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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this mixed-methods study is twofold: to examine the professional development and supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crises response and management on colleges and universities. The literature review consisted of empirical research for crises, professional development and supervision. The study sample consisted of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals employed at colleges and universities across the United States. The researcher utilized a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design using a demographic survey, Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS), for the first, quantitative phase, and a semi-structured interview format for the multiple case-study design for the qualitative phase of the study, to answer specific research questions. The results overall indicated that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were prepared to manage crises. Based on the findings of the current study, the researcher presented implications for housing and residence life administrators and live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

It is a scene that is widely known and played out across the United States year after year between mid-August and mid-September: new college students with their cars full of bedding, clothes, and non-perishable food items, arrive on campuses, ready to move into their assigned residence halls and embark their college experience. The new collegiate students are eager to leave their high school days behind and make new friends on newer and much larger campuses and to begin post-secondary education in earnest. For many, it is a first taste of freedom from family and initial forays into independent living.

As parents and guardians send their children off to college campuses, they entrust the safety of their students to the housing and residence life professionals. Although parents and guardians may feel angst and concern leaving their children in the care of perceived strangers, parents and guardians may be able to rest a little easier knowing that there are policies and procedures in place to protect their students and notify them of any incidents regarding their students (Nguyen et al, 2018). Policies and legislation such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Clery Act, and policies and procedures that involve the safety and well-being of their students were put into place to protect students living on college campuses (Akers, 2007; Kelly, 2015; Nguyen et al, 2018).

Statement of the Problem

Colleges and universities are places for students to pursue their educational goals and ambitions, but also to grow and learn more about themselves. However, some have become places of horror and tragedy. In recent years, between the 2014 and 2017, reported incidents have increased nearly 5% (Figure 1.1) (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2018).
In addition to campus shootings, the spotlight has increased on other campus tragedies that significantly affect students such as natural disasters and hazing deaths (StopHazing, n.d; Treadwell, 2017). These tragedies include the Virginia Tech shooting (2007), the Oklahoma State University plane crash (2001), and the University of Alabama tornado (2011) (Treadwell, 2017). Because of such events, there has been increasing focus on college campuses and their responses to the tragic events, specifically prevention and recovery procedures and policies.

The transition from high school to college poses many adjustments and challenges for college students. The transition to new and oftentimes, larger college campuses from the familiar hallways of high schools produce adjustment challenges which can result in stress, depression, and anxiety (Kahn, Kasky-Hernandez, Ambrose, & French, 2017). The transition to college has overwhelmed some college students to the point that they reported experiencing signs and symptoms of depression within the first week of college (Kahn et al., 2017). The Center for Collegiate Mental Health (CCMH), reported that collegiate clinicians identified
anxiety, depression, relationship problems, stress, and family as the top five concerns for college
students during the 2016-2017 school year (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017). It is no
wonder students experience these concerns given the high stress the transition entails (Hales,
2009). The college experience has had more students seeking counseling centers instead of the
nearest parties (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017).

According to the 2017 annual report from the CCMH, while the rates of college
enrollment increased 5%, college students who sought counseling and mental health services
increased 30% to 40% between 2010 and 2016 (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017, p. 4).
As it relates to crises, between 2010 and 2017, students who experienced traumatic events
increased 5% from 22% to 27% (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017, p. 4). Overall, more
university students reported experiencing various mental health concerns. As more students
head to campus counseling centers, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals
are often the first lines of defense for students who experience crises and live on campuses.

In residential halls, housing and residence life are seen as influential in helping resident
college students persist through school and maneuver through the college transition processes
(Bernard, 2015; Erb, Sinclair, & Braxton, 2015; Kranzow, Hinkle, & Foote, 2015). Housing and
residence life professionals who are considered as live-in housing and residence life
professionals reside in residence halls. However, those housing and residence life professionals
who are considered live-on housing and residence life professionals live on campus. Live-in and
live-on residence and housing life professionals are staff members that reside on college
campuses and are tasked with ensuring the safety and well-being of students who reside on their
campuses (Schroeder and Mable, 1994; McClellan & Stringer, 2009). For live-in and live-on
housing and residence life professionals who helped students navigate through difficult
situations, crises, and/or tragedies, it is essential that they receive professional development and supervision to effectively and efficiently deal with crisis management.

To meet the growing demand of crises affecting college students who live on campuses, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional staff members must be prepared and readily available to support their students. Managing traumatic incidents can result in burnout and stress that can negatively affect the quality of support that housing and residence life professional staff provide to their students (Paladino, Murray Jr., Newgent, & Gohn, 2005). With live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals being at risk of burnout and stress in addition to assisting their residents manage their crises, professional development and supervision that they receive becomes more essential (Reed, 2015; Vaughn, 2013).

The myriad roles and responsibilities of residence life and housing professionals related to both work schedules and the nature of the work contribute to burnout (Blimling, 1998; Deluga & Winters, 1991; Vaughn, 2013). Housing and residence life professionals work nontraditional schedules that often include both nights and weekends, as well as 24-hour workdays, and are often at work seven days a week (Blimling, 1998). These professionals typically live and work in college or university residential housing facilities and are believed to have one of the more comprehensive positions within the student affairs profession (Russell, Allen, & Jeff, 2001). Housing and residence life professionals have significant responsibilities to develop and maintain environments that are conducive for living and learning and help their students grow in all aspects of their lives (Blimling, 1998; Reed, 2015). These professionals facilitate the development of community environments through several roles and responsibilities. Because of this, residence life and housing professionals are more predisposed to occupational burnout compared to other professionals in student affairs (Reed, 2015; Vaughn, 2013).
Professional development trainings are provided to “enhance the careers” of professionals (Mizell, 2010, p. 1). Supervisors are influential in encouraging live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals to attend professional development trainings. This is evident as nearly 90% of working professionals indicated that they are encouraged to attend professional development opportunities (Ellet, Belch & Klein, 2008, p. 14). Most entry-level live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are members of professional organizations such as Association of College and University Housing Officers - International (Ellet, Belch & Klein, 2008).

Opportunities for professional development are seen as a best practice to retain housing and residence life professionals (Belch, Wilson, & Dunkel, 2008). However, according to Collins and Hirt (2006), more needs to be done when it comes to training entry-level residential life staff. More investments in areas of training that can reduce attrition and increase the effectiveness of the residence life professionals would be beneficial to entry-level residence life staff. A report by ACUHO-I (2008), suggested that the training of residence life professionals needs to be examined and overhauled. Effective professional development needs to include deliberate and intentional implementation with opportunities to provide feedback and apply newly acquired knowledge and skills into practice (Mizell, 2010). Overall, professional development in housing and residence life has room for growth. Helping professions, like live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, employ professional supervision as means to support their employees (Janosik et al., 2003; Shupp & Arminio, 2012). For the examination of professional supervision among housing and residence professionals may provide insights on the types and levels of professional supervision received by comparable helping professions.
Professional supervision sessions are critical to the development, the successes of their supervisees and towards completion of the goals that organizations have (Janosik et al., 2003; Shupp & Arminio, 2012). Within student affairs, synergistic supervision is the model most used (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). Synergistic supervision is a cooperative effort between supervisors and supervisees with a focus on joint-effort, two-way communication, competency, and goals for the betterment of the organizations and the individuals (Winston & Creamer, 1998). The purpose of synergistic supervision is for supervisors to support and work with their supervisees to move towards the advancement of the companies or organizations’ goals (Winston & Creamer, 1998). This model provides supervisors with the opportunities to communicate expectations, informally assess, and discuss supervisees’ performances (Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). As a result, supervisors and supervisees have clear understandings of what is expected. This can provide increased job satisfaction and opportunities for advancement for supervisees (Tull, 2006).

Professional supervision is utilized in other helping professions such as counseling, social work, teaching and nursing to provide support to professionals which can be essential to maintain job satisfaction and avoiding burnout (Winston & Creamer, 1997). Supporting live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional staff by providing them with similar professional supervision can be an effective tool. In the current study, the researcher will examine the growing needs of college students who live on campuses, factors that contribute to burnout and occupational stress, and supervision among helping professionals in other disciplines, the study can provide the case for live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff members to have professional supervision and trainings as it relates to student
crises. This, in turn, will allow live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals to feel more supported and confident to manage student crises.

The purpose of this current mixed-methods study is twofold: to examine the professional development experiences of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crisis response and management on campuses, and to examine the supervision practices of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crises response and management on campuses.

**Research Questions**

This study addressed the following, overarching main research question and subsequent research questions. How prepared do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff believe they are to manage student crises?

RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?

RQ2: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management?

RQ3: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises?

H₀3: There is not a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.
Ha3: There is a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the student crisis management levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

RQ4: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their professional development trainings regarding student crisis management?

RQ5: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management?

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined for the purpose of the current study. Citational authority is provided for each term.

**Clinical Supervision:** “a formal process of professional support and learning which enables individual practitioners to develop knowledge and competence, assume responsibility for their own practice and enhance consumer protection and safety in complex situations (Department of Health, 1993).

**Crisis:** A state of disorganization in which people face frustration of important life goals or proud disruption of their life cycles and methods of coping with stressors. Usually refers to a person’s feelings of fear, shock, and distress about the disruption, not the disruption itself (Brammer, 1985, p. 94).

**Crisis Management:** Refers to how an organization prepares for and responds to a significant event. This includes, but not limited to, responses to natural disasters, campus violence, sexual assaults, hazing incidents, and student deaths. (Kenner, 2018).
**Live-In Residence Life and Housing Professionals:** Residence Life or student housing professionals that live within the residence halls. These professionals are residence life coordinators (RLCs), resident hall directors (RDs), and area coordinators (ACs) (Eastern Washington University, 2018). They are responsible for management and administrative responsibilities of the residence hall(s), supervising resident advisors (RAs) and student assistants, crisis response and management, provide trainings to staff members, and other tasks (Eastern Washington University, 2018).

**Live-On Residence Life and Housing Professionals:** Residence Life or student housing professionals that live on campus. These professionals are typically Residence Life Coordinators (RLCs), Resident Hall Directors (RDs) and Area Coordinators (ACs) (Eastern Washington University, 2018). They are responsible for management and administrative responsibilities of the residence hall(s), supervising resident advisors (RAs) and student assistants, crisis response and management, provide trainings to staff members, and other tasks (Eastern Washington University, 2018).

**Professional Development:** Defined as “the strategy… used to ensure that educators continue to strengthen their practice throughout their career” (Mizell, 2010, p. 1). Synonyms to professional development include training, in-service, continuing education (Mizell, 2010, p. 5).

**Student Crises:** Including, but not limited to campus shootings, mental illnesses, and distresses that are contributing negatively to their adjustment in college while living on campus (Canto, Cox, Osborn, Becker, & Hayden, 2017, p.46).
**Supervision:** Winston and Creamer (1997) defined supervision in higher education as “a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and to enhance the personal and professional capabilities and performance of staff” (p.186).

**Trauma:** Defined as “An emotional response to a terrible event like an accident, rape or natural disaster. Immediately after the event, shock and denial are typical” (American Psychological Association, 2013).

**Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks**

The underpinnings of this study include three theoretical frameworks and two conceptual frameworks. The three theoretical frameworks are Adult Learning Theory, Crisis Theory, and Social Learning Theory. In addition, the concepts of professional development and supervision will be discussed.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

**Adult Learning Theory.** Malcolm Shepard Knowles developed the Adult Learning Theory (1968) to differentiate adult learning (andragogy) from childhood learning (pedagogy) (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). He expounded his ideas using five main assumptions. From these five assumptions, he extrapolated four principles to make adult learning education more effective (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

Andragogy refers to a theory of adult learning that details some of the ways in which adults learn differently than children. In this theory, adults are more self-directed, internally motivated, and ready to learn compared to children (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). There are five assumptions to consider when working with adult learners:
1. **Self-Concept** – Adults are at a mature developmental stage, and they have a more secure self-concept than children. This allows them to take part in directing their own learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

2. **Past Learning Experience** – Adults have a variety of experiences to refer to as they learn, as opposed to children who are in the process of learning new experiences (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

3. **Readiness to Learn** – Here, adults generally reach a point in where they see the value of education and are ready to be serious about and focused on learning (Cox, 2015, p. 30).

4. **Practical Reasons to Learn** – Adults are life-centered in their orientation to learning. They want to learn information that is practical and involve problem-solving skills. The vast majority of adults actively seek out educational programs or professional development to learn something new or if there is any uncertainty (Cox, 2015, p. 30).

5. **Driven by Internal Motivation** – Children are extrinsically motivated, for example avoiding punishment, if they get bad grades or obtain rewards for good behavior – adults are more intrinsically motivated (Cox, 2015, p. 30).

Based on the assumptions of adult learners, Knowles developed four principles of Andragogy that educators and practitioners should keep in mind when teaching or designing courses for adults (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

1. Adults are self-directed; therefore, they should have a say in the content and how they process information.

2. Adults should focus on adding to their depth of past experiences.

3. Adults are looking for practical learning; thus, the content should focus on applicable issues related to their work or personal life.
4. Learning should be centered on problem-solving instead of memorization (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

**Crisis Theory.** Crisis Theory discusses presumptions and factors that identifies how individuals experience crises (Caplan, 1964; Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011; Parikh & Morris, 2011). Crises result when “a precipitating event, disorganization and disequilibrium, breakdown in coping, a reduction in defensiveness, and the time-limited nature of an acute response” (Caplan, 1964; Parikh & Morris, 2011, p. 369). The onset of crises will be preceded by an initial episode within individuals’ lives where they feel vulnerable (Collins & Collins, 2005; James, 2008; Parikh & Morris, 2011). Once the crises occur, the individuals will experience “disequilibrium” Parikh & Morris, 2011, p. 369). As a result of the disequilibrium the individuals experience, symptoms of crises will develop, such as, stress, anxiety, worry, fear, panic, etc., and difficulty in relationships (Caplan, 1964; Halpern, 1973; Parikh & Morris, 2011).

The consequences of disequilibrium result in the minimization of the abilities of the individuals to handle situations (coping) to do things they would typically do or enjoy, like spend time with family and friends or go to work (Parikh & Morris, 2011). There are two ways individuals can cope: “problem-solving or self-management” (Lazarus, 1980; Parikh & Morris, 2011, p. 369). Crises prevents the use of either of the coping mechanisms. To restore equilibrium, interventions and skills such as stress management techniques and counseling must occur within a month and a half of the crises (Caplan, 1964; Danish & D’Augelli, 1980; Parikh & Morris, 2011).

**Social Learning Theory.** Individuals learn through observing others’ behaviors, attitudes, and outcomes of those behaviors (Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory explains human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and
environmental influences. Bandura (1977) Social Learning Theory states that people learn from each other through observation, imitation, and modeling. Bandura believed that there are conditions that are necessary for effective modeling, such as, attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (Bandura, 1977.)

**Conceptual Frameworks**

**Professional Development.** In terms of theories and models of professional development for student affairs professionals in the United States, there research is limited. However, Canada provides a professional development framework for student affairs professionals. Student affairs professionals follow development frameworks utilized in the Canadian Association of College and University Student Services (CACUSS) (Hambler, 2016). The frameworks used “layered” approaches that include “the process of member engagement and secondary research” listed below (Hambler, 2016, p. 1). The model is considered as the foundation for professional development practices of student affairs professionals in Canada (Hambler, 2016).

- “The context of our work in Canada, including the values, history, culture, and existing research.
- Relevant research and theory in adult learning and continuing professional education including notions of ‘how learning happens’ in through acquisition, participation and knowledge creation.
- How professionals learn in practice.
- Approaches to supporting learning within a professional learning community. (Hambler, 2016).”

The questions below are used to guide student affairs professional development:

1. *How do people learn?*
2. How does one learn within a chosen profession?

3. How does professional growth happen and how can it be facilitated within a network of professionals?

4. What is the role of a professional association in supporting its members’ learning and development? (Hambler, 2016).

CACUSS used their professional development model to dictate policy and practice as it relates to the components and delivery of professional development (Hambler, 2016).

Figure 1.1 below provides a visual representation of how the professional development framework is used among student affairs professionals in Canada.

Figure 1.2. CACUSS Student Affairs Professional Development Model

Source: Hambler, 2016.

College students are increasingly experiencing more stress, tragedies, and crises on college campuses (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017; Cohen, Azrael, and Miller, 2014). These professionals, due to their close proximities to college students, assist their students with
their academics, social and emotional needs, and any crises that the students may endure. It is imperative, that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive adequate professional development in student crisis management to support their students. Additionally, as stressful as their positions are, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals need to receive supervision to prevent low job satisfaction and burnout (Reed, 2014; Vaughn, 2015).

**Supervision**

The primary purpose of supervision is to provide the professional being supervised opportunities to explore different areas of both professional and personal growth and development in their professional practices. Supervision in the helping professions, (e.g., counseling, social work, teaching, and psychology) involve structured relationships between two or more professionals. Traditionally, supervision is provided by more experienced or senior members of the profession, though there are exceptions where group supervision or peer supervision formats are used. Smithells and Smithells (2011) defined supervision in the following ways: (1) evaluating and reflecting on professional strengths and areas for improvement; (2) discussing successful outcomes in work with clients and what led to those successes; (3) exploring practice, ethical issues and complex client situations and processing possible solutions; and (4) enhancing the development of new professional practice skills, methods, and knowledge. Incorporating these elements into professional supervision for residence life and housing professionals might provide them with the support and the resources needed to be effective and productive employees, while providing support for populations with growing health and mental health concerns (Reed, 2015).
Chapter Summary

This chapter included a purpose for the current mixed-methods study, conceptual and theoretical frameworks, and an overview of issues germane to examination of the professional development and the supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crises response and management on colleges and universities, and review of terms. In Chapter Two, the researcher reviewed literature significant to this study. In Chapter Three, the researcher outlined the mixed-methods methodology utilized in the current study.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are multiple factors that underscore live-in and live-on housing and residential life professionals’ abilities to manage college and university student crises. In this chapter, the researcher reviewed studies that examined student crisis management as it relates to college students, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, and policies and procedures at the university levels. In addition, student development theories that affected students’ abilities to cope with crises and tragedies, crisis intervention and management models, and university-level student crisis prevention and response management literature were also reviewed by the researcher.

The literature review provided overviews of the relevant literature as it related to student crisis management, and the professional development and supervision of professionals who work with students. First, the researcher presented the case for the importance of the role of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who are on the frontlines to address conflicts and mental health crises of their students, increasing campus tragedies on campuses, and the college and university preventative measures and responses to campus crises (Center for Collegiate Mental Health, 2017; Cohen, Azrael, and Miller, 2014). Next, the researcher discussed the professional development of student affairs professionals, as well as, helping professions, such as, counseling, social work, nursing and school psychology. Finally, the literature review concluded with the evaluation of the supervision of student affairs professionals, as well as, helping professions, such as, counseling, social work, and school psychology.

For this literature review, the researcher mainly used one search engine, Louisiana State University EBSCO database. The following descriptors were used: college student crises, live-in
and live-on housing and residence life professionals, crisis management, student crisis management, student affairs professional development, and supervision.

According to the Turner and Berry, 96% of college and university students sought counseling services for issues, such as, eating disorders, mental illnesses, substance abuse, and suicidal ideation (2000, p. 30). Despite the desire and need for mental health services, availabilities in university mental health centers are limited (Trela, 2008). Ultimately, when students experience crises on campuses, the crises affect everyone who are in their networks which include other students, staff, and faculty at the institutions. The longer the students’ crises go unattended or untreated, the worse and more pervasive the distresses get (Gallagher, 2006). For students who live on campuses and experience these types of crises live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals have the significant task of being on the first responder to crises and distresses that their residents face (Bernard, 2015).

**College Student Crises**

Crisis is defined in several ways and can be applied to both individuals and systems as a whole (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). Definitions of crises include “acute emotional upset arising from situational, developmental, or sociocultural source;” individuals who “knows no response to deal with a situation;” causes “psychological or physiological distress” (Caplan, 1961, p.18; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1977, p. 165; Hoff, Hallisey & Hoff, 2009). When individuals suffer crises, crises can negatively affect all parts of their bodies and can be difficult to deal with (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). How the students are able to cope will determine how they recover and their overall well-being. When communities or institutions experience crises, the symptoms can affect the system as a whole. Systems’ responses to crises can affect the members positively or negatively (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). Student development
theories that shape how college students respond to types of crises, as well as, students’ experiences, their responses, and the effects as a result will be discussed.

**Student Development Theories**

There are two student development theories that provide context as to how college students approach and deal with crises that occur during their collegiate academic careers. Chickering’s (1969) Theory of Identity Development and Sanford’s (1962) Challenge and Support Theory will be discussed. Chickering’s (1969) Theory of Identity Development Seven Vectors theory is one of the most known theories of student development (Long, 2012). Chickering (1969) emphasized the importance of students developing their identities during their college years that occur through seven vectors. These vectors are also considered developmental stages in the students’ lives (Chickering, 1969). The vectors are grouped into three categories the first category, which includes the first four vectors (*developing competence*, *managing emotions*, *moving through autonomy*, and *developing mature interpersonal relationships*) occur simultaneously through the students’ first and second years in college; the second category, the last three vectors, *establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity*, occur during the students’ last two years of college, if they are on the traditional four-year plan (Chickering, 1969). Each vector builds upon each other, and the students can move back and forth.

The first vector, *developing competence*, students learn a variety of new cognitive, psychosocial, and technical skills as they master new challenges in their collegiate lives (Chickering, 1969). Next, students move into the second vector which is titled *managing emotions*. In this vector, the students learn how to appropriately manage and express their emotions. The students learn how to effectively monitor and express their emotions. In the third
vector, *moving through autonomy*, students learn how to become more autonomous and learn to solve their own problems (Chickering, 1969). Here, the students learn to problem-solve and take accountability for their own actions and decisions. During the fourth vector, *developing mature interpersonal relationships*, the students learn to appreciate others for their similarities and differences, based on qualities they possess, and begin to form intimate relationships (Chickering, 1969). The fifth vector is titled, *establishing identity*, students begin to form and explore their identities, while being influenced by many sources including society and family culture and history. In the sixth vector, *developing purpose*, the students learn to develop and articulate clear career interests and goals and establish committed interpersonal relationships (Chickering, 1969). In the final vector, *developing integrity*, the students move away from “all-or-nothing” thinking regarding personal, moral, and ethical values to a more pragmatic way of thinking. During this vector, other perspectives are acknowledged and respected and the students’ thoughts and behaviors align with their established values and goals (Chickering, 1969). The Chickering’s (1969) Theory of Identity Development broke down each stage according to stages in college, as well as the ability to move back and forth in each stage. However, the Chickering’s (1969) theory does not include cultural differences, ages of the students, or take into the consideration that not every student fits that typical timeline.

Sanford’s (1962) Theory of Challenge and Support posited that students experience significant personal growth and development, which are influenced by their college environments in and out of the classroom. Sanford (1962) believed that for the students to adequately grow the students’ need to have a balance of challenges and supports for the tasks they plan to achieve. If students receive too much support, they will not receive the skills and traits to adequately grow and develop. However, if the students have too many challenges and
not enough support, they will become frustrated and give up. Readiness was a factor that was added in 1966 (Sanford, 1966). In order for students to grow and develop, they will need to be psychologically, physically, and emotionally prepared. In collegiate environments, in and out of the classroom, students are exposed to different experiences and environments and must be appropriately challenged to accomplish their experiences and tasks (Sanford, 1966).

Challenges can come in the form of failure in academics, determining identities, not adequately adjusting to living on campus, or experiencing tragedies and crises (Sanford, 1962). Sources of support on college campuses can be identified as places where students would receive assistance or support (Sanford, 1969). These sources include friends, peers, faculty, staff, family members, resident assistants, and student support services offices on campus, such as, the counseling centers, offices of multicultural affairs, the dean’s offices, etc. Sanford’s (1962) Challenge and Support Theory provides the foundation for student affairs professionals to understand how to successfully support their students by providing their students opportunities to be challenged and supported in and out of the classroom.

Chickering’s (1969) Theory of Identity Development and Sanford’s (1962) Theory of Challenge and Support share similarities and have a few differences. While both are applicable to traditional age college students, they are not applicable to the diverse college population that includes females, students of different ethnic and racial backgrounds, gender, and members of the LGBTQ community. However, Chickering’s (1969) Theory of Identity Development focuses exclusively on overall identity development while Sanford’s (1962) Theory of Challenge and Support discusses how students interact with their environment. Although both Chickering (1969) Theory of Identity Development and Sanford’s (1962) Theory of Challenge and Support are prominent student development theories, they both have different applications for college
students. Both theories can be extremely beneficial to professionals who work with college students to assist them through any academic or personal crises that the students may encounter.

**Types of Crises Students Experience**

According to the 2017 CCMH report, college students frequented the counseling center more than five times the rates of college students’ enrollment at higher education institutions (CCMH, 2017, p.5). Anxiety, depression, and stress were the top three concerns students sought treatment for at the student health centers, which continued an upward trend over the last four years (CCMH, 2017, p.17; Kahn, Kasky-Hernandez, Ambrose, & French, 2017; Reetz, Krylowicz & Mistler, 2014). Also on the rise are students who reported experiencing trauma (CCMH, 2017). Over 43% of students identified as experiencing trauma, suffering grief/loss, suicidal ideation, identifying as victims of sexual assault, or victims of assault or physical abuse (CCMH, 2017, p. 17). The types of crises college students experience, and their potential cause will be discussed.

One reason for stress, anxiety, and depression can be attributed to the transition from high school to college is the transition from high school to college itself (Kahn et al., 2017). One cause can be attributed to academics. Students who were academically at risk of failing and/or receiving lower grade point averages (GPAs) can experience stresses that lead to the development of anxiety and depression (Kahn, et al., 2017). Kahn et al., (2017) conducted a study to explore how protective factors affect the students’ transition to college. Sources of support, such as parents, friends, and peers can provide comfort and stress-relief (Gefen & Fish, 2013; Kahn et al., 2017).

Kahn et al. (2017) examined attachment styles between parents and students as it relates to the students’ adjustment in college. The participants in the study were 90 first-year freshmen
students, who were enrolled in course that focused on how students can successfully transition from high school to college (Kahn et al., 2017). Several instruments were used in the study to measure stress, anxiety and depression, attachments, how stress is disclosed, and familial supports (Kahn et al., 2017). The data in the study were obtained via the participants’ ACT scores, grade point averages, and questionnaires (Kahn et al., 2017). The results of the study suggested that the students reported experiencing stress, anxiety, and depression within the first week of school (Kahn et al., 2017). In addition, those whose families were identified as “attachment avoidance” resulted in higher feelings of anxiety and depression (Kahn et al., 2017, p. 18). Students who sought family support during their stressful experiences transitioning to college, whether through having a more secure attachment style or those who talked about their problems to others, were able to alleviate more stress than those who had insecure attachment styles or did not disclose their stresses or concerns at all (Kahn et al., 2017). This research provided examples of how looking to others for support can yield positive results.

Compared to their peers who do not attend college, college students experience higher rates of sexual assault (Garcia et al., 2011). Within the first couple of months of the school year starting is when students are most likely to report sexual assault or violence (Curcio, 2016; Krebs et al., 2016). During a study conducted between 2005 and 2007, freshmen women are most vulnerable, as one in five women reported being sexually assaulted (Curcio, 2016; Krebs et al., 2007). Even more troubling is that the first few months of a semester are termed the “red zone” for sexual assault due to the high number of cases (Curcio, 2016; Kimble et al., 2008). As a result, students who are victims of sexual assault or sexual violence are affected long-term physically, mentally, and throughout other parts of their lives (Howard et al., 2017; Huerta et al., 2006). Academics, career ambitions and dreams are also affected (Howard et al., 2017; Leblanc
&Turner, 2014; Macmillan & Hagan, 2004; Potter et al., 2018). These students are more likely to stop going to classes, have lower GPAs or may even drop out of schools entirely (Banyard et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2007; Leblanc, Barling, & Turner, 2014; Macmillan & Hagan, 2004).

Students who reside on campuses are more likely than their off-campus peers to be sexually assaulted. One-third of students who experience sexual assaults actually report it (Boyton Health Service, 2010; Garcia et al., 2011). An overwhelming 82% of reported rapes occurred in student housing facilities (Curcio, 2016, p. 1; Peters, 2012, p.iii). On-campus facilities that are considered residential housing include dormitories, and any university-owned fraternity and sorority houses (Curcio, 2016). Given these outstanding statistics, it is essential that there are measures for departments of campus and residential life to protect their students and ensure that they do not add to the staggering statistics of becoming victims of sexual assault or violence.

Garcia et al. (2011), conducted a qualitative study to identify how male and female college students perceive resources and support services geared towards sexual assaults (Garcia et al., 2011). Male and female college students between the ages of 18-24, across a midwestern college campus were interviewed to determine their familiarity and usage of sexual assault resources and services (Garcia et al., 2011). Results from the study indicated that sexual assault is an issue on their campuses. Additionally, major themes included attributing sexual assaults to substance usage, viewing posters around campus that displayed sexual assault resources, discussions held during orientation sessions, encouraging students to report sexual assault and ‘no means no’ were instrumental. The students’ levels of comfortability going to their campuses’ housing personnel such as a resident assistants or staff members with whom they felt close to, transportation and security were also identified as ways to help students feel safe and prevent sexual assaults on their campuses (Garcia et al., 2011, p. 65).
Another form of trauma that over 9% of students sought treatment for at campus counseling centers is suicidal ideation (CCMH, 2017, p.17). Suicides were listed as the second highest cause of deaths for college students, with 1,000 students committing suicides annually (Rodriguez & Huertas, 2013, p.1; Safe Colleges, 2019). Of those 1,000 students, nearly 20 to 30 percent did not receive assistance from their counseling centers on campus (Kisch, Leino, & Silverman, 2011; Safe Colleges, 2019, p.1). Counseling centers’ caseloads have increased to 1:1,600 (National Survey of Counseling Directors, 2013, p. 1). This has caused national organizations caution the consequences if the ratios do not decrease including, not being able to service students who suffer from “severe psychological issues” (National Survey of Counseling Directors, 2013, p. 1). Eliminating the stigma of suicides, creating awarenesses, providing on-campus resources, trainings for faculty/staff, and support for students experiencing suicidal ideations may prevent students from ending up on the counseling center waitlists and worse, ending their own lives (Safe Colleges, 2019).

Another form of trauma that can result in deaths of college students is hazing. Hazing is defined as “any activity expected of someone joining or participating in a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers them regardless of a person’s willingness to participate” (StopHazing, 2019, p. 1). Hazings are notoriously associated with initiation processes of fraternities or sororities but are also associated with joining on-campus organizations such as sports teams and honor societies (Allan & Madden, 2008; University of Maryland Student Affairs, 2019;). Acts of hazing include being beaten, harassment and participating in behaviors such as shaving their heads and participating in sexual acts (McGlone, 2005; University of Maryland, 2019). Hazings can be alcohol-related and affect students mentally (McGlone, 2005; University of Maryland, 2019). Of the reported hazing behaviors, more than one-third of
students either participated in drinking activities or consumed alcohol until they became ill or passed out (StopHazing, 2019). Over the last few years, hazing deaths by excessive alcohol consumptions as part of a hazing fraternity initiations, have made headlines in the national news (CNN, 2018). As high school students transition to colleges and look to experience the social college scenes or joining organizations to “fit in,” it is imperative that campus officials at all levels educate their students and campus organizations about hazings and enforce consequences for hazing behaviors.

**College Student Crisis Management: Preventions and Responses**

Historically, crises have occurred on college campuses (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). Over time, the need for counseling centers on college campuses increased as their roles evolved from handling academic and financial aid issues to handling personal and psychosocial issues (CCMH, 2011; Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). The Clery Act, which influences how campus crimes are reported, was established after the murder of Lehigh University college student Jeanne Clery in 1986 (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011). Once it was discovered that the university failed to disclose violent incidents that occurred on their campus, Jeanne’s parents sued and lobbied for institutions to disclose any criminal behavior that occurs on college campuses (Myer, James, & Moulton, 2011).

The case for the significance of the roles of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals to address conflicts and mental health crises of their students on campuses could be encapsulated in the shooting at Virginia Tech (CCMH, 2017; Cohen, Azrael, and Miller, 2014). The Virginia Tech shooting occurred on April 16, 2007 and was committed by Seung-Hui Cho, a student at Virginia Tech (Kelly, 2015). Although there have been other campus shootings, the tragedy at Virginia Tech was the number of deaths reported; 32 students and staff members died
Cho was diagnosed with mental health conditions--social anxiety disorder, selective mutism, and a mood disorder. Additionally, Cho had access to a firearm (Kelly, 2015). Privacy laws such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Federal Educational Right and Privacy Act (FERPA), protect students’ privacies of their medical and student records, respectively (Newman & Fox, 2009), however, these laws make it more difficult to recognize early signs and symptoms of individuals who commit violent campus crimes (Kelly, 2015).

According to the research, traits of individuals like Cho, who have committed campus shootings, are similar (Kelly, 2015). Most of the campus shootings committed were by males (Blair & Schweit, 2014). Masculinity was identified as the top predictor of school violence (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003). According to the Gender Role Socialization Theory, “aggressiveness” is considered acceptable behavior in young males and those who do not exhibit these behaviors were shamed (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003, p. 1446).

Felix, Dowdy, and Green (2018) discussed the pre-and post-psychosocial adjustment of students who experienced the shooting that occurred at the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB), in May 2014. The school shooting, which occurred as a result of a young man who did not attend UCSB, killed six students and wounded over a dozen others, before killing himself (Felix, Dowdy, & Green, 2016, p. 76). The study examined how “resource loss” affected students who experienced traumas, determined how students’ psychosocial adjustments were affected based on the loss of resources, and provided recommendations on how helping professionals, can become better prepared to help their students (Felix et al., 2018, p. 76).

The results of the study discussed the areas of exposure to traumatic events, the analyses of demographics prior to the tragic events, pre- and post-tragedy psychosocial adjustments,
mental health concerns, post-tragedy, and what the participants found helpful after the tragic events occurred. Less than 24% reported not being directly exposed to the tragic events that took place (Felix et al., 2018, p. 80). Of those who were present during the tragedy, nearly three-quarters were not outside (Felix et al., 2018). Resource losses were the most significant and had the strongest correlation to depression and anxiety (Felix et al., 2018). Regarding the demographic analyses, there were no differences in exposures to the events relative to resource losses or adjustments after the tragedy took place (Felix et al., 2018).

Regarding what the students found helpful, and what events they attended post-tragedy; responses were more positive towards the on-campus events. The students attended “official” school events, such as, campus memorial, class discussions, and events that built a sense of community (i.e. potlucks, school spirit) (Felix et al., 2018, p. 81). The events the students identified as the most helpful activities were supportive memorial events such as candlelight vigils and activities like yoga and meditation (Felix et al., 2018).

Treadwell (2017) evaluated the responses of high-ranking student affairs professionals during college campus tragedies in a phenomenological study. The role of senior-level student affairs administrators during campus crises is to lead the campus recovery efforts post-tragedy (Cherey, 2006; Johnson, 2007; Sandeen, 2006; Treadwell, 2017). These administrators were seen as “first responders” to tragic incidents on college campuses along with other essential personnel such as police officers and medical personnel (Harper, Paterson, & Zdziarski, 2006; Treadwell, 2017; Zdaziarski, 2001). Student affairs personnel are called upon during campus crises because of their work with students’ and “physical and mental well-being” of students on their campuses (Fried, 2011, p. 110). Student affairs professionals are often considered the first to respond crises on college campuses (Akers, 2007; Kelly, 2015).
Ten practicing senior-level student affairs administrators who experienced handling campus crises were interviewed regarding their experiences and responses to tragedies on their campuses (Treadwell, 2011). Their interviews revealed that the administrators naturally experienced feelings of fear, anxiety, and panic (Treadwell, 2017). The administrators admitted that their first-hand crises experiences were things you are “never fully prepared for” and felt like they had to put their processing of their traumas, as results of the incidents, on the backburner, to prioritize the healing of their institutions (Treadwell, 2017, p. 49). The Treadwell (2017) study provided context of what student affairs professionals, who are tasked with the responsibility of leading the response and recovery efforts during campus crises, experience personally and professionally during the recovery processes. Treadwell (2017) suggested universities establish crises plans that address the emotional trauma that occur as administrators respond to crises in addition to formal crises prevention planning.

Kelly (2015) conducted a qualitative case study to explore how decisions were made to prepare for active shooter incidents at institutions such as universities in response to college campus shootings such as the one committed at Virginia Tech in 2007. The study took place at a large public four-year university, pseudonym-given, Malibu University (MU) that was located in the southwestern part of the United States. At the date of publication, there was not a shooting incident on that campus. The results from the study suggested that MU was prepared for active shooters. The main themes the researcher identified was an efficient response design; discussed and studied other responses from shooting incidents at other universities to prepare for possible future incidents; adequate preparation through practicing and processing scenarios; providing information to faculty and staff members on their roles and responsibilities during shooting incidents (Kelly, 2015). MU demonstrated a unified commitment to preparedness and their plan
incorporated components from national policies and standards that stemmed from previous campus shootings; roles of all faculty and staff members need to be emphasized (Kelly, 2015). The results also suggested that the designation of MU’s president’s responsibility to dictate the response efforts, along with his team; best practices are employed through scenarios practiced and feedback from members of the community (Kelly, 2015).

**Crisis Intervention and Management Models**

The researcher reviewed crisis intervention and crisis management models. The crisis intervention models discussed in the literature are: (1) Caplan (1961, 1964) equilibrium model and (2) Datillio & Freeman (2007) cognitive model, and (3) Hoff et al., (2009) psycho/social/cultural transition model (Belkin, 1984; Myer et al., 2011). These models, collectively, serve as frameworks in crisis management. The literature discussed the highlights of the crisis intervention models; the crisis management model was discussed based on the application to campus tragedies.

Caplan’s (1961, 1964) equilibrium model is recognized in crisis research as one of the most prominent crisis intervention models (Myer et al, 2011). Caplan (1961, 1964) stated that if crises or issues of concern cannot be solved, a “breaking point will be reached and previous coping mechanisms will no longer work (Myer et al., 2011, p. 33). The crises occur when the equilibrium is not present, and an individuals’ coping strategies are essentially ineffective. The primary objective of the model is to return individuals to their state pre-tragedy (Caplan 1961, 1964; Myer et al., 2011). In order for the individuals’ equilibrium to be restored, the crises must be dealt with early in the intervention process (Myer et al., 2011; Viney, 1976).

The second crisis intervention model, Datillio & Freeman’s (2007) cognitive model states that crises are based on how individuals interpret them. Crises result from misrepresentations
regarding the timeline of events that occurred, instead of the actual events that took place. As a result, from cognitive distortions such as all-or-nothing thinking, individuals may believe that no other options are available (Beck et al., 2004; Datillio & Freeman, 2007; Myer et al., 2011). The primary objective of the cognitive model is to challenge and eliminate distorted cognitions. This can be done through individuals changing their perceptions of the situation and examining the positives in the situation (Meichenbaum, 2001; Myer et al., 2011).

The final crisis intervention model is the Hoff et al., (2009) psycho/social/cultural transition model (Myer et al., 2011). The Hoff et al., (2009) psycho/social/cultural transition model states that individuals can rely on themselves and sources of support to navigate crises situations (Myer et al., 2011). The primary purpose of the psycho/social/cultural transition model is for individuals to develop proactive strategies and identify resources and sources of support to deal with crises. The best times to use this model are during the pre-crisis phase or after homeostases are established following tragedies (Myer et al., 2011).

The national organization, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, known as NASPA, is a prominent organization that higher education professionals are members of. NASPA has magazines that features studies and articles that involve student affairs matters, including college campus crisis management. The NASPA president convened a committee and provided a report to evaluate the responses by student affairs professionals to tragedies, specifically regarding violence, on their campuses in the areas of “prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery” (NASPA, 2008, p. 1). The report was a response to the shooting at Virginia Tech, that occurred in 2007 (NASPA, 2008). The report discussed the implementation of a Crisis Management Model which is considered as one of many steps that college and universities can use to prepare for crises (NASPA, 2008).
The Crisis Management Model, which was established by the United States Departments of Homeland Security (2003) and the Department of Education (2007), is a four-phase model, which includes “prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery” (NASPA, 2008, p. 8). During the prevention phase, campuses must evaluate their current efforts to prevent crises from occurring (NASPA, 2008). The campuses must use the information to inform how they will prevent the tragedy from occurring and once the prevention methods have been determined, response actions and decisions are made (NASPA, 2008). Finally, during the recovery phase, which can happen for an extended period of time—up to years, includes the aftermath of the crises and what the next steps are to move forward (NASPA, 2008). Creating campus cultures of awareness that include prevention are very important. In terms of crisis response and management, the research identified that universities must be prepared (Kelly, 2015).

The nature of the roles and responsibilities of student affairs professionals should be considered in comparison to campus policies and procedures. In particular, the evaluations of university campus policies and procedures related to student crisis prevention and management are significant.

According to (NASPA, 2008) student affairs professionals are seen as leaders during times of crises. At Virginia Tech, the student affairs professionals shared what they learned from the incident with their colleagues at other institutions (NASPA, 2008). Providing trainings to faculty and staff members is considered “the most important” components of the prevention processes (NASPA, 2008, p. 24). Planning is another key part of preventions. Having strong communications plans are essential to communicate warnings of incidents occurring on campuses in efficient and timely manners (NASPA, 2008; Kelly, 2015). Incorporation of hotlines are recommended to aid preparations to manage rumors and help during crisis situations.
Virginia Tech did not have effective communication protocols (Kelly, 2015). After the Virginia Tech tragedy, campuses created emergency notification systems (ENSs) on their campuses to quickly inform their students of incidents on campuses (Kelly, 2015). Methods of notifications included phone calls, emails, and text messages to notify faculty, staff, and students of tragedies on campuses (Kelly, 2015).

How universities respond to tragedies is an essential component of crisis management. Student affairs personnel should adequately understand their roles in responding to crisis management (Kelly, 2015; NASPA, 2008). Ensuring that the students’ mental and emotional needs are tended to are very important as student affairs professionals can help prevent mental health diagnoses resulting from the tragedies (NASPA, 2008). The final phase, recovery, is the part of the crisis management process that takes the longest to go through (NASPA, 2008). For example, Virginia Tech moved forward after the tragedy by re-opening the fall to the students and staff (NASPA, 2008). The staff also established a memorial where the tragedy occurred. Additionally, they hired additional student affairs personnel and created an office specifically to “assist in the recovery process” (NASPA, 2008, p. 30). Student affairs professionals are seen as front-and-center in helping the students to move forward, while being sensitive to the students’ concerns and needs (NASPA, 2008). As mentioned previously, Virginia Tech actively addressed and debriefed what went wrong and what went well, which can help to develop best practices in crisis management planning (NASPA, 2008; Kelly, 2015).

As a result of Virginia Tech’s poor handling of the shooting during the crisis management process, many colleges and universities identified best practices to be followed in event of an emergency (Fox and Savage, 2009; Kelly, 2015; TriData, 2009). Best practices discussed by Bolman and Deal (2008) include the creation of a Campus Multi-Hazard
Preparedness Plan (CMHPP). Other best practices include designating a student affairs professional who can confidently lead and provide direction to staff members during crises. (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Although there has been extensive research conducted in the topics of supervision and burnout, there was little research on professional development trainings and the direct impacts of these topics specifically for live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. This study addressed the gaps in literature and made the case of the importance of providing support in the forms of professional supervision for live-in and live-on residence life and housing professionals.

In this section of the literature, the researcher discussed three crisis intervention models and one crisis management model: (1) Caplan’s (1961, 1964) equilibrium model; (2) Datillio & Freeman’s (2007) cognitive model, and (3) Hoff et al., (2009) psycho/social/cultural transition model (Belkin, 1984; Myer et al., 2011). These models, collectively, served as frameworks in crisis management. It is important to determine the appropriate usage of the models, as they serve different purposes and were implemented at different points in the crises process. It is imperative that professionals who work with individuals who have encountered crises, are proactive and utilize sources of support and resources.

This section of the literature discussed the evolution of college student crises, college and university preventions, and management. The researcher also examined the literature regarding crisis intervention and management models, and university-level student crisis prevention and response managements. Next, the researcher will discuss professional development in housing and residential life, student affairs and teaching professions.
Professional Development

Professional development is provided by organizations to ensure that their employees continue to grow in their knowledge, skills, and practices in their fields (Koellner & Jacobs, 2015; Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey & Peak, 2018). Many organizations view professional development as essential and require their staff to participate, while employees within organizations see them as opportunities to learn or practice essential skills (Mizell, 2010).

Professional development can occur in different formats, which include online, mentoring, meetings, or subject-specific workshops (Mizell, 2010). As it relates to the literature, there were many studies that discussed professional development in education. Fewer studies discussed professional development in student affairs and residential life; it was difficult to locate literature related to professional development and college student crises. This section of the literature provided reviews of professional development in housing and residential life, student affairs and teaching.

Professional Development in Housing and Residential Life

Belch, Wilson, and Dunkel (2009) conducted a study to determine best practices to keep new, entry-level live-in residence life professionals. The researchers utilized a Delphi panel, which was comprised of high-ranking housing staff members from ACUHO-I, and collectively determined the criteria to ultimately select the 12 universities who were identified to have the best practices in terms of recruiting and retaining their employees. (Belch, Wilson, & Dunkel, 2009; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). In terms of professional development, providing a culture of promotion and opportunities are essential and the institutions provided strong supports and funding (Belch, Wilson, & Dunkel, 2009). Other themes were enacting formal policies encouraging their staff to attend professional development opportunities, including educational
advancements and institutions that demonstrated support for professional development opportunities for their employees are considered best practices and seen as worthy investments.

**Professional Development in Student Affairs**

Among student affairs professionals, Collins and Hirt (2006), compared the experiences of senior-level student affairs and residence life professionals, focusing on three concentrations: work responsibilities, professional relationships and benefits (Collins & Hirt, 2006). Work responsibilities included opportunities for promotion and advancement, relationships with stakeholders such as students, faculty/staff, and parents, and recognition including extrinsic (money and awards) and intrinsic rewards (altruism and passion) (Collins & Hirt, 2006). Over 500 professionals in both fields were randomly sampled and completed questionnaires which discussed the three concentrations (Collins & Hirt, 2006). In the component of rewards, specifically regarding professional development, residence life professionals allowed more opportunities to participate in professional development than student affairs professionals (Collins & Hirt, 2006). Intrinsically, residence life professionals reported lower job satisfaction due to the low levels of appreciation from their colleagues (Collins & Hirt, 2006). Overall, residence life professionals viewed professional development to be available.

**Professional Development in Teaching Professions**

Teacher education places strong emphases and high-values on professional development. A study conducted by Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey and Peak (2018) compared general-practicing educators to those who specialized in working with students with special needs and evaluated their professional development focused on working with special needs. The purpose of the study focused on pre-service educators and their knowledge and levels of involvement in professional development (Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018). As part of this study, 164 pre-service
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educators, predominately female Caucasians in Texas completed assessments with 25 questions that covered varieties of professional development topics (Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018). The results of the study indicated that the pre-service educators’ understanding of professional development was ambiguous (Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018). Ninety percent of the teachers who attended professional development thought the content provided was useless and irrelevant (Darlin-Hammond et. al, 2014; Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018). However, regardless of the content provided, the participants still viewed professional development as essential (Peterson-Ahmad, Hovey, & Peak, 2018). The findings from the study could be applied to professional development of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals.

Professional development is practiced in a variety of disciplines. While numerous scientific and professional articles exist on the impact of professional development in the elementary and secondary teaching profession there is relatively little in higher education. Further, research within student affairs and residence life fields were nominal. Regardless, the themes of the literature were still relevant; professionals must know and understand what professional development is to benefit from it.

Supervision

One of the reasons professionals leave their careers is the lack of effective supervision (Creamer & Winston, 2002; Tull, 2006). Supervision is defined as “an intensive, interpersonally focused,” one-to-one relationships in which persons (supervisors) are designated to facilitate the development of competencies in the other persons (supervisees) (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982, p. 4). Quality supervision is seen as complicated and difficult to attain by supervisors because of the extensity which is required (Tull, 2006). Some professionals viewed supervision
as ways to acknowledge problems or issues with employees (Winston & Creamer, 1997), however, the benefits of quality supervision outweigh the negatives, especially within the helping professions. In the counseling profession supervision is seen as impacting the qualities of therapy provided to their clients (Bambling et al., 2006). Field supervision in the social work field is seen as beneficial because the students are experiencing in real life how to apply themselves and become better prepared for more clinical environments (Solo, 2018).

Supervision does not look the same across the board. There are supervision models used in a variety of disciplines and models that are better suited in one profession compared to another. The literature discussed prominent models in supervision and supervision models utilized in the student affairs, counseling, social work and nursing fields.

**Supervision Models**

Clinical supervision is considered to be vital parts of training in professions (Bambling et al., 2006). The Department of Health in England (DoH) (1993), defined clinical supervision as “formal process of professional support and learning which enables individual practitioners to develop knowledge and competence, assume responsibility for their own practice and enhance consumer protection and safety in complex situations (p.8). Clinical supervision sessions occur in individual, group, and peer-to-peer formats (Borders et at., 2011). Regarding the effects of clinical supervision, the research suggested that it positively impacts the therapeutic relationships with the clients, provides clarification of roles and responsibilities of the professionals, reduces role ambiguity and strengthens confidences and counseling skills (Bamling et al., 2006). Although clinical supervision is seen as important, there is little research to support the overall effectiveness the supervision has on the clients involved (Bambling & King, 2000; Bambling et
Synergistic supervision is a cooperative effort between the supervisors and supervisees with focuses on joint-efforts, two-way communications, competencies, and goals for the betterment of the organizations and the individual (Winston & Creamer, 1998). The main purpose of synergistic supervision is for supervisors to support and work with their supervisees to work towards the goals of the companies or organizations (Winston & Creamer, 1998). This model provides supervisors with the opportunity to communicate expectations, informally assess and discuss their performances (Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). As a result, supervisors and supervisees have a clear understanding of what is expected which can lead to increased job satisfactions and opportunities for advancements (Tull, 2006). Additional benefits of synergistic supervision include the opportunities for professionals to grow professionally and personally through professional development opportunities and tailored supervision which can provide supervisors’ accessibilities and meaningful interactions (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006). Opponents to the model stated that it discussed employees’ perceptions of their supervisors and does not take in to account the realities of the organizations’ cultures or other external factors that can affect the perceptions of their supervisors (Saunders, Cooper, Winston, & Chernow, 2000). Due to the lack of empirical research on synergistic supervision, the connection between the favorable perceptions of professionals’ views toward their supervisors and the investments, productivities, and commitments to the organizations they serve cannot not be truly established (Saunders et al., 2000). Despite the drawbacks, synergistic supervision is widely used in business and higher education professions, particularly student affairs (Tull, 2006).
There are various models of supervision used throughout the working world. Some supervision models focused on the perceptions of the supervisors/supervisees’ relationship and how they affect the accomplishment of the goals of organizations, while others prioritized the development of the employees’ knowledge and skills within their professions. Both clinical and synergistic supervision models have their benefits, drawbacks and reasons why professions prefer one over the others. For the purposes of this study, literature was examined which focused on supervision models that were used student affairs and similar helping professions such as counseling, nursing, social work, and school psychology.

**Supervision in Student Affairs Professions**

Although there was relatively little literature available regarding supervision in student affairs, there was one model that was more referenced most often (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Winston & Creamer, 1998). The Synergistic Supervision model is most used in student affairs and is most appropriate for their population (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). Student affairs professionals are demographically younger and are often undergraduate and graduate students. Additionally, many of those that enter the field do so as new professionals (Barham & Winston, Jr., 2006; Tull, 2006; White & Nonnamaker, 2011). Supervision is generally viewed within the student affairs profession as negative and often seen as corrective or as a disciplinary measure instead of a source of encouragement, development and support (Winston & Creamer, 1998). With the focuses of synergistic supervision, supervisors provide supports, increase communication, increase knowledge, skills and address confidence and attitudes. Because of this, the model pairs well with a profession that perceives supervision sessions are seen as negative (Winston &
Creamer, 1998). Overall, the perceptions have been positive; there are numerous studies that
discuss the effects of synergistic supervision in student affairs.

Several studies highlighted the successes and deficiencies of the synergistic supervision
For the purposes of the literature review, two prominent studies in synergistic supervision were
discussed. Saunders et al. (2000) evaluated supervision literature within the student affairs
profession and the effectiveness of supervision using the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS).
The SSS is a 22-item scale that was created to increase comprehensions of the synergistic
supervision models amongst higher education professionals (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006).
The purpose of the study was the uses of the SSS, to evaluate professionals’ perceptions of their
relationships with their supervisors and analyze the tasks that occur as part of the supervisory
relationship (Saunders et al., 2000). Nearly 480 participants across 15 colleges and universities
completed the scales (Saunders et al., 2000). The results of the study suggested that synergistic
supervision is a “valid construct that has significance” as a supervision model in the student
affairs field (Saunders et al., 2000, p. 186). Regarding the variables that were evaluated, 47
percent had less than five sessions with their supervisors. In terms of formal and informal
evaluations, over one-fourth of the respondents did not receive any formal performance
evaluations, and even more astounding, more than half of the participants reported that they did
not receive any form of informal evaluations (Saunders et al., 2000). In the department of
student affairs, synergistic supervision is an effective model to determine the success of
organizations (Saunders et al., 2000). This can be extremely beneficial for supervisors to
understand the needs of their employees, while working towards collectively achieving the goals
of the units.
Tull (2006) studied the relationship between the synergistic supervision model and its effect on new employees’ job satisfaction and turnover in student affairs (Tull, 2006). The results of the study demonstrated that new professionals who believed their supervisors demonstrated a higher level of synergistic supervision, have a higher levels of job satisfaction and that new employees are more likely to want to leave their careers due to the lower synergistic relationships with their supervisors (Tull, 2006). It was determined that supervisors who demonstrated openness and developed relationships with their supervisors based on trust and genuine concern, strengthen themselves professionally and personally and made greater strides towards accomplishing the goals of their organizations, while retaining their employees in the process (Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). The studies discussed qualities and practices that were essential in the supervisors/supervisees’ relationship within the synergistic supervision models.

**Supervision in Other Helping Professions**

The next section of literature discussed how supervision was implemented in the helping professions of counseling, social work, school psychology and nursing. As mentioned previously, professions use a variety of supervision models, but few have entire divisions dedicated to supervision (Borders et al., 2014). The counseling professions utilize the clinical supervision model and have specialized standards, education, and designations (licensure and certifications) for their supervisors, as specified by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), under the umbrella of the American Counseling Association (ACA) (ACES, 1990; Borders et al., 2014). Clinical supervision is viewed as beneficial in the counseling professions due to the priority of encouraging and facilitating personal and
professional development of counselors and their clients’ therapeutic outcomes (Borders et al., 2014).

There is an abundance of information that is provided to counselors with a strong emphasis on clinical supervision (Borders et al., 2014). Requests to ACES were made by practicing counseling supervisors for clarification on how to interpret the research to inform their practices were heard and a taskforce was assembled to provide recommendations on best practices in clinical supervision in the counseling professions (ACES Practices Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision, 2011; Borders et al., 2014; Pettigrew & Roberts, 2006). As a result, the ACES Taskforce identified best practices for supervisors within the Supervision of Best Practices Guidelines report (Borders et al., 2014). The document discussed best practices in 12 areas, which are: “initiating supervision, goal setting, conducting supervision sessions, providing feedback, choosing a supervision format, conducting evaluations, dynamics of the supervisory relationship (boundaries, conflict, and resistance), diversity, ethical considerations and documentation” (Borders et al., 2014. p. 3).

Highlights of the Supervision of Best Practices Guidelines report were provided in initiating supervision, goal setting, conducting supervision sessions, conducting evaluations, and evaluating the dynamics of the supervisory relationship. The report recommended that counselor supervisors collaboratively discuss with their supervisees and set guidelines for supervision sessions, including the meeting format, times and locations of the sessions. Further sessions should allow supervisors and supervisees to mutually discuss and set professional and personal goals; regularly provide and process feedback for supervisees; supervisors meet regularly in a structured format; become multiculturally competent and assess their awarenesses (Borders et al., 2014). There were similarities to the synergistic supervision model in that the focuses are on
providing feedback to the supervisees, collaborating with the supervisees to set and regularly assess progress towards the supervisees’ professional and personal goals (Borders et al., 2014; Winston & Creamer, 1998).

Like counseling, the field of social work utilizes the clinical supervision model (Corey et al., 2010; Reed, 2015). Social work supervisors incorporate the “relational and dyadic supervisory relationships” (Miehls, 2000; Ringel, 2003; Solo, 2018, p. 1; Stoltenberg et al., 1998;). Solo (2018) discussed the uses of developmental theories in social work clinical supervision to provide more contexts when supervisors meet with their supervisees. Particularly, Saari’s (2012) Five Stages of Development for Social Workers theory discussed the evolution from the beginning with practicum and ending in the career fields as professionals (Solo, 2018). The stages are titled (1) Caring helps—individuals who become social workers because they care about helping others; (2) Talking helps—in addition, to caring, words matter when it comes to working with individuals; (3) Understanding helps—the integration of theories and practices converge, applying theoretical frameworks into their work with their clients; (4) Reliving helps—at the clinician stages, the individuals realize that “what happens in treatment is a reflection of the complexity of the client’s experience” few individuals reach this stage; and (5) Reorganization helps involve the “…ability to understand, manipulate, and create theories, the time of advanced symbols thinking. The stages that the things that experienced professionals constantly struggle to achieve and maintain” (Saari, 2012, p. 124; Solo, 2018).

Stages I and II were determined by outside observations and controls, stage III focuses on the individuals’ perceptions of themselves, and the final two stages emphasize the “interactive therapeutic dyad” (Saari, 2012; Solo, 2018, p. 74). The proponents of the Saari (2012) model stated that because the model focused on developing the individuals, instead of the completion of
responsibilities, it allows the students to cyclically apply the principles in practice in and out of
the social work field (Solo, 2018). Compared to traditional clinical supervision used in the
counseling profession, individuals were focused on growing and learning, instead of tasks that
need to be completed. This allows for individuals to learn about themselves and incorporate the
clinical skills to collectively, and successfully apply them in practices (Solo, 2018).

The field of psychology evolved from clinical supervision models grounded in “clinical
psychology therapy” models (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Simon et al., 2014, p. 636). The
supervision models were heavily influenced by therapeutic orientations used in counseling and
clinical social work such as person/client-centered and behavioral (Simon et al., 2014). Though
the applications were appropriate in discussing and processing case conceptualizations, it was
not transferable in the supervision sessions. Specifically, in school psychology, none of the
models were able to the multidimensional components of school psychology (Simon et al.,
2014). Competency-based outcomes were established for professionals to identify appropriate
behaviors (Fouad et al., 2009; Simon et al., 2014). Despite efforts, the competencies were not
applicable to school psychology (Simon et al., 2014).

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), developed the NASP (2010a)
Model for Comprehensive and Integrated Psychological Services, which discussed

“10 domains of practice: data-based decision-making and accountability; consultation
and collaboration; interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills;
interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills; school-wide
practices to promote learning; preventative and responsive services; family-school
collaboration services; diversity in development and learning; research and program
evaluation; and legal, ethical, and professional practices” (Simon et al., 2014). There are still gaps in terms of the supervisors’ roles.

Simon et al., (2014) aimed to develop a supervision model that incorporates the standards and requirements of the school psychology field to address the gaps in traditional clinical models. The Simon et al., (2014) Developmental/Ecological/Problem-Solving (DEP) model discussed the foundation for supervisors’ roles, responsibilities, and problem-solving techniques. The DEP model includes up-to-date and relevant content that incorporates classroom-based content and knowledge with applicable practical experiences. The components provide foundation for supervisors that allows them to understand how to support their supervisees and assist them to strengthen their skills and knowledge. Supervisors were given the opportunity to incorporate best practices and their evolving roles within the school psychology fields, were not available in traditional clinical psychology models (Simon et al., 2014).

The nursing profession finds clinical supervision to be beneficial and uses three models of clinical supervision within their fields (Winstanley, 2000). Within England, 92 percent of health providers implemented clinical supervision (Winstanley, 2000, p. 15). The supervision sessions were held in structured formats from 15 minutes up to two hours, monthly (Butterworth et al., 1997; Winstanley, 2000). In terms of the reception of clinical supervision, the nursing practice embraced the supervision models (White et al., 1998; Winstanley, 2000). Benefits included experiencing feelings of concern and support from their supervisors, confidences in their knowledge and skills, opportunities for self-reflections and increased staff morale (Butterworth et al., 1994; Cutliffe, 1997; Dudley & Butterworth, 1994; Hallberg & Norberg, 1993; Winstanley, 2000). Opponents to clinical supervision were resistant to clinical supervision and found that supervisors were not readily available for supervision sessions, they
were expensive to implement, and complicated to understand (Butterworth, 1996; O’ Sullivan, 1999; Winstanley, 2000; Yegdich, 2001).

The clinical supervision models that are used in nursing are Faugier (1992) Growth and support model, where the purpose is to facilitate the knowledge and personal growth of the supervisee; (2) Integrative approach (Hawkins & Shohet, 1989), is guided by four parts and are divided into two components: supervisees and clients, and supervisors and work environments, the first two and last two, respectively and work together towards common purposes or goals; (3) Three-function interactive model of supervision (Proctor, 1986), operates within three functions: normative-policies, standards-content, knowledge, and skills, and procedures-empathy and understanding of physiological and psychological demands in the field, formative, and restorative (Winstanley, 2000). The most implemented model is Proctor (1986) Three-Function Interactive Model of Supervision. Although clinical supervision is mainly used in mental health professions, clinicians in the field of nursing found it valuable for their employees and clients, despite the drawbacks.

This section of the literature discussed prominent models in supervision such as clinical supervision and synergistic supervision. Higher education, particularly student affairs professionals prefer synergistic supervision models, while other helping professions, such as, counseling, social work, nursing, and school psychology fields prefer clinical supervision. Two of the models, social work and school psychology, discussed the integration of developmental theories within the clinical supervision contexts.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed the literature surrounding the college student crises, professional development and supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence
life professionals for crisis response and management on colleges and universities in the United States. In Chapter Three, the researcher will discuss the current study of professional development and the supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for college and university crisis response and management.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

In this chapter, the components of the current study are presented. These components include the study’s information about the mixed-methods research design, quantitative and qualitative phases of data collection, prospective target populations and sampling techniques for both quantitative and qualitative phases. Ethical considerations, the researcher’s positionality statement, and potential limitations of the study are also discussed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this current study was twofold. First, the current study examined the professional development of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crises response and management on colleges and universities. Secondly, the current study examined the supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crisis response and management on colleges and universities.

Research Questions

This study addressed the overarching main research question and subsequent research questions. How prepared do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff believe they are to manage student crises?

RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?

RQ2: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management?

RQ3: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory
behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises?

H\textsubscript{0}3: There is not a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

H\textsubscript{a}3: There is a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

RQ4: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their student crisis management professional development trainings?

RQ5: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management?

**Study Design**

**Methodology**

To accomplish the stated purpose of the current study, mixed-methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003) was utilized. Mixed-methods (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003) is a methodology for collecting, analyzing, and combining both quantitative and qualitative data during the research process within a single study to understand research problems more comprehensively (Creswell, 2007). Quantitative nor qualitative methods are sufficient by themselves to complete the picture of the topics studied. When used together, quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other, allowing for more complete analyses (Green, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).
Mixed-methods research examines issues in multiple ways, and thus, overcomes limitations of a single design (Creswell, 2013; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Mixed-methods designs acknowledge and value the knowledge gathered through qualitative instruments, such as perceptual data of participants as well as understandings based on verifiable aspects found in related studies (Burke, Johnson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

There are three things to consider when designing mixed-methods studies, priority, implementation, and integration (Creswell, Plano Clark, Guttman, & Hanson, 2003). Priority involves the method that was given more emphasis in the study; either quantitative or qualitative. Implementation involves the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analyses. This occurs in sequences or chronological stages, either parallel or concurrently. Integration is the phase in the research process where the combination of quantitative and qualitative data took place (Creswell, Plano Clark, Guttman, & Hanson, 2003).

The current study used a mixed-methods design that is prominent in educational research. The sequential explanatory mixed-methods design consists of two phases (Creswell, 2002, 2003; Creswell et al., 2003). First, the participants are selected via explanatory designs known as the participant selection model (Creswell, 2007), then the participant selection models are utilized when quantitative information is needed to identify and purposefully select participants to follow-up for in-depth qualitative studies (Creswell, 2007).

The benefits of having two phases in the explanatory designs are the clarity and effortless implantation they provide. Another benefit is that it allows the quantitative and qualitative results to be reported in two formats. One drawback of the methods is that the methodology required more time to implement the two phases. It is important that the researcher specified the
criteria for the selection of the participants for the qualitative portions of the studies (Creswell, 2007).

**Overview**

During the first part of the current study, the quantitative portion, numeric data were collected using an online questionnaire through LSU Qualtrics survey software, including the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) (Saunders et al., 2000), a standardized psychometric assessment. The primary objective of the quantitative phase was to identify live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals using criterion-based selection (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007; deMarrais, 2004; Merriam, 2009) and evaluate their responses on the SSS (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007). Participants for the second phase were purposively selected on the following: a) identified as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, (b) currently employed at colleges or universities, (c) managed student crises, (d) completed the SSS (e) and indicated that they were interested in participating in a follow-up interview to discuss their answers on the survey more in-depth.

In the second phase of the study, the researcher employed a qualitative multiple-case study design to obtain text data through individual semi-structured interviews. Multiple-case studies involved collecting recommended maximum amount of four cases (Creswell, 2013). This approach provided more context to their answers in the questionnaire and SSS, their supervisory relationships, and professional development trainings in college student crisis management. The quantitative data and results provided a comprehensive view of the research problem and the researcher identified participants to follow-up with in in-depth qualitative interviews. The qualitative data and analyses refined and explained the statistical results for exploration of the participants’ views in more depth.
A major focus of data collection and analyses in qualitative method was that it concentrated on in-depth explanations of the quantitative results. The quantitative phase occurred first in the sequence and revealed the participants’ supervision and professional development experiences in college student crisis management. The quantitative and qualitative methods were intertwined at the beginning of the qualitative phase while selecting the participants to analyze and developing the interview questions based on the results of the questionnaire and SSS. The findings of the two phases are discussed during results portion of this study.

**Phase I: Quantitative Data Collection**

**Population and Sample Identification**

The participants for this study were currently employed live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who resided on public and private college campuses across the United States. These professionals have positions, including, but not limited to, Residence Life Coordinators, Residence Hall Directors, Area Coordinators, Hall Directors, or Community Directors (Reed, 2015; Schroeder & Mable, 1994). The staff members worked under the umbrella of the student affairs division on college and university campuses. The primary responsibilities of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals included overseeing the operations of residence halls. Other responsibilities included managerial, supervisory, and administrative tasks, such as (1) supervising staff members, (2) being on-call to respond and intervene to crises, (3) facilitating student disciplinary meetings, (4) participating and providing professional development and trainings, and (5) coordinating academic and social activities for their residents and employees (McClellan & Stringer, 2009; Reed, 2015).
Quantitative Sampling Strategies

Multiple sampling techniques were used in the study. Initially, the researcher recruited from a housing and residential life professional organization, the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I). ACUHO-I has over 1,000 members at 950 institutions, internationally (ACUHO-I, 2017; 2015; Reed, 2015). ACUHO-I is an international professional organization for housing and residence life professionals. The researcher requested assistance from ACUHO-I to distribute the survey to members of their organization who identified as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Permission was subsequently granted, and the researcher sent the IRB approval, description of the study, including the survey links, as requested by ACUHO-I to email the survey to its members. After the surveys were sent out initially, the surveys were sent out an additional time one day before the surveys closed.

To increase the response rate of study, the research employed convenience and snowball sampling strategies. The researcher obtained referrals through snowball sampling methods and obtained referrals from colleagues and classmates who were aware of possible participants who met the criteria for the study (Merriam, 2009). A benefit of snowball sampling to gain additional participants that can increase the probability of getting “new information-rich cases” (Patton, 2002, p. 237). Convenience sampling was used to recruit live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, via emails to over 130 residence life directors or similarly ranked or titled positions. The colleges and universities varied in sizes, Carnegie classifications and institution designations across the United States. The researcher chose convenience sampling strategies to ensure the participants are “willing and available to be studied” (Creswell, 2008, p. 155).
The selection process was based on the following: (a) identified as live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals, (b) currently employed at colleges or universities and (c) managed student crises.

**Quantitative Sample Size**

To determine the sample size for the quantitative portion of the study, the research utilized power analyses recommendations to decide the sample size for the study. According to Collins, Onwuegbuzie, and Jiao (2007), power analyses are conducted to increase the representativeness of studies. Using the sample size recommendation for two-tailed correlational research designs provided by Collins et al. (2007), the researcher determined that an appropriate sample size for this study would be a minimum of 82 participants. To obtain a sample size of at least $n = 82$, the researcher offered participants an opportunity to be one of four participants selected to receive $25$ Amazon gift cards. Additionally, the survey was issued using multiple methods during the mid-fall semester when it was believed that the live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals would have more time to complete surveys.

**Quantitative Instruments**

Additionally, the researcher asked ACUHO-I to distribute the survey to members who identified as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, who have been employed in their positions for at least one year. The purpose of the instruments were to describe the data obtained from the questionnaire and SSS, and assisted in the selection of the participants for second phase of the study, “the purpose of the survey is to produce statistics, that is, quantitative or numerical descriptions about some aspects of the study population” (Fowler, 2002, p. 1).
The focus of this study was to quantify the frequencies of the perceptions live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. The SSS is a psychometric assessment designed to quantify the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship (Saunders et al., 2000). The SSS was created from the supervision literature composed of 22 questions from Winston & Creamer’s (1997) *Student Affairs Staffing Survey, Form B*, which asked staff members to provide information on the number of times their supervisors demonstrated actions relating to matters that were discussed during supervision, how often the employees were evaluated, and how often employees met with their supervisors (Saunders et al., 2000; Winston & Creamer, 1997). Reliability and validity of the SSS were established (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006).

The SSS was a 22-item scale created to increase comprehension of the synergistic supervision model amongst higher education professionals (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The 22 items on the instrument were scored items; responses were made on a Likert 5-point scale (1 = never or almost never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always or almost always) (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The purpose of the SSS scale was to evaluate professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationships (Saunders et al., 2000). More specifically, the SSS scale examined the following attributes of their supervisors: concerns about staff members’ personal and career development, equitable staff treatments, management that encourages productivities, cooperative problem-solving with staff, systematic goal settings, and two-way communications and systematic feedback (Saunders et al., 2000). Synergistic supervision is “a management function
intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and to enhance the professional and personal capabilities of staff” (Winston & Creamer, 1997, p. 186).

Reliability and validity of the SSS were established (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). Saunders et al. (2000) tested the reliability of the SSS by computing a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The result was an alpha coefficient of .94 (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The range of the coefficients for the scale was between .44 and .75 (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The validity of the SSS was determined by the correlation of the scores of two assessments: Index of Organizational Reaction (IOR) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Saunders et al., 2000). As a result, the “Pearson product-moment correlation between the IOR and SSS was .91(n= 275), p < .001,” (Saunders et al., 2000, p.185; Tull, 2006, p. 470).

**Quantitative Data Collection Procedures**

To initiate the quantitative phase of this research, approval was sought from one of the authors of the SSS (Saunders et al., 2000), ACUHO-I and LSU Institutional Review Board (IRB), respectively. The researcher completed the Endorsed Research Application and submitted it to ACUHO-I. Once the Endorsed Research Application was approved, the researched submitted the IRB approval to ACUHO-I, as requested. Once permission was granted, the researcher began obtaining referrals from colleagues and classmates who were aware of possible participants who met the criteria for the study.

After obtaining written permission to use the SSS, the researcher created a survey using the online survey tool Qualtrics, offered through LSU. The online survey included the SSS and a demographic questionnaire. This method was beneficial because it saved time, provided easier data entries, reduced the probability for errors, and saved money. Invitations were sent via email
and included the consent form and were distributed to the target populations to encourage and increase participations in the study. The invitations provided summaries of the purposes of the study, described the incentives involved for participation, asked participants to access and complete questionnaires and the SSSs through link to complete the survey online, and provided the estimated time frames to complete the survey. Additionally, contact information for both the researcher and the advisor conducting the research study was provided. The LSU Qualtrics software was also used to collect and organize the data. Participants were given three weeks to complete the survey. The survey deadline was never actually shared with participants, other than the survey that was initially distributed through ACUHO-I.

To increase the response rates, the researcher identified Directors of Residence Life at over 70 institutions and sent the directors an email detailing the study, as well as a link to the survey and asked the survey link could be forwarded to the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals on their respective campuses. After a couple of days, if a response was recorded, indicated the participants had not successfully submitted a survey, the participants who indicated that they were interested in making themselves available for the second phase of the study and provided their contact information, emails were sent, informing the participants that their surveys were not yet submitted. According to Sue and Ritter (2007), sending follow-up emails to remind participants to complete the survey increases the response rates of the participants.

Participants who accessed the survey were first shown the informed consent page, which provided an overview of the study, in addition to a consent and confidentiality statement. Additionally, a statement indicated that four participants would be selected to participate in the second phase of the study and would be offered $25 Amazon gift cards, within five days of
providing contact information for the four purposively selected participants. Incentives were offered as a strategy to increase the response rates. To be considered for the selection for the second phase of the study and to receive the prices, the survey participants were provided with the option to give their names and e-mail addresses at the completion of the survey, if they were interested in receiving rewards. The selection and incentive processes for the second phase of the study, were described on the informed consent page, in detail, and was not included in the actual data submitted. Participation in the incentive program was voluntary and completely separate from the survey process.

After the participants were provided the informed consent, the participants were asked a series of questions along five areas: (a) demographic information, (b) position information, (c) college student crisis management experiences, and (d) their professional development trainings and (e) supervision sessions regarding student crisis management. Following the demographic section, participants were asked to complete the SSS. A total of 22 questions were asked on the surveys. The estimated time frames to complete the entire survey was shared with the respondents prior to survey beginning. The respondents were shown status bars and completion percentages to monitor their completion of the surveys. This format and length of the surveys were designed to increase response rates. The survey was then opened for three weeks.

**Quantitative Data Analyses**

The demographic and descriptive data were collected from the questionnaires and the SSS were processed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software (SPSS) 25 program. The data were summarized using descriptive statistics (Kline, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).
The researcher reviewed the data to ensure that the data were accurate, checked for outstanding data, and tested various assumptions. After the initial analysis was conducted, the descriptive statistics and frequencies were calculated, the analysis included measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode), variability (spread), and position (comparison to other scores).

The first research question, how often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management, and the second research question, was answered by examining the means for the number of hours of trainings the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals stated that they received on the questionnaires. The researcher reviewed the mean scores to determine the frequencies of the number of hours of professional development trainings regarding student crisis management.

The second research question, how often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management, was also answered by examining the means for the number of times of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals stated that they met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management. The researcher reviewed the mean scores to determine the frequencies of the number of times the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals met with their supervisors.

Regarding research question three, to what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on levels of preparedness to manage student crises, multiple analyses were used. The descriptive statistics for the SSS responses will be summarized in the results portion of the current study. The frequencies of the perceptions of
the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship were presented in measures of frequencies, such as graphs and charts. Frequency distributions organized the data, which painted pictures of the distribution of scores (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000).

In addition to using descriptive statistics to analyze the data, the Pearson correlation coefficients of the means of the composite scores of the SSS and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ levels of preparedness to manage student crises were computed to determine if a relationship exists between synergistic supervision and student crisis management levels of preparedness. The correlation coefficients range in values from -1 to +1, in which -1 equals strong negative relationships, +1 equals strong positive relationships, and 0 indicates no relationships. The researcher used a two-tailed test for the data analysis, due to the direction of correlations not being known prior to the study. If there was a statistical significance ($p < .05$), then it was confirmed that was a significant relationship between the perceived levels of synergistic supervision received and the student crisis management levels of preparedness.

The descriptive statistics for the SSS responses are summarized in the results portion of the study. The frequencies of the perceptions of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship were presented in measures of frequencies, such as graphs and charts. Frequency distributions organized the data, which paint pictures of the distribution of scores (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000).

The objective of the quantitative phase was to identify live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007; deMarrais, 2004; Merriam, 2009) and their responses on the SSS (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007). To be considered
for the study, the second phase were purposively selected on the following: (1) the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were ideally employed at institutions located in the United States, (2) had experience managing student crises, and (3) completed the SSS. Using these criteria allowed the researcher to present multiple perspectives of individuals to represent “the complexity of our world” (Creswell, 2002, p. 194).

**Phase II: Qualitative Data Collection**

**Population and Qualitative Sample Identification**

After the collecting the quantitative data, the next step was to address the qualitative data collection and analysis of a multiple-case study design. Multiple-case study designs examined similarities and differences of topics within and between multiple cases of in more detail (Creswell, 2002; Yin, 2003). Multiple-case study designs are in-depth analyses of more than one case. The data gathered from multiple-case studies are more information-rich than single-case designs (Yin, 2009). In multiple-case study designs, the researcher repeated the research processes for each case separately. Additionally, multiple cases increase the reliabilities and validities of studies by providing opportunities to draw conclusions from varieties of experiences (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Therefore, the current study included multiple cases of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals where the researcher replicated the research process with each case. The multiple-case design provided opportunities live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who worked in different colleges and universities across the country to participate in the study. Comparisons were made between the professional development and supervision experiences regarding of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Furthermore, the researcher was able to conduct cross-case analyses to provide syntheses of the selected live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ crisis
management, professional development, supervision session experiences (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009).

**Qualitative Sampling Strategies**

The primary sampling technique was purposive sampling to ensure even distributions of participants, including but not limited to, years of experience, number of crisis situations managed, number of professional development trainings attended, and supervision sessions received. Purposive sampling was defined as the “selection of individuals/groups based on specific questions/purposes of the research in lieu of random sampling and on the basis of information available about these individuals/groups” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 76).

The sample was selected through purposive, maximal sampling strategy. For the purpose of the second part of the study, the qualitative phase, the purposeful sample, which will imply intentionally selecting individuals to learn and understand the central phenomenon, was used (McMillan & Schumacher, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The idea was to purposefully select participants who would provide quality responses to the research questions (Patton, 1990). Due to the sequential design of this mixed-methods study, participants selected for the qualitative phase of the study were determined based on the findings of the initial quantitative phase. Based on these results, maximal variation sampling was used. In maximal variation sampling, the researcher sampled cases or individuals based on varying characteristics. This method allowed the researcher to present multiple perspectives of individuals (Creswell, 2002).

**Qualitative Sample Size**

Four live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were chosen for further exploration to conduct in-depth analyses to explore their crisis management, professional development and supervision session experiences (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009).
participated in the second phase of the study. The number was chosen also using the power analyses provided by Collins et al. (2007) and Creswell (2013) to limit the number of participants in case studies between three and five participants. The power analysis was conducted with a .05 significance level and .80 power. The four individuals that participated in this study were assigned pseudonyms (Carrie, James, Samuel, and Rebecca). Any identifying information were not included throughout the study to keep their identities anonymous.

Table 3.1. Participants’ Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Lengths of Time in Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Campus Coordinator</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>Residence Life Coordinator</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>Area Coordinator</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Resident Director</td>
<td>5 or more years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Instrument

The primary method of data collection were semi-structured interviews. Interviews are used to conduct in-depth studies on selected the individuals (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative interviews allowed for the participants to author their stories and share their perspectives in their own words (Creswell, 2013). Specifically, semi-structured interviews are formatted to be flexible; where the researcher developed an interview guide to frame topics or themes that were explored during the interviews. The researcher organized the questions and topics in a variety of methods and posed the questions in multiple ways. This benefitted the research with the best opportunity to maximize the data collected (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). During the interview process, the researcher developed rapport with participants by communicating in a conversation style dialogue while examining the topics at hand. This model allowed the participants the best
opportunity to identify and share their perceived experiences. Qualitative research methods have cited various strengths and limitations to semi-structured interviews.

The researcher sought to understand the experiences of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, which could not be easily observed. The dialogues with the participants provided greater insights into their crisis management, professional development and supervision experiences. Furthermore, the interviews assisted the researcher to explore the professionals’ answers on the questionnaires and the SSSs. Limitations of interviews were the researcher interpreted the findings, and it was time-consuming (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

**Qualitative Data Collection Procedure**

After the prospective participants from the results were identified during quantitative phase using maximal variation sampling, the researcher identified and personally contacted each live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional, via the contact information provided during the completion of the survey, to invite them to participate in the qualitative phase of the study. The researcher informed potential participants of the purpose of the study, the value and importance of their contribution to the research, and the reasons they were selected. Furthermore, the researcher provided information regarding the logistics of the interview, including length of the interviews (one hour) and next steps regarding to setting up a mutually convenient location and time. The participants were asked to provide dates, times, and location or preferred virtual interview methods (i.e. Skype or FaceTime). Confirmations of times and locations/interview methods occurred prior to the scheduled interviews.

An interview protocol was followed. The participants were asked a series of opening questions surrounding demographic topics as an initial opportunity to build rapport between the researcher and the interviewees. Following these questions, the researcher asked questions that
will relate specifically to crises and traumas on their campuses, followed by questions relating to their professional development trainings and their experiences during their sessions with their supervisors. The interview protocol consisted of three parts: (a) demographic information, (b) position information, (c) college student crisis management experiences, and (d) their professional development trainings and (e) supervision sessions (see Appendix D).

The interview questions below were asked during the interviews:

**Demographic**

1. How long have you been in your position?
2. How long have you been at your college/university?
3. Please describe your professional experience prior to your current role in residence life.

**Crisis and Trauma**

4. Please describe any crisis situations you encountered in your role in residence life.
5. What are the most common types of crises students in your residence halls experience?
6. How did you handle the crisis?
7. How did you react to handling the crisis?
8. What protocols/plans does your institution have in place when crises occur on campus?
9. What is your role in your institution’s crisis management plan?

**Professional Development**

10. Please describe your orientation and training when you arrived at your institution for your role in residence life.
11. What professional organizations are you a member of?
12. What professional development opportunities does your institution provide?
13. How are you able to attend the professional development opportunities?
14. Please describe professional development trainings that you have attended related to college student crises.

**Supervision**

15. Please describe the meetings you have with your supervisor.

16. Please describe your supervisor and your supervisor’s personality.

17. Tell me about the general process of supervision with your direct supervisor?

18. What types of activities occur during your supervision sessions?

19. Describe a time you had a crisis. How was this addressed in supervision? What was the outcome?

During the interview, the researcher posed questions and allowed the participants to respond as necessary. The nature of semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to follow up with additional questions on a topic or ask questions that were not listed in the interview protocol. The researcher informed the participants of the opportunities to review and revise their transcripts of their interviews, if needed. Also known as member checking, it allowed opportunities for participants to approve the analyses of the data provided during the course of the interviews and post-interview when the transcription was completed (Doyle, 2007; Merriam, 1998). The interviews lasted between 36 minutes and one hour and eight minutes. The interview responses were transcribed, and the participants were sent a ‘Thank You’ email by the researcher and asked to provide email addresses where they would like their $25 Amazon gift cards sent.
Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data sources were coded and analyzed and coded for themes using the features of the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010). ATLAS.ti organized codes into diagrams and networks. Themes were created and analyzed.

The steps in qualitative analysis for the current study were:

1) Explored the preliminary data by reading through the transcriptions and taking notes;
2) Coded the data by separating and classifying the content;
3) Developed themes by grouping similar codes,
4) Connected any associating themes, and
5) Constructed descriptive narratives (Creswell, 2007).

The data analysis process commenced by creating detailed descriptions of each case. The researcher placed each case within the appropriate context so that the descriptions related to the specific scenarios and situations that were involved in each case (Creswell & Maitta, 2002). Next, the researcher supplled detailed narrations of the case. During multiple-case study designs, the researchers analyzed across the cases and within each individual case (Stake, 1995). The analyses may be comprehensive, addressing all aspects of the cases, or concentrate on the unique aspects, contingent upon what the researcher decided. Over the course of the study, the data that were obtained from the participants will particularly analyzed for common themes in the areas of crisis management, professional development, and supervision. Finally, the researcher merged the results from the qualitative phase with results reported in the quantitative phase to interpret the cases and reported the findings in the analysis portion of the study.
Credibility in qualitative research viewed differently than in quantitative methods. Qualitative designs used processed of verification rather than traditional validity and reliability measures. The design used four forms of validation that will also be used in the context of this study: (a) triangulation-combined various sources of information, (b) member checking-obtained observations from the participants regarding the accuracy of the categories or themes, (c) comprehensive descriptions of the results, and (d) identified independent evaluators to audit the studies and provide their observations (Creswell, 2003; Creswell & Miller, 2002).

**Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality**

Safeguarding the identities of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who participated in the study was imperative and ethical. This approach reassured the participants and encouraged them to be open and honest in their responses. To ensure the confidentiality of the participants, the researcher included sections within the informed consent forms that the completion of the survey and interviews were voluntary and gave the participants the options to terminate the interviews at any time. Prior to the interviews, the researcher reviewed the informed consent forms again and to reassure the participants that they could stop the interview or skip questions that they were uncomfortable answering.

Additional protections that required ethical consideration were vicarious traumas experienced by live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Vicarious trauma is a concept that described the indirect exposures or impacts of client trauma experiences have on professionals, generally therapists, disclosed during therapeutic relationships (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). Ethically, it was essential to address the issues of vicarious traumas, as both therapists and researchers, were charged with providing appropriate and effective care for client survivors as well as those who served them (Harrison & Westwood, 2009).
If ethical dilemmas related to vicarious traumas or any other situations occurred, the researcher utilized the American Counseling Association (ACA) Ethical Decision-Making Model (2014). The ACA Ethical Decision-Making Model (2014) served as practical protocols to guide practitioners through step-by-step processes to determine the best courses of action (Forester-Miller & Davis, 2016). There are seven steps in the ACA Ethical Decision-Making Model which include the following: (1) Identify the problems or situations, (2) Apply the applicable ethical codes (*ACA Code of Ethics, 2014*), (3) Determine the ranges and complexities of the dilemmas, (4) Develop probable courses of action, (5) Examine the possible consequences of all decisions and determine the best solutions; (6) Assess the preferred courses of action, and (7) Execute the selected courses of action (*ACA Code of Ethics, 2014*; Forester-Miller & Davis, 2016). Some participants who have experienced or witnessed severe trauma may feel mild discomfort. In the event discomfort occurs, participants may end their participation at any time, and the investigators can assist in referrals for counseling services if needed. All participation is voluntary.

For participants who may have experienced emotional traumas or experience symptoms of emotional distressed, the researcher provided the Disaster Distress Helpline contact information was provided in the informed consent forms. The Disaster Distress Helpline is a 24/7, 365 days/year, national hotline dedicated to providing immediate crises counseling for people who experienced emotional distresses related to any natural or human-caused disasters (SAMHSA, 2019). The number is toll-free, multilingual, and provides confidential crises support services. The services are available to all residents in the United States and its territories (SAMSHA, 2019). Additionally, if necessary, the researcher acknowledged the participants’
demonstration of characteristics of vicarious traumas and provided counseling resources to the affected live-in and live-on professionals to seek further treatment.

**Positionality Statement**

I have worked with students from elementary schools to college students for all of my professional life, nearly 14 years. Currently as a college access professional and previously as a professional school counselor, I have been preparing and supporting students to achieve academically and successfully graduating college to go on to pursue their secondary options have been priorities of the mine. Also, during that time, I witnessed students experience personal crises that range from feelings of anxiety from getting a ‘C’, grieving the death of loved ones, and everything in-between. Thankfully, I have been in positions, and currently in a position, where I am able to provide support and encouragement to them. However, that is not the case with many school counselors today. Due the increase of non-direct service responsibilities, such as testing and other administrative duties, professional school counselors are counseling their students less and less Gilfillan (2017). According to a longitudinal study by the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC) and American School Counselor Association (ASCA) (2015), the average school counselor has increased beyond the 250:1 student to counselor ratio to an average of 482:1 (p. 6). At the collegiate level, it is not much better.

College and university counseling centers are having a hard time keeping up the with the demand of their students requesting counseling appointments (CCMH, 2017; ISAC, 2019; The Daily Reveille, 2018). It is well-documented in the media the crises that students experience on college campuses, such as anxiety, depression, hazing, and crime (Gajilan, 2018; Auglair, 2018; Jones, 2019). I read an article in *The Daily Reveille* (2018) about students not being able to be
seen to address issues of concern at the mental health center on campus. I began to wonder how students who live on campus deal with any crises they endure when they cannot get an appointment at the counseling center or end up on the waitlist (ISAC, 2019). I wondered about the professionals who work in the residence halls and how they handle student crises. I came upon two studies about live-in and live-on housing residence life professionals and how they suffer from burnout and low job satisfaction (Reed, 2015; Vaughn, 2013). I immediately thought about school counselors that I know, and how they are feeling the same way. At that point, I became interested in how live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are trained and receive supervision regarding crisis management.

I lived on campus and had a great experience; I knew who resident assistants (RAs) were but had not heard about live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Once I realized their roles and learned that they deal with crisis management, I wanted to learn more about them and their experiences with crises and the support they receive through professional development trainings and supervision sessions. I do not have any known biases in this study, as I have not been employed in student affairs or housing and residence life field. Within this study, my strategy for preventing any biases from developing was to be open to the participants’ responses and ensure that the participants felt comfortable with me and to understand that their experiences, which are different than mine, informed their practices.

**Study Design Limitations**

The limitations to the design also existed in the sequential explanatory mixed-methods designs. They included the possibilities that using quantitative data in the initial phase of the study may not demonstrate any significant differences amongst the participants and the
significant amount time and resources that were required to collect and analyze the data (Creswell, 2003).

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher discussed how she used the sequential explanatory mixed methodology to use quantitative instruments to select participants who were explored more in detail using qualitative measures. In this chapter, the researcher provided additional information regarding the mixed-methods research designs, quantitative and qualitative phases of data collection, study populations and sampling techniques for both quantitative and qualitative phases, ethical considerations, the researcher’s positionality statement, and imitations of the study methodology. In Chapter Four, the researcher will discuss the current study’s findings.
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Overview

This researcher presented the data analyses of surveys conducted during a sequential explanatory mixed-methods study in the fall of 2019. The surveys were administered to 86 live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. The researcher examined the professional development and supervision experiences of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for handling crisis response and management on college and university campuses. The study was conducted in two phases. During phase one, online questionnaire data was collected through LSU Qualtrics cite survey software that included demographic questions and the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) (Saunders et al., 2000) standardized psychometric assessment. In phase two, four participants were selected for interviews using a semi-structured interview protocol. The participants were interviewed either in-person or virtually.

This chapter includes five main sections that provide detailed results from the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. The first four sections highlighted the quantitative data collections and response rates information of the study. In the second section, the researcher provided demographic information on the survey participants in the quantitative phase of the study. The researcher included information on the reliabilities of the scales that were used in the survey, the statistical assumptions that were made, in the third section. In the fourth section, the researcher included the quantitative data analysis and is divided into several subsections used to address each of the quantitative research questions and a hypothesis. In the final section, the researcher presented the qualitative data collections information, participant profiles, and data analyses.
Research Questions

In the current study, the researcher addressed the following overarching, main research question and subsequent research questions. How prepared do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff believe they are to manage student crises?

RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?

RQ2: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management?

RQ3: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises?

H₀₃: There is not a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

Hₐ₃: There is a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

RQ4: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their student crisis management professional development trainings?

RQ5: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management?
Research Study Participants

The participants for the current study were currently employed live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who resided on public and private college campuses across the United States. The surveys were initially disseminated through the Association of College and University Housing Officers - International (ACUHO-I), who distributed the surveys to 601 members. These members identified as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. To increase the response rates, the researcher sent e-mails to an additional 130 senior-level residence life and housing officials requesting dissemination of the survey to the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals and asked for participants to send the survey to their colleagues. At the time the data was ran to determine the response rate, 731 live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were invited to participate in the study. Of the 731 individuals, who were invited to participate in the study, 108 individuals accessed the surveys, 86 individuals submitted their surveys yielding a 11.76% response rate. The data were then screened to ensure accuracy and completion. As a result, 82 individuals successfully completed both parts of the survey. The researcher then examined the data to ensure all of cases had values and the items were coded properly. The data from the 82 completed responses were analyzed.

Study Participants’ Demographics

The participants for this study were currently employed live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who may also be members of ACUHO-I, that reside on public and private college campuses across the United States. Of the participants in the study, 20.7% of the respondents were between 20-25 years of age, 48.8% were between 25-30 years of age, 15.9% were between 30-35 years of age, and 6.1% were 40 years or older (Table 4.1). In terms of
gender, 53.7% identified as female, 45.1% identified as male and 1.2% identified as gender non-binary (Table 4.2). Regarding race/ethnicities, 2.4% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, 22% identified as Black or African-American, 64.6% identified as Caucasian or White, 6.1% identified as Hispanic or Latinx, 2.4% identified as Bi-racial or multiracial, and 1.2% identified as other (Table 4.4). With regard to highest education level attained, 9.8% attained a bachelor’s degree, 84.1% attained a master’s degree, 3.7% attained a doctorate degree, 2.4% attained a degree listed as other (Table 4.4).

Table 4.1. Study Participants’ Age Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Study Participants’ Gender Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3. Study Participants’ Race/Ethnicity Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian or White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial or Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Study Participants’ Highest Education Levels Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the participants’ institutions, responses were received from 30 states, including Washington, D. C., and represented from 58 institutions (see Table 4.5 and Table 4.6).

Regarding residential areas the participants’ institutions are located in, 43% were located in suburban areas, and 36.6% were located in urban areas (Table 4.7). As far as the institutional designations, 1.2% of the participants’ institutions are designated as Alaska Native Serving Institutions (ANSIs), 7.3% of the participants’ institutions are designated as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), 8.5% of the participants’ institutions are designated as
Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), 81.7%, and 1.2% of the participants’ institutions are designated as Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) (Table 4.9). With regard to the Carnegie classification of the participants’ institutions, 29.3% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Doctoral Universities: Very High Research Activity, 22.0% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity, 9.8% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Doctoral/Professional Universities, 4.9% of the participants’ institutions are Master’s Colleges and Universities: Larger Programs, 4.9% of the participants’ institutions are Master’s Colleges and Universities: Medium Programs, 14.6% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts and Sciences Focus, 11.0% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields, 2.4% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Baccalaureate/Associate’s College: Mixed, Baccalaureate/Associate’s, and 2.4% of the participants’ institutions are classified as Special Focus Four-Year: Arts, Music, & Design Schools. Regarding the participants’ institution sizes, 1.2% of the participants’ institutions have 1,999 students and under, 36.6% of the participants’ institutions have between 2,000 and 9,999 students, 17.1 of the participants’ institutions have between 10,000 and 19,999 students, 45.1% of the participants’ institutions have more than 20,000 students (Table 4.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalton State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalle University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University, Mankato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Western State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues...)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Fairbanks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Charleston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland at College Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continue...)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida St. Petersburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Alphabetical Listing of Study Participants’ State Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Study Participants’ Institution Residential Area Frequencies

(cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8. Study Participants’ Institution Type Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Private</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Public</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Study Participants’ Institution Designation Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Designations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native Serving Institutions (ANSIs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Designations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominately White Institutions (PWIs)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Study Participants’ Institution Size Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,999 &amp; under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-9,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the participants’ positions, responses were received from 58 institutions (Table 4.5). In terms of the number of students that the participants reported being responsible for, 1.2% reported being responsible for 100 students and under, 6.1% reported being responsible for 200-499 students, 40.2% reported being responsible for 200-499 students, 30.5% reported being
responsible for 500-599 students, and 22% reported being responsible for 200-499 students, and 22% reported being responsible for more than 1,000 students (Table 4.13).

Table 4.11. Study Participants’ Carnegie Classification Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities: Very High Research Activity</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities: High Research Activity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges &amp; Universities: Larger Programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges &amp; Universities: Medium Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associate’s College: Arts &amp; Sciences Focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Focus: Four-Year: Arts, Music, &amp; Design Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Positions</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Coordinator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Residence Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director for Residential Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director for Residential Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Living &amp; Community Development Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Housing and Residence Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Residence Life &amp; Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Positions</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Residence Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Student Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Apprentice Residence Hall Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Hall Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Residence Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Residence Hall Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Director</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Coordinator and Student Conduct Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Positions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Life Coordinator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Community Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Resident Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13. Study Participants’ Number of Students Responsible for Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Responsible For</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 &amp; under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Responsible For</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-499</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were also asked about student crisis management. One hundred percent of the participants reported managing student crises. Regarding familiarity with crime rates on their campuses, 65% stated knowing their campuses’ crime rates, while 34.1% reported not knowing their campuses’ crime rates (Table 4.14). As it related to the participants’ preparation levels to manage student crises, 4.9% of the participants stated that they were unprepared manage student crises, 1.2% of the participants stated that they were neither prepared nor unprepared to manage student crises, 67% of the participants stated that they were prepared to manage student crises, 26.8% of the participants stated that they were very prepared to manage student crises (Figure 4.1).

Table 4.14. Study Participants’ Knowledge of Crime Rates on Campus Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Crime Rates on Campuses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were asked if they attended student crisis management professional development between August 2018 and August 2019. Sixty-two percent of the participants reported that they attended professional development related to student crisis management while 37.8% of the participants reported that they did not attend professional development related to student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019 (Table 4.15). Of the participants who stated that they attended student crisis management professional development trainings, the participants stated receiving between one and 100 hours. Regarding how helpful the participants found the student crisis management professional development trainings, 3.7% of the participants found the student crisis management professional development unhelpful, 6.1% of the participants found the student crisis management professional development neither helpful nor unhelpful, nearly half of the participants, 46.3% found the student crisis management professional development trainings helpful, and 6.1% of the participants found the student crisis management professional development very helpful (Figure 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance at Student Crisis Management Professional Development-August 2018 to August 2019</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16. Study Participants’ Meetings with Supervisors-Student Crisis Management Frequencies from August 2018 to August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met with Supervisors-Student Crisis Management Frequencies-August 2018 to August 2019</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. Study Participants’ Years in Position
In terms of meetings with their supervisors regarding student crisis management, an overwhelming 85.4% of the participants reported meeting with their supervisors while 14.6% of the participants reported meeting with their supervisors between August 2018 and August 2019 (Table 4.16). Of the participants who stated that they met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management, the participants met with their supervisors between one and 50 times (Figure 4.4). Regarding how helpful the participants found the student crisis management meetings with their supervisors 1.2% of the participants found the student crisis management meetings very unhelpful, 4.9% of the participants found the student crisis management meetings unhelpful, 7.3% of the participants found the student crisis management meetings neither helpful nor unhelpful, nearly two-thirds of the participants, 61.0% found the student crisis management meetings helpful, and 11.0% of the participants found the student crisis management meetings very helpful (Figure 4.3).

Figure 4.3. Study Participants’ Levels of Helpfulness of Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions (table cont’d.)
Synergistic Supervision Survey (SSS)

All of the respondents were administered the SSS is a psychometric assessment designed to quantify the live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship (Saunders et al., 2000). The SSS was created from the supervision literature from 22 questions from Winston and Creamer (1997) *Student Affairs Staffing Survey, Form B*, which asked staff members to provide information on the number of times their supervisors demonstrated actions relating to matters that were discussed during supervision, how often the employees were evaluated, and how often employees met with their supervisors (Saunders et al., 2000; Winston & Creamer, 1997). Reliability of the SSS was provided by computing the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The result was an alpha coefficient of .94 (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006) and the validity of the SSS was .91(n= 275), p < .001,” (Saunders et al., 2000, p.185; Tull, 2006, p. 470).
The SSS is a 22-item scale that was created to increase comprehension of the synergistic supervision model amongst higher education professionals (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The 22 items on the instrument that are scored items; responses are made on a Likert 5-point scale (1=never or almost never; 2=seldom; 3=sometimes; 4=often; 5=always or almost always). The purpose of the SSS scale was to evaluate professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship (Saunders et al., 2000). More specifically, the SSS scale examined the following attributes of their supervisors: “concern about staff members’ personal and career development, equitable staff treatment, management that encourages productivity, cooperative problem-solving with staff, systematic goal setting, two-way communication and systematic feedback (Saunders et al., 2000) Synergistic supervision is “a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and to enhance the professional and personal capabilities of staff” (Winston & Creamer 1997, p. 186).

The researcher examined the 82 scores on the SSS as well as the mean scores for all 22 behaviors on the scale. Overall, each of the 22 behaviors scored relatively well and were perceived to be practiced at meaningful levels. Regarding the individual behaviors, the total mean score was 3.74. All the behaviors reported mean scores above 3.0 (sometimes), with all but five having mean scores above 3.5. Moreover, four behaviors had mean scores above 4.0 (often) (Table 4.17). Information on the mean scores of all 22 behaviors is reported in Table 4.17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions that affect my areas of responsibilities.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information he/she feels is important.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor criticizes staff members in public. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about the goals of the division and institution.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor shows interest in promoting my professional or career advancement.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/her decisions. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing things, in other words, “don’t rock the boat.” (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My supervisor has favorites on the staff. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My supervisor breaks confidences (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When faced with a conflict between external constituents (for example, parent or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents, even if they are wrong. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My supervisor is open and honest with me about my strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
16. If I am not careful, my supervisor may allow things that are not my fault to be blamed on me. (REVERSE KEY)  
3.94  1.15

17. My supervisor rewards teamwork.  
3.49  .984

18. When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to overcome barriers.  
3.35  .961

19. My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake. (REVERSE KEY)  
4.37  1.04

20. My supervisor and I develop yearly professional development plans that address my weaknesses or blind spots.  
3.04  1.42

21. When problem solving, my supervisor expects staff to present and advocate differing points of view.  
3.62  .964

22. In conflicts with staff members, my supervisor takes students’ sides (even when they are wrong). (REVERSE KEY)  
4.07  1.03

Note: Response options: 1 = never or almost never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always or almost always. (REVERSED KEY)-Reversed items were changed before computations.

Figure 4.4. Study Participants’ Overall SSS Scores

Participants’ Overall SSS Scores
Phase I: Quantitative Data Presentation

The researcher created the qualitative research questions to examine the professional development and supervision sessions of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals regarding crisis response and management. The third research question examined the relationships between the levels of preparedness of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals to manage student crises and their perceptions of their supervisors exhibiting synergistic supervisory behaviors. Figures 4.4 and 4.5 shows the answers to the first two research questions that were asked in this study. The third research question will be presented in Tables 4.22 and 4.23.

### Table 4.19. Quantitative Research Questions and Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Research Questions</th>
<th>Quantitative Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?</td>
<td>Demographic Questionnaire Question #9: How many hours of training did you receive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: How often do live-in and live-on residence life and housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management?</td>
<td>Demographic Questionnaire Question #13: Approximately, how many times from August 2018 to August 2019 were the focus of meetings with your supervisors, specifically crisis management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
Quantitative Research Questions

RQ3: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises?

Demographic Questionnaire Question #6: How prepared did you feel to handle a student crisis? SSS questions 1-22 (Table 4.16)

Quantitative Data Analyses

Research Questions

RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?

Figure 4.5. Study Participants’ Number of Hours of Student Crisis Management Professional Development between August 2018 and August 2019

Table 4.20. Descriptive Statistics of Number of Hours of Student Crisis Management Professional Development between August 2018 and August 2019 (table cont’d.)
To answer Research Question One, how often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management, the researcher examined the numbers of hours of student crisis management professional development between August 2018 and August 2019. Out of the 82 participants, 62% (N = 51) of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals indicated that they had attended professional development related to student crisis management. Of the 62% (N = 51), 92% (N = 47) of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, were able to definitively identify the number of hours of professional development trainings related to student crisis management. Four responses were eliminated from analysis that used words that were ambiguous or did not specify approximate numbers of hours received. Of the 47 respondents who attended student crisis management professional development trainings, the mean number of hours received was (M=17.68) hours between August 2018 and August 2019. During the same time period, overall, two-thirds of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who indicated that they attended professional development trainings relating to student crisis management, received between one and 15 student crisis management professional development hours.

Figure 4.6. Study Participants’ Number of Meetings with Supervisors Regarding Student Crisis Management between August 2018 and August 2019 (figure cont’d.)
Table 4.21. Descriptive Statistics of Number of Meetings with Supervisors Regarding Student Crisis Management between August 2018 and August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of SCM Meetings with Supervisors</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To answer Research Question Two, how often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management, the researcher examined the number of sessions live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals and with their supervisors regarding student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019. Over 85% of the participants, (N = 70) of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals reported that the content of the meetings with their supervisors related to student crisis management. Of the 85% (N = 70) of the participants, 92.9% (N = 65) of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, were able to definitively identify the number of meetings with their supervisors related to student crisis management. As mentioned with Research Question One, how often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management, the responses were analyzed for completeness and were eliminated from further analysis if responses included words that were estimations or did not specify the approximate numbers of meetings attended. As a result, 85% (N = 65) were analyzed. The mean number of times that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management was (M = 7.57) times between August 2018 and August 2019. More than 80% of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who indicated that they met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management met between one and 15 times.

Research Question Three, to what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the student crisis management levels of preparedness, was answered by examination of the relationships between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and
professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

As part of the initial demographic collection, the participants were asked to identify, using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = very unprepared and 5 = highly satisfied), their current levels of levels of preparedness to manage student crises (Table 4.2). The live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals largely reported that they believed that they were prepared to manage student crises, and nearly 27% of participants stated that they believed that they very prepared to manage student crises. The mean score of the participants (M = 4.15) indicated that the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals believed that they were prepared to manage student crises.

The live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors were measured by the total scores of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ responses on the SSS. The range of scores for the respondents was from a low score of 36 to a high score of 104. The overall mean score on the SSS was 80.96 (N = 82), which equated to an average behavior score of 3.74. Other data regarding the scores on the SSS included a median of 83 and a mode of 87.

The researcher conducted a Pearson’s correlation test was run to determine whether a correlation between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ scores on the SSS and live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises (Table 4.23). The analysis found a weak positive correlation between the SSS scores and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises. There were
not statistically significant differences between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises. As a result, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for Research Question Three.

An additional analysis was conducted to determine the effect size of the variables of a relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises student crises. Eta squared ($\eta^2$) is typically used in cases where dependent variables are measured on interval scales and independent variables with limited number of categories (Hinkle et al., 2003). Based on Cohen’s (1992) guidelines, Cohen’s $d$ value between 0 to 0.3, small effect size; considered small (Table 4.24).

Table 4.22. Descriptive Statistics of Levels of Participants’ Preparation to Manage Student Crises and Total SSS Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SSS Scores</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Preparation-Student Crisis Management</td>
<td>4.16 (Prepared)</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7. Participants’ Levels of Preparation to Manage Student Crises
Table 4.23. Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total SSS Score</th>
<th>Levels of Preparation-Student Crisis Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SSS Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Preparation-Student Crisis Management</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24. Eta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by Interval</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Levels of Preparation-Student Crisis Management</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total SSS Score Dependent</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Quantitative Findings

A total of 82 live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals successfully completed both parts of the survey, which included a demographic questionnaire and the SSS. The professionals represented varied groups of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals from various institution sizes across the United States, as well as genders, ages, and levels of experience. Regarding the SSS, the range of scores for the respondents was from a low score of 36 to a high score 104. Overall, the live-in and live-on housing and residence life
professionals perceived their supervisors to demonstrate synergistic supervisory behaviors relatively often. Between August 2018 and August 2019, 62% (N = 51) of the participants attended student crises professional development. Of the 47 respondents who attended student crisis management professional development trainings, the mean number of hours received was 17.68 hours. During the same time period, more than 85% of the participants, (N = 70) of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals reported that they met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management an average of 7.57 times between August 2018 and August 2019. More than 80% of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who indicated that they met with their supervisors regarding student crisis management met between one and 15 times.

Results indicated that despite the incidents of crisis increasing on college and universities across the country, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive very few hours of professional development and supervision in student crisis management. The data supported that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors as demonstrating synergistic supervisory behaviors did not affect their perceptions of their levels of preparedness to manage student crises. Moreover, there were not statistically significant relationships between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

**Phase II: Qualitative Data Presentation**

Due to the fact that there were no statistically significant relationships for live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic
supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises, four live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were sampled using maximal variance sampling for in-person and virtual interviews. The rationale of the qualitative phase of the study was to purposefully select participants who would provide in-depth, quality responses to the research questions (Patton, 1990). Given the sequential design of this mixed-methods study, the selection of the participants for the qualitative phase of the study were decided based on the results of the previous quantitative phase.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Based on the results of the data analysis, the researcher utilized maximal variation sampling. The maximal variation sampling process involved the researcher identifying sample cases or individuals based on varying attributes. This method provided the researcher opportunities to present multiple perspectives of participants (Creswell, 2002). The researcher identified four participants based on the varying characteristics and availabilities to meet with the researcher. The live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were carefully selected to represent various responses on the SSS as well as various genders, institution types sizes, and designations, experience levels, geographic locations, hours of student crisis management professional development, and levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

The researcher utilized a multiple-case study design to conduct four qualitative interviews. The interviews were conducted either in-person or virtually. Email addresses of the selected live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were retrieved from the survey question field, where the participants from the first phase of the study indicated that they were interested in and making themselves available to be contacted for follow up interviews.
Initial contact emails were sent to the four selected participants disclosing the purpose of the purpose of the study and asking participants to respond with their willingness to participate and provide their availabilities. The participants that were interviewed virtually, were asked to provide their preferred methods of interviews, FaceTime or Skype. Once the participants agreed, the interviews were scheduled. Each of the four live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals participated in semi-structured interviews ranging from 36 minutes to one hour and discussed their student crisis management experiences, professional development and supervision.

The researcher developed and utilized a semi-structured interview format. Semi-structured interviews are flexible in nature. The researcher developed an interview guide to frame topics or themes that were explored during the interviews. This benefitted the research the best opportunity to maximize the data collected (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). The participants were asked a series of opening questions surrounding demographic topics as an initial opportunity to build rapport between the researcher and the interviewees. Following these questions, the researcher asked questions that related specifically to crises and traumas on their campuses, followed by questions relating to their professional development trainings and their experiences during their sessions with their supervisors. The questionnaire consisted of five parts: (a) demographic information, (b) position information, (c) college student crisis management experiences, and (d) their professional development trainings and (e) supervision sessions. Subsequently, data analyses continued while listening to and transcribing interviews to ensure accuracy. While data were collected, the researcher conducted both within-case analyses of each individual case study and cross-case syntheses of the participants’ experiences. In this section, the researcher provided overviews of each case study. The researcher also conducted within-
case analyses and cross-case synthesizes of the data that pertained to research questions four and five.

**Multiple-Case Study Overview**

In multiple-case study designs, the researcher analyzed across the cases as well as within each individual case (Stake, 1995). Specifically, in this study, the data collected from participants were analyzed for general themes in the areas of student crisis management, and professional development and supervision related to student crisis management. Finally, the researcher combined the results from the qualitative phase with results reported in the quantitative phase to develop an interpretation of the cases and report outcomes in the analysis portion of this study.

In this section, the researcher provided general overviews of the participants and demographic and institutional information. All of the participants met the following selection criteria that were discussed in the previous sections. All of the participants currently serve in positions as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals in the United States, managed student crises and completed the first phase of the study. Demographically, two of the participants identified as males and two of the other participants identified as females. Each participant had at least one year of experience in residence life and at least one graduate degree. Regarding student crisis management-related professional development and supervision, the participants shared similarities and differences in their experiences. Despite these similarities, each participant worked in different sizes and types of institutions in urban, rural and suburban environments. Likewise, the participants differed in their perceptions of their supervisors demonstrating synergistic supervisory behaviors and levels of helpfulness of student crisis management professional development and supervision. The researcher provided a profile of
participants in Table 4.1. Participants and their institution information were assigned pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. Additionally, any personal identifiers were also removed.

**Introduction of Participants**

**Carrie.** Carrie, at the time of the interview, was a campus coordinator at a small private Predominately White Institution (PWI) and was in her position for a little over a year. Carrie identified as female and was in the 25-30 age range. She has since relocated to another university in a different state in a leadership residence life position. She previously managed crises including overconsumptions of alcohol, medical and mental health incidents. She attended professional development related to student crisis management at her previous institution and advocated for additional crisis management trainings with the university counseling due to the increase of mental health crises at her institution.

**James.** James is a residence life coordinator at a large PWI and has a Carnegie classification as having very high research activity in the southeastern part of the United States. He identified as male and was in the 20-25 age range. James has served in positions in housing and residence life for a total of six years and is in his second year at his current institution. He has managed a wide range of crises including mental health concerns to student deaths. He was very active in professional organizations and has attended student crisis management professional development with his organizations and through self-sought methods via webinars, books, and by reaching out to universities demonstrating best practices in crisis management.

**Rebecca.** Rebecca was an area coordinator at a small Historically Black College and University (HBCU) in the southeastern part of the United States. She identified as female and was in the 20-25 age range. Rebecca previously served in a graduate assistantship at a large PWI
and has managed crises including roommate conflicts, student deaths, and mental health crises. She attended professional development trainings related to natural disasters and is part of the regional housing and residence life professional organization and participated in a convening of HBCUs in her state to discuss issues in residence life, including natural disasters.

**Samuel.** Samuel is a resident director at a very large PWI in a southern state. He identified as a male and was the 35-40 age range. Samuel served in his position for eight years and previously worked in residence life at a small private HBCU. He managed crises such as fights, assaults, fires, and mental health incidents, which he stated has increased at his university within the last three years. Samuel was not a member of any professional organizations and only attended a few student crisis management professional development sessions at his institution’s conferences.

This multiple-case study provided detailed descriptions of the selected live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ while examining the similarities and differences between their experiences. However, the syntheses may not be applicable to all live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Later on, in this section, research questions four and five will be answered for live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, individually, and subsequently synthesized across cases.

**Student Crisis Management Prominent Codes and Themes**

As mentioned previously, cross-case analyses are conducted to provide syntheses of individuals’ experiences (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Through cross-case analyses, the researcher was able to provide syntheses of the selected live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ student crisis management experiences. The cross-case analyses collectively highlighted the crisis management experiences amongst the live-in and live-on
housing and residence life professionals. The prominent codes and themes from live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ crisis management experiences will be presented by the researcher in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25. Student Crisis Management Codes and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured Hierarchal Campus Police Counseling Center Staff</td>
<td>Crisis Management Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Contacts On-Call Trainings</td>
<td>Counseling Center Staff Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Mental Health Counselor Referrals</td>
<td>Scopes of Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Lines Liaisons Counselors Consolers Advisers</td>
<td>Roles in Institutional Crisis Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Deaths Mental Health Medical Alcohol-Related</td>
<td>Types of Crises Managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Suicidal Ideations Depression Anxiety</td>
<td>Most Prevalent Crises Managed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple themes and codes resulted from the profiled live-in and live-in housing and residence life professionals’ student crisis management experiences. Among those shared
experiences were similarities and differences. From the interviews, it was evident that the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ institutions had established crisis management protocols. All of the participants’ student crisis management plans were structured and there were defined hierarchical reporting procedures present. The crisis management protocols included the resident assistants (RAs), unless the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were the initial points of contact, reporting the incidents directly to the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals and/or contacting the campus police in cases of emergencies. What differentiated the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ student crisis management plans were the use of manuals and incorporation of the institutions’ counseling staff as part of the procedure. While each live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional eventually involved the counseling staff as appropriate during student crises, some of the participants’ plans had the counselor more incorporated into the process while other participants’ institutions, the counseling staff served on call, communicating via phone calls or an referral basis.

The second theme of the participants’ student crisis management experiences were the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ counseling staff at their respective institutions. Some of the participants stated having working relationships with their institutions’ counseling staff, including psychologists during student crises. However, the levels of involvement differ. One participant stated having strong relationships with their on-call psychologists, which allowed the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals during the de-escalation of panic attacks, knowing when to call the psychologists, if the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals were unable calm the students down.
However, another participant stated contacting the counselors, via phone calls, to assist the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, at their institution, manage student crises.

The most unified theme of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ student crisis management experiences are understanding their scopes of responsibilities regarding counseling or advising students during crises. Unanimously, all four participants stated that they informed their students who experience crises that the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are not trained mental health professionals and encouraged or referred their students to seek assistance from the counseling professionals at their institutions’ student health centers. This was important because this prevented any harm from being done to the students due to misinformation or misguidances.

The third prominent theme amongst the live-in and live-on residence life professionals were their roles in their divisions’ crisis management plans. The similar roles at their divisions included serving as the first points of contact during crises, viewing their roles at the most important roles during crisis management. Some of the participants included liaisons, consolers, counselors, and advisors during student crises responses.

The final themes related to the types of student crises managed and the most prevalent student crises managed on the live-in and live-on housing and residential life professionals’ campuses. The participants managed crises included roommate conflicts, sexual assaults, suicidal ideations, mental health issues and student deaths. Two of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional stated that they managed student deaths. Of those student crises that the participants managed, the participants reported suicidal ideations and mental health crises such as depression and anxiety. Overall, the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals that were interviewed collectively shared similarities and difference
regarding types of crises managed, protocols and partnerships with mental health professionals during student crisis management. The major themes and codes related to student crises professional development and supervision will be discussed in the next section.

In the next section, the researcher provided qualitative data to answer the final two research questions, how do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe managing student crises after attending professional development trainings; how do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management; the researcher provided within-case analyses of data that pertained to each live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional, individually (Carrie, James, Rebecca and Samuel) followed by cross-case syntheses, where the results are compared across cases.

Within-Case Analysis Findings

Student Crisis Management Professional Development

According to the participants, attendance and participation at professional development regarding topics of student crisis management were offered through their institutions and professional organizations that they were members of. Although the opportunities to attend professional development and trainings were available, in terms of student crisis management, were not widely attended or offered. The live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals described their orientations and trainings related to student crisis management as well as their perceptions of the ideal student crisis management professional development trainings. During the data analysis, four themes emerged from live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ responses to interview and survey questions regarding student crisis professional development: (1) Orientations/Trainings, (2) Open Doors/Closed Doors, (3)Self-
Sought Professional Development and (4) Ideal Student Crisis Management Trainings. Four themes also surfaced regarding the student crisis management supervision sessions: (1) Supervisor Characteristics, (2) Meeting Formats, (3) Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions, (4) Lack of Uniform Standard Code of Ethics.

The researcher presented the student crises professional development experiences of each live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, individually. Overall, each participant did not attend student crisis management professional development trainings often during the 2018-2019 school year.

**Carrie.** Carrie’s experiences with student crisis professional development were limited to first-hand encounters during her first few days on the job as a campus coordinator.

**Orientations/Trainings.** Carrie stated that she did not attend any conferences but credited her institution’s onboarding process and personal experiences with dealing with crises with her comfortability to manage student crises. She described her orientation experiences as very organized, comprehensive and hands-on:

It was one of the best you know like employee orientations, of the best onboarding processes that I’ve ever had. I received a calendar that spelled out my hourly schedule for the month. I was getting trained right alongside the RAs. It was good getting two weekends of shadowing the professionals who have been there the year before. When I finally had my first night on-call, I felt pretty comfortable and ready to handle a call.

Additionally, Carrie found the professional development provided by the counseling staff helpful. “The trainings with our counseling—like our own counseling center. I think that was very helpful.”

Regarding attendance at conferences, Carrie stated that she did not attend or participate in any student crisis management related professional development and what was provided was limited:

I did not do a conference that was specifically crisis management. I didn’t do you know—a webinar that was specifically crisis management. I didn’t read a book that was
specifically crisis management. I didn’t take a class, a course furthering education. I would say outside of in-person trainings that was by our counseling center. I would say outside of that, there was nothing else.

Carrie stated that her institution provided funding for her to attend one conference. With that allotment, she chose to attend a conference relating to her other duties with fraternities and sororities. She stated how she wanted to attend a regional college and university housing conference, but could afford to go or secure scholarships from the organization to attend:

Yeah, so, I was fortunate to work for an institution that budgeted for professional development. I almost had the opportunity to attend, but um didn’t find out about it in time to register for it. I tried to reach out the [regional university organization housing] to see if there were any scholarships or if there were—if I could volunteer for a day, in lieu of a registration waiver.

**Open Doors/Behind Closed Doors Trainings.** However, Carrie did state how the “Behind Closed Doors” trainings her institution provided were helpful regarding student crisis management during the onboarding process with her colleagues. She discussed how the scenarios discussed how to handle student crises through simulations and scenarios:

Three of [live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals] we were going through trainings together and like classroom settings and took part in behind closed doors training sessions with RAs which is where new RAs, are confronted with scenarios of things that could happen while on duty or doing rounds.

**Self-Sought Professional Development.** Although Carrie’s institution provided formal crisis management trainings during orientations, held annually, it was up to her or her colleagues they were referred or self-sought:

Our assistant dean of students who oversaw our res life and fraternity and sorority life like an article or webinar. That would be on us, if we wanted to read it or register for it.

Although Carrie was provided student crisis management professional development through annual orientations that included practice and simulations, she did not believe it was enough.
**Ideal Student Crisis Management Trainings.** Carrie and her colleagues observed the lack of the mental health professional development and described how they advocated for the training to their supervisor:

The five coordinators who served as live-in staff, we were the ones who advocated for additional crisis training of mental health issues students or situations. We advocated for that additional training that our supervisor was able to work with the counseling center that provided it for us.

Although, Carrie’s institution offered annual trainings that were hands-on, structured and organized related to student crises, she did not think it was enough. Carrie and her colleagues advocated to her supervisor regarding the need for mental health crises, demonstrating the need and importance for such training.

**James.** The types and numbers of crises that James managed in his six years in residence life has been more than some professionals encounter in their lives or their careers. Out of the participants, he, by far, has the most extensive experience with managing student crises. Given James’ extensive crisis management history, he did not believe that the crisis management trainings his current institution provided were enough or helpful.

**Orientations/Trainings.** James stated that he received 16 hours of student crisis management professional development, although he thought it was enough, did not feel it adequately prepared him and that more are needed. Additionally, James did not believe live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals can truly be prepared for everything:

We had 16 hours of training on anything from crises to policies and stuff like that. It helps but is not helpful. I tell people all the time, you learn on the job. You can tell me, you can prepare me, you can have me go through trainings, simulations, as much as you want. It is nothing like until you are there, and you are responding.

James discussed his frustration with the lack of collaboration and not using “experts” to help facilitate crisis management content sessions related to the experts’ competencies:
The additional trainings with our counseling—like our own counseling center. I think that was very helpful. I think part of it also comes to people are siloed here. People do what is best for their departments. I do not feel like sometimes we use the experts. We try to use our own trainings and I realize that there is someone who does this for a living.

When asked to provide an example, James discussed how collaborations were common at his previous institutions, but has yet to see evidence at his current institution:

From past institutions where collaborations were huge. Why do we have 15 of the sexual assault programs when—if the 15 of us come together, we can do a mass program. We can have more money, more outreach and all of this. We can all bring in our different pools to have a more engaged conversation.

**Open Doors/Behind Closed Doors Trainings.** Like Carrie, James also saw the benefits of Open Doors/Behind Closed Doors trainings. He described in detail how the trainings are helpful, but still not as realistic as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals managing crises themselves. He also discussed how the trainings are more policy-based and procedure focused:

So, it is more like student crisis. How do you follow up with a student? Do you respond to certain situations whether it’s a student do—whether it’s ‘Behind Closed Doors’ and ‘Open Doors.’ So ‘Behind Closed Doors’ is where a student comes—a student comes to you and they’re pregnant. A student tells you they are thinking about committing suicide, or student is more, I do not want to say, serious. But the student is more serious. The other one which is more policy-based. You are learning both sides of the policy parts, but you are also learning this part is how would you respond in the situation.

**Self-Sought Professional Development.** James was very resourceful and very invested in his career. He stated that a lot of his student crisis management professional development trainings do not come from his institution, but from his own research, networking and attending conferences:

A lot of my professional development personally does not come from [institution]… So, a lot of my things come from webinars, or books or just talking to others at other institutions. I am big on reaching out to others and also just ‘Googling.’ I am big on reading and also understanding seeing what others are doing. For example, I actually get the Chronicle of Higher Ed in print and I read that every day so I can see what other
schools are doing. I feel that a lot of times, copy genius and tweak it. People always trying to re-invent the wheel. If someone is doing something good, I need to know about it then tweak it to what I can do, and I found that your network, a lot of times, determines your impact.

James went on to discuss the student crisis management sessions at a conference he recently attended, but was not enough content:

I went to the conference last year, and there was a session I did go to—I think it was responding to crisis situations. They gave a lot of overall good advice. Overall, they are like, ‘Hey, make sure you do this. Let’s do this. How about this from this perspective?’ I think there could be more.

**Ideal Student Crisis Management Trainings**

When James was asked what his ideal student crisis management training would look like, since he did not believe what was provided is not enough or helpful, he mentioned the preparation, in terms of coursework in the student affairs graduate programs. He suggested the incorporation of counseling courses in the curricula, which he found beneficial during his graduate program. When asked if he thought counseling training should be incorporated into coursework, he stated:

My master’s program was very counseling-focused. It was college student personnel. Our emphasis was counseling, so we took five counseling courses like group counseling, helping skills, individual counseling, career counseling and counseling mediations.

Additionally, James discussed his ideal trainings, modeled after what he believes are the best practices in the professional development trainings that he experienced in his profession to date:

I think it would be the ‘Behind Closed Doors or ‘Open Doors’ or something. Although going through a simulation it prepares you but does not fully prepare you. I think that is the closest you are going to get to it. So, the more and more you practice and get more comfortability around it, you can go in with more confidence.

James was very knowledgeable in his experience and his understanding of the scope of student crisis management. Based on James’ experiences it was evident that, although 16 hours of student crisis management appears to be enough, when compared to the types of crises that he
has experienced, the crisis management professional development that were provided to him were not enough.

**Rebecca.** According to Rebecca, her student crisis management professional development trainings were combinations of primarily institutionally provided and professional organizations. She credited her expertise to manage crises partially to her crisis management experiences at her previous institution where she served as graduate assistant and was eventually promoted to a permanent position.

**Orientations/Trainings.** Rebecca described her student crisis professional development trainings at her current institution as highly collaborative with counseling staff and other departments and engaging but noted that they needed to be more in-depth:

> So, the counseling center does come in for some training sessions. We have our colleagues in Title IX come in—they actually come in and do an actual presentation for the students and they also do [Behind Closed Doors] scenarios, so when we can address the sexual assault and know what to do. We have campus police. Because we have a collaborative relationship, it is important to make sure we are all saying the same things.

Additionally, Rebecca discussed the student crisis management professional development she had received at her previous institution, particularly, regarding natural disaster:

> I would say they were about simulations. I would say you would be hard-pressed to find any institution that does not have this. We have about a two-week period of training and in that training we talk about crises and crisis management. Going back to my experience at [previous institution]. I would say that at [previous institution], if there was any crisis that [previous institution] did amazing, it was hurricanes. Our roles and expectations were reviewed to prepare for a hurricane. I really, really appreciated that. Having had everything spelled out for me, having been in a meeting where everything is explained, I was able to ask what other questions that I might have. The training was very helpful because it made me feel prepared to manage a natural disaster on my campus.

**Open Doors/Behind Closed Doors Trainings.** Along with Carrie and James, Rebecca also had experience with ‘Behind Closed Doors’ at her current and previous institutions.
Rebecca mentioned that the trainings are part of annual trainings where campus partners and resources shared resources and provided trainings:

So, every year, we do what is called ‘Behind Closed Doors.’ Behind Closed Doors allows for people to come in. We will have returner RAs who act and professional staff members who act. People get the opportunity to address a situation or to address a concern before the residents come back. We always have campus partners come in for that.

**Self-Sought Professional Development.** Rebecca mentioned how she and a group of her peers at HBCUs in her state meet to discuss crisis concerns:

I worked at an HBCU, so we started an HBCU roundtable as a way for people like [live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals at HBCUs] to come together, help each other out, like to become more professionally developed in our areas as well. We did have some sessions on crisis management. More specifically, we had one or two about hurricanes.

**Ideal Student Crisis Management Trainings**

When asked what her vision of an ideal training would be at her current institution, Rebecca stated revisiting the manual, particularly for roles and responsibilities, along with collaborating with campus partners:

I would say, in terms of crisis management, the first thing that we need to do, I would say is at my current institution is to visit our manual. I think that, at my current institution, we can do a better job of spelling things out. I think if we were to spell things out, we would have an easier time in creating trainings. My wish-list would be to honestly actually give a good training of what to do in a crisis. What to do to break down those situations and to have campus partners come in. Who are the actual experts of that field, that particular crisis, because they are the experts of this crisis and we need to follow what they say.

Rebecca credited a large part of her successes managing student crises to her experiences at her previous institution. It seemed that Rebecca perceived her current institution needing to do more to better prepare their live-in and live-on residence life professionals to manage student crises.

**Samuel.** Samuel has served consistently in his position the longest of any of the interviewed live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Like the other
participants, he has worked at more than one institution. However, unlike the other participants, he did not find that the professional development trainings, in general, catered to his experience levels. Samuel believed a lot of the professional development were geared towards entry-level professionals.

**Orientations/Trainings.** Samuel described his onboarding process as unusual because he started in his position after orientation had taken place. He described not having had opportunities for formal orientation/trainings. Therefore, he just had to begin his position without the normal development transition:

> My first year, I did not get a very structured training. When I first started [at my current institution], they arranged some meetings for me with various people during the first three weeks that I was there. For the most part, I was kind of just put into the fire. [Current institution] assumed that I had most of the skills that I needed because I had worked this position at another school.

Additionally, Samuel compared and contrasted his experiences coming from an institution where the processes were very different.

> Looking back, I was definitely at a disadvantage. Before I was here, I was at an HBCU. The processes between here and there are drastically different. For things I was not trained on specifically, when I got here, I arrived with what I already knew which really did not fit the environment. It was that big adjustment period that first year that first year that I was here.

Samuel stated that he had to self-navigate and went from an environment where he had more free reign to a very controlled environment. When asked to elaborate about the differences in the two environments, Samuel said:

> I was at [institution name]. You know a small, private HBCU and in that environment, there was a lot more autonomy to just do the things that I saw fit. And here, everything at [current institution] is very, very structured. Everything has a very deterministic set of processes and it is meant to be followed pretty much exactly. To go from somewhere where I could almost do whatever I wanted, to a place that has all these processes …I ran into a lot of walls the first year.

When asked about the how he overcame the barriers, Samuel stated:
A lot of it was just knowing that everything. So, there is a very high need to know everything here at [institution], when things happen. I usually have to rope in at least three different people for like anything. When you are not really told that, you get a lot of reprimands. It was a lot of just having to sit down and either figure out which questions to ask to get the answers that I needed.

When Samuel was asked about his student crisis management trainings related to managing panic attacks he said:

At this point in time—I have had some training with it. I do not reach for the psychologist. If I walk in and see that [the situation] is super intense, I will reach for the professional. Or if I work for the student for more than 10 minutes and I am not getting anywhere then I will go ask for the psychologist.

**Ideal Student Crisis Management Trainings.** Relating to student crisis management professional development, Samuel stated the professional development that he received primarily came from institutionally-based conferences, as he mentioned that he is not part of any professional organizations. At those conferences, there were only a few sessions related to student crisis management:

There are always a couple of sessions on like crisis interventions, incident management and I—have had some in the past. I think at this level in my career where the information that they present is not always as useful to me.

Samuel mentioned that he believes that is at the end of his career and the content of the trainings are not geared toward live-in and live-on professionals like him and feels left out:

When I was at [previous institution], every resident director who was there had been an RD for five to ten years or more. Then I came to [current institution], and the average tenure is about three years. So, a lot of the information that we get at the conferences, a lot of our in-house stuff, it is always geared for that new entry-level professional. It is kind of assumed, taken for granted that after about two to three years that I am about to have an entirely new group to represent to or after three years; there’s not much more to develop with it. There are things that could still use some development, but it is never really thought of.
Samuel continued to elaborate how the trainings are not keeping up with the changing demographic of students. Specifically, providing professional development on how better to serve the students and their needs:

One of the things that I have noticed in the years that I have been [at institution] is that the demographics the types of students that we serve has changed a lot. We do not really work on development in terms of how to both supervise these new student employees but also deal with a new kind of student. We talk about it, but we never really work on it, not really doing something about it. That has always concerned me a little bit.

As mentioned previously, Samuel has the most experience out of all the participants that were interviewed. It was very enlightening to hear Samuel’s sentiments regarding how the content of the professional development and trainings needs to be more inclusive of experienced live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals as well as incorporating updated training content and switching up the presentation formats, so the content does not become stale and irrelevant.

**Within-Case Analysis Findings**

**Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions**

To answer the final research question regarding the experiences of the supervision sessions of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, the following themes will be discussed by participant: *Supervisor Characteristics, Meeting Formats, Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions, Lack of Uniform Standard Code of Ethics.*

**Carrie.** Carrie had two supervisors because her role involved duties in residence life and fraternity and sorority life. For the purposes of this section, she referred to her housing and residence life supervisor, who she described as being one of the best she’s had. Regarding her crisis management supervision sessions, Carrie met with her supervisor weekly, and 12 of those meetings were regarding student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019.
**Supervisor Characteristics.** Carrie described her supervisor as being very knowledgeable, experienced and willing to support her colleagues by providing mental health crisis training. Carrie’s description supported how she evaluated her supervisor on the SSS:

He had several years of housing experience at this institution. He also had several years of housing experience at other institutions. He was definitely well-versed in the functional areas of residential life and supervision. He was very supportive, and he was really great at allowing myself and his other supervisees autonomy, to make decisions; particularly with the RAs that we supervised.

**Meeting Formats.** Carrie met with her supervisor regularly in one-on-one, group formats with other live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, “I had a one-on-one with him once-a-week, every Friday at like 10:00am.”

In addition to meeting regularly, Carrie and her supervisor met as needed when crises arose:

He would be available if there was an issue or if there was something that happened that day. He also had this great open-door policy. If I needed to walk in his office and ask him a question or receive a directive on something, he would be available. He would also be available if I needed to email questions or ask him about anything.

**Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions**

Regarding the student crisis management supervision sessions, Carrie mentioned that she and her supervisor met after crises occurred. They would discuss the situation, how it was handled and provide recommendations to handle the crises better:

I would ask him, what should be the protocol you to having to work with wild animals because it should not be the officers’ responsibility to get rid of the wild animals, he just did. He said, “What you would do is call the consultant, who is on duty, and get permission from the agent.”

**James.** James informally has several supervisors. The one he evaluated on the SSS is no longer his supervisor. For the purpose of this section, James referred to his supervisor during the evaluation period and his current supervisor during the interview. James managed many intense crises and met with his supervisor a total of eight times between August 2018 and August 2019.
**Supervisor Characteristics.** James described his relationships with several supervisors. The supervisor he evaluated on the SSS, James described him as easy-going, supportive and able to talk to him about anything “My [current supervisor] and I think a lot alike.”

**Meeting Formats.** Regarding his meetings with his supervisor, James meets one-on-one with his supervisor as needed.

**Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions.** Regarding the student crisis management supervision sessions, like Carrie, James also mentioned that he and his supervisor meet after crises occurred. They would discuss the situation, how it was handled and provide recommendations to handle the crises better:

The conversations that were had with my supervisor were like ‘walk me through the procedures, walk me through the steps.” “What were some of your thoughts on scene? “So, you are going to have to make some of those decisions. We walked through step-by-step some of my decisions and [he] asked a lot of probing questions, like ‘why did you do this?’ ‘Why did you not do this?’

Given the extent of the traumatic nature of the student, James’s supervisor also tended to James to ensure he was okay. He encouraged James to pursue therapy and take the rest of the day off. My supervisor said, “You can take [the next day] off, take time for yourself.”

**Lack of Uniform Standard Code of Ethics.** When asked if he followed a uniform code of conduct for all live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, James mentioned institution and a professional organization, but nothing standardized profession-wide:

We followed ethical guidelines…it is a mixture of everything. [Institution] has certain guidelines. There are certain things that are per [institution]. Then there are certain things that are res life. We followed NASPA and ACPA competencies. It is a mix of everything.

It was evident that James relationship with his supervisor impacted how he was able to effectively handle high levels of crises. James’ supervisor tended to his well-being during his
student crisis management session, which was extremely important and beneficial to both James and the students that he served.

Rebecca. Rebecca described her student crisis management supervision sessions as neither helpful nor not helpful. For the purpose of this section, Rebecca referred to her current supervisor during the interview. Rebecca stated that she managed a few crises and had between five and ten supervision sessions relating to student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019.

**Supervisor Characteristics**

Rebecca was very candid in how she described her supervisor. Rebecca described her supervisor as well-read and very knowledgeable. However, Rebecca became frustrated with her perceived supervisor’s unwillingness to hold her and others accountable. Rebecca’s description supported how she evaluated her supervisor on the SSS. Rebeca stated, “I would say that [the meetings] were helpful, and not helpful. [My supervisor] has been in the field since 2012. She has knowledge and experience.”

**Meeting Formats**

Regarding her meetings with her supervisor, Rebecca met one-on-one with her supervisor weekly as well as her colleagues in group formats. Rebecca said, “We have one-on-one meetings and the we have res. ed meetings. Every Friday, all of the professionals and grads and resident directors, and our portion of the department.”

**Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions**

Regarding the student crisis management supervision sessions, like Carrie and James, Rebecca also mentioned that she and her supervisor met after crises occurred. They would discuss the situation, how it was handled and provide recommendations to handle the crises
better. Rebecca stated, “I determined what information [my supervisor] is going to need. What information she is going to ask for.”

When Rebecca was asked if to describe times when her supervisor was helpful during the aforementioned supervision, Rebecca stated, “I would say that when there are situations and I am not sure what to do, if I send her an e-mail, she will get back to me and explain to me what I need.”

Rebecca’s experience managing crises coupled with her perceptions of her supervisor, has Rebecca meeting with her supervisor only when absolutely necessary. It seemed that what Rebecca wanted most from her supervisor is for her supervisor to provide guidance and substantive feedback regarding how she could handle situations better. Regarding the aforementioned student crisis management supervision session, with her supervisor, Rebecca seems to have found that session in particular helpful despite Rebecca’s frustrations with her supervisor.

Samuel. Samuel, in general, described the environment at his university as micromanaged and multiple parties being involved in every situation or incidents that occurred. Samuel stated that the operations at his institution are very organized and structured. However, he described his immediate supervisor being concerned with the overall well-being of his employees. In this section, Samuel referred to the same supervisor that he evaluated during the SSS part of the survey. Samuel reported meeting with his supervisor five times relating to student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019.

Supervisor Characteristics. Samuel described his supervisor as relaxed and going with the flow, which was contrary to the self-described micromanaged environment at Samuel’s institution. Samuel’s description supported how he evaluated his supervisor on the SSS. Samuel
said, “I would say that he has a very relaxed demeanor. He is very big on gathering the facts before he makes a decision. We get along pretty well.”

**Meeting Formats.** Regarding the meetings with his supervisor, Samuel also met one-on-one with his supervisor weekly as well as her colleagues in group formats.

My supervisor and I meet twice a week. There is one where it is just he and I in a one-on-one session and then we have unit meetings like once-a-week, and we touch base in those meetings. In the group meetings, it is more about him just giving [me and my colleagues] information. During the one-on-one meeting that I have with him, we do a lot of talking about the week or something that I should have done or involved him in.

Samuel described the activities that occurred in his supervision sessions.

A lot of it is either basic planning or us just talking about our week and what’s going on. They are pretty unstructured meetings, the one-on-ones. We use that period for anything that I might need him for that I have not heard about yet. He would also use that period to get me some feedback on some things that I have done recently, other areas to improve upon or recognition for things that I have done well. Then we just talk about ways where we can help the rest of our team for the coming week.

**Student Crisis Management Supervision Sessions.** Regarding the student crisis management supervision sessions, like the other participants, Samuel also mentioned that he and his supervisor met after crises occurred. They discussed the situation, how it was handled and provided recommendations to handle the crises better:

I really did not have to talk to my supervisor that much right after that except to figure out the cost of the damages. [My supervisor] touched base with me to see how things were going. My supervisor and I after about two weeks, we sat and discussed the crisis situation I managed again. I gave him some updates and that was pretty much it.

Samuel stated that he is at the end of his career in residence life. In talking with Samuel, it was evident that his supervisor is very knowledgeable and easygoing. It appeared that despite Samuel working in very structured environments, Samuel’s supervisor’s relaxed demeanor allowed Samuel to perceive managing stressful situations not as stressful.
Summary of Qualitative Findings

In this section, the researcher presented the results related to the final two research questions:

RQ4: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their professional development trainings regarding student crisis management?

RQ5: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management?

The research provided within-case analyses of data that pertained to each live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional, individually (Carrie, James, Rebecca and Samuel) followed by cross-case syntheses, where the results are compared across cases.

The live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals had similar student crisis management protocols and overwhelmingly listed mental health crises and suicidal ideations as the most prevalent crises the participants managed. In terms of student crisis management, there were five themes that resulted from the interviews with the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. The first theme was professional development; the participants emphasized more needs to be done, occur more often and diversify the content and training formats. The second theme was participants suggested professional development trainings incorporate the formats of the ‘Open Doors/Closed Doors’ trainings, including providing the opportunities to have the experts in the mental health fields be part of the trainings, practice what was learned during the trainings. The third theme, regarding supervision, the participants described their supervisors as knowledgeable, caring, easy-going, and supportive. The fourth theme, all of the participants reported meeting with their supervisors in multiple formats such as one-on-one and group formats, meeting regularly, whether weekly or bi-weekly. Finally, the
fifth theme, all of the participants reported their student crisis management supervision sessions having the same structures: discussed the situations, how the situations were handled and provided feedback and recommendations and to handle the crises better.

**Chapter Summary**

The purposes of this sequential explanatory mixed-methods study were to examine the professional development and supervision relating to crises response and management. Live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals served as the sample for the study. The results of the study determined that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals do not receive student crisis management professional development often. However, live-in and live-on professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management often. Additionally, it was found that there are not statistically significant relationships between relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises. Chapter Five of the study will explain the findings, study limitations, implications for practice, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

On college campuses, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are essential in helping college students persist through colleges and maneuver through the college transition processes (Bernard, 2015; Erb, Sinclair, & Braxton, 2015; Kranzow, Hinkle, & Foote, 2015). More importantly, these professionals are also responsible for the safety of their students in their residence halls. (Erb, Sinclair, & Braxton, 2015; Gregory & Janosik, 2006). In recent years, this role has been more prominent as more college students reported experiencing crises such as anxiety, depression, and stress, trauma, suffering grief/loss, suicidal ideation, identifying as victims of sexual assault, or victims of assault or physical abuse (CCMH, 2017, p. 17; Kahn, Kasky-Hernandez, Ambrose, & French, 2017). For live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who helped students navigate through difficult situations, crises, and/or tragedies, it is essential that they receive professional development and supervision to deal with crisis management. To meet the growing demand of crises affecting college students who live on campuses, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professional staff members must be prepared and readily available to support their students.

Studies such as ACUHO-I (2008), suggested that the training of residence life professionals needs to be examined and overhauled. Moreover, in order for professional development to be effective they need to deliberate and intentional, providing opportunities to apply the newly acquired knowledge and skills into practice (Mizell, 2010). The research found that synergistic supervision the most widely practiced supervision model in student affairs divisions, (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). The literature from previous research suggested that professional supervision can be effective as it is with other helping professions such as counseling, social work, teaching
and nursing to provide support to these professionals which can be essential in maintaining job satisfaction and avoiding burnout (Winston & Creamer, 1997).

The purpose of this current mixed-methods study is two-fold: to examine the professional development and the supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for crisis response and management on colleges and universities. This study examined the student crisis management experiences of four live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals in the areas of professional development and supervision.

**Study Overview**

This researcher employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, which included a combination of a demographic questionnaire and a quantitative screening assessment, Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) (Saunders et al., 2000) to identify potential participants for a second, qualitative, phase involving in-depth interviews. Four live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals from various sizes and types of institutions from across the United States participated in this study. All four of the participants perceived their supervisors as demonstrating synergistic supervisory behaviors.

The research questions posed in this study were answered using the both the quantitative data gathered from the demographic questionnaires and SSSs and qualitative data collected during semi-structured interviews with each of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals which lasted between 30 minutes and one hour. Their demographic profiles and their answers on the SSSs were used as supplementary information to interpret the data collected during the interviews. The findings for each research question are presented below.
Research Questions

This study addressed the following overarching main research question and subsequent research questions. How prepared do live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional staff believe they are to manage student crises?

RQ1: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management?

RQ2: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management?

RQ3: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises?

H₀₃: There is not a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

Hₐ₃: There is a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the student crisis management levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

RQ4: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their professional development trainings regarding student crisis management?
RQ5: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management?

Summary of Findings

Research Question One: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals receive or attend professional development trainings relating to student crisis management? Although the literature suggested residence life professionals departments allowed more opportunities to participate in professional development, when it came to professional development opportunities relating to student crisis management, that was not the case (Collins & Hirt, 2006). Nearly two-thirds of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals reported that they attended professional development trainings related to student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019. Of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals who stated they attended professional development related to student crisis management between August 2018 and August 2019, who stated that they attended student crisis management professional development trainings, they an average of over 17 hours student crisis management content. In general, the institutions designated as very-high research activity and private schools reported receiving higher numbers of student crises professional development hours between August 2018 and August 2019.

Research Question Two: How often do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management? In terms of meetings with their supervisors regarding student crisis management, over 85% of the participants reported meeting with their supervisors between August 2018 to August 2019 an average of seven and a half times. These findings support the research that professionals meet with their supervisors less than 10 times in one year (Saunders et al., 2000). In alignment, with
the first research question, the institutions designated as very-high research activity and private institutions reported the receiving higher numbers of student crises professional development hours between August 2018 and August 2019.

Research Question Three: To what degree do relationships exist between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises student crises? The data supported that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors as demonstrating synergistic supervisory behaviors did not affect their perceptions of their levels of preparedness to manage student crises. Moreover, there were not statistically significant relationships between live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life and professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises.

The participants completed the SSS, which is psychometric assessment with a 22-item scale that was created to increase comprehension of the synergistic supervision model amongst higher education professionals (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The 22 items on the instrument that are scored items; responses are made on a Likert 5-point scale (1=never or almost never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always or almost always). (Saunders et al., 2000; Tull, 2006). The purpose of the SSS scale was to evaluate professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationship (Saunders et al., 2000). More specifically, the SSS scale examined the following attributes of their supervisors: “concern about staff members’ personal and career development,
equitable staff treatment, management that encourages productivity, cooperative problem-solving with staff, systematic goal setting, two-way communication and systematic feedback (Saunders et al., 2000) Synergistic supervision is “a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and to enhance the professional and personal capabilities of staff” (Winston & Creamer 1997, p. 186).

The results from the current study indicated that the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals surveyed believe they perceived their supervisors demonstrated behaviors that are related to synergistic supervision. The researcher examined the 82 scores on the SSS as well as the mean scores for all 22 behaviors on the scale. Overall, each of the 22 behaviors scored relatively well and were perceived to be practiced at meaningful levels. All the behaviors reported mean scores above 3.0 (sometimes), with all but five having mean scores above 3.5. Moreover, four behaviors had mean scores above 4.0 (often). Table 4.16 provided information on the mean scores of all 22 behaviors.

Several of the synergistic behaviors were more practiced than others. Regarding the positive behaviors that were perceived to be practiced most frequently, the top two, respectively, were: (5) My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional (M = 4.32) and (8) My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person (M = 4.02). The negative synergistic behaviors that were perceived to be practiced least frequently, the top two, respectively were: (19) My supervisor criticizes staff members in public (reversed M = 4.37) and (3) My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake (reversed mean = 4.33).

The positive synergistic behaviors that were perceived to be practiced least frequently were: (20) developing yearly professional development plans (M = 3.04) and (18) When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to
overcome barriers. (M = 3.33). The negative behaviors that were perceived to be practiced most frequently were: (10) My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing things, in other words, “don’t rock the boat.” (reversed M = 3.13) and (11) My supervisor has favorites on the staff. (reversed M = 3.40).

Table 5.1. Descriptive Statistics-Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) (N = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that affect my areas of responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he/she feels is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor criticizes staff members in public. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about the</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals of the division and institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is personal or professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My supervisor shows interest in promoting my professional or career</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her decisions. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of doing</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things, in other words, “don’t rock the boat.” (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. My supervisor has favorites on the staff. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. My supervisor breaks confidences (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. When faced with a conflict between external constituents (for example, parent or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents, even if they are wrong. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. My supervisor is open and honest with me about my strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. If I am not careful, my supervisor may allow things that are not my fault to be blamed on me. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. My supervisor rewards teamwork.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. When the system gets in the way of accomplishing our goals, my supervisor helps me to devise ways to overcome barriers.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. My supervisor looks for me to make a mistake. (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. My supervisor and I develop yearly professional development plans that address my weaknesses or blind spots.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. When problem solving, my supervisor expects staff to present and advocate differing points of view.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont’d.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. In conflicts with staff members, my supervisor takes students’ sides (even when they are wrong). (REVERSE KEY)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the results of the study suggested that the participants perceived their supervisors to sometimes practice synergistic behaviors regularly. These findings support the literature that the connection between the favorable perceptions of professionals’ views toward their supervisors cannot not be established (Saunders et al., 2000).

Research Question Four: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their professional development trainings regarding student crisis management? The current study found that student crisis professional development trainings needs to occur more often. Additionally, more variation in the student crisis professional development content and training formats should be provided. When describing the ideal student crisis management trainings, the participants suggested that professional development trainings incorporate hands-on simulations and scenarios include providing opportunities to have the experts in student crisis management such as campus mental health professionals, campus police and other campus departments and resources be incorporated into trainings, practice what was learned during the trainings. The findings supported the assumptions of Adult Learning Theory which states that adults want to have input in how they learn, learn something new, learn content that is practical and applicable, and solution-focused (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). Additionally, the results supported Bandura (1977) Social Learning Theory which states that individuals learn from each other through seeing and doing tasks.
Research Question Five: How do live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals describe their supervision sessions regarding student crisis management? Overall, the participants described their supervisors as knowledgeable, caring, easy-going, and supportive. All of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals reported meeting with their supervisors in multiple formats such as one-on-one and group formats, meeting regularly, whether weekly or bi-weekly. Finally, all of the participants reported their student crisis management supervision sessions having the same structures: discussed the situations, how the situations were handled and provided feedback and recommendations and to handle the crises better. These assertions support the research that synergistic supervision is the model most used in student affairs (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). Additionally, the participants’ descriptions of the content of their student crisis management supervision sessions having the same structures: discussed the situations, how the situations were handled and provided feedback and recommendations and to handle the crises better. The results supported the literature that supervision sessions provide opportunities to communicate expectations, informally assess and discuss their performances (Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998).

Findings Related to the Literature

In a national survey study, Center for Collegiate Mental Health (2017) found that Anxiety, depression, and stress were the top three concerns students sought treatment for at the student health centers. The current study supported the report’s findings that the student crises most managed by live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals were depression, anxiety. Regarding live-in and live-on and housing residence life professionals reporting managing suicidal ideations, the literature also supported suicidal ideations as a large portion of
crises that are reported by students on college campuses (CCMH, 2017). The reporting of anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideations as mentioned by the live-in and live-in housing and residence life professionals also support the research that the aforementioned crises are increasing on their campuses (CCMH, 2017; Kahn, Kasky-Hernandez, Ambrose, & French, 2017; Reetz, Krylowicz & Mistler, 2014). Prior researchers such as Sanford (1962) and Kahn et al. (2017) suggested that one explanation for students experiencing crises on college campuses is that students experience challenges that come from the transition from high school to college, failure in academics, determining identities, not adequately adjusting to living on campus, or experiencing tragedies and crises.

Schroeder and Mable (1994), McClellan and Stringer (2009), and Safe Colleges (2019) indicated that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are seen as the front-lines of crisis management. All of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals stated their roles as being essential and the primary points of contacts in their crisis management plans. Moreover, these findings support the research that student affairs professionals like live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are seen as first responders such as police officers and medical personnel (Harper, Paterson, & Zdziarski, 2006; Treadwell, 2017; Zdaziarski, 2001). Specifically, the live-in and live-on housing and residence interviewed identified their role as counselors during crises, which is in line with the role Fried (2011) student affairs professionals as counselors because of their work with students’ and “physical and mental well-being” of students on their campuses (p. 110).

In the current study, 62% of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals indicated that they had attended professional developments related to student crisis management. However, Carrie stated during that her institution provided funding for her to
attend one conference. This finding from the current study contradicted the Belch, Wilson, and Dunkel (2009) study which reported that formal policies encouraging their staff to attend professional development opportunities and were considered best practices and seen as worthy investments.

Utilizing survey questions created by Saunders et al., (2000) to evaluate professionals’ perceptions of their relationships with their supervisors and tasks that occur as part of the supervisory relationships. As mentioned by the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals that were interviewed, reported their student crisis management supervision sessions had the same structures: discussed the situations, how the situations were handled and provided feedback and recommendations and to handle the crises better. This research finding supported the Synergistic Supervision model which provided supervisors with the opportunity to communicate expectations, informally assess and discuss their performances (Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). In terms of characteristics of their supervisors, the participants described their supervisors as knowledgeable, caring, easy-going, and supportive. These characteristics are in line with the primary purpose of synergistic supervision which focuses on joint-efforts, two-way communications, competencies, and goals for the betterment of the organizations and the individuals (Winston & Creamer, 1998). While the current study substantiated many of the claims made by prior researchers, the current study provided a foundation for research, specifically, regarding live-in and live-on and professionals and crisis management professional development trainings and supervision sessions.

**Limitations of the Research Study**

The study had several limitations, primarily within the research methodologies. The survey administration being completed solely online may have posed concerns for participants
with limited or accesses to computers, did not have email addresses or limited due to no internet connection (Nulty, 2008). Furthermore, completion of online surveys through emails, have lower response rates than surveys completed manually (Nulty, 2008). However, since the use of computers with Internet connection and e-mail, communications have increased significantly over the last five years. This may suggest that web-based data collection methods are becoming the norm rather than the exception (Davidson, 2009; Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). The last limitation was the population used for the current study. The targeted sample included individuals who identified as live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. The survey, initially distributed through ACUHO-I to its members, did not yield high response rates despite the organization’s size. Additionally, not all live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals are members of organizations or are members of other professional organization and may impact the generalizability of findings of the research (Creswell, 2014).

Implications

The findings of the current study indicated that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals stated that they were prepared to manage student crises. However, 40% of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals indicated that they had not attended professional development related to student crisis management. Moreover, over 15% of the participants of the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals reported meeting with their supervisors regarding student crisis management. Consequently, there are several implications for graduate school programs, student affairs administrators and live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals.
Graduate School Programs

Year after year, graduate students enroll in student affairs graduate programs across the United States to become aspiring higher education professionals. Student affairs graduate preparation programs provide the knowledge and skills for students to have successful careers in higher education (Tull, 2016). During the graduate preparation, student affairs graduate many students serve in graduate assistantships while pursuing their degrees. While students maintain a full-time course load, they are also expected to hold a graduate assistantship within student affairs that oftentimes require long-working hours with little time for breaks or days off. Additionally, many graduate students who work in student affairs are on-call and can add to an already high stress load (Bamberg, Dettmers, Funck, Krahe, & Vahle-Hinz, 2012; Vaughn, 2014.)

Burnout is significant within the student affairs profession, particularly among live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals (Guthrie et al., 2005; Reed, 2015; Vaughn, 2014). Sisley, Capel, and Desertrain (1987) define burnout as “a response to chronic job-related stress for some people in the helping/service profession” (p. 106). Unattended burnout can cause additional health concerns such as high-blood pressure and insomnia (Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Reed, 2015). To address burnout, researchers identified interventions to reduce incidents of burnout. Effective supervision and maintaining positive, supportive relationships were found to successfully reduce burnout (Reed, 2015; Stewart, 2014).

Student affairs graduate programs can support their students to successfully complete their graduate coursework while alleviating burnout, by implementing uniform ethical standards to protect their graduate students and future employees. Helping professions such as counseling provide ethical codes, standards and responsibilities to serve as a guide for ethical practice in the
counseling profession (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014). Within the student affairs profession, the College Student Educators International (ACPA), NASPA and The Council for the Advancement of Standards provide; provide competencies and ethical standards for student affairs professionals (CAS Standards, 2012; ACPA & NASPA, 2015). However, there is not a uniform code of ethical standards or guidelines for student affairs professionals, particularly, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Student affairs graduate preparation programs implementing uniform standards across programs will ensure the preparation curriculum, internship experiences, professional development trainings, and supervision sessions are consistent and ensure that students are able to work reasonable work schedules and ultimately successfully complete their graduate programs to continue a career in student affairs.

**Housing and Residence Life Leadership Staff**

Over the last few years, students on college campuses across the country are increasingly experiencing crises on college campuses years (CCMH, 2017, p.17; Kahn, Kasky-Hernandez, Ambrose, & French, 2017; Reetz, Krylowicz & Mistler, 2014). Students are experiencing crises such as anxiety, depression, and even student deaths (CCMH, 2017). As campus counseling centers are unable to accommodate the number of students experiencing these crises, within residence halls, the role falls on live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals who viewed as the front lines of crises and traumas (Schroeder and Mable, 1994; McClellan & Stringer, 2009; Safe Colleges, 2019). The findings of the current research study indicated that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals have managed crises and overall believe that they are prepared to manage student crises. However, the professionals do not receive adequate professional development trainings and supervision in terms of student crisis management.
A report by ACUHO-I (2008), suggested that the training of residence life professionals needs to be examined and overhauled. Effective professional development needs to include deliberate and intentional implementation with the opportunities to provide feedback and apply the newly acquired knowledge and skills into practice (Mizell, 2010). Overall, professional development in housing and residence life has room for growth. Helping professions, like live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, employ professional supervision as means to support their employees (Janosik et al., 2003; Shupp & Arminio, 2012). Findings in this area from the current study suggested components of ideal student crisis management trainings which include the professional development trainings incorporate the hands-on simulations, scenarios including providing the opportunities to have the experts in student crisis management such as campus mental health professionals, campus police and other campus departments and resources be incorporated into trainings, practice what was learned during the trainings. The findings supported the assumptions of Adult Learning Theory which states that adults want to have input in how they learn, learn something new, learn content that is practical and applicable, and solution-focused (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). Regarding supervision, the literature suggested that synergistic supervision the most widely practiced supervision model in student affairs divisions, (Shupp & Arminio, 2012; Shupp, Wilson, & McCallum, 2018; Tull, 2006; Winston & Creamer, 1998). The current study found that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals meet with their supervisors regularly. However, regarding student crisis management, the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals do not meet with their supervisors regularly. As housing and residence life leadership staff, collaborating with mental health professionals and other campus partners that manage crises to provide more in-depth, hands-on orientation and trainings that discuss best practices in student crisis
management will be helpful to ensure that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals feel very prepared and supported to manage student crises.

**Live-in and Live-on Housing and Residence Life Professionals**

Amongst other duties, live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals have the responsibility to ensure the safety and well-being of the students in their residence halls (Erb, Sinclair, & Braxton, 2015; Gregory & Janosik, 2006). The findings from the study supported the literature that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals do manage student crises in addition to their other duties. However, almost half of the participants reported not receiving professional development regarding student crisis management. It was more encouraging that most of live-in housing and residence life professionals stated that they met with their supervisors after crises that live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals managed from August 2018 to August 2019.

Participants in the current study identified the need for student crisis management trainings and advocated to their supervisors to have mental health crises trainings make live-in and feel more comfortable managing mental health crises. In Canada, the student affairs professionals use Canadian Association of College and University Student Services (CACUSS) Professional Development Model, where the professionals utilize applicable research, theories, and professional development to guide their practices (Hambler, 2016). Live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals in the United States, can used this model as a guide to justify their attendance at crisis management professional development or to advocate for more crisis management trainings. Institutions provide funding for housing and residence life professionals to attend conferences (Belch, Wilson, & Dunkel, 2009). Live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals advocating for themselves to their leadership staff to
provide student crisis management trainings during their staff orientations, staff trainings or attending crisis management sessions at conferences will not only provide opportunities to learn more about crises students on their campuses experience, but also can learn best practices to support their students through the crises that they encounter.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The current study provided a solid foundation for research on live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals, their experiences with student crisis management, student crises professional development and student crisis management supervision sessions; however, the study is just that—a foundation. More research is needed to build upon the existing literature on the student crisis management experiences, student crises professional development and student crisis management supervision sessions of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals. Reviewing the literature and completing of the study lead to three recommendations for future research which are listed below:

1. Expand the current study to include more participants and determine the relationships between demographic variables and student crisis management professional development and supervision sessions.

2. In continuation of the current study, determine if there are relationships between the demographic factors of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals and their responses on Synergistic Supervision Scale.

3. Examine student affairs graduate programs in the United States to determine the prevalence of counseling courses in the curricula.
Chapter Summary

The purpose of Chapter Five was to summarize the findings of the regarding the professional development and supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals regarding crises response and management research study. The results determined that live-in and live on housing and residence life professionals do not receive student crisis management professional development nor meet with their supervisors regarding student crisis management often. Moreover, it was found that there is not a statistically significant relationship between live-in and live-on residence life professionals’ perceptions of their supervisors’ synergistic supervisory behaviors and the live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals’ perceptions of the levels of preparedness to manage student crises. In Chapter Five, the researcher explained the discussion of the results, limitations of the study and the implications for practice in the departments of Housing and Residence Life and the researcher concluded with recommendations for future research.
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APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Please read this informed consent in its entirety prior to agreeing to participate in this study.

1. Study Title: Professional Development and Supervision of Live-In and Live-On Housing and Residence Life Professionals for Crisis Response and Management

2. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this mixed-methods study is twofold: (1) to examine the professional development of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals for handling crisis response and management on colleges and universities, and (2) to examine the supervision of live-in and live-on housing and residence life professionals during crisis response and management on colleges and universities.

Study Procedures: The study will be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, participants will spend approximately 15-20 minutes completing one questionnaire about the participants’ demographic, position, college student crisis management, professional development and supervision, and completing the Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS) (Saunders et al., 2000). Participants will have the opportunity to participate in the second phase of the study. In the second phase, four selected participants will spend approximately one hour in an interview (virtual or in-person). The participation will be audio or video recorded. Verbal and/or written consent must be provided prior to start of interview.

3. Risks: There are several minimal risks associated with the study. They are listed below:

(a) The inadvertent release of sensitive information found on the tape recorder. However, every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. Files will be kept in secure cabinets to which only the investigator has access.

(b) Virtual interviews (i.e. Skype, Web X, or FaceTime)- The risk of conversations, locations, and identities on the Internet is a possibility. In addition, video conferencing companies (i.e. Skype, Web X, Apple) have the right, according to their user agreements, to record and share what you type, speak, or act while using their programs.

Skype even has the right to record your conversations although they do not make that clear when you sign up. The video recording will not include facial pictures, subject’s face any other identifiers. The video will be viewed by the researcher and co-investigator only. The researcher strongly encourages the participants to use their personal computers with a secure internet connection.

(c) Some participants who have experienced or witnessed severe trauma may feel mild discomfort. In the event discomfort occurs, participants may end their participation at any time, and the investigators can assist in referrals for counseling services if needed. All participation is voluntary.

If you experienced emotional trauma or are experiencing symptoms of emotional distress, the Disaster Distress Helpline, call 1-800-985-5990 or text TalkWithUs to 66746 to connect with a
trained crisis counselor. The Disaster Distress Helpline, is a 24/7, 365 days/year, national hotline dedicated to providing immediate crisis counseling for people who are experiencing emotional distress related to any natural or human-caused disaster. The number is toll-free, multilingual, and confidential crisis support service. The service is available to all residents in the United States and its territories. For additional information and resources, please visit SAMHSA.org

4. Benefits: There is no cost to participants. Four participants who are selected for the second phase of the study, will receive a $25.00 Amazon gift card upon completion of the interview. Additionally, the information gathered from this study will add to the body of knowledge about the impact of professional development and professional supervision in student crisis management.

5. Alternatives (if applicable): It is specified whether there are proven, established treatment options available that may be advantageous to the participant (in lieu of the study treatment).

6. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study:

M – F: 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Juterh Nmah: jnmah2@lsu.edu
Jennifer R. Curry: jcurry@lsu.edu

7. Performance Sites: Virtual (Skype or Web X) and participants’ institutions

8. Number of Participants: 82

9. Participant Inclusion: In order to participate in this study, you must identify and hold a position as a live-in or live-on housing/residence life professional. To participate in this study, you must meet the requirements of both the inclusion and exclusion criteria:

1) Identify as live-in or live-on housing and residence life professional
2) Currently employed at a college or university
3) Have managed a student crisis (Second phase)
4) Completed the questionnaire and SSS. (Second phase)

10. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. The participants’ identities will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

11. Right to Refuse: Participation is voluntary. Participants may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.
Your information or audio or visual recordings collected as part of the research, even if identifiers are removed, may be used or distributed for future research.

- Yes, I give permission (1)
- No, I do not give permission (2)

---

Display This Question:
*If Your information or audio or visual recordings collected as part of the research, even if identif... = Yes, I give permission*

Yes, I give permission.

---

Display This Question:
*If Your information or audio or visual recordings collected as part of the research, even if identif... = No, I do not give permission*

No, I do not give permission.

---

Please indicate whether or not you are willing to participate in, and make yourself available for a follow-up interview, if deemed necessary by the researcher.

- I am interested in participating in, and making myself available for a follow-up interview, if deemed necessary by the researcher. (Please enter your first name, last name, and email address in the field below. (1) ____________________________
- I am NOT interested in participating in a follow-up interview. (2)

---

Display This Question:
*If Please indicate whether or not you are willing to participate in, and make yourself available for... = I am interested in participating in, and making myself available for a follow-up interview, if deemed necessary by the researcher. (Please enter your first name, last name, and email address in the field below.*
Please indicate if you are willing to have this interview audio recorded. You may still participate in this study if you are not willing to have the interview recorded.

☑ Yes, I agree to have the interview audio recorded. (1)

☐ No, I do NOT agree to have the interview audio recorded (2)

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. For injury or illness, call your physician, or the Student Health Center if you are an LSU student. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Dennis Landin, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, or www.lsu.edu/research. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Please enter today's date

____________________________________________________________________

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

☐ I consent, begin the study (1)

☐ I do not consent; I do not wish to participate (2)

End of Block: Block 1
APPENDIX C. QUESTIONNAIRE AND SYNERGISTIC SUPERVISION SURVEY (SSS)

Start of Block: Block 1

1 Live-In and Live-On Housing and Residence Life Professional Development Training and Supervision for Crisis Response and Management Questionnaire  Instructions: Please answer the following questions regarding your experience in professional development training and supervision in role as a live-in and live-on residence life and housing professional.

2 Demographic

Q1 What is your age range?

- 20-25 (1)
- 25-30 (2)
- 30-35 (3)
- 35-40 (4)
- 40+ (5)
Q2 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Non-binary (4)
- Prefer to self-describe (5)
- Other (6)

Q3 What is your racial or ethnic background?

- Asian or Pacific Islander (1)
- Black or African-American (2)
- Caucasian or White (3)
- Hispanic or Latinx (4)
- Native American (5)
- Bi-racial or Multiracial (6)
- Other (7)
Q4 What is your highest level of education?

- Associate's (1)
- Bachelor's (2)
- Master's (3)
- Doctorate (4)
- Other (5) ________________________________________________

3 Institution

Q5 Institution Name

________________________________________________________________

Q6 Which state is your institution located in?

▼ Alabama (1) ... Wyoming (51)

Q7 Which type of residential area is your institution located in?

- Urban (1)
- Suburban (2)
- Rural (3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8 What type of institution are you employed in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Two-Year Private  (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two-Year Public   (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four-Year Private (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four-Year Public (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9 What is your institution's designation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▼ Alaska Native Serving Institutions (ANSIs)  (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs)      (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10 What is your institution's Carnegie classification?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▼ Doctoral Universities: Very High Research Activity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ Special Focus Four-Year: Other Special Focus Institutions (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11 What is the size of your institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1,999 &amp; under   (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2,000-9,999    (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10,000-19,999  (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20,000 +      (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Position
Q12 How many years have you been in your position?

- Less than 1 year (1)
- 1-3 years (2)
- 3-5 years (3)
- 5 or more years (4)

Q13 What is your current position?

________________________________________________________________

Q14 How many students are you responsible for?

- 100 & under (1)
- 101-199 (2)
- 200-499 (3)
- 500-1000 (4)
- 1,000+ (5)

5 College Student Crisis Management

Q15 In your position, have you had to handle a student crisis?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q16 How prepared did you feel to handle a student crisis?

- Very Unprepared (1)
- Unprepared (2)
- Neither Prepared/Unprepared (3)
- Prepared (4)
- Very Prepared (5)

Q17 Are you familiar with the crime rates on your campus?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q18 If you were provided the opportunity to attend professional development from August 2018-August 2019 related to student crisis management, did you attend?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q19 How many hours of training did you receive?

________________________________________________________________________
Display This Question:
If If you were provided the opportunity to attend professional development from August 2018-August 2... = Yes

Q20 How helpful did you find the training(s)?

☐ Very Unhelpful (1)
☐ Unhelpful (2)
☐ Neither Unhelpful/Helpful (3)
☐ Helpful (4)
☐ Very Helpful (5)

Q21 Did you meet with your supervisor from August 2018 to August 2019 regarding student crisis management?

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Display This Question:
If Did you meet with your supervisor from August 2018 to August 2019 regarding student crisis manage... = Yes

Q22 Approximately how many times from August 2018 to August 2019 were the focus of meetings with your supervisors specifically student crisis management?

________________________________________________________________
Q23 How helpful did you find these meetings?

- Very Unhelpful (1)
- Unhelpful (2)
- Neither Helpful/Unhelpful (3)
- Helpful (4)
- Very Helpful (5)

End of Block: Block 1

Start of Block: Block 2
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**SURVEY QUESTIONS**

Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)

For each question, please use the scale below to choose the response that most closely reflects your relationship with your current supervisor.

- A=Never (almost never)
- B=Seldom
- C=Sometimes
**Q25**

**SURVEY QUESTIONS**

**Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D=Often</th>
<th>E=Always (almost always )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor includes me in a significant way when making decisions that affect my areas of responsibilities. (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor works with me to gather the information needed to make decisions rather than simply providing me the information he/she feels is important. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor criticizes staff members in public. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor makes certain that I am fully knowledgeable about the goals of the division and institution. (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each question, please use the scale below to choose the response that most closely reflects your relationship with your current supervisor.
A=Never (almost never)
B=Seldom
C=Sometimes
D=Often
E=Always (almost always)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A (1)</th>
<th>B (2)</th>
<th>C (3)</th>
<th>D (4)</th>
<th>E (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor willingly listens to whatever is on my mind, whether it is personal or professional. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows interests in promoting my professional or career advancement. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is personally offended if I question the wisdom of his/her decisions. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor shows that she/he cares about me as a person. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SURVEY QUESTIONS
Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)
For each question, please use the scale below to choose the response that most closely reflects your relationship with your current supervisor.

A=Never (almost never)
B=Seldom
C=Sometimes
D=Often
E=Always (almost always)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A (1)</th>
<th>B (2)</th>
<th>C (3)</th>
<th>D (4)</th>
<th>E (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor speaks up for my unit within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor expects me to fit in with the accepted ways of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing things, in other words, &quot;don't rock the boat.&quot; (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor has favorites on the staff. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor breaks confidences. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SURVEY QUESTIONS
Synergistic Supervision Scale (SSS)

For each question, please use the scale below to choose the response that most closely reflects your relationship with your current supervisor.
A=Never (almost never)
**B=Seldom**  
**C=Sometimes**  
**D=Often**  
**E=Always (almost always )**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A (1)</th>
<th>B (2)</th>
<th>C (3)</th>
<th>D (4)</th>
<th>E (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes negative evaluations of programs or staff and uses them to make improvements. (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When faced with a conflict between an external constituent (i.e. parent or donor) and staff members, my supervisor supports external constituents, even if they are wrong. (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is open and honest about my strengths and weaknesses. (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am not careful, my supervisor may allow things that are not my fault to be blamed on me. (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Time of interview:

2. Date:

3. Place:

4. Interviewee:

5. Interviewer: Juterh Nmah

6. Type of interview:

7. Purpose of interview: To provide an opportunity for the participants to expound on the responses they provided in the survey regarding their experiences attending professional development trainings and supervision as it relates to managing student crises.

8. Questions:

9. Demographic

10. How long have you been in your position?

11. How long have you been the at your college/university?

12. Please describe your professional experience prior to your current role in residence life.

13. Crisis and Trauma

14. Please describe any crisis situations you encountered in your role in residence life.

15. What are the most common types of crises students in your residence halls experience?

16. How did you handle the crisis?

17. How did you react to handling the crisis?

18. What protocols/plans does your institution have in place when crises occur on campus?

19. What is your role in your institution’s crisis management plan?

Professional Development
20. Please describe your orientation and training when you arrived at your institution for your role in residence life.

21. What professional organizations are you a member of?

22. What professional development opportunities does your institution provide?

23. How are you able to attend the professional development opportunities?

24. Please describe professional development trainings that you have attended related to college student crises.

**Supervision**

25. Please describe the meetings you have with your supervisor.

26. Please describe your supervisor and your supervisor’s personality.

27. Tell me about the general process of supervision with your direct supervisor?

28. What types of activities occur during your supervision sessions?

29. Describe a time you had a crisis. How was this addressed in supervision? What was the outcome?
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