) Is subject to re-examination and reformulation; and,

(6) Is situational in that the context defines actions and outcomes.  

In short, the capacity of action research to generate knowledge for use in problem-solving situations faced by the chief student affairs officers and to develop the skills of the participants to solve their own time allocation problems led to the researcher's using this approach.

Selection of Subjects

This study rests on the assumption that an investigation of the time allocations and managerial work of those in leadership positions in student personnel administration will increase our understanding of the field in general. Furthermore, by studying those who have achieved some of the most significant leadership positions in student affairs, it was hoped that the research would have value to others who aspire to be chief student affairs officers. It may also be argued that the

vice presidents and deans have potential influence on
the field in view of their leadership roles directing
student affairs divisions, setting institutional policies,
and involvement in professional associations.

Alternative approaches would have been: (1) to
survey educators and ascertain specific criteria which
seem to capture the notion of a "successful administr­
tor;" (2) to focus on those persons holding significant
leadership roles within professional associations; or
(3) to simply select at random a group of deans from a
stratified sample. 31

In this study, however, the sample was further de­
limited to chief student affairs officers at large,
comprehensive universities. This decision was based upon
a number of factors—both pragmatic and research-oriented:

(1) A number of institutional typologies were
considered, yet a review of the literature
focusing on multiversities convinced the reader
that these institutional types, particularly
within the "academic mountain ranges or peaks"
which Kerr32 highlighted, had the soundest future
and the greatest impact upon our society as well
as upon other institutions of higher learning.

31 In this study, the randomness is built into the
sampling of activities, functions, and contacts by the
random impulse generator, a critical component of the
Extensor System described in a later section.

32 C. Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge,
(2) It was hypothesized that the range of activities and contacts would be maximized by studying chief student affairs officers at large, complex universities.

(3) Preliminary discussions with chief student affairs officers from a number of institutions indicated that there was a greater willingness to participate among C.I.C. vice presidents than among small college deans.

(4) The researcher possessed an intrinsic interest in, and prior and more intimate knowledge of, C.I.C. institutions.

(5) Prior experience at two of the institutions in question and first-hand experience as an understudy to two vice presidents at a C.I.C. university were conducive to better understanding the campus environment and the work setting of the chief student affairs administrators.

(6) The eleven campuses within the potential pool of institutions were reasonably accessible geographically.

(7) Due to financial and time constraints, a small, homogeneous sample was advantageous over a large, stratified sample from among the universe of colleges and universities. Regarding the latter point, the choice of a small sample mandated by limited resources and budget was consistent with both the action research approach and field studies conducted by Mintzberg and Pitner. Moreover, it may be argued that a careful and intensive study of a few subjects will illuminate the issues and subjects more clearly than an effort to conduct and record a large number of observations and interviews. A detailed picture of their time allocations and the nature of their work was preferred over a superficial treatment of their
time usage.

Finally, it was postulated that a genuine interest in the study as ascertained through preliminary contacts with prospective subjects would increase the likelihood of cooperation, the level of commitment to the task, and the accuracy and reliability of data recording and self-reports. The willingness and desire of subjects to engage in a month-long study of their time allocations grounded in their daily activities became a most important factor.

**Procedures: A Chronology**

The proposed research was first discussed with representatives from C.I.C. institutions at the Midwestern Deans Meeting in Allerton, Illinois on October 7-9, 1979. Included in the discussions and a written outline were:

1. Objectives of the research;
2. Major research questions and their significance;
3. An overview of the research methodology;
4. A description of the data gathering systems and interview techniques to be employed;
5. A prospective timetable;
6. Attention to potential benefits and implications of C.I.C. deans and vice presidents' engaging in a month-long time allocation study.

During the weeks following the Allerton conference, the dissertation outline was revised and the methodology refined. Subsequently, on October 25, 1979 personal letters were sent to all chief student affairs officers
at C.I.C. institutions highlighting the research questions, noting previous studies and the need for more exploration in the area of time usage, emphasizing the requirements of subjects, and inviting each of the vice presidents and deans to participate in the study.

In response, two administrators sent correspondence to the researcher indicating their unwillingness to participate. One vice president tersely stated "I'm afraid not. But good luck." Another vice president declined the proposal after careful consideration and deliberation among his staff. In the latter case, the individual expressed some skepticism regarding the value of the study stressing the importance of diversity among institutions and administrators at C.I.C. institutions and assuming that,

The research presumes the goodness of standardization, of common patterns, or of a unified theoretical base ... leading toward standard practices and producing common mediocrity instead of imaginative diversity.

In closing, he stated that he was not sympathetic to the research goals, but admitted to not fully understanding them. Despite a clarification letter from the researcher and a personal discussion with this

33In this section and the following chapters direct quotes are used from correspondence sent to the researcher by certain C.I.C. vice presidents. The names of these persons are not indicated, however, to maintain confidentiality.
administrator, he preferred not to be included in the study noting also that: (1) he was not professionally trained in the field and (2) he had been inundated with a variety of research surveys over the past academic year. (Ironically, this same vice president was present at a later orientation meeting for his colleagues and commented on the uniqueness of the methodology, the researcher's approach, and the potential benefits to the profession.)

A series of follow-up calls were made to the remaining nine administrators from November 5-13, 1979 to elaborate upon the project and to encourage participation. One of the deans failed to respond to the researcher's repeated written and telephone inquiries.

The following week, confirmation letters were sent to eight chief student affairs officers providing more details regarding the data gathering system, scheduling a January 21, 1980 orientation session, and requesting that they forward to the researcher the following: (1) a vita; (2) a job description; and (3) copies of bylaws and institutional statutes governing their position.

In early January, 1980, a memorandum was sent to each vice president in preparation for the January 21 C.I.C. meeting. On January 12, the researcher met with approximately twenty-five chief student affairs officers who attended the Executive Committee Meeting of the
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (N.A.S.P.A.) in Columbus, Ohio. Among this group were five vice presidents from C.I.C. institutions and representatives from colleges and universities marked by diversity in terms of institutional type and geographical distribution. The researcher met individually and in small groups with the N.A.S.P.A. participants to discuss the research questions and methodology and to refine the code list used during the first month of the study.

The project formally began on January 21 in Chicago with an orientation session for the participants and distribution of project manuals and data gathering systems. A pilot week occurred from January 28-February 1 followed by a month of data collection (February 4-29) during which the subjects randomly recorded their activities related to several dimensions approximately thirty times per day.

During the five week period including the test week and actual data collection, the researcher maintained written and verbal contact with the participants to answer questions regarding the data gathering devices, to clarify correct means of punching data cards and recording activities away from the office (such as at Board of Trustees meetings), and to maintain support over the extended period of time. At the end of each week, data cards were forwarded from each campus to the researcher.
In turn, the cards were scanned and checked and the
subjects given immediate feedback based upon this manual
auditing process if problems existed. At the end of
the month, all data cards were tabulated in the computer
resulting in descriptive statistics and detailed profiles
in the form of summary data and matrix tables.

It should be noted that two additional administra­tors withdrew from the study--or, more accurately, never
became engaged in the project as they had origanally
consented. One vice president commented that the design
appeared to minimize what he called "the problem"--that
is, that chief student affairs officers have different
sets of functions and responsibilities. He also ques­tioned the use of a month-long study to represent their
activities in view of the cyclical and spontaneous nature
of student affairs work. The strongest objections,
however, seemed to be based upon the frequency of inter­ruptions as "unnecessary and unacceptable," his own
unwillingness to commit the time required to study his
time allocations, and his admitted misunderstanding of
the logistics of the study. Another potential subject
was ultimately unable to participate during the month of
February due to three weeks of personal time away from
his campus. Neither of these persons attended the
orientation session in Chicago due to personal and campus-
related concerns, respectively.
For those six professionals in the sample who engaged in the first phase of data analysis, however, efforts resulted in some 3,141 observations using the Extensor methodology.

Instructions for concluding the first portion of the project were forwarded to each participant in late February along with highlights of the interview process to follow. During the month of March an interview plan was designed based upon Dexter's elite and specialized interview technique, the literature, and the time allocation data. Interviews were conducted with each of the six vice presidents or deans in April and the results of the Extensor phase of the study were shared at this time. Following completion of the entire study, an analysis of both the Extensor and interview data was discussed with each subject as well as possible intervention strategies, action plans, and staff development programs.

To this point, references have been made to the two basic phases of this action research: (1) data gathering using the Extensor System and (2) follow-up intensive interviews modeled after Dexter's elite and specialized technique. Both methodologies are treated in more detail in the following sections.
The Extensor System: An Innovative Means of Data Collection

The Extensor System, developed as Frekvensor in Sweden by inventor Hans Hindersson and marketed in the United States by a group of researchers formerly associated with the University of Minnesota, is an innovative approach to administrative development relying totally on the cooperation between the participants and the researcher. It is designed so that individuals involved in time allocation studies can describe the factors influencing performance, quantify them, evaluate them, and take constructive action to improve planning, time management, and performance. Data collected through the Extensor System—and, in this case complemented by open-ended interviews—become the basis for individual and organizational development.

Lewis and Dahl have characterized the Extensor System as:

... a completely new development in the field of time management and random sampling. Combining the measurement of attitudes and judgments with random activity sampling, the device can be used in any situation where self-recording is feasible or desirable.35

34 The original name, Frekvensor, is derived from a Swedish word meaning frequency or rate.

The Extensor System was designed as a powerful means to assist managers in business, industry, government, and education to generate hard data about their everyday activities and to understand their work more fully through a process of self reporting and analysis. The system is based on the premise that managers are capable of—and interested in—being responsible for their own development. By producing data grounded in the day-to-day lives of executives, the Extensor System provides a greater awareness of how individuals allocate their time, a means for recognizing one's own problems and generating solutions within the framework of the organization, and a foundation for rational decision-making and job improvement.

Extensor is a sort of "automatic interviewing-observing system" that collects data on behavior, attitude, and judgment in several dimensions simultaneously with a high degree of statistical validity (reported to be as high as 90-95 per cent). Data are collected on the job by the participants themselves taking approximately 5-10 minutes per day and recorded in machine-readable format, permitting direct data processing and a turnaround time of about 2 weeks following data collection.

The system consists of: (1) a console approximately the size of a telephone containing a random impulse generator; (2) a code list of descriptors created by the researcher; and (3) a deck of machine-readable computer punch cards for recording responses. Approximately 30 times a day, the units emitted a signal at random indicating to the subjects that they were to record data on all 5 dimensions at the given moment. During an 8-hour period, participants utilized about 4 data cards to record their activities. An average of 19 cards were used by each participant per week to record their activities resulting in a total of 422 data cards being submitted for the project.

The process of developing the Extensor study and collecting and analyzing data consisted of several steps:

(1) **The identification of a particular problem or set of objectives needing attention.** In this case the research problem centered around the time allocations of chief student affairs officers.

(2) **The development of behavioral and subjective (attitudinal and judgmental) dimensions related to the problem statement.**

---

37 The five dimensions were outlined in Chapter I and are defined on pp. 15-16.

38 For details concerning the research problem, related questions, and objectives of the study, see Chapter I.

39 A more complete explanation of the development of the code list follows.
(3) The installation of the Extensor Units. Distribution of the systems followed an orientation session and development of a project manual for each participant.

(4) The collection of data. It was recommended by Extensor consultants that data collection be preceded by a pilot week and that main measurement occur over a four week period to obtain a good cross-section of tasks, problems, and contacts.

(5) Processing of the data. Data cards initially went through a manual auditing process. Since data were recorded on machine-readable punch cards, this phase of the project occurred quite rapidly following the month-long collection period. Data were converted from punch cards to tape before being fed into the computer.

(6) Feedback of the data to clients and follow-up interviews. The final stage occurred in April during which time summary and matrix tables and an explanation of the results were provided to each respondent confidentially. Intensive interviews were also conducted as a complementary means of data collection to explain the meaning of the Extensor data.  

Step two in the process merits special consideration. Lewis and Dahl have remarked that "the key to any successful study of executive behavior is a carefully designed code list."  

40 The reader should be aware that step six actually consisted of two distinct phases: Extensor data feedback and intensive interviews.

41 Lewis and Dahl, "Time Management in Higher Education," p. 52. The researchers have conducted studies involving two distinct populations--hospital administrators and academic administrators in a college of education--each with separate code lists developed in conjunction with the participants.
This process entailed the translation of the research problems and objectives into appropriate and measurable dimensions consisting of complete and mutually exclusive categories and grounded in the work of chief student affairs officers. The researcher was not content to merely extrapolate code lists and descriptors from Extensor studies of secondary school educators, city managers, or hospital administrators. Rather, the code list emerged principally from the research questions. Consideration in designing the code list was also given to:

(1) Observations of vice presidents and deans of student affairs including first-hand observations over the past three years.

(2) An analysis of job descriptions and university bylaws governing C.I.C. chief student affairs officers.

(3) Interviews with chief student personnel administrators at the N.A.S.P.A. Executive Committee Meeting.

(4) A review of the literature related to student personnel work, time management, leadership, and incentive systems.

(5) Categories utilized in other time allocation studies of college presidents, academic affairs deans, and secondary school administrators.

(6) Sample code lists shared by Extensor Corporation.

(7) Consultation with the doctoral committee.
The final code list found in Table 6 includes five dimensions, each with a series of descriptors, which are explained briefly below.

(1) **Instrumental Activity Dimension.** The first, and perhaps most basic, dimension was a description of the physical or kinetic activities of the participants. Such activities are performed in order to further a purpose or a function, but do not represent goals or ends in and of themselves. In order to measure the daily activities of the vice presidents, a list consisting of twelve categories covering a range of work-related behaviors was produced and refined. The participants were asked to record their activities by responding to the question "What are you doing as chief student affairs officer?"

(2) **Functional Dimension.** As a logical follow-up to the first question related to instrumental activities, participants were asked to select among twelve categories to answer the question "For what organization purpose?" Respondents recorded the primary purpose for which they were engaged in a given activity. The emphasis here was upon administrative and educational functions of the vice presidents.

(3) **Contact Dimension.** The amount of contact that chief student affairs officers had with their presidents, colleagues, students, and other constituencies provided insights into their work environment. Participants simply had to respond to the question "With whom?" by choosing any one of twelve categories each time the unit emitted a signal.

(4) **Work Assessment: Importance/Improvability.** This was a more subjective dimension addressing two major questions: (a) "How important is what you are doing right now to you as a chief student affairs officer of your institution?" and (b) "Should your performance of certain tasks in which you are engaged be improved or is it okay as is?" The work assessment dimension focused on both the improvability and priority or importance and the perceived centrality of their work within their organizations and whether they expressed a need for additional skills in certain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Column C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>INITIATIVE/ SATISFACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Telephone IN</td>
<td>1 Self</td>
<td>1 Proactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Telephone OUT</td>
<td>2 President/Chancellor</td>
<td>2 Proactive/Moderately Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>3 Campus Vice Presidents</td>
<td>3 Proactive/Moderately Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>4 Chief Assistant/ Assistant Vice</td>
<td>4 Proactive/Highly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>5 President/Dean of Students</td>
<td>5 Reactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Write/Dictate</td>
<td>5 Student Affairs Staff</td>
<td>6 Reactive/Moderately Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2 Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>5 Student Affairs Support Staff</td>
<td>7 Reactive/Moderately Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+3 Read/Study/Review/ Evaluate</td>
<td>5 Student Affairs Faculty Members</td>
<td>8 Reactive/Highly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+4 Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>6 Students Secretary/Clerical Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+5 Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>1+3 Faculty Members Academic/College Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+6 Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>1+4 Academic/College Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+3 Other</td>
<td>1+5 Colleagues-Other Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+6 Other University Constituents/ Parents/Alumni/ae</td>
<td>1+6 Other University Constituents/ Parents/Alumni/ae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+3 Other Publics/ Citizens/Business Persons/Legislators</td>
<td>2+3 Other Publics/ Citizens/Business Persons/Legislators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6 continued

FIVE DIMENSIONAL CODE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>WORK ASSESSMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPORTANCE/IMPROVABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>7 High Importance/Should Be Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Staffing/Personnel Students</td>
<td>8 High Importance/O.K. As Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Counsel/Advise Students</td>
<td>9 Average Importance/Should Be Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Organizational Crisis</td>
<td>10 Average Importance/O.K. As Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Consult Student Affairs</td>
<td>11 Low Importance/Should Be Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Consult Other Administrators/Academic Units</td>
<td>12 Low Importance/O.K. As Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+9 Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>DO NOT USE COLUMN C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+10 Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>#9 THRU 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+11 General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+12 Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+9 Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThis is the actual code list as distributed to the participants and affixed to their Extensor consoles. The list was clarified and detailed in an accompanying project manual and discussed at the January 21, 1980 orientation session. The format was based upon keypunch needs and coding requirements.
domains. It was hypothesized that this dimension might provide some clues as to professional development or inservice training needs of the vice presidents.

(5) Initiative/Satisfaction. The final dual dimension required the participants to indicate whether activities were initiated by themselves (proactive) or others (reactive) and required a subjective judgment as to the satisfaction derived from activities, functions, and contacts. It allowed the researcher to step back and assess the level of internal satisfaction the respondents experienced in their jobs.

Advantages of the Extensor System

How people spend their time has been the subject of many studies using a variety of methods. None has seemed very satisfactory. The methods have been slow, cumbersome, costly, interruptive, and disruptive. They have intruded into the work setting and caused obstacles to accurate and confidential data gathering.

Traditional work measurement, work sampling, and time allocation studies are usually associated with scientific management, time and motion studies, participant observer techniques, or self-recording logs or diaries. Carlson's studies of executive behavior were based on data recorded by secretaries as well as on self-reports and subjective rating scales. A special form was designed for registering such dimensions as time, location, and personal contacts. A standardized questionnaire also was developed to solicit opinions
opinions rather than behaviors.  

Robinson relied heavily upon the use of diaries for his study of over 2000 Americans. These persons recorded their activities for only a single day as compared to the month-long study of chief student affairs officers.

Cohen and March gathered data on dimensions such as location, group size, contact patterns, and initiative in their study of college presidents. Every thirty minutes, presidents' current time allocations were coded by their secretaries. Attempts to log activities based on telephone calls proved to be too erratic to provide systematic data.

However, the use of time logs or diaries as well as participant observers have proven to be problematic for a number of reasons. Written time logs or diaries take an inordinate amount of time to complete. The former interrupt the work process and create compliance problems. In addition, since the data do not exist in a machine-

42 S. Carlson, Executive Behaviour (Stockholm: Strombergs, 1951).


readable format the codification and analysis of data can become time consuming and expensive. In order to make the self-reporting process a manageable task, participants are typically asked to write what they are doing at pre-determined intervals (usually every 15 or 30 minutes). However, this may create a cyclical sampling bias since the participants are aware of the intervals and may condition their behavior. They may also plan to be engaged in something "significant" (for example, long-range planning) rather than being caught in more menial tasks. If the sampling procedure is omitted and the subjects simply asked to write down everything that occurred during a given day, the process becomes tedious and less spontaneous and loses the effectiveness of not only recording, but also appraising a certain activity at the time of its occurrence. Some meaning is lost.

As pointed out earlier, the presence of an observer is likely to affect the behavior of the observed individuals and may lead to one of the sources of human error or invalidity of measures alluded to by Webb and Campbell. Lewis and Dahl also emphasize the "considerable problems in assuring observer reliability." 46


46. Lewis and Dahl, "Time Management in Higher Education," p. 50. The authors cite O. Gilbert's estimate that observers may deviate ten to twenty per cent from the group mean.
The Extensor System enables the researcher to gather data quantitatively and multidimensionally without the use of obtrusive or biased observers or cumbersome diaries or time logs. One of the critical barriers, people observing people, is removed, yet the system allows the researcher to enter the work setting (indirectly) and to obtain immediate information on several dimensions (directly). The Extensor System, in effect, did the first phase of "interviewing" in a private setting by "asking" the subjects questions on categories related to their activities, functions, contacts, and subjective dimensions. This methodology was therefore selected over other techniques since it offered several advantages, among which were:

1. Randomness was built into the unit, the generator emitted random signals approximately 30 times in an 8-hour work day for a month allowing for a good sampling of work-related activities and 3,141 observations on 5 dimensions or a rich data base of over 15,000 bits of information.

2. Extensor data are quantitative and multidimensional and were accumulated at a rather high rate. The total number of information bits submitted by each participant was in the thousands and were interrelated in a complex matrix of patterns. To falsify such complex data in a consistent fashion would have been extremely difficult. It was infinitely easier for the participants to describe reality each time the unit signaled than it was to
(3) Contingency rules were built into the data reporting procedures whereby participants who were away from their offices for a period of time could return to their desks and enter in their activities by estimating their allocations in fifteen minute segments. The system also had the capacity to backfill information.

(4) Rater bias and the anticipation of intervals were minimized. Subjects remarked that the units sometimes emitted signals in close proximity and repeatedly during a very short duration of time while other activities were uninterrupted for substantial time periods.

(5) The data were easily recorded in machine readable format leading to instantaneous codification and quick turn-around time in terms of analysis. This allowed the researcher to give more immediate feedback in concise summary and matrix tables and to proceed with the interview phase of the project.

(6) Consistent with the action research approach, the system required the participation of the vice presidents in all phases—defining objectives and descriptors of their work, reporting their use of time, receiving feedback, and being asked to propose changes in their work patterns. Accordingly, a greater level of trust and interest may have resulted from these heavy investments on the part of the sample group.

Perhaps a more compelling reason for not falsifying data was a self-serving but socially acceptable one. The participants recorded a month of their work over the course of the study demonstrating resiliency and concerted efforts to record their activities. Honest data afforded the participants an opportunity to have meaningful profiles of their work over a considerable period of time—a sort of codified job description grounded in their everyday work. The data also had the potential, if accurate, to lead to self-improvement or a restructuring of responsibilities.
Any resistance on the part of the respondents may have been minimized through increased participation, the elimination of others directly observing their work, and the benefit of obtaining hard data related to their work.

The study was built into the real work settings and patterns of the subjects with little or no disruptions to normal activities.

The Extensor System would not be without its critics, however. Lofland would consider the system as a substitute for intimate familiarity requiring less stamina and humility than direct observations. Also, he is critical of techniques that make use of the ready availability of data generating devices simply because such substitutes guarantee some kind of results.  

Webb and Campbell are a bit more positive labeling such techniques as "contrived observation." They acknowledge that researchers use hardware as a substitute for human record-keeping and observation to reduce the threats and sources of error associated with participant observation. In addition, "contrived observation" methods overcome problems associated with privacy, confidentiality, and prohibitive observation costs. Finally, a major gain of using hardware for data collection is the permanence and completeness of the record.

---

48 Lofland traces this problem to major funding agencies which are wedded to quantifiable substitutes and want to buy something that is "demonstrably deliverable."

In the case of the Extensor study, punch cards, computer tapes, and summary tables can be retained for further analysis and hypothesis testing.

Yet, even Lofland concedes,

By whatever means, technique, or strategy of access, the first step, aspect, or principle of deciphering how people do things is to get close to the social life that is happening somewhere, to make records of people actually doing social things, and to develop intimate familiarity with those things.  

In effect, the Extensor System required the interaction between humans and a machine. The researcher and the subjects decided what they wanted to study and outlined the objectives of the research. The machine then provided a system of recording observations the participants made about themselves.

The Elite and Specialized Interviewing Technique

As expressed earlier, Phillips has maintained that research demands the balancing of strategy and tactics in light of one's overall purpose. Dexter makes the same point using the metaphor of tools. Interviewing is seen as a type of tool. Just as one type of chisel is more useful for particular purposes than another, so for one particular research purpose or design a special sort of interviewing technique is better or more useful than

---

In this case, the elite and specialized interview technique was adapted as a promising means of collecting data and as a follow-up to the Extensor phase of the study. The main function of the kind of interview selected was "... to focus attention upon a given experience rather than to ask specific questions."\(^{52}\)

It was the researcher's intent to focus on the time allocations of vice presidents and their experience of recording their activities over a month-long period of time. In keeping with Dexter's model, an interview plan was developed outlining areas to focus upon and to explore. The interview plan which emerged from the research problem and objectives, the literature, and the time allocation analysis is contained in the appendix.

Dexter has outlined five essential characteristics of the elite and specialized technique—characteristics which hold true for the research methods used in this study:

1. Persons interviewed were known to have participated in an uncontrolled but observed social setting.

\(^{51}\)Dexter, *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*, pp. 81-82.

\(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 83.
(2) The hypothetically significant elements, patterns, and total structure of this situation have been previously analyzed by the investigator.

(3) On the basis of this situational analysis, the interviewer has fashioned an interview plan which contains a general idea of the major areas of inquiry.

(4) The interview itself is focused on subjective experiences of persons to test the validity of hypotheses or to give rise to fresh hypotheses.

(5) The interview is more successful when the interviewer can obtain clues through observation and verbal reports. . . . the good interviewer is continually alert, attentive and eager.\textsuperscript{53}

In addition to outlining the characteristics of the elite and specialized technique, throughout his work, Dexter delineates a number of requirements for the researcher/interviewer beyond alertness and eagerness. These, too, become a basis for modeling. Among the traits described by Dexter are:

(1) independent knowledge of the subject based on observation;

(2) relevant, pertinent experience in the field being studied;

(3) a capacity to catch meanings of an interview and listen with empathy or a "third ear;"

(4) "sensitized imagination" and the ability to codify subtleties and complexities;

(5) neutrality;

(6) a knack of using the value-laden phraseology of the subjects in free-flowing discussion;

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., pp. 82-88.
(7) an implicit understanding of the usefulness and importance of participatory research;

(8) humility—that is, deferring to the interviewee as the "wiser" person;

(9) flexibility and breadth of vision to perceive the undefined and unexpected;

(10) "concentrated attention" to cues and implications;

(11) a capacity to "shift gears;"

(12) the acceptance of social science as a conceptual system which lacks closure and is sensitive to new ideas and actions and a skill for guarding against premature closure and misplaced concertness;

(13) a willingness to make "imaginative leaps" and to have fun playing with ideas and patterns;

(14) an ability to deal with inferences;

(15) a skill for organizing data to explain issues;

(16) an acknowledgement that the interview is part of a social situation; and,

(17) the development of a self-consciousness about what is affecting the interviewer.54

In short, good interviewing according to Dexter is both from the standpoint of practice and analysis a matter of perspective.

A good interviewer is able to make good and applicable guesses, while the interview is going

---

54 It is important to realize that it was incumbent upon the researcher to develop this self-consciousness in view of his experiences working directly for one of the vice presidents and with a majority of the chief student affairs officers through professional associations. Additional factors were a familiarity with the institutions and professional aspirations to continue a career at C.I.C. universities.
on, as to how he is regarded by the interviewee and to adapt his strategy accordingly; he is able to make intelligent guesses which are affecting the interviewee's choice of role and response . . . is aware of his own reactions while the interview is going on . . . is able to take account of his own reactions and responses and those of the interviewee . . . is able to regard himself as an instrument, analyzing his relationship to the interviewee . . . and is able to acquire perspective. 55

Much time has been devoted to describing the essential characteristics of the elite and specialized technique and the requirements for a "good interviewer." Attention has been given to the process since the interview process itself may be as important as the results. It is also evident that the elite and specialized technique contrasts sharply with survey and scheduled interview techniques in that its purpose is to discover, not test, beginning with the general and moving to the particular. Questions are based on observational data and are varied among participants. Finally, an inherent goal in conducting the interviews with the vice presidents was to improve the interview as a means of data collection as well as to explore.

Therefore, intensive interviews were conducted with each vice president during the month of April to elaborate on the time allocation data and to explore additional issues related to their managerial work. Dexter's elite

55Ibid., pp. 150-151.
and specialized technique became the model for designing the interview plan and completing this important phase of data collection leading to a more comprehensive picture of the chief student affairs officers.

**Multiple Operationalism or Triangulation**

Despite the promising nature of the elite and specialized interviewing technique, even Dexter cautions that "no one should plan an entire study in advance relying chiefly upon interviews."\(^{56}\)

As addressed previously, interviews and survey techniques introduce foreign elements into social settings and can be the sources of a variety of errors. Webb and Campbell have also taken issue with the overdependence on interviews and questionnaires as sole means of data collection. Their principal objection seems to be that such methods are typically used alone for data gathering.

A solution to this methodological dilemma is found in the social science literature which advocates the use of multiple methods. This form of research is usually described as one of "multiple operationalism"\(^{57}\) or "triangulation," that is, "the combination of methodologies

---

\(^{56}\)Ibid., p. 17.

\(^{57}\)Webb, Campbell, *et al.*, Unobtrusive Measures, p. 3.
in the study of the same phenomenon." \( ^{58} \)

These notions share the conception that research methods should be viewed as complementary—to cross validate and compensate for weaknesses inherent in single methods.

Furthermore, triangulation provides the researcher with several important opportunities:

1. It allows more confidence in the results;
2. It stimulates the creation of inventive methods and new ways of capturing a problem;
3. It can lead to an enriched explanation of the research problem;
4. It can promote a synthesis or integration of theories. \( ^{59} \)

In short, Jick maintains that,

Triangulation has vital strengths and encourages productive research. It heightens qualitative methods to their deserved prominence and, at the same time, demonstrates that quantitative methods can and should be utilized in a complementary fashion. Above all, change demands creativity from its user—ingenuity in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data... it can stimulate us to better define and analyze problems in organizational research. \( ^{60} \)

---


\( ^{60} \) Ibid., p. 610.
Toward these ends, the dual methodologies of the Extensor System and elite and specialized interviews were employed in this study. It is to the analysis of the data that our attention now turns.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Objectives of the Time Allocation Study

During February, 1980 a majority of the chief student affairs officers at C.I.C. institutions agreed to undertake a self-study of their time allocations. The six vice presidents and deans entered into the study with seven primary objectives linked to the overall research goals of the study:

1. To classify, identify, and better understand their physical activities over time.

2. To produce and log an inventory of job functions which responded to the question: "For what organizational purpose are you engaged in a given activity?"

3. To determine the nature and amount of interaction and communication between chief student affairs officers and other constituents.

4. To study the managerial work and administration of student affairs by identifying the frequency of various management tasks and administrative activities.

5. To produce a subjective work assessment for each participant measured in terms of importance and improvability.

6. To study the originating source for the initiation of tasks (either self or other).
(7) To measure the extent of job satisfaction felt by the participants.

The Major Research Questions

Toward these ends, the study was designed to gather a random sampling of activities, functions, and contacts as well as subjective judgments regarding work assessment, initiative, and satisfaction. These objectives were met by utilizing the multiple methods as described in the previous chapter—namely, self reports and observations using the Extensor System and intensive follow-up interviews to elaborate upon and interpret the data.

The study resulted in some 3,141 observations over a month-long period complemented by responses to a series of 20 interview questions. By their own acknowledgement, the results seem to present an accurate picture of what this select group of chief student affairs officers believe that they do.

The results of the study are best reported systematically by addressing the major research questions posed in the previous chapters:

(1) What is it that student personnel administrators do? More precisely, what is it that chief student affairs officers at C.I.C. institutions do? How is their time allocated?

1 These objectives were shared with the participants during the project orientation session for C.I.C. chief student affairs officers on January 21, 1980 in Chicago.
(2) What kinds of managerial functions do chief student affairs officers perform? For what organizational purpose?

(3) With whom do chief student affairs officers spend their time?

(4) How do chief student affairs officers assess their work? How important are their activities, functions, and contacts? Should they be improved?

(5) At whose initiative is the work of chief student affairs officers performed? With what level of satisfaction?

Focus on the Group Profile

In view of the nature of the research questions and the methodological approaches employed, attention is focused on the group profile or mean data—that is, an aggregate picture of what C.I.C. vice presidents and deans do, for what purposes, with whom, with what assessment of their work, at whose initiative, and with what feelings of satisfaction.

Mean data are represented in a series of tables and figures corresponding to each of the five dimensions.\(^2\) Ranges are noted as well for each category. Further, the five dimensions are presented in two-dimensional tables

---

\(^2\)Given the emphasis on mean data, group profiles for each dimension as well as group cross-tabulations are presented in this chapter. Individual summary reports and matrix tables as well as the group data were prepared for and shared with each of the chief student affairs officers. Individual reports may be found in the appendix. Each vice president had access to all relevant cross-tabulations to trace personal sources of importance, improvability, initiative and satisfaction.
where the interactions of each dimension are made evident.

Consistent with the purpose of the overall study as outlined in the initial chapter, attention is given to commonalities and patterns. However, anomalies are also noted and explanations for differences are derived from an interpretation of individual data and from interview responses.

The Activity Dimension: What Do Chief Student Affairs Officers Do?

Overall, the findings related to instrumental activities, presented by their own admission, few surprises for the chief student affairs officers contrary to Lewis and Dahl's reporting of a sizeable "time illusion" among academic affairs officers.³

Even the fact that as a group the chief student affairs officers leaned heavily towards formal meetings (57.1%), particularly group meetings (40.1%) rather than one-to-one sessions (17.0%) or spontaneous interaction (9.4%) failed to surprise the respondents.⁴


⁴As explained later in this chapter and explored in the interviews, the process of self-reporting one's time seemed to raise the consciousness level of the respondents regarding activities, functions, and contacts. (Continued)
Other activities beyond meetings were allocated in ranges from .2 per cent (sort, file, and retrieve) to 7.0 per cent (read, study, review, evaluate).

This propensity to spend time in formal, planned meetings rather than spontaneous interaction may be highlighted by taking an illustration of the conventional forty-hour work week. This means that almost twenty-three hours per week, or more dramatically, over four and one-half hours per day are allocated for scheduled meetings.

It should be noted that the 57.1 per cent figure noted for chief student affairs officers is consistent with Mintzberg's findings that meetings occupy fifty-nine per cent of managerial time. Pitner's similar

4This may be one explanation for the lack of surprise in these and other findings. One administrator commented on the fact the study raised his level of awareness regarding the "boredom and length of meetings," yet he continually rated meetings as important and satisfying.

5In reality, the vice presidents reported work weeks of approximately sixty hours, a figure consistent with Cohen and March's analysis of forty-two college presidents. The conventional figure of forty hours is used since many of the chief student affairs officers' activities entailed evening work, weekend responsibilities, and ceremonial tasks outside of the office--activities not always reported by the respondents.

TABLE 7a
SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY DIMENSION
C.I.C. GROUP PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Average % of Time Allocated</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Read/Study/Review/  
  Evaluate                 | 7.0                        | 19.7  | 0    |
| Think/Plan                |                            |       |      |
| SHORT-TERM                | 2.4                        | 6.2   | 0    |
| Think/Plan                |                            |       |      |
| LONG-TERM                 | 1.2                        | 4.3   | 0    |
| Sort/File/Retrieve        | .2                         | .5    | 0    |
| Otherb                    | 3.7                        | 11.7  | 0    |
| Adjustmentsc              | .9                         | 2.9   | 0    |

aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

bIncludes instrumental activities not incorporated in the code list or the above categories.

cIncludes truncations, "round-offs", and punching errors.
findings for school superintendents, and Lewis and Dahl's report that academic affairs administrators devote 52.7 per cent of their time to scheduled meetings outside of the classroom.

In an attempt to explain the high percentage of meeting behavior, one of the vice presidents near the mean stated that it was "... a function of the collegial atmosphere, the norms to meet face-to-face, and congruent with consensual decision-making methods" which he employed.

One chief student affairs officer who exceeded the mean percentage for meetings by over 20 per cent noted that this was a reflection of "... front-end, one-time responsibilities as a newly appointed vice president ... indicative of initial priorities to get out and meet a variety of constituents as well as the lack of adequate support staff to pick up the slack." This same vice

---


9 Consistent with the practice used in the previous chapter, direct quotes will be used without acknowledgement of specific vice presidents to protect confidentiality in keeping with the Human Subjects' Committee guidelines. Note also that the pronoun "he" is used in view of the fact that all subjects in the study were male.
president admitted that meetings would continue to be a high priority, however, in view of his tendency to utilize advisory groups to a high degree.

The vice president on the low end of the meeting spectrum (38%), on the other hand, was pleased with the limited time devoted to meetings adding that "the figure is an adequate reflection of my delegating style and a function of M.B.O. principles to which I adhere."

In terms of the group profile, meetings were generally held for the purpose of general administration\textsuperscript{10} followed by budget, staffing/personnel, public relations/service, consultation, and advising students, respectively. These percentages are summarized in cross-tabulation format in Table 8.

This group of vice presidents cannot point to others for infringing upon their time with meetings since twice as many meetings were noted as self-initiated than reactive.

In addition, although meetings were identified as one of the top "time-wasters" by college presidents,\textsuperscript{11} more than half of the meetings were rated as having high importance and almost ninety-one per cent were rated as having a low

\textsuperscript{10}The general administration category of the Function Dimension is explained in greater detail on pages 201-203 of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>Telephone IN</th>
<th>Telephone OUT</th>
<th>Formal Meet. 1:1</th>
<th>Formal Meet. 1+</th>
<th>Spontaneous Interaction</th>
<th>Write/Dictate</th>
<th>Edit/Sign/Update</th>
<th>Review/Eval.</th>
<th>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</th>
<th>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</th>
<th>Initiate/Sort/File/Retrieve</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Students</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleagues</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Acad Units</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
need for improvability. Dissatisfaction with meetings (2.5%) was minimal, too, for the C.I.C. group.

The range of time noted for spontaneous interaction (2.1-14.9%) seemed to be a reflection of job expectations and management style. The vice president with the lowest level of spontaneity pointed to increased efforts to monitor the demands on his time, and support from professional staff as well as the geographical location of his office. The two chief student affairs officers at the other extreme expressed some delight in having some spontaneity emerge during their day. Reasons offered were their dual roles as chief student affairs officers and deans and the strong relationships that they had with their associate deans.

Telephone time, also a major "time-waster" for college administrators in the Mackenzie study,\textsuperscript{12} seemed less of a problem for these vice presidents. Over nine per cent of their time was devoted to using the telephone based on a random sampling of some thirty activities a day. It is also clear that of this time, a greater proportion was noted as telephone "out"--consistent with the vice presidents' efforts to better control their time and their perceived image as proactive. One can note by using the cross-tabulation in Table 9 that almost seventy-two per cent of the telephone conversations were proactive in nature--a figure approximating the mean for all activities.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 79, 248.
### TABLE 9

**ACTIVITY VS. INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS**

A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0% Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfd</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Satisfd</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Dissatisfd</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive/Highly Dissatisfd</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive/Highly Satisfd</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Satisfd</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissatisfd</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissatisfd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
The vice president at the top of the range expressed some surprise at twenty-two per cent of his activities being allocated to the telephone. This figure was attributed to the fact that the vice president for student services on that particular campus was not located in the same administration building with the president and his cabinet. Therefore, he explained, it was necessary to rely on the telephone to a greater degree than spontaneous interaction. Geographical location of student affairs offices, indeed, seemed to be a factor.

The chief student affairs officer who made limited use of the telephone indicated that it was a function of his gregarious style, his relative newness to the position and a related need to learn the campus, his preference for face-to-face encounters at least initially, and his transition from dean of student services to vice president.

The next logical cluster of activities centers around the categories of write/dictate (5.0%), edit/sign/update (3.7%), and read/study/review/evaluate (7.0%). One may note the relative balance among these administrative tasks. Those persons who spent more time in these activities, moreover, generally noted more time reserved for themselves. Overall, they comprised 15.7 per cent of the vice presidents' time. The minimal time (.2%) devoted to sorting, filing, and retrieving activities may substantiate the fact that these high level managers have
learned to delegate such tasks and make use of support staff personnel.

The most surprising—and, perhaps, disturbing—finding is the fact that only 3.6 per cent of the chief student affairs officers' time (and in no cases more than 10.5%) was devoted to thinking and planning, either short-term or long-range. More specifically, half of the sample noted 0 per cent long-range planning time, one subject noted 0 per cent short-range planning, and three vice presidents noted that less than .6 per cent of their time was devoted to short-term thinking and planning.

These findings were in direct contradiction with the vice presidents' job descriptions which highlighted providing long-term planning and the defining of division-wide and institutional objectives related to student life.13

Furthermore, more than one chief student affairs officer noted his discomfort with this statistic and vowed to take steps to re-allocate more time for "... not only long-range planning and more immediate objectives, but just plain quality thinking time ... even vice presidents must daydream and star-gaze."

---

13 The implications for these results related to thinking/planning are considered in greater detail in the concluding chapter.
It should be noted that some of the subjects took exception to the data indicating that a majority of their thinking and planning time was not conducted in the office, but in settings such as home, commuting to and from work, and jogging across campus. Noted one vice president, "The Extensor Unit simply was not well-suited for those of us who are not office-bound."¹⁴

In support of this notion, the vice president who most frequently utilized the data gathering system while at home on weekends or in the office on evenings not surprisingly recorded the highest percentage of planning time--10.5 percent. He also accounted for this allocation by indicating that he had set new priorities three years ago after a time management seminar "... with a conscious eye on increasing my time allocated to thinking and planning." He also admitted that the addition of two professional staff members as primary operational officers had enhanced his planning time.

What minimal planning that did occur among the student affairs officers was predominately related to general administration, teaching/instruction, and budget/finance. Furthermore, the mean data show that planning was generally

¹⁴ A set of contingency rules for giving oneself credit for out-of-office activities was included in the project manual and is explained briefly in Chapter III.
perceived as average or highly important, but "okay as is"; nowhere was it noted that planning should be improved. Thinking and planning were also seen as always proactive and generally the source of moderate to high satisfaction (only .1 per cent was recorded as moderately dissatisfying).

The Function Dimension: For What Organizational Purpose Do Chief Student Affairs Officers Engage in Activities?

As predicted and forewarned by the chief student affairs officers, the month of February represented a period of time heavily linked to the budget cycle. Therefore, the fact that on the whole over ten per cent of their time was devoted to budgetary and financial matters came as no surprise. Over half of this budget time was consumed in one-to-one and group meetings, although the budgetary function seemed to be a part of telephone conversations, spontaneous interaction, writing, studying, and reviewing activities, and, to a lesser extent, the planning process.

Interaction with campus constituents (Table 11) for the purpose of budgetary and financial matters was primarily accomplished through contacts with chief assistants, other campus vice presidents, the president, and to a limited degree, with student affairs staff. Regarding the latter, it is interesting to note that budgetary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Average % of Time Allocated</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchasing</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Students</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Student Affairs Colleagues</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Other Administrators/Academic Units</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

b"Consultation" was defined as requests from others for advice and information. In other words, directionality was implied.

cIncludes functions not incorporated in the code list or the above categories.

dIncludes truncations, "round-offs", and punching errors.
TABLE II
CONTACT VS. FUNCTION FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Students</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleagues</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Acad Units</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
discussions occurred with equal frequency among the chief student affairs officers and non-student affairs colleagues such as the president and campus vice presidents and student affairs associates such as chief assistants and line staff. Student input was clearly minimal in the budgetary process. Faculty, academic administrators, other university constituents, and even secretarial support staff had more involvement in terms of contact time.

Time devoted to budget and finance was seen as a high priority with little need for improvement, almost entirely satisfying and proactive—an indication that the chief student affairs officers retained some control over initiating financial matters.

One vice president in the sample explained his relatively low involvement in budgetary matters (1.9%) in terms of his newness to the position. Despite his low involvement, nevertheless he assessed budget as a function of average to high importance. In addition his chief assistant had held this responsibility with a great deal of autonomy for the past nine years. The chief student affairs officer also expressed his preference for delegating this function among his staff.

Most percentages were clustered around the mean with the high value reported by a vice president who "... made budgets a personal priority" and whose graduate training had included emphasis upon management and
accounting courses.

The staffing/personnel function reported to occupy 8.6 per cent of the chief student affairs officers' time also occurred largely in formal meetings. However, in contrast to budgetary matters being discussed largely in group settings, staffing and personnel functions were almost equally balanced between one-to-one and group meetings. Contacts logically revolved around student affairs staff and chief assistants (some of whom were delegated the personnel and affirmative action responsibilities) to a large extent. Presidents were infrequently consulted for such matters. Students, once again, had no input. In fact, no time was allocated to discussing personnel functions with students. Chief student affairs officers were more likely to contact faculty directly regarding such matters.

Much like budgetary matters, staffing functions were largely self-initiated and the source of considerable satisfaction. There was only a negligible perceived need to improve this area of high importance.

The one vice president who differed greatly from his peers in the time devoted to this function (less than one per cent) explained that it was his style to delegate personnel matters to his chief assistant. (It should be noted that the chief student affairs officer had only minimal contact with his chief assistant:
3.1 per cent compared to a group mean of 9.7 per cent.)

Again, this vice president affirmed that he was dedicated to a management-by-objectives style of administration whereby goals and objectives for staffing and personnel functions are codified formally at the beginning of the academic year. This means that a summer or autumn sampling of this same vice president might reveal a higher amount of time allocated to defining staffing and personnel objectives.

Although the student personnel field is founded upon principles involving maximizing the potential for the development of students,15 apparently this purpose is fulfilled through other means than counseling or advising students, or at least by other persons within the C.I.C. student personnel administration hierarchy. The relatively small amount of time devoted to the function of counseling and advising students (5.3 per cent; 3.9 per cent actually involved performing this function directly with students as revealed in Table 11) confirms for this group of vice presidents the widely held maxim that as one progresses through leadership positions from entry through middle management to the top echelons, one's involvement in the counseling and advising of students and one's direct

contact with students (in this case, 8.4 per cent, as detailed under the Contact Dimension) decreases.

In follow-up interviews, reactions to these data ranged from delight (that is, intentionally planned three years ago as a result of a time management study performed) to admission that this function was left to the line officers with student contacts for vice presidents limited to a significant group of student leaders.

It was generally acknowledged that the role of the vice president was, by design, cabinet-level, and not conducive to direct involvement in the counseling/advising process. At least two of the vice presidents were in the process of revitalizing the dean of students functions as a line officer to more adequately address this function—also labeled as student advocacy by one chief student affairs officer.

The chief student affairs officer who was newest to his vice presidential role candidly expressed some concern over the limited amount of time allocated to this function (although his time allocated exceeded the mean by one percent) and indicated that steps would be taken to increase his own role in the advising process.

Nevertheless, this advisory function was perceived largely as having average to high importance, proactive, and moderately satisfying by the C.I.C. group. Few
chief student affairs officers recognized a need to improve this particular function.

The function of organizational crisis intervention showed a range of over thirteen per cent in terms of time allocated. Some of the vice presidents interviewed simply did not see this as a significant role or preferred to call it problem-solving or conflict resolution with less reactive connotations. This function was performed largely in formal group meetings but was more spontaneous in nature than most other functions. The vice presidents tended to rely on their chief assistants and student affairs staff in performing this task rather than attacking it individually. The president was seldom consulted regarding such matters. Still, in spite of reactive or pejorative connotations, this function was seen as proactive and the source of moderate satisfaction. Improvability did not seem to be a factor.

The area of consultation was an interesting function in that it was defined as "requests for advice from colleagues" and, therefore, denoted directionality. Nevertheless, consultation, at least with student affairs colleagues, was perceived to be self-initiated according to the data—seemingly a contradiction. Consultation with other administrators and academic units was more readily reported as reactive—one of the few categories where the function was more reactive than proactive. Taken in
combination, this may be seen as some evidence that the respondents understood the definition of consultation as stated in the project manual, but maintained their proactive posture even when receiving requests for information—at least with their own staffs where they exercised direct supervision and leadership.

Responses varied widely in terms of time allocated to the dual consulting functions and may be a product of factors such as chief student affairs officers' visibility, areas of expertise, accessibility, openness for advice, and perceptions of influence and importance by their colleagues. Such factors are open for further investigation.

It is also interesting to note that the chief student affairs officer who reported the highest amount of time allocated to consulting with staff (25%) came from a background outside of student personnel work, emphasized staff autonomy and M.B.O. practices, and maintained the highest contact time with student affairs staff (29%). This suggests that some complex patterns exist.

Consultation with academic units seemed to be both of importance and a priority to those vice presidents interviewed who defined their leadership roles more broadly beyond student affairs areas to institutional policy implementation and decision-making.
The teaching and research functions are more closely associated with faculty members and academic affairs administrators as evidenced by the Lewis and Dahl study where 15.9 per cent and 8.5 per cent were allocated to these functions, respectively.\(^{16}\)

Four of the six vice presidents in the sample held tenured professorships, served on doctoral committees, and taught graduate seminars. The minimal time commitment of 2.5 per cent devoted to teaching and formal instruction, nevertheless, seemed to be congruent with the subjects' expectations.

The extraordinarily high percentage of time dedicated to the general administrative function (35.8\%) compared to teaching-related functions lends credence to the self-perceptions of the chief student affairs officers who admitted that they were educators in the sense of being administrative leaders more than instructors in the formal sense.

It should be noted that the chief student affairs officer with the highest percentage of time allocated to teaching (6.7\%) also holds a joint appointment as dean of academic affairs and coordinated and taught a number

\(^{16}\)Lewis and Dahl, "Time Management in Higher Education," p.56.
of courses as part of his responsibilities as director of his institution's summer session. In contrast, those who recorded no time for teaching did so either as a conscious objective (that is, not to have a standing course load but to do occasional lecturing) or as a result of administrative leadership priorities as a new vice president.

Those who did teach remarked that: (1) they wished to maintain linkages with faculty and students in a purely academic setting to complement student life settings; (2) they saw it as a means of exercising scholarly pursuits (a dimension of satisfaction which was rated as very unsatisfactory in follow-up interviews); (3) they recognized the need to see students—and be seen—in a different light (that is, in the classroom environment) to maintain a sense of perspective; (4) they saw teaching as complementary to their work, but not equal; and (5) they viewed teaching as an alternative career following their "administrative lives".

Much like their administrative functions, they viewed their teaching efforts as highly important, "okay as is", and almost entirely proactive and satisfying.

Research activities were limited for the vice presidents—in all cases under three per cent and averaging under two per cent. Most research was addressed in formal meetings and students were included in research
endeavors to a slightly higher degree than faculty or academic deans or student affairs colleagues. When involved in research, only a moderate degree of dissatisfaction was noted and this function tended to be more evenly balanced along the proactive/reactive dimension. This function was uniformly assigned a high degree of importance with some opportunity for improvement noted.

As might be predicted for a group of chief student affairs officers who perceived their roles beyond student affairs to institutional, community, and national leadership, their time allocations for public relations and service exceeded that for their teaching and research functions. The 7.7 per cent total was still surprisingly low given the range of services under their domain, the demands placed on their time for representing the president at public functions, the strong notion of volunteerism and community service evident in student life, and the leadership positions which many held in civic groups and national student personnel associations. Perhaps, the Extensor technology did not accompany them to civic functions; nor did they enter in the data when returning to their offices!

One chief student affairs officer commented that had the study been conducted during the spring quarter marked by more ceremonial functions and year-end banquets, the
figure would have been substantially higher. This is just one indication of the cyclical basis of student personnel work and the bias of the data collection's meaning in this study.

Expectedly, this function drew the chief student affairs officers into more frequent contacts with other university constituents (parents and alumni/ae) and other publics (citizens, business persons, and legislators) and less predictably with students who, remarked one chief student affairs officer, were "showing livelier signs of a commitment to community service."

Up until this point, the diversity of functions reported each represents ten per cent or less of the time allocations according to the group profile.

The notion of general administration proved to be problematic and a convenient "catch-all" for chief student affairs officers unable or unwilling to make discriminating choices among their functions. A group mean of 35.8 per cent allocated to general administration with a range of 15.4 per cent indicated a high tendency to use this category and to use it repeatedly. It should be stressed that an earlier study of academic affairs administrators at the University of Minnesota rendered a similar finding: Academic administrators in the College of Education allocated 44.2 per cent of their time to their administrative role, overshadowing research,
teaching and service functions.\textsuperscript{17}

An initial manual audit of the data cards by the researcher also disclosed that the subjects used this category in patterns over the duration of several cards or hours of work. They also used it intermittently in combination with a variety of activities and contacts. For example, general administration was prevalent in formal meetings as well as in writing and reviewing activities alone. Although recorded most frequently when the chief student affairs officers were by themselves, general administration accounted for two-thirds of presidential time as well as in lesser proportions with contacts with student affairs staff, university administrators, and other constituents. In other words, this function was not confined to specific activities or contacts.

In terms of explanation, the chief student affairs officers indicated that they used this category to capture the potpourri of administrative tasks not delineated elsewhere--tasks which required "administrative detail" such as report or grant writing, student advocacy and an ombudsman function, campus governance, problem identification and solving, curriculum planning, policy implementation, and the myriad of issues and functions

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.
subsumed under central administration, regents, and trustees meetings. General administration, according to one chief student affairs officer, was also used in combination with activities such as writing and reviewing "... to reflect the vast amount of time devoted to drafting materials, opening and reviewing mail, and the less glamorous administrative demands associated with student affairs work--demands that are not singular in purpose."

The data do indicate, however, that a majority of general administration work is seen as proactive, yet only moderately satisfying, and also generally of high importance with little perceived need for improvability.

The Contact Dimension: With Whom Do Chief Student Affairs Officers Spend Their Time?

As one reviews the time allocated to the various contacts in the chief student affairs officers' worlds, it is evident that they spend a considerable portion of their day--over twenty per cent--by themselves. It is also apparent that this private time, although interrupted on occasion for telephone calls, meetings, spontaneous interaction and other activities, is highly valued and the source of moderate to high satisfaction. As a group, the vice presidents rated this time alone most often as having high importance, yet with little need for improvement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Average % of Time Allocated</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Chancellor</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Vice Presidents</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Assistant/Assistant Vice President/Dean of Students</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Staff</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Clerical Support Staff</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues--Other Institutions</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University Constituents/Parents/Alumni/ae</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Publics/Citizens.Business Persons/Legislators</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

*bWhenever possible generic terms with universal meaning among C.I.C. chief student affairs officers were used.

*cIncludes truncations, "round-offs", and punching errors.
## Table 13a

**Activity vs. Contact for C.I.C. Chief Student Affairs Officers**

A two dimensional matrix format

| Contact                                      | 100.0%   | Telephone | Telephone | Telephone | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Meet | Call/Me |  

### Notes:

**a** Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

**b** To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
Moreover, time alone was consciously structured in that fashion and controlled as expressed in individual interviews and as substantiated by the data—eighty-six per cent of the overall time alone was recorded as proactive.

Over three-quarters of this private time was devoted to writing, editing, updating, reading, studying, reviewing, and evaluating activities. Most of the vice presidents admitted that this was the only time to accomplish such tasks with any degree of concentration. One chief student affairs officer rated his time alone as "the most demanding part of the job, far outweighing crisis intervention, negotiating, and other aspects of being a chief student affairs officer."

Furthermore, a manual audit of the data cards indicated that the aforementioned activities, although sometimes interspersed with other activities and contacts, typically occurred in blocks of time. This suggests that the chief student affairs officers utilize some of the time-saving techniques recommended by Mackenzie, Lakein, and others such as setting aside blocks of uninterrupted solitary time. Unfortunately, little of this solitary time—less than one per cent—was devoted to long-range planning and only slightly more than two per cent for short-term thinking and planning.
In terms of functions carried out alone, budget was second to the predominant general administration function, followed by personal matters— one of the few times allocated for non-job-related functions. Other functions were distributed somewhat evenly with each occupying less than one per cent of their time alone. A cross-tabulation of contact and function allocations is depicted in Table 11.

The vice president who recorded the highest percentage of time alone, thirty-four per cent, was extremely pleased to see the results of his conscious efforts to control his time. Again, he had taken specific steps to re-allocate his time following a time management seminar three years previous and a self-study and logging of his time conducted two years ago with the aid of his secretary. The appointment of two full-time assistants, the delegation of time with students (in his case, five per cent) to "counselors better prepared to advise them", and the constant monitoring of his calendar by support staff helped him to achieve his goal of at least one-third of his time alone for reading, writing, thinking, and planning. Regarding the latter, this particular vice president also recorded the greatest amount of planning time, both short-term and long-range, among his peers. Most of this "quality time", as he called it, was accomplished alone.
The vice president who recorded the lowest percentage of time alone, less than six per cent, ironically also expressed some pleasure in the minimal amount of time he was "out of the mainstream of contacts." As the newest vice president in terms of longevity in his present position he did offer the cautionary note that he fully expected this figure would increase over time once he had realized his initial priorities of establishing a strong and diversified network of constituents.

Presidential time (that is, contact with the chief executive officer of each C.I.C. campus) was of considerable interest to the researcher and, therefore, the subject of more in-depth exploration during the interview phase of the study. When asked to describe "typical issues" or to elaborate on the contents of contacts with their presidents, the responses of the chief student affairs officers were focused on the following categories:

1. Consideration of fees and budgetary matters and the implications of financial decisions on the university community—the student population in particular.

2. Information sharing and dissemination involving all other cabinet-level officials.

3. Discussion of "campus tone," and mood, and the environment.

4. "Anything and everything" related to student issues. Remarked one vice president:

   I have the unenviable job of
being perceived as being responsible for students, of carrying the burden for the most unpredictable constituency in the university community, and having to interpret student-related issues to my president and to the greater community. . . . This is what we talk about!

(5) Formal "need to know" sessions, one-to-one with the president "to keep ahead of the game" and serve as a buffer and information agent.

(6) The development and interpretation of policies particularly as they relate to student life.

(7) The identification and resolution of problems related to the campus community in general.

Extensor data related to presidential time confirmed that most of the time spent with presidents was in group meetings with other cabinet-level administrators. The purpose of such meetings and other contacts with the president was not clearly delineated due to the preponderance of general administration functions reported. Budgetary matters, as predicted, seemed to be shared with some frequency; however, the actual counseling/advising function of students—historically at the heart of student personnel work—was only marginally the focus of chief student affairs officers' time with their presidents.

Despite claims that chief student affairs officers serve at the whim of their presidents, the data indicate that as with other contacts, chief student affairs
officers asserted their initiative, albeit to a lesser degree. Although more than sixty per cent of their time with presidents was recorded as proactive, this is in contrast to seventy-five per cent of their overall time being self-initiated.

The satisfaction level, nonetheless, exceeded the overall level of 94.4 per cent by 4.5 per cent and a greater tendency toward being highly satisfied was expressed. Apparently, time with the president was most satisfying for the chief student affairs officers.

The vice president with the lowest level of contact with his president (half that of his colleagues) expressed some surprise regarding the "intrusion level" of his colleagues. He postulated that if all cabinet-level vice presidents had similar demands on the president this would easily occupy half of a president's day. This same vice president theorized that the amount of time spent with the president is inversely proportional to a chief student affairs officer's autonomy—in effect, a sign of dependence. All other responses clustered around the eight per cent to twelve per cent range in terms of time allocated to the president with the chief student affairs officer at the highest end of the spectrum setting a priority to reduce the time he was demanding of his chancellor.
As indicated above, much of the time allocated to meeting with the president also involved sessions with other vice presidents. Nevertheless, on an average approximately a half-hour per working day was devoted to contacts with other cabinet members: the provost, the vice president for business and finance, the vice president for development, and other executives at the vice presidential level. This time allocation varied only slightly among the subjects. Most of the contact occurred in group meetings, and to a lesser extent, one-to-one sessions and through telephone contacts.

The purpose of such encounters was much like that of presidential contacts—general administration followed by budget. The data indicate that some of the requests for consultation came from fellow vice presidents although the type of advice requested is not clear.

Despite the fact that much has been written about the student affairs-academic affairs relationship, it is interesting to note that no time was recorded for the purpose of considering teaching or instruction with this group of vice presidents.

---

18One of the shortcomings of the Extensor System is that it presumes that categories within a given dimension are mutually exclusive. The method used most frequently by the chief student affairs officers when facing two or more possible alternatives was to select the primary person or persons towards which particular activities or functions were addressed. This method was conveyed in follow-up interviews conducted by the researcher.
Contacts with campus vice presidents were related as having high importance and "okay as is" eighty-four per cent of the time as opposed to the mean of fifty-three per cent for this category for importance and improvability. In terms of initiative, each hour of contact initiated by campus vice presidents was offset by two and one-half hours initiated by chief student affairs officers. The chief student affairs officers expressed a more moderate degree of satisfaction interacting with their cabinet-level peers than with their presidents.

Time with chief assistants varied widely among the sample group—from 3.1 per cent to 17.3 per cent; or an average of 9.7 per cent. Again the vice president on the low end of the spectrum justified his limited time with his chief assistant by stressing autonomous working relationships and clearly defined roles and objectives as a product of systematizing M.B.O. for his student affairs division. On the other hand, the chief student affairs officer who spent the greatest amount of time with his chief assistants credited this to the larger make-up of his full-time professional staff—two assistant vice presidents and an acting dean of students. This same vice president consulted with his chief assistants most frequently in formal one-to-one meetings whereas some of the other chief student affairs officers...
reportedly took advantage of this contact time to exercise a much greater level of spontaneity in their contacts.

Overall, almost ninety per cent of the time with chief assistants was initiated by the vice presidents lending credence to one chief student affairs officer's belief that it is a vice president's prerogative to initiate activities and contacts and to delegate certain tasks to professional staff members.

Although largely satisfied with such contacts, the chief student affairs officers also exercised their prerogative to report some dissatisfaction, but only about five per cent of this time with chief assistants. This figure is minimal; however, it was proportionally exceeded only by the dissatisfaction expressed during student contact time and time with parents and alumni/ae. Nevertheless, the aggregate picture that emerges from a comparison of time with chief assistants against work assessment is one of relatively high importance and little perceived need to improve the quality of the contact.

Next to the time allocated to self, there was a sizeable segment of time devoted to contacts with student affairs staff—18.6 per cent. As might be expected of persons exercising leadership over their staffs, this time, too, was proactive consistent with the mean
figure for proactive time—that is, three-quarters of chief student affairs officers' time. Yet, in follow-up interviews, the chief student affairs officers admitted to seemingly frequent requests from their line officers—matters which required them to react and to feel uncomfortable in doing so. However, if one accepts the notion of directionality alluded to earlier and built into the consultation category, the 7.3 per cent figure for consultation with student affairs colleagues with fifty-one per cent constituting direct contact with student affairs staff for the purpose of advice places their feelings of reacting to staff members in a more realistic perspective.

Nevertheless, the above feelings may account for relegating contacts with student affairs staff to average or low importance although over half of these contacts maintained high importance according to the chief student affairs officers. Little need for improvement was noted.

Much like contacts with chief assistants, contacts with student personnel staff occurred in formal meetings at least half of the time, with group sessions being twice as prevalent as one-to-one meetings. The chief student affairs officers exercised less spontaneous time with their student affairs staff overall than with their chief assistants, but still more than
with non-student affairs constituencies. Student affairs staff were omitted from what little time was allocated for short and long-range planning—perhaps the result of a forced choice in the instrumentation between group meetings and planning.

Staffing and personnel functions as well as the aforementioned consultation function rivaled time spent with student affairs staff regarding general administration. Crisis intervention emerged more frequently with this group than with others. The budget function was allocated only 1 per cent of the 18.6 per cent total allotment with student affairs staff. As conjecture, this may provide some insights regarding the budgetary process utilized or simply be a reflection of timing in the budget cycle.

It is apparent by looking at the divergence of time allocated to student affairs staff that a number of different management styles may be reflected. One of the two vice presidents who noted the highest percentage of time allocated to his staff—some ten per cent above the group mean—indicated that he had built in meetings, both individual and group, on a weekly basis as part of his orientation to the institution and the student services division and to provide adequate "air time" initially for his staff. He also admitted that much of his problem identification and problem-solving
was accomplished through formal meetings and consultation with his staff. His M.B.O. - inspired colleague on the high end of the spectrum (28.9%), noted that much of his contact time with his line officers was devoted to working through mutually defined objectives. This is in marked contrast to his very limited time (3.1%) with his chief assistants. Apparently, his M.B.O. style translates very differently when it comes to contacts with staff and line personnel.

The somewhat limited time with students (8.4%) for the C.I.C. group overall suggests that such contacts occur in well-controlled settings. This was the case in terms of contacts occurring in scheduled meetings. However, when dealing with students, the data show that the vice presidents were more inclined to fall into a reactive mode—thirty-five per cent versus twenty-three per cent reactive time overall.

Contacts with students were divided equally among one-to-one and group activities with the combined meeting time comprising eighty-two per cent of the time allocated to students. This left only limited time for spontaneous interaction, telephone contacts, and other unplanned activities with students.

To illustrate further the notion of student contact based on the mean data, if one were to study a C.I.C. chief student affairs officer over a month
resulting in some 524 observation (the mean for the group), only 44 of those occasions would include students as the principal contact.

To account for this low ratio of time devoted to student contacts, the vice presidents again recognized their cabinet-level responsibilities and admitted that it was more in keeping with their organizations that line officers maintain the primary responsibility for student contacts. In addition, chief assistants were many times perceived as buffers to handle drop-in students and spontaneous problems. During the interviews, a majority of the chief student affairs officers emphasized their high expectations for their directors and coordinators to maintain a high level of student contact. Also, in terms of work assessment, the vice presidents rated their own contacts with students as being important with only minimal need for improvement.

Many of the structured meetings chief student affairs officers had with students took the form of advisory groups—a primary means of maintaining student input and keeping current without inundating their total time allocations. The purpose of such meetings was usually noted as counseling and advising with other functions such as organizational crisis intervention, public relations and service, teaching, and general administration (identified as campus governance in many
cases of student contacts) being distributed almost equally. As noted earlier, student contacts did not generally occur for the purpose of budget, staffing, or personnel matters.

The chief student affairs officer with the lowest time allocated for student contacts (4.3%) explained that three factors may have contributed: (1) He did not have regularly scheduled committee meetings with students on a weekly basis; (2) he did not maintain a standing teaching commitment; and (3) it was consistent with his style to delegate student concerns to his department heads since "they are the ones where the action is." He also admitted that there was some educational value in having students address their concerns at the appropriate level and follow established grievance procedures rather than reverting to what he called the "top dog syndrome."

Those vice presidents with a higher percentage of contact time devoted to students acknowledged that: (1) They saw themselves in the dual role of dean of students and cabinet-level administrators; (2) the student advocacy role was one which they enjoyed and were reluctant to relinquish; (3) they had pledged to go beyond senior staff and residence hall directors to make first-hand impressions and assessments of the student culture; and (4) students were a vital part of their network of problem-identification agents and
critical to the resolution of problems.

Lewis and Dahl have underlined the value of the Extensor System in highlighting "islands of non-communication"\(^\text{19}\) within the realm of contacts. For one of the subjects, an analysis of his lack of faculty contacts was enlightening. More significantly, it provided a rational basis for beginning to change his contact patterns. Through the interview it was learned that his priorities were admittedly to initiate contacts and strengthen relationships with his president, fellow vice presidents, students, alumni/ae and parents, and most importantly, with his own student affairs staff.\(^\text{20}\)

However, the absence of time set aside for faculty contacts was of considerable concern. Despite not having natural means for association through teaching at this point, the vice president expressed his intent to build contacts with faculty through consultation, service on student life committees, and by calling for their assistance on search and screen committees—all tactics used with some success by his colleagues. In fact, overall contacts with faculty centered around general administration (campus governance was again noted),

\(^\text{19}\) Lewis and Dahl, "Time Management in Higher Education," p. 58.

\(^\text{20}\) A review of his time allocations for these contacts reveals substantial time devoted to each of these constituencies.
staffing and personnel, consultation, and instruction.

To the extent that faculty are involved in academic advising, it is interesting that very little time was allocated to discussing the advisement of students with faculty. In addition, it is surprising that the chief student affairs officer who also functions as an academic affairs officer recorded contacts with faculty below the group mean.

Those chief student affairs officers reporting higher levels of faculty contact expressed generally moderate levels of satisfaction. Even when crossing into "faculty turf" (many of these meetings with faculty occurred outside of the vice presidents' offices in academic settings), the chief student affairs officers maintained their tendency to meet formally as a group, a proactive stance, a belief in the importance of such encounters, and a judgment that there was little need to improve the quality of the contact time.

The chief student affairs officer with the highest percentage of contact with academic deans (9.3%) spent most of it in formal meetings, but also allowed for spontaneous interaction with these persons to a higher degree than with faculty members.

Once again, the chief student affairs officer who held a joint title as vice president for student affairs and dean of academic affairs recorded less time
allocated to contacts not only with faculty members, but also with academic deans. In both categories, his responses were below the mean data. However, his time with his own student affairs staff was significantly lower than other C.I.C. officials; therefore, it is difficult to draw inferences other than relying on his statement that he "valued his time alone" (34.1%) and attempted to minimize wasteful meetings through more time planning, organizing, writing, editing, and reviewing his thoughts (30.5%) and "not relying upon the resources of my academic colleagues to a high degree."

It is also noteworthy that the chief student affairs officer with the lowest percentage of time allocated to academic deans held broader responsibilities for campus affairs under his job description. Apparently, from his perspective, the process of coordinating the academic milieu did not require more substantial time allotments with academic and college deans. Nevertheless, his action plan included more time devoted for contacts with academic units. The minimal contact that occurred in February happened over the telephone rather than in face-to-face meetings and was noted as of average importance, "okay as is," proactive, and moderately satisfying.

Overall, the chief student affairs officers rated contacts with college deans as moderately satisfying
with an even balance occurring between proactive and reactive contacts. A majority of the contacts were purported to center around requests for advice or consultation.

One category where the abbreviation on the code list ("Colleagues--Other Inst.") and a misinterpretation by one of the subjects may have skewed the data was the "Colleagues from other institutions" classification. A number of chief student affairs officers reported having "healthy professional associations;" indeed, at least two-thirds of the group had been or were currently active on executive boards of major student personnel associations. Others were more modest in their approach admitting that their own campus constituents sufficiently demanded their time. However, the chief student affairs officer on the high end of the percentages (8.3%) advised the researcher in subsequent discussions that he had construed the category to mean other colleagues within the institution not subsumed under other categories. In fairness, although others in the sample did not make this error, a prevalent constructive criticism was the fact that the code list should have designated a category for other administrators outside of student affairs but not at the campus vice president or dean level (for example, the bursar, the chief of public safety, the registrar, and the associate vice president
General administration and personnel/staffing headed the list of functions engaged in with colleagues from other institutions lending support to one vice president's conjecture that colleagues from other institutions were contacted most frequently to discuss professional association activities, common administrative issues confronting chief student affairs officers, and as resource persons and references in staff selection processes. It was predicted, furthermore, by a majority of the subjects that their contacts with colleagues from other colleges and universities would increase during the months of March and April, traditionally the months for professional association conferences.

The last two categories in the contact dimension proved to be a good index of the chief student affairs officers' propensity for establishing contacts with persons outside of the university. Combined with responses for public relations/service under the function dimension, some clear patterns emerged:

(1) The four chief student affairs officers who were below the mean in terms of temporal contacts with other university constituents such as parents and alumni/ae were also below the mean in terms of time spent with "other publics" (for example, citizens, business persons, and legislators).

(2) The average percentage of time allocated to these constituents combined was 7.7 per cent for this subgroup of four as opposed to 15.9 per
cent and 24.3 per cent devoted to these contacts by the two other chief student affairs officers. None of this first subgroup exceeded 10 per cent.

(3) The two chief student affairs officers who recorded a larger percentage of contact time with these constituents also reported 10.3 per cent of their functional time being earmarked for public relations and service. This figure, too, exceeds the public relations/service percentages for the other four vice presidents whose responses ranged from 2.9 per cent to 8.4 per cent.  

One could infer, therefore, that the two chief student affairs officers reporting the higher percentage in the three categories cited above were more externally oriented in their priorities, and perhaps in their behaviors.

The Work Assessment Dimension: How Important Is the Work of Chief Student Affairs Officers? What Aspects Should Be Improved?

Unlike the first three dimensions considered, the work assessment dimension goes beyond a recording of activities, functions, and contacts to subjective judgments regarding the importance and improvability of student personnel work.

This dimension required the respondents to address two major questions each time the Extensor unit emitted

21 These figures were computed by using the individual summary tables found in the appendix.
a signal:

(1) "How important is what you are doing right now as a chief student affairs officer of your institution?"

(2) "Should your performance of the task in which you are engaged be improved or is it okay as is?"

In short, the work assessment dimension enabled the researcher to look at the subjects' subjective feelings as they reflected upon their work over several dimensions.22

In looking at the overall picture of the importance of the chief student affairs officers' work as illustrated in Figure 4, it is evident that this sample group attached a high level of importance to their work: nearly ninety-seven per cent of the total observations were rated as having average or high importance with nearly two-thirds of their work rated at the highest level.

Uniformly, the participants attached a good deal of importance to their work. Moreover, this finding was met with no surprise from the chief student affairs officers during interviews conducted after the initial data collection. Acknowledged one vice president:

---

22Since specific notations have been made repeatedly regarding the work assessment and initiative satisfaction dimensions throughout the analysis of the first three dimensions, and based on cross-tabulations of these subjective dimensions with the more objective dimensions, the treatment of these last two dimensions will be more general.
FIGURE 4a

A SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPORTANCE OF C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS' WORK

Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. For the purposes of this illustration percentages are rounded off to the nearest whole number.
FIGURE 5a

A SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPROVABILITY OF C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS’ WORK

aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. For the purposes of this illustration percentages are rounded off to the nearest whole number.
### TABLE 14a

**SUMMARY OF WORK ASSESSMENT DIMENSION**  
**C.I.C. GROUP PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Improvability</th>
<th>Average % of Work</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Importance</td>
<td>Should Be Improved</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Importance</td>
<td>O.K. As Is</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Importance</td>
<td>Should Be Improved</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Importance</td>
<td>O.K. As Is</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Importance</td>
<td>Should Be Improved</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Importance</td>
<td>O.K. As Is</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustmentsb</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

*b* Includes truncations, "round-offs", and punching errors.
It surprises me little that I assigned a high level of importance to my work; nor do the comparable figures for my colleagues bring any surprises. Student affairs and cabinet-level responsibilities in a large institutional setting denote high expectations for leadership and importance—a sense of priority. One must look at the total context. Although some tasks admittedly seem mundane, there is an overall sense of importance that comes with a vice presidency in the Big Ten.

Echoed a colleague,

It's reasonably gratifying to know that over ninety per cent of our time is of average or high importance. It's of great concern to a lot of us that we are not spinning our wheels dealing with trivia. That's good from my perspective.

The data seem to go beyond this overall feeling of importance, however, or at least document an intuitive feeling with hard data related to a myriad of activities. In the Extensor study it was not the general concept of C.I.C. chief student affairs officers' work which was purportedly being assessed, but each contributing piece—some 3,141 observations gathered over a month-long period of time. The diverse data generate this collective picture of importance. It should be reiterated that each activity was rated at the time of its random occurrence; this differs greatly from a methodology requiring respondents to assign a percentage to the overall importance of their work. It is a cumulative picture that emerges.

Where individual differences did exist, the researcher was able to match their unimportant
classifications, however limited, against the relevant activities, functions, and contacts using the two-dimensional matrix tables.

Nevertheless, this pervasive sense of importance seems to be reflected in the full range of activities, functions, and contacts. No clear picture of anomalies seems to emerge beyond the fact that very few tasks or interactions were reported as being of low importance. Meetings, for example, noted occasionally as "time-wasters," were not relegated to the low importance category to a greater degree than the norm (2.9%). No clear trend of unimportant functions can be noted. In terms of contacts, time with the president, campus vice presidents, and chief assistants were never rated as low in importance while contacts with others reported to have a somewhat lower value were seldom, if ever, noted as needing improvement.

This sense of importance of the day-to-day responsibilities of C.I.C. vice presidents is matched by an equally pervasive feeling that "things are really okay as they are" almost ninety per cent of the time. The chief student affairs officers' self-assessment that
### TABLE 15a

**ACTIVITY VS. WORK ASSESSMENT FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS**

*A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ASSESSMENT: IMPOR/IMPROV</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>Telephone IN</th>
<th>Telephone OUT</th>
<th>Formal Meet 1:1</th>
<th>Formal Meet 1+</th>
<th>Spontaneous Interaction</th>
<th>Dictate</th>
<th>Read/Study/Review</th>
<th>Sort/File/Arrange</th>
<th>THINK/PLAN SHORT-TERM</th>
<th>THINK/PLAN LONG-TERM</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/OK as is</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

bTo find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
### TABLE 16

**FUNCTIONS VS. WORK ASSESSMENT FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS**

**A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ASSESSMENT: IMPOR/IMPROV</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>Budget/Purch</th>
<th>Staffing/Personnel</th>
<th>Casework/Advisement</th>
<th>Crisis/Organization</th>
<th>Consult/STD/Outreach</th>
<th>Consult/Oth/Adm</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching/Instruction</th>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>General Admin</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/OK as is</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Improv</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

*b To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
### TABLE 17a
CONTACT VS. WORK ASSESSMENT FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMATb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>20-79%</th>
<th>President/Chancellor</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>90-99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>90-99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>90-99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>80-89%</th>
<th>90-99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Impro</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/Should be Impro</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/OK as is</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Impro</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

b To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
only 10.8 per cent\textsuperscript{23} of their activities, functions, and contacts should be improved speaks to their belief in the concomitant importance of their work and their ability to maintain, as one chief student affairs officer remarked,

\ldots a sense of perspective, worth, and stability in our work . . . but also a combination of humility and acceptance that what we are doing is of sound quality . . . that it has some integrity and requires little improvement. . . . I think the seasoned professional has come to grips with this realization.

Apparently, even those minimal number of activities, functions, and contacts that were rated as having low importance were accepted as is with few indications (less than 1\%) that improvements should be made.

It should be noted that of all the dimensions shared with the C.I.C. chief student affairs officers initially, work assessment seemed to be the most problematic. Concerns centered around a reluctance to rate activities according to a forced choice format and the assumption that some tasks were really neutral, value-free, or accepted as "part of the territory" and, therefore, could not be rated in terms of importance and

\textsuperscript{23}Even this figure may be misleading since five of the six chief student affairs officers were in the 1.6 per cent-8.8 per cent range and one vice president indicated a 36.4 per cent need for improvement. The same administrator questioned the validity of his colleagues' assessment.
improvability. In the follow-up interviews, one vice president commented on the rigidity of the categories and advocated more flexibility in the work assessment dimension in future studies.

Unfortunately, the data provide few clues to the researcher for staff development activities or interventions to improve certain aspects of the chief student affairs officers' work as anticipated nor are the assessments as helpful as expected in terms of assisting chief student affairs officers in rearranging priorities.

What can be inferred is that a number of highly rated activities, functions, and contacts are competing for segments of the chief student affairs officers' time. Without being able to discriminate among their relative importance, the vice presidents will be unable to rank these categories as suggested in the time management literature and build allocations around set priorities.

The Initiative/Satisfaction Dimension: Who Initiates the Work of Chief Student Affairs Officers? What Level of Satisfaction is Derived from Student Personnel Work?

The final dual dimension required the participants to indicate whether their activities were initiated by themselves (proactive) or by others (reactive) and required a subjective judgment as to the level of satisfaction derived from various activities, functions,
and contacts. In addition, one phase of the follow-up interview questions centered around the determinants of job satisfaction as cited by Solmon and Tierney in their study of higher education administrators.24

If one accepts the inference that a myriad of complex and highly important activities, functions, and contacts are placing demands on chief student affairs officers as suggested in the previous section, it could be assumed that this situation would cause vice presidents to revert to a reactive mode of management and be less than satisfied with their work. This assumption contradicts sharply, however, with the findings as presented in Table 18 and depicted in Figures 6 and 7.

What emerges is a picture of chief student affairs officers who maintain a high degree of control over the initiation of activities—as a group over three-quarters of their observed activities were recorded as proactive. All chief student affairs officers in the study rated their work as self-initiated more than half of the time and one vice president responded that virtually all (99.9%) of his work was proactive. The

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION DIMENSION
C.I.C. GROUP PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At Whose Initiative</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Average % of Work</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfied</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Moderately Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfied</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Moderately Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

*Initiative was defined as either proactive (i.e., self-initiated by the chief student affairs officer) or reactive (i.e., in response to others).

*Includes truncations, "round-offs", and punching errors.
FIGURE 6a

INITIATIVEb IN STUDENT AFFAIRS WORK AS PERCEIVED BY C.I.C. VICE PRESIDENTS AND DEANS

aBased on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. For the purposes of this illustration percentages are rounded off to the nearest whole number.

bInitiative was defined as either proactive (i.e., self-initiated by the chief student affairs officer) or reactive (i.e., in response to others).
FIGURE 7

A REPRESENTATION OF THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION DERIVED FROM CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS WORK

Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. For the purposes of this illustration percentages are rounded off to the nearest whole number.
same subject admitted that:

The 99.9 per cent figure was probably not an accurate reflection of the extent to which some activities are reactive. It may be a reflection of the feeling that the job is never done . . . that there is always more to do. Therefore, you choose those things upon which you are going to take initiative. Others will pick up those that are perhaps more reactive.

Finally, he used a football analogy to explain a vice president's prerogative: "You learn quickly to hand-off to your running back those things which are more reactive and where there is less satisfaction."

Still another chief student affairs officer explained his preponderence of proactive time slightly exceeding the group mean (75.6%) by stating that, "It is a product of one's sense of overall control and of the proportion of time I spend alone." (In this case, the chief student affairs officer spent 34.1 per cent of his time alone, the highest among his peers.)

As indicated previously, this proactive pattern held true whether the vice presidents were interacting with their presidents, colleagues, or students, although the percentage dropped to sixty per cent when dealing with the president. The range of activities were also self-initiated to a high degree, particularly the writing, editing, reading, thinking and planning activities. Proactive functions were positively skewed as well.
Finally, it was emphasized in a majority of the follow-up interviews that the term "proactive" is highly prized in the student personnel field. Stated one vice president:

The high percentage of our time devoted to proactive activities is indicative of our efforts to constantly strive to anticipate issues. It is expected in our field. In this sense, it is an accurate— if not objective—reflection of how we perceive our time.

It is interesting to compare these findings to Lewis and Dahl's findings that less than half of the time allocations of academic administrators were self-initiated\(^{25}\) and Cohen and March's study of forty-two college presidents in which it was reported:

... about thirty per cent of the average president's contacts are initiated by him. This varies from about thirty-five to forty per cent of the contacts he has with student officers, administrators, and trustees to only seven to twenty per cent of his contacts with ordinary students and faculty. Only in the case of his chief administrative subordinates does the president initiate a higher share of the contacts than are initiated by the other person involved.\(^{26}\)

Part of the divergence in terms of self-initiated activities and contacts may be explained by the


TABLE 19a
CONTACT VS. INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>20.7%</th>
<th>President/Chancellor</th>
<th>9.4%</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Vps 9.7%</th>
<th>Chief Assst VP/DOE</th>
<th>VP/DS 9.7%</th>
<th>Std Affairs 0.5%</th>
<th>Staff 8.4%</th>
<th>Students 4.6%</th>
<th>Support Staff 2.2%</th>
<th>Faculty 6.4%</th>
<th>Chairs 4.9%</th>
<th>Acad/College Deans 3.3%</th>
<th>Colleagues Only 6.8%</th>
<th>Other Inst 3.7%</th>
<th>Other UI 6%</th>
<th>Other Public 4.9%</th>
<th>Other Club/Bus/Leg 4.3%</th>
<th>Adjustments 0.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proactive/Highly Satisfd   |                  | 21.8%| 5.3  | 1.4                 | 2.2  | 2.0    | 4.6      | 1.2               | .7         | .7               | .7           | .4             | .7              | .4          | .4          | .4                         | .4               | .4           | .4        | .4             | .4             | .4
| Proactive/Mod Satisfd      |                  | 51.6%| 13.1 | 4.0                 | 2.7  | 6.4    | 9.7      | 4.0               | 1.3        | 2.6              | 1.2          | 2.0            | 2.5             | 2.1          | .1          | .1                         | .1               | .1           | .1        | .1             | .1             | .1
| Proactive/Mod Dissatisfd   |                  | 1.6% | .5   | .1                 | .1   | .3     | .1       | .3                | .3         | .1               | .1           | .3             | .3              | .3          | .3          | .3                         | .3               | .3           | .3        | .3             | .3             | .3
| Proactive/Highly Dissatisfd|                  | .4%  | .2   | .1                 | .1   | .2     | .1       | .2                | .2         | .6               | .1           | .7             |                | .7          | .7          | .7                         |                  | .7           | .7        | .7             | .7             | .7
| Reactive/Highly Satisfd    |                  | 6.6% | .1   | 2.2                 | .5   | .3     | 1.8      | .2                | .6         | .1               | .1           | .7             |                | .7          | .7          | .7                         | .7               | .7           | .7        | .7             | .7             | .7
| Reactive/Mod Satisfd       |                  | 14.4%| .9   | 1.6                 | 1.3  | .5     | 1.9      | 2.2               | .1         | 5                | 1.2          | .7             | 2.7             | .8          | .8          | .8                         |                  | .8           | .8        | .8             | .8             | .8
| Reactive/Mod Dissatisfd    |                  | 2.1% | .1   | .1                 | .2   | .3     | .3       | .5                | .1         | 1                | 1            | .6             |                | .6          | .6          | .6                         |                  | .6           | .6        | .6             | .6             | .6
| Reactive/Highly Dissatisfd |                  | .8%  | .8   | 1.4                 | .1   | .2     | .3       | .5                | .1         | .1               | .1           | .6             | .4              | .4          | .4          | .4                         | .4               | .4           | .4        | .4             | .4             | .4

a Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

b To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
different institutional contexts, data collection methodologies employed, differences in the demands on the chief executive officers and vice presidents, and other factors. However, it may also be argued that in the case of college presidents, these chief administrators typically are surrounded by a variety of personnel serving as buffers who should theoretically protect presidential time to a greater degree by regulating the flow of contacts. Yet, few presidents in the Cohen and March study expressed a sense of control over their time.

The data related to satisfaction presented in Table 20 seem to confirm Solmon and Tierney's findings that college administrators are satisfied with most aspects of their jobs and that "satisfaction is a fundamental part of the quality of working life for the individual."27

Furthermore, Solmon and Tierney assert that "if an individual is satisfied with his job generally, he is more likely to indicate satisfaction with a wide variety of dimensions of that job."28

This seems to be a plausible explanation for the fact that the aggregate picture of chief student affairs

27Solmon and Tierney, "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators," p. 413.
28Ibid., p. 428.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Students</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Student Affairs Colleagues</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Acad Units</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

b To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
officers at C.I.C. institutions shows a 94.4 per cent satisfaction level with 28.4 per cent of their time reflected as highly satisfying and 66 per cent of their time noted as moderately satisfying. These high satisfaction levels held relatively constant across all dimensions.

Again, however, given the uniformity of the data over a variety of dimensions, it is difficult to decipher the primary determinants of satisfaction and dissatisfaction to a high degree—that is, those aspects of the job which, in particular, contributed to this subjective judgment regarding satisfaction.

Using Solmon and Tierney's nineteen determinants of satisfaction, in the interviews the vice presidents were asked to rate each factor as highly satisfying, somewhat satisfying, or not satisfying. The results are represented in Table 21.

As in the Solmon and Tierney study, the lack of time for outside activities and scholarly pursuits seemed to be prime sources of dissatisfaction. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that when the chief student affairs officers were involved in limited teaching/instruction and research functions the reaction was

---

29See Chapter II, Table 2 and the interview plan included in the appendix.
TABLE 21a

C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS' SATISFACTION WITH ASPECTS OF THEIR JOBS

| Very Satisfied:                              | Personal Status, Institutional Status; Autonomy; Variety; Competency; Responsibility; Job Security; Congenial Relationships; Challenges; Student Relations. |
| Somewhat Satisfied:                         | Salary; Fringe; Power; Influence; Opportunities; Family Time; Visibility. |
| Not Satisfied:                              | Leisure Time; Scholarly Pursuits. |

aBased on elite interviews with the sample group of C.I.C. chief student affairs officers, March-April, 1980.

TABLE 22a

INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION VS. WORK ASSESSMENT FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
A TWO DIMENSIONAL MATRIX FORMAT b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ASSESSMENT: IMPORT/IMPROV</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Impr</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/Should be Impr</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av Import/OK as is</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Impr</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on data collected over a four week period totaling 3141 observations for six chief student affairs officers at institutions affiliated with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

b To find the number of observations of any particular activity, multiply the percentage by the total observations (3141) and then divide by 100.
satisfying ninety-two per cent and fifty-six per cent of the time respectively. In addition, personal time was noted in all instances as either highly or moderately satisfying. Asked what he would like to change about his job, one vice president insisted that he "take some time for travel and professional activities outside of the institution and become more involved in mainstream academic pursuits."

One C.I.C. official may have summarized it best when he responded to the interviewer's skepticism regarding the high satisfaction level among vice presidents stating that:

If you don't like what you are doing, it's time to get out. Apparently, we all like what we're doing because we are still here and able to express satisfaction in a variety of aspects about our jobs. That's just my attitude toward student personnel work.30

Summary

An analysis of the data collected on the time allocations of C.I.C. chief student affairs officers during February, 1980 revealed an aggregate picture of the dimensions of their work.

30When confronted with Solmon and Tierney's findings that student affairs officers expressed significantly less satisfaction with their jobs than presidents and academic affairs administrators, the same chief student affairs officer questioned the timing of the study in the mid-seventies and pointed out that the sample was drawn from private liberal arts colleges rather than major research universities such as C.I.C. institutions.
Specifically, chief student affairs officers' work was characterized by a range of kinetic instrumental activities dominated by formal meetings in both one-to-one and group sessions and marked by a lack of spontaneity. The group of chief student affairs officers sampled apparently preferred face-to-face, scheduled meetings to telephone conversations or unplanned encounters. A lower percentage of the vice presidents' work was devoted to writing, editing, reading, studying, and reviewing skills with minimal time reflected in thinking and planning—apparently important activities reserved for "off-hours" at home, commuting, or during other physical activities.

The organizational purposes for which vice presidents engaged in this range of activities varied widely as well with a tendency to be directed toward general administration. Although this category seemed to be a favorite "catch-all," the notion of general administration was later refined and noted as worthy of study as an individual dimension. Other functions occupied varying amounts of time in the five per cent to ten per cent range: budget/finance; staffing/personnel; public relations/service; consultation with student affairs colleagues; organizational crisis intervention; consultation with other administrators and academic units; and counseling/advising students, in descending
order of percentage of time allocated. Lesser percentages of time were devoted to personal, teaching, and research functions leading to some dissatisfaction as expressed in follow-up interviews.

The contact dimension shows a sociogrammatic picture of communication patterns identifying channels of contact as well as non-communication that have already motivated changes in the contact patterns of the vice presidents studied. Vice presidents for student services apparently need and take advantage of time alone to carry out the myriad of activities and functions demanded of them. Those chief student affairs officers surveyed expressed pleasure in seeing the amount of time protected for themselves. Time with student affairs staff and chief assistants was considerable, but time with constituents outside of the student affairs division exceeded this total. Chief student affairs officers, somewhat surprisingly and contrary to the Cohen and March study, initiated more contacts with their presidents than vice versa; yet, this was consistent with the overall perception of proactive leadership. Furthermore, the demands vice presidents placed on their presidents was considerable raising some concern on one chief student affairs officer's part regarding the espoused autonomy

\[31\text{Based on interview data.}\]
As a group, these self-assured chief student affairs officers viewed their work as important and satisfying over ninety per cent of the time. There was little perceived need for improvement in the quality of activities, functions, and interactions.

While chief student affairs officers were faced with a number of demands and time constraints, they exercised a high level of control over their time to the extent that seventy-five per cent was self-initiated—a figure exceeding that for presidents and academic affairs officials as cited in previous studies.

The results of the last two subjective dimensions are cause for some concern over both the structure of the questions posed by the methodology and the apparent inability of the respondents to differentiate. The latter may have serious implications if linked to the organizational literature focusing on creative leadership.
CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Recapitulation of Major Questions and Findings

What do chief student affairs officers do? How is their time allocated? What organizational purposes and functions are addressed? Who constitutes their network of contacts? What subjective feelings emerge from a self-assessment of the importance and improvability of their work? At whose initiative do they perform their work? With what level of satisfaction?

These were the major questions to which the previous chapters were directed in an effort to better understand the nature of the work of chief student personnel administrators. An aggregate picture of C.I.C. chief student affairs officers along five dimensions was presented, analyzed, and elaborated upon utilizing descriptive data which emerged from a random sampling of their everyday work and interviews to inform the meaning of the data.
Much like Cohen and March's presidents,¹ Mintzberg's managers,² and Pitner's superintendents,³ the picture of chief student affairs officers as revealed in this study is not an exotic or bizarre one, but a rather mundane pattern of professional activities, functions, and interactions comprising their everyday work.

To recapitulate, the activities of the chief student affairs officers studied seemed to center around formal meetings a majority of the time. This group of chief student affairs officers furthermore clearly indicated their tendency to operate within the context of scheduled meetings rather than through spontaneous encounters. Although one might expect a significant amount of time devoted to thinking and planning to conceptualize and organize agenda prior to these meetings, minimal time was allocated for this purpose by the vice presidents. A number of the chief student affairs officers commented on the heavy paper work requirements of the position; this demand was evident if one totals the time devoted


to writing, dictating, editing, signing, updating, reviewing, and evaluating activities.

The work of the chief student affairs officers was largely administrative in nature—it's primary purpose being to sustain the budget, programs, and personnel to deliver services through hierarchical student affairs divisions to university constituents.

The contact pattern that emerged was one of chief student affairs officers interacting with their presidents and other cabinet-level officials to a high degree. The subjects studied also came in contact with those outside of student affairs slightly more frequently than those within their divisions; however, a significant amount of time was devoted to consultation with chief assistants and line officers within their divisions. About twenty per cent of their time was retained for themselves with relatively little time set aside for contacts with "other" university constituents and publics and still less time devoted to student contacts.

Taken collectively, the chief student affairs officers participating in the research expressed a high sense of importance in their work and perceived little need to improve it. The fact that fewer than eleven per cent of their activities were viewed as improvable provides few clues for staff development. It also gives
the impression of these vice presidents working in idyllic, nirvana-like settings; yet, higher education is many times pictured in the media as being chaotic.

It is evident from this study that chief student affairs officers like to view their work as proactive. Over three-quarters of their tasks were perceived as initiated by themselves rather than others. Finally, the chief student affairs officers studied had attained a high level of satisfaction in their work. Apparently, few of the demands of being a vice president lead to dissatisfaction.

At this point, it may be helpful to briefly re-examine the work of the chief student affairs officers based upon their responses to some of the interview questions. We will then consider the implications of the findings for practice and research.

An Expanded View of the Work of Chief Student Affairs Officers

The follow-up interviews conducted with each of the chief student affairs officers provided an additional opportunity to explore several questions related to the research problem, to elaborate on the Extensor data, and to consider the implications of their time
allocations for practice and research.\textsuperscript{4}

Through interviews, the subjects described their own student affairs work as:

(1) highly diverse
(2) problem and crisis-oriented
(3) never dull; always interesting and exciting
(4) highly visible
(5) satisfying
(6) frustrating and stressful
(7) often trivial
(8) management-oriented
(9) stylized
(10) fragmented
(11) cyclical
(12) demanding

In regard to the latter, in individual interviews all of the chief student affairs officers made a point of commenting upon the demanding nature of their work. A question regarding the most demanding part of their jobs led to differences, however, as expressed by the chief student affairs officers and categorized below:

(1) Planning to avoid problems and crisis intervention.

\textsuperscript{4}Although many of the responses to the interview questions were integrated in the previous chapter to explain commonalities and differences, additional information gleaned from the interviews is shared here to expand the aggregate picture of chief student affairs officers which emerged.
(2) Identifying and motivating creative staff.

(3) Pushing for students' legitimacy in the educational enterprise.

(4) The overall leadership role of giving direction to diverse personnel and departments and integrating student affairs with academic affairs.

(5) The overwhelming volume of paper work.

(6) Problem identification and problem-solving.

These ongoing demands combined with the plethora of activities, functions, and contacts described in the previous chapter convey a picture of an unrelenting pace of student affairs work. Mintzberg's work provides support for the rhythmic nature of the managerial workday:

Thus the work of managing an organization may be described as taxing. The quantity of work to be done, or that the manager chooses to do, during the day is substantial and the pace is unrelenting. After hours, the . . . executive . . . appears to be able to escape neither from an environment that recognizes the power and status of his position nor from his own mind, which has been well trained to search continually for new information.5

Out of these observations arises the question of why managers maintain this pace and workload. Mintzberg hypothesized that the manager's job is inherently open-ended.

The manager must always keep going, never sure he has succeeded, never sure his whole organization may come down around him because of some miscalculation. As a result, the manager is a person with a perceptual preoccupation. He can never be free to forget his job, and he never has the pleasure of knowing, even temporarily, that there is nothing else he can do. No matter what kind of managerial job he has, he always carries the nagging suspicion that he might be able to contribute just a little bit more. Hence, he assumes an unrelenting pace in his work.\footnote{Ibid.}

Although the chief student affairs officers in this study did not, according to the data, express ambivalence about the importance of their work or the satisfaction derived from it, they did share in the feeling that their jobs were open-ended and the demands almost never ceased. It is also interesting that Mintzberg's explanation of the work pace\footnote{Mintzberg, Cohen and March also offer the explanation of the ambiguity of work contributing to its pace. This explanation is not consistent with the data collected in the present study conveying a picture of a well-controlled, proactive set of activities, functions, and contacts maintained by the chief student affairs officers.} matches very closely the observations of some of the vice presidents in the present study who explained their proactive posture by indicating that it was a function of their feeling that their work was never done; there is always more activity to anticipate.

Finally, the chief student affairs officers interviewed captured their work as being cyclical much as

\begin{itemize}
\item [\footnote{Ibid.}]
\item [\footnote{Mintzberg, Cohen and March also offer the explanation of the ambiguity of work contributing to its pace. This explanation is not consistent with the data collected in the present study conveying a picture of a well-controlled, proactive set of activities, functions, and contacts maintained by the chief student affairs officers.}]
\end{itemize}
Mintzberg found monthly and seasonal patterns of managerial activities and Cohen and March recognized the existence of cycles in the work of college presidents:

... we believe that the presidential day and week are both characterized by a temporal movement from relatively programmed activity to relatively unprogrammed activity; from relatively precise problems to relatively diffuse problems; from relatively stable, repetitive relations to relatively less stable, less repetitive relations; from relatively technical administrative roles to relatively royal, symbolic roles.

Although Cohen and March admit that they did not gather sufficient data to confirm the above, nor do the Extensor data substantiate such temporal movement for vice presidents for student affairs, during the planning stages of the study, the chief student affairs officers did caution that there would be cyclical biases almost any time of the year. (The Extensor data do reflect a ten per cent budget allocation in February, 1980.)

Cycles during the week, moreover, seemed to be prevalent according to interview data. The pattern of activities which emerged from the interviews can be captures as follows:

(1) Early-week: Central administration meetings; contacts with other cabinet-level executive officers; and goal setting for the week.

---

8Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 31.

9Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, p. 141.
(2) **Mid-week:** Meetings with student affairs staff, student groups, and academic colleagues.

(3) **Late-week:** Reports from student affairs staff; feedback loop to the president.

Noted one respondent, "The highest energy levels are evident during the initial part of the week. . . . This is when we are all seemingly most productive."

The temporal location of activities, functions, and contacts is no doubt open for further study. With the addition of dimensions centering around the day of the week or time periods during the day—capabilities inherent in the Extensor methodology—further research regarding cycles and temporal pacing is recommended.

The above observation is but one implication that emerges for both practice and research. Fuller attention is now devoted to further implications for the field of student personnel work and for future studies.

**Implications for Practice**

Thus far, a great deal of attention has been devoted to a description of the time allocations of chief student affairs officers. A comprehensive profile of C.I.C. vice presidents has been presented through an examination of a series of research questions related to the nature of their work and an effort has been made to share an expanded view of their work by considering some descriptors and the rhythmic, open-ended, and cyclical nature of their work.
What has not been addressed in detail are the critical questions related to the meaning of their time allocations and of chief student affairs work and the implications for practice and research. It is with these matters that this study is ultimately concerned.

1 The chief student affairs officers studied are clearly managers in charge of their student services divisions. According to self-reports, they exercise administrative leadership and control over their activities, functions, and contacts and subsequently derive high levels of importance and satisfaction from their work. Therefore, the classical functions of managerial work introduced by Henri Fayol\textsuperscript{10} in the early nineteen hundreds—in particular coordinating, organizing, commanding, and controlling—as well as the expanded managerial acronym presented by Luther Gulick in the late 1930's\textsuperscript{11}—have meaning for their administrative work.

These notions, of course, merely serve as "a way to fit together all generally accepted activities of


management."12

Nevertheless, with the exception of planning, they provide an accurate description of how these chief student affairs officers spend their time. In short, they look very much like other managers. Therefore, the findings suggest that those who aspire to be chief student affairs officers at multiversities may benefit from graduate work and inservice training that focuses on basic managerial skills.

(2) The findings seem to support what Cohen and March call "Gresham's Law of Planning"—that is, that "highly structured activity such as administration will take priority over less-structured activity such as reflection or broad-ranging discussion."13

In this study, administrative functions clearly outweighed service, teaching, and research functions. Structured activities took precedence over thinking and planning.

Despite the overall satisfaction level recorded and little perceived need to change, in follow-up interviews all of the chief student affairs officers indicated that providing for more planning time would be part of their action plan. An acknowledgment of Gresham's


13Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, p. 141.
principles and the reality of planned meetings and administrative functions prevailing over spontaneous acts and reflections may lead to a more realistic assessment of their work as well as to the application of priorities and guidelines to reallocate their efforts.

(3) Given the image of the chief student affairs officers that emerges from this study, the lively metaphors and heuristic notions inherent in some of the organizational literature would have little meaning and applicability to their work.

The time allocation data would seem to indicate that more classical administrative and managerial notions are imbedded in the world view and day-to-day behavior of the chief student affairs officers (as alluded to in the first pragmatic implication). Prescriptive imagery such as "loosely coupled systems"\(^{14}\) and "camping on seesaws"\(^{15}\) simply have no meaning in the highly administrative worlds of these vice presidents. In much the same vein Cohen and March's notions of ambiguity and rationality balanced by playfulness\(^{16}\)


\(^{16}\)Cohen and March, Leadership and Ambiguity, p. 229.
would have little applicability and attractiveness for these administrators.

In addition, it may be argued that the time allocation data (including the predominant activities, functions, and network of contacts as well as an assessment of how the chief student affairs officers felt about their work) suggest that these chief student affairs officers simply are not psychologically oriented or in organizational positions to assume suggested roles such as boundary-spanning.¹⁷

(4) The lack of planning time—one of Fayol and Gulick's classical dimensions of managerial work—engaged in by the chief student affairs administrators makes them appear to be acting more like operational officers than managers.

This notion is graphically depicted in Mackenzie's "Analysis of Management Function by Organization Level" (Figure 8, page 265).

However, Mintzberg may have an explanation for this phenomenon. Again, he claims that the open-ended nature of managerial work and its concomitant responsibilities for information processing and strategy-making lead to managers' taking on heavy work loads. Moreover, the
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fragmented nature of managerial work is not conducive to thinking and planning: "The job of managing does not develop reflective planners; rather it breeds adaptive information manipulators who prefer a stimulus-response milieu."\(^{18}\)

It may be that chief student affairs officers are also caught in this dilemma despite their assessment that their work is largely proactive. The planning time data (less than four per cent of their activities) seem very telling.

This problem may also be indicative of the larger problem of providing educational leadership—a paradox addressed by Frederic Ness:

While our academic institutions need educational leadership perhaps more than any time in this century, the task of providing it has become far more complex. . . . [our leaders] are caught up by the demands of crisis management. . . . unable to devote thought and energy to educational leadership.\(^{19}\)

(5) Based on the data, it is also apparent that chief student affairs officers live in verbal worlds characterized by a high degree of personal interaction.

The vice presidents studied spent over three-quarters of their time either talking to or listening

---

\(^{18}\) Mintzberg, *Managerial Work*, p. 5.

to people. A verbal world "demands an ability to produce oral wisdom, to enjoy verbal encounter, and to sustain interest in prolonged exercises in discussion and conversation."^20

Attention in both graduate programs and inservice training needs to be given to the development of skills related to effective communications, interpersonal relations, and group interaction.

Mintzberg makes the following recommendations regarding the development of managerial skills:

We need to pay special attention in our management development programs to the development of verbal skills. In fact, we should develop methods to train managers and management students in the use of all managerial media. The telephone, the scheduled and unscheduled meetings, and the mail are the manager's prime tools. We should train the student systematically in their use.21

Furthermore, if one adds together the various clusters of activities involving direct contact with others—meetings (57.1%), spontaneous interaction (9.4%), and telephone activities (9.3%)—over three-quarters (75.8%) of the chief student affairs officers' time is based upon such interactions. A review of the contact dimension data (78.8% with others) confirms this fact.

21 Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 190-191 (emphasis added).
An ongoing assessment of the contacts of chief student affairs officers is also recommended. The use of Lofland's approach and other social science methods would seem to promote a better understanding of the interactions of chief student affairs officers.

Although the chief student affairs officers studied expressed little need for improving their contacts, given the high level of interaction expected of student affairs administrators, it may be worthwhile to build into the training and practice for other student affairs personnel what Mintzberg refers to as peer skills. Mintzberg outlines a number of skills necessary for managers to enter into and maintain effective peer relationships. These include:

(a) Developing contacts with other parties to serve mutual needs;

(b) Building and maintaining an extensive network of contacts;

(c) Communicating effectively; and

(d) Negotiating and consulting skills.23

The vice presidents who expressed a strong tendency for meeting behavior (57.1%) should step back and assess objectively the value of meetings as well as


23Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 189.
other aspects of their work. To do so, however, may re-
quire the creation of new techniques of collecting data
grounded in their work without using the sophisticated
Extensor technique.

John Coleman, former President of Haverford College
and one who experienced the world of Terkel's blue-
collar workers first-hand, had these words for his col-
leagues regarding meetings.

Begin by looking at your own meetings. At
their best they are expert examples of reason
triumphing over rubbish. At their worst they
cast doubt on the entire intellectual adventure.
... Don't give up those meetings. Efficiency
isn't everything and rationality isn't often
fun. ... Just remember every once in awhile
to step back and laugh at the business and to
sit a bit in awe of lesser creatures who make
up their minds faster and aren't demonstrably
worse off on that account.24

(7) The pattern of managerial behavior which
emerged characterized by a preponderence of administra-
tive functions, personal interaction, and group meetings
occurred in the complex educational milieu of multi-
versities. The multiversity setting, moreover, may have
influenced the time allocations of the chief student
affairs officers.

(8) An analysis of the contact patterns of chief
student affairs officers shows that they have more contact
with those outside of the student affairs area (44.6%)

24 J. R. Coleman, "Point of View: What I Wish I'd
Said Before I Left," The Chronicle of Higher Education,
XV (1977), p. 32.
than with their own colleagues (34.2%). This means that chief student affairs officers need to be able to articulate their thoughts and use their management skills with those who may not necessarily share the same philosophy of student affairs work.

(9) It is postulated that the "overload" situation in which the chief student affairs officers found themselves was a function of the diversity and complexity of tasks they faced, but also a product of: (a) the open-ended nature of their jobs; and (b) their own self-concept of having important jobs.

In regard to the former, Mintzberg asserts that the prime occupational hazard of managers is superficiality:

Because of the open-ended nature of his job and because of his responsibility for information processing and strategy-making, the manager is induced to take on a heavy load of work, and to do much of it superficially. Hence, his work pace is unrelenting and his work activities are characterized by brevity, variety, and fragmentation.26

In addition, the data in this study show that the chief student affairs officers had both a high regard for their work (96.7% important) and a propensity to initiate tasks (75.6% proactive). A combination of the perceived importance of their work and the need to

---


26Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 5.
be proactive may have led to the feeling, as one vice president expressed it, "... that our work as educational leaders is never done."

(10) In contrast to the presidents studied by Cohen and March, the chief student affairs officers did not seem to suffer from the perception that they were misworked.

In Cohen and March's study of college presidents they noted a sense of frustration due to a perceived misallocation of their efforts.\(^7\) Perkins highlights this picture of frustrated presidents as follows:

Most presidents testify that they find it difficult, if not impossible, to direct their efforts towards being most influential in the area where they perceive their greatest responsibility—providing purpose and direction for their institutions. Although they work a long and tiring week, they are forced to divide their time to attend to a multiplicity of functions and, as a consequence, they find their success diminished by relatively inconsequential problems.\(^8\)

Apparently, the chief student affairs officers did not see the importance of their work diminished by superficial demands. It may be hypothesized that the use of delegation as noted in the interviews, their proactive posture, and the use of "buffers" may have


enabled the chief student affairs officers to retain this perspective of importance.

Chief student affairs officers seem to make use of "buffers" to a high degree to enhance their job satisfaction, to limit their attention to important matters, and to better control their time allocations.

Thompson has considered the notion of "buffering" environmental influences, fluctuations, and demands and the importance of smoothing out inputs and outputs in organizations. Cohen and March, in applying this term to the university environment note that college administrators are surrounded by buffers to regulate the flow of contacts and activities.

The findings of this study would seem to suggest that vice presidents for student affairs use their chief assistants, deans, student personnel staff, and support personnel (constituting over thirty per cent of their contacts) not only to limit the vice presidential tasks to those of high (59.7%) or average (37.0%) importance, but also to enhance the chances that their work will be proactive (75.6%) and satisfying (94.4%). These buffers also seem to regulate and minimize student contact (8.4%).

---

(12) It is essential that one re-examine the data which emerged from the work assessment and initiative/satisfaction dimensions and consider the implications for problem-coping abilities and creative leadership.

In the previous chapter, a number of explanations were offered for the high levels of importance, proactive time, and satisfaction generated through the last two dimensions. Of equal note were the limited tendencies to record activities as improvable, reactive, or the source of high dissatisfaction. Interviews were, therefore, utilized by the researcher to explore these rather uniform responses and to elaborate on the participants' reasoning.

One hypothesis not offered up until this point is the notion that the subjects in the study may have been what Gerald Gordon describes as "non-differentiators." According to Gordon, non-differentiators "appear to minimize differences and perceive more similarity . . . non-differentiators tend to see the universe as more uniform than it really is."31

Continues Gordon, "It would therefore appear likely that the data suppressed by non-differentiators to be

data which contradicts their particular perceptions."

The chief student affairs officers may have perceived themselves as proactive, satisfied educators faced with important tasks and, therefore, unconsciously suppressed subjective feelings about data which would indicate that their activities were contrary to this self-assessment.

Although the present study involved no instrumentation to test differentiating abilities, given the uniformity of the data in the two subjective dimensions, the tendency of the subjects to fall into set patterns of coding responses as revealed by an audit of the data cards, and the apparent failure of the chief student affairs officers to discriminate to the extent that they did for the first three objective dimensions, it could be argued that the chief student affairs officers functioned as non-differentiators in responding to the subjective dimensions of work assessment and initiative/satisfaction.

If, in fact, the chief student affairs officers who failed to show differentiating skills based on their responses to the last two dimensions do, indeed, function as non-differentiators, and function, based on their interview responses, more as problem-solvers than

---

32 Ibid., p. 10.
identifiers, this could have implications for exercising creative leadership.

When confronted with questions dealing with problem-formulation and problem-solving during intensive interviews, the chief student affairs officers shared a variety of means of approaching problem-situations:

(a) Formal reporting procedures and the receipt of timely information ranging from staff reporting channels and advisory groups to newsletters and written reports.

(b) Informal "antennae," listening and sensing mechanisms.

(c) Feedback loops from directors, executive officers, the president, and student groups.

(d) Direct observation and assessment of the environment and extending beyond superficial contacts.

(e) Proactive leadership and dealing with issues before they reach the problem stage.

(f) Didactic techniques, problem-solving grids, and attention to theory.

(g) Accessibility to a variety of university constituents.

(h) Close attention to areas of conflict.

In short, as stated by one chief student affairs officer, "Problems are best identified and resolved when full data are available through open channels of

---

communication, thorough inquiry, and the identification of alternatives."

Through the interviews, it was confirmed that a majority of the chief student affairs officers considered themselves more as problem-solvers than recognizers and largely depended upon their staffs to gather diverse bits of information about the environment and to assume the creative roles (the chief student affairs officers also assessed themselves as more productive than creative).

Gordon expresses grave concerns, however, regarding managers involved only in problem-solving and asserts that, "the ability to recognize problems suggests administrative competence." 34

What Gordon advocates then is the selection of administrators with both sets of skills—to locate and resolve problems. 35 To maximize the contributions of persons with both qualities, moreover, he suggests placing them in positions which require both policy determination and procedural implementation and locating them in focal points in the information system.


As an alternative Gordon and Morse propose the building of staffs and task groups utilizing persons with complementary problem-recognizing and problem-solving skills. Even in this situation, however, they urge the placement of high differentiators in administratively superior positions as a catalyst to persons with integrative abilities:

The high differentiating administrator strategically placed in an organization possesses a superior ability to react to other persons' unique abilities and to delegate tasks and resources more effectively.36

To summarize, Gordon and Morse state that in order to operate effectively in a changing environment, organizations need personnel who can both identify problems and resolve them through creative management. This entails the dual skills of differentiation and integration. The lack of leadership possessing both abilities, it has been postulated, may severely hinder an organization's ability to deal with unanticipated problems and an uncertain environment.

Such notions, therefore, have implications for the exercising of creative leadership, for the organization of staff, and for further research dealing with problem-recognizing and problem-solving abilities and their impact on administrative practice.

36Ibid., p. 13.
In view of the complex set of variables affecting the use of time, practitioners would do well to: (a) adopt paradigms that help them to understand and explain this phenomenon; (b) explore more fully the notion and meaning of time and temporal metaphors beyond pragmatic time-saving techniques; and (c) attempt to understand time as a unit of analysis.

Two helpful paradigms alluded to previously are:

(a) Mintzberg's "Contingency Model of Managerial Work" in which environmental, job, personal, and situational variables influence basic managerial role requirements and characteristics and the overall work of a manager.

(b) Robinson's "Social-Psychological Conceptual Framework" in which time is portrayed as being determined by four sets of factors: personal; role; resource; and environment.

Such models are helpful, however, only in that they assist one in better understanding the complex nature of managerial time allocations, not as prescriptors for managerial work.

---


Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 103. Also see Figure 3, Chapter II, p. 98.

Only through attention to the many meanings of time, the paradoxes of time, and the myths of time will this concept be better understood and accepted as a critical resource. Furthermore, given the plethora of time management workshops and the perceived need for such skills, student personnel workers, armed with an understanding of time, could benefit professionally and enhance their worth by establishing skills in this area.

An understanding of time management and the use of time usage data for educational policy purposes has great potential. However, as Robinson pointed out, time has been ignored as a unit of analysis and time usage data has simply not been used for making educational policy decisions. It has been encouraged throughout the study that the chief student affairs officers make use of their data reports as a basis for decision-making.

This study highlights the importance of what Mintzberg calls resource allocation skills.

As stressed in the latest Carnegie Council report, the effective use of resources should be a priority of colleges and universities. Administrators, it follows,

---

40 Ibid., p. 195.

41 Mintzberg, The Nature of Managerial Work, p. 192.

should be responsible for the effective allocation of resources—time being one such resource.

Therefore, staff training programs that deal with the issue of time allocations merit further development. An effort should be made in leadership courses and staff development workshops to simulate situations in which student personnel administrators must make decisions concerning time allocations. Although the chief student affairs officers studied indicated their abilities to allocate their time resulting in a high level of satisfaction, entry-level and middle management personnel might benefit from programs designed to enhance their time allocation skills.

Implications for Research

Given the significance, scope, methodology, findings, limitations, and generalizations of the present research, it is suggested that the following recommendations and ideas may serve as an impetus for future research studies.

1. Researchers need to accumulate more descriptive data on the everyday work of student affairs administrators. Significant contributions to the knowledge base and a more substantive understanding of what student affairs administrators do could be accomplished through follow-up studies focusing on:
(a) student affairs practitioners other than vice presidents;
(b) a sample group that includes women administrators;
(c) different institutional contexts beyond the multiversity setting;
(d) additional questions related to the nature of student personnel work and tied to different dimensions such as cyclical behavior, stress, productivity, delegation, and a myriad of other categories and variables;
(e) administration as a primary dimension rather than a functional category;
(f) a replication of this research conducted during a different time of the academic year or several years hence;
(g) an elaboration of the subjective judgment dimensions to ascertain more information related to the "why" questions of student affairs work; and
(h) individual data and case studies rather than an aggregate profile.

(2) Through the interviews the notion of being administrative and conceptual leaders was articulated. This study speaks most clearly to the administrative, management-oriented component of chief student affairs officers' work. More research is needed to explore the conceptual dimension of their leadership.

(3) It may be postulated, given the consistency of the time allocations of the chief student affairs officers, that there are common denominators for success as a vice president (assuming that these vice presidents were successful as well as satisfied in their work).
Much may depend upon organizational factors, however, apart from individual competencies. This would indicate a need for research focusing on the developmental levels of organizations and their appropriate styles of administration.

(4) The chief student affairs officers in this study seemed to operationalize their work through a variety of interpersonal, informational and decisional roles described by Mintzberg and depicted in Figure 9, page 283. Additional research with attention given to inferred roles of student affairs administrators will aid in further clarifying the nature of student personnel work.

(5) The incentive system under which the chief student affairs officers operate resembles somewhat that to which others in higher education adhere; yet, most of the research is limited to the study of faculty incentives. An exploration of the inducements which attract administrators has the potential for promoting a better understanding of their work and creating new linkages between student affairs administrators and faculty.

When the chief student affairs officers were asked to respond to a number of incentive categories drawn

---

43 Mintzberg, Managerial Work, p. 167. See Table 3, page 95 for a complete description of Mintzberg's managerial roles.
Formal Authority and Status

INTERPERSONAL ROLES
Figurehead
Leader
Liaison

INFORMATIONAL ROLES
Monitor
Disseminator
Spokesman

DECISIONAL ROLES
Entrepreneur
Disturbance Handler
Resource Allocator
Negotiator

Figure 9a

THE MANAGER'S ROLES

from the literature, the aggregate picture that emerged is that quality of life and professional opportunity inducements combined with interpersonal relationships and associations with colleagues are primary motivators for the C.I.C. chief student affairs officers. These categories, derived from Smart's treatment of incentives in higher education organizations, lend credence to Clark and Wilson's organizational typology that captures educational institutions as solidary organizations characterized mostly by intangible inducements derived from associating, socializing, congeniality, group membership, and professional opportunities.

These findings are complemented by perceptions based on Barnard's classification scheme that personal satisfaction, pride in their work, institutional loyalty, a sense of competency, and a feeling of enlarged participation in the course of events were predominant incentives


for the chief student affairs officers. Regarding the latter, two of the vice presidents indicated that as chief student affairs officers of C.I.C. institutions they "wanted to do things that made a difference."

Another colleague perhaps summarized most succinctly the chief student affairs officers' thoughts on incentive systems: "It is a whole set of interrelated motivational factors which are operating."

Although the notion of incentives was an important one in this study, its exploration was limited primarily to interview inquiries. It was hoped that the subjective work assessment and initiative/satisfaction dimensions when cross-tabulated with specific activities, functions, and contacts would at least provide indirect data regarding dominant inducements of chief student affairs officers. However, the inclination of the subjects to record over ninety per cent of their tasks as important and satisfying and over seventy-five per cent as proactive made it impossible to explore in depth the specific sources of motivation.

It is therefore recommended that follow-up research using the Extensor methodology employ a distinct dimension which requires participants to respond to specific questions about motivators that influence their time allocations. In this way, the complex relationships between incentives and daily activities, functions, and
contacts may be studied in a systematic fashion.

(6) Researchers should give attention to what is not happening in the everyday lives of student personnel administrators as well as what is occurring. In addition to what they do, what do they not do? Whom do they not see? What functions are not included in their work? This approach may provide greater insights regarding the nature of student affairs work.

(7) Researchers need to expand the theoretical bases related to time management through creative research and the exploration of new data gathering technologies.

It has been demonstrated through this study that the use of a unique data collection technique can add to our knowledge regarding time allocations. There may be other means beyond the Extensor System, but also grounded in the day-to-day work of student affairs administrators, that will enhance our understanding of their work.

(8) Researchers should resist forming premature conclusions or theories and, instead, strive to form provisional hypotheses and generalize beyond their data.

---

John Van Maanen contends that researchers tend to theorize well in advance of their facts precluding the potential of theories emerging from factual data and allowing for the possibility of facts being manipulated to fit a given theory.48

Paraphrasing Sherlock Holmes, Van Maanen asserts that "the temptation to form premature theories upon insufficient data is the bane of our profession."49

The best we can do to grasp empirical phenomena, claims Van Maanen, is to form "provisional hypotheses, tentative speculations, commonsensical hunches, and other tenderly held presuppositions about the world. . . ."50

Stated in another way, this process entails the generating of hypotheses and a willingness to take creative leaps of the sort described recently by Mintzberg in his consideration of "direct research:"

The fact is that there would be no interesting hypotheses to test if no one ever generalized beyond his or her data. Every theory requires that creative leap, however small, that breaking away from the unexpected to describe something new.51

---


50Ibid.

The above implications suggest, therefore, that the conclusions drawn in this study should be considered as provisional and the basis for further speculation, generalization, and inquiry.

(9) The emerging strategy of "direct research" as described by Mintzberg is worthy of consideration in designing future studies focusing on the time allocations of student affairs administrators.

Research activities utilizing the "direct" approach have seven common themes. "Direct research:"

(a) Is as purely descriptive as possible;

(b) Relies on simple, inelegant methodologies, limited sample size, and close observation;

(c) Is as purely inductive as possible and makes use of creative leaps;

(d) Is systematic in nature;

(e) Is measured in real organizational terms;

(f) Is intensive and ensures that systematic data are supported by anecdotal data;

(g) Seeks to synthesize and integrate elements into ideal or pure types.53

(10) It is recommended that more action research be promoted to aid in the exploration and resolution of

52 Ibid., pp. 582-589

53 Ibid., pp. 583-588.

practical problems that organizational members face in higher education.

The present study has stressed the collaboration between researcher and practitioner and has been grounded in the everyday lives of chief student affairs officers. It has also been pursued to provide a model for future research linking theory and practice.

Consistent with this action research approach, studies should continue to contribute to:

(a) The practical concerns of people in problematic situations;

(b) The development of self-help competencies of persons facing organizational problems by promoting action principles and action competencies rather than prescribing rational rules;

(c) The implementation of interventions and time management strategies in student personnel administration.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of student personnel work. To guide this inquiry, five sets of questions relating to the activities, functions, contacts, importance and improvability of work, and initiation and satisfaction were posed. These five areas of inquiry served as a framework for developing a code list, for recording and observing the behavior of six chief student affairs officers at C.I.C. institutions, for conducting follow-up interviews with the
subjects, for presenting, analyzing and interpreting the data, and for generating a number of implications for practice and research.

Much attention has been given to the methodology employed both in view of its uniqueness and its potential contribution for advancing action research. Until recently, there was no effective means to randomly sample behavior, attitude, and judgment of managerial behavior. Fortunately, the instrumentation in this study permitted a detailed recording of managerial work simultaneously across several dimensions. Both the Extensor methodology and the elite and specialized interview technique required close collaboration between the researcher and the subjects in keeping with the aims of action research. In addition, the dual methodologies seemed to serve the purpose of raising the subjects' consciousness about their use of time both during the collection of data and following the formal data gathering process. Concerns about the rigidity of the system and the necessity of subjective judgment were outweighed by positive feelings about the randomness of activities sampled, the efficiency of automatic coding, the soundness of the overall data collection technique complemented by follow-up interviews, and confidence in the accuracy and utility of the time allocation reports.
The findings reveal that chief student affairs officers engaged in frequent meeting behavior interacting with a range of constituents both within and outside of student affairs. The vice presidents and deans studied expressed their preference for face-to-face, scheduled meetings calling on the use of verbal, problem-solving, and negotiation skills. Spontaneity was minimal. Yet, the subjects retained a substantial portion of their time alone to pursue reading, writing, and reviewing activities. The chief student affairs officers' work was predominately administrative in nature with limited involvement in public service, teaching, and research functions noted. The lack of time for scholarly pursuits, moreover, led to some dissatisfaction. The chief student affairs officers clearly acted as cabinet-level administrators both in terms of the tasks addressed and the interactions they chose. Regarding the more subjective dimensions, the chief student affairs officers expressed a high sense of importance in their work and perceived little need for improvement. Finally, it is clear that this select group of chief student affairs officers valued the proactive nature of their work and exercised considerable autonomy and initiative. As a result, a substantial level of satisfaction was derived from their managerial work despite the pace of activities and the open-ended nature of their leadership positions.
The chief student affairs officers studied also indicated that a complex set of motivational factors guided their work, but that non-material inducements related to needs for association, professional opportunities, and an enlarged sense of participation in the course of events were more powerful incentives than tangible rewards.

The aggregate picture that emerges, then, is one of administrators who are gregarious in terms of meeting behavior, but individuals who value their time alone. Their network of contacts is largely within the university setting, but not confined to student affairs colleagues. They accept the administrative nature of their work, sense its great importance, and derive satisfaction from almost all aspects of their jobs.

The emergence of this profile based upon a month-long study of the work of chief student affairs officers means that one can now more adequately address the question of what student affairs administrators do--and address it in a scholarly way that is grounded in practice. For the neophyte contemplating a future in student affairs work, the data may allow for an informed career decision. For each participant in the study, the process of recording time allocations and the results may have the potential for providing a rational basis for change or the stimulus
ultimately, however, this study may promote a better understanding of the nature of student personnel work not only through an examination and interpretation of the research findings, but also through the impetus for future inquiries.

Mintzberg maintains that the primary benefit of managerial research is to stimulate self-study and informal analyses focusing on our own actions. The result is a better understanding of what we do. See Mintzberg, *Managerial Work*, p. 175.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE DAILY SCHEDULE AND TELEPHONE LOG

FROM COHEN AND MARCH STUDY
President's Daily Schedule

Date 

Log completed by: 

Institution 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Where was he?</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Activity or general topic of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10

SAMPLE DAILY SCHEDULE FORMAT FOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

This is a sample schedule form. The actual form used by 42 college presidents in 1970 included a twenty-four hour grid.

President's Telephone Log  
(7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Log completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of call</th>
<th>To whom did he speak?</th>
<th>Who initiated the call?</th>
<th>How long did they talk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

FIGURE 11a

SAMPLE TELEPHONE LOG EMPLOYED BY 42 COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL SUMMARY REPORTS OF TIME ALLOCATIONS
FOR C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pres/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>Campus VP's</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>Chief Asst/Asst VP/DOS</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Secr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other U. Const/Par/Alum</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Publ/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>WORK ASHN'T: IMPOR/IMPROV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Improv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Stds</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Improv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/OK as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleg.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Improv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Acad U</td>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER &quot;A&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER &quot;A&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER &quot;A&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24

**SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS**

**C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER "B"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied 37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pres/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied 28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>Campus VPs</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Dissat. 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>Chief Ass/Ass VP/DOS</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Satisfied 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Secr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other O, Const/Par/Alum</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Publ/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>WORK ASSESS: IMPR/IMPROV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Impv 24.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personal</td>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is        48.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Advise Stds</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Impv 10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/OK as is        12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Collg.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Impv 6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Adc U</td>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is        9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments               2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>                 103.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table includes activity time allocations and corresponding contact and satisfaction levels for C.I.C. Chief Student Affairs Officer "B".
### TABLE 25
SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS

C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER "C"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied 6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pres/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Satisfied 77.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>Campus VPs</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Dissat. 4.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>Chief, Asst/Asst VP/DOS</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Dissat. 1.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Satisfied 1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Satisfied 9.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Scr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat. .2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.  .8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other O. Const/Psr/Alum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Publ/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>130.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>WEIGHT ASKNT: IMPROV/IMPROV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Impr 6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>Hi Import/CK as is 24.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advis. Stds</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Impr 1.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/CK as is 64.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleg.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Impr 7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adv/Adm U</td>
<td>Lo Import/CK as is 3.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td>2.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td>4.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admistration</td>
<td>26.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>1.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 26

**SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS**

**C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER "D"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pres/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1</td>
<td>Campus VPs</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 11</td>
<td>Chief Asst/Asst VP/DOE</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Secr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other O. Const/Per/Alum</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Publ/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FUNCTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>WORK ASMT: IMPORT/IMPROV</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Imp 2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is 94.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Stds</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Imp 2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crg/Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/OK as is 1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Collag.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Imp 2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Ada/Acad U</td>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is 2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments .2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 %
### TABLE 27

**SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS**

**C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER "E"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied: 12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pres/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Satisfied: 52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>Campus VPs</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>Chief Asst/Asst VP/DOS</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Dissat.: 28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Secr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other O. Const/Par/Alum</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Pub/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>WORK ASMT:IMPOR/IMPROV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Improv:  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is: 36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Stds</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Improv:  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/OK as is: 59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleg.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Improv:  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adv/Acad U</td>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is: 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 28

**SUMMARY REPORT OF TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR FIVE DIMENSIONS**

**C.I.C. CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER "F"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>INITIATIVE/SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone IN</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Proactive/Highly Satisfied 21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone OUT</td>
<td>Pras/Chanc</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Satisfied 50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1:1</td>
<td>Campus VPs</td>
<td>Proactive/Mod. Dissat. 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Meeting 1+</td>
<td>Chief Asst/Asst VP/CGS</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous Interaction</td>
<td>Std Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write/Dictate</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Reactive/Mod. Satisfied 25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit/Sign/Update</td>
<td>Secr/Cler Support Staff</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed/Study/Review/Eval.</td>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan SHORT-TERM</td>
<td>Academic/College Deans</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think/Plan LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Colleagues-Other Inst.</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/File/Retrieve</td>
<td>Other O. Const/Per/Alum</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Publ/Cit/Bus/Leg</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>Reactive/Highly Dissat. 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>WORK ASMT: IMPR/IMPROV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Finance/Purchase</td>
<td>Hi Import/Should be Impr 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Personnel</td>
<td>Hi Import/OK as is 76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel/Advise Std</td>
<td>Av Import/Should be Impr 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Av Import/OK as is 18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Std Aff Colleag.</td>
<td>Lo Import/Should be Impr 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Other Adm/Acad U</td>
<td>Lo Import/OK as is 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **100.0 %**                    | **100.0 %**                    |
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PLAN
INTERVIEW PLAN FOR CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS
AT C.I.C. INSTITUTIONS

Part A: Prior to Reviewing Extensor Report

1. We have now completed a month-long study of how you use your time as a vice president/dean of a major university. Let's begin by getting your general reactions to the study. What impressions do you have regarding the whole process of self-analyzing your time?

2. By just taking part in the process of reporting your activities, functions, contacts, etc., and without seeing the actual results, what did you learn about yourself—that is, what did you realize about your time allocations almost intuitively as you engaged in the study?

3. What specific remarks could you make about the Extensor System for logging time usage and collecting data?

4. What alternative methodologies might you suggest?

5. Do you believe the Extensor report will present an accurate accounting of your time? Why or why not?

6. What categories were omitted? Were there other dimensions you would have liked to have studied?

Part B: Questions Based on the Extensor Report

7. Now that you have seen the report and have had an opportunity to review it, how do your actual time allocations compare to what you might have predicted or thought was happening with your time? How close does it approximate your actual job description?

8. What do you like about the overall picture of your time usage?

9. What do you not like about what you see?

10. What would you like to change about your job in terms of activities, functions, and contacts?

11. How might this self-study assist you in initiating change?

12. Taken in total, your time allocation report captures you as ______. Let's examine some of these dimensions and characteristics of your managerial work. (The researcher shares the profile and certain highlights of individual reports. Then dimensions are explored in greater detail; mean and individual data are compared and contrasted. The categories below serve as examples.)
a. Presidential time--content (9%)
b. Time with self (21%)
c. Administrative Function--define and refine (35-45%)
d. Minimal time with students (8%)
e. Utilization of telephone (9%)
f. Short or long-range planning (4%)
g. Satisfaction (95%)
h. Proactive (75%) How much control do you really have over your own time?

Part C: Leadership (From Cohen and March's Study of College Presidents)

13. What are the most demanding parts of your job—that is, what are those things that ask the most of you in terms of physical, psychological, and intellectual energy?

14. In Leadership and Ambiguity, Cohen and March talk about three roles of the college president--administrator (dealing with subordinates), political leaders (dealing with constituents), and entrepreneur (dealing with customers, suppliers). Do these roles portray your work as a vice president/dean? Do they have any meaning? What roles might characterize your work (based upon your increased awareness through the time management study)?

15. What adjectives would you use to describe your work?

16. What kind of cycles exist in your work—that is, yearly, weekly, or daily?

Part D: Problem-Solving (From Lyles and Mitroff)

17. How do you become aware of problems in your organization? That is, how do you gather information? What contacts and activities do you use? What processes do you and your organization/institution go through in formulating/defining problem situations?

18. Would you consider yourself a problem recognizer/identifier or problem solver? . . . creative or productive?
Part E: Satisfaction (From Solmon and Tierney)

19. One dimension of the Extensor study, as you know, dealt with job satisfaction. In the Extensor phase of the study you expressed a high level of satisfaction regarding your job (___%). Let's be more specific. What aspects of your job make you most or least satisfied?

- Salary
- Fringe
- Personal Status
- Institutional Status
- Autonomy
- Variety
- Student Relations
- Power
- Influence
- Congenial Relationships
- Competency
- Opportunities
- Visibility
- Challenges
- Responsibility
- Job Security
- Scholarly Pursuits
- Family Time
- Leisure Time

Part F: Incentives (From Smart and Barnard)

20. Finally, I am interested in exploring what motivates you in your work? What motivates you to use your time as you do? What led you to choose your profession as a chief student affairs officer at a major university? (At this point respondents were asked to react to and rate in terms of importance the incentive categories developed by Barnard and Smart.)
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