

Values Congruence as an Examination of Person-Organization Fit for Student Affairs

Administrators

Ashley Tull, Ed.D.

Associate Dean of Students for Campus Life and
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Higher Education Leadership

University of Arkansas

Christianne I. Medrano, M.Ed.

Program Coordinator, Office of Student Activities

University of Arkansas

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ashley Tull, Associate
Dean of Students for Campus Life, University of Arkansas, ARKU 665, Fayetteville, AR
72701, 479-575-6664, atull@uark.edu

This study examined the frequency of chosen character values deemed important for work in student affairs administration by 953 members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Demographic characteristics of gender, graduate curriculum, institutional type and functional area of employment were examined to determine the level of congruence for the purposes of studying person-organization fit.

Person-Organization Fit

Person-Organization (P-O) fit has been said to occur when an organization satisfies an individual's values. Values have been defined as consciously held desires that encompass preferences, interests, motives, and goals (Edwards, 1996; Kristof, 1996). Kristof (1996) broadly defined P-O fit as the compatibility between individuals and organizations and further stated that compatibility between people and organizations can occur when: (a) one provides what the other needs, or (b) similar fundamental characteristics are shared, or (c) both. Livingstone, Nelson and Barr (1997) stated that fit is the degree of similarity or compatibility between individuals and situational characteristics. Locke (1976) found that people are attracted to situations that fulfill their own values. P-O fit has been defined as congruence that occurs when work values and characteristics, and organizational work values match (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Amiot, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2006; Chatman, 1991; Hult, 2005; Westerman, & Cyr, 2004).

P-O fit has previously been studied through the examination of employees' values congruence because the match between people's values and the values of their organizations have been conceived as fundamental and relatively enduring (Chapman, 1991; Kristof, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1992; Sims, & Keon, 1997). P-O fit and

values congruence has been associated with work related outcomes such as motivation (Chatman, 1991, Fritzsche, Powell, & Hoffman, 1999); job satisfaction (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Bretz, & Judge, 1994; Choi, 2004; Fritzsche, Powell, & Hoffman, 1999; George, 1992; Gustafson, & Mumford, 1995; Kristof, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1992; Sims, & Keon, 1997; Van Vianen, 2000); work attitudes (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Westerman, & Cyr, 2004); organizational commitment and tenure (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Bretz, & Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1991; Fritzsche, Powell, & Hoffman, 1999; George, 1992; Gustafson, & Mumford, 1995; Kristof, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1992; Sims, & Keon, 1997; Van Vianen, 2000; Westerman, & Cyr, 2004); job performance (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Bretz, & Judge, 1994; Gustafson, & Mumford, 1995; Van Vianen, 2000); job involvement (Bretz, & Judge, 1994); stress (Gustafson, & Mumford, 1995; Livingstone, Nelson, & Barr, 1997; Westerman, & Cyr, 2004); socialization (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1992); and recruitment and selection (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1992).

P-O fit is important for understanding how staff members will function within their environments and to examine how likely it is they will adapt to the environment, leave the environment or attempt to change the environment (Strange, 2003). P-O congruence has been described as the degree to which persons and their work environments are said to be congruent with the dominate type found within that work environment (Strange, & Banning, 2001). Congruence within environments has been found to have a significant impact on a person's satisfaction within that environment (Holland, 1992; Strange, & Banning, 2001). People are likely to remain satisfied and

encouraged by those behaviors, values, and attitudes that attracted them in the first place or become dissatisfied when dissimilarities occur (Strange, & Banning, 2001). Winston and Creamer (1997) stated, “While all institutions want a good fit between staff member[s] and the institution, it is recognized that initial fit is only a starting place. Recognizing that staff members have a greater potential for productivity when they fully understand the institution’s [values], each college or university is seriously involved in further education of staff about the institution” (p. 89). Toma and Grady (2002) stated, “people find meaning, and meaning in activities that are aligned with their core values” (p. 103). For many an alignment of values brings meaning and energy. Without this alignment staff can become alienated and disengaged from their work (Quinn, O’Neil, & Debebe, 1996).

Student Affairs Values Defined

Values in student affairs administration have been defined in the literature as: espoused as well as enacted ideals of an institution or group (Kuh, & Hall, 1993); what a culture asserts as most important (Kuh et al., 1991; Cummings, & Worley, 2001); summaries or beliefs that explain the group (Young, 1997); guideposts that provide an enduring place to stand in the midst of change (Dalton, 1999); and beliefs and knowledge that influence the ways in which student affairs staff work with individuals and groups (SPPV, 1987). Higher education has been described as not being free of value preferences. Chickering (2006) stated, “the gap between our espoused values and the values actually in use [are] often large, unrecognized and unarticulated” (p. 4). He further stated, “each policy and practice we adopt, each resource allocation judgment, staffing and personnel decision we make, expresses a value priority” (p. 4). Values have been

defined in the literature in both abstract and apparent terms. Kuh and Hall (1993) described values as more abstract than perspectives and as reflective of ways in which cultures and subcultures judge situations, acts, objects, and people. Dalton's (1999) guidepost definition is more apparent, as values are described as keeping work on track and giving continuity. This would require cultures and subcultures to have a clear understanding of their espoused values.

Student affairs professionals have also held the responsibility of outlining and communicating values important to life within the college or university. Student affairs staff members, "can be expected to support and explain the values, mission, and policies of the institution" (Student Personnel Point of View, p. 12). The Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs (1996), stated:

Values evident across the history of student affairs work include an acceptance and appreciation of individual differences; lifelong learning; education for effective citizenship; student responsibility; ongoing assessment of learning and performance (students' and our own); pluralism and multiculturalism; ethical and reflective student affairs practice; supporting and meeting the needs of students as individuals and in groups; and freedom of expression with civility (p. 2).

Good practice in student affairs assists students faculty and staff in developing and demonstrating values important in a learning community. To this end, the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs stated:

Good practice in student affairs helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards. Good student affairs practice provides opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and student affairs educators to demonstrate the values that define a learning community. Effective learning communities are committed to justice, honesty, equality, civility, freedom, dignity, and responsible citizenship. Such communities challenge students to develop meaningful values for a life of learning. Standards espoused by student affairs divisions should reflect the values that bind the campus community to its educational mission (p. 3).

Young and Elfrink (1991) found eight cardinal values of the student affairs profession, through their consensus oriented survey research of scholars and practitioners. These were found to be supported by a large percentage of respondents as having an enduring role in student affairs practice. They are:

1. Altruism, defined as concern for the welfare of others and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including caring, commitment, compassion, and generosity
2. Equality, defined as having the same rights or privileges and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including acceptance, assertiveness, fairness, tolerance, and diversity
3. Aesthetics, defined as qualities of objects, events, and persons that provide satisfaction and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including appreciation, creativity, imagination and sensitivity
4. Freedom, defined as capacity to exercise choice and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including confidence, hope, independence, openness, self-direction, and self-discipline
5. Human dignity, defined as inherent worth and uniqueness of an individual and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including consideration, empathy, humaneness, kindness, respectfulness, trust, and self-esteem
6. Justice, defined as upholding moral and legal principles and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including courage, integrity, morality, and objectivity
7. Truth, defined as faithfulness to fact or reality and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including accountability, authenticity, honesty, inquisitiveness, rationality, and reflectiveness
8. Community, defined as mutual empowerment and associated with attitudes and personal qualities including cooperation, commitment, development, participation, and collaboration (pp. 52-53).

Young (1993a, 1993b) later provided arguments for reordering the eight enduring values listed above to reflect the primacy of three values-human dignity, equality, and community. Young described the values as terminal (desirable end states) or instrumental (desirable modes of conduct to achieve end states). He concluded that these three are terminal values of the profession, and that freedom, altruism, truth, and justice are instrumental values of the profession. Young summarized the three as: Human dignity (including freedom, altruism, and truth); Equality (including individuals and groups);

Community (including justice).

Espoused values held by members of colleges, universities and divisions of student affairs are often reflected in: mission statements; college catalogs; student and staff handbooks (Dalton, 1999; Strange, 1996; Strange, & Banning 2001); and convocation speeches and core planning documents (Strange, & Banning, 2001). Values are communicated in less tangible ways through; symbols, rituals, traditions, and role modeling (Dalton, 1999); ceremonies, rites, rituals, stories, myths, heroes, symbols and language (Wagner, & Hollenbeck, 2002); and artifacts, perspectives, and assumptions (Strange, 1996).

The Impact of Institutional Culture on Values

All colleges and universities hold and communicate institutional values, whether intentionally or unintentionally to members of their cultures and sub cultures. These are used to shape members behaviors and as a means for understanding organizational culture (Wagner, & Hollenbeck, 2002). These are most often shared with students in what they must learn and practice (Dalton, 1999). Campus culture has been described as a, “confluence of institutional history, campus traditions, and the values and assumptions that shape the character of a given college or university” (Kuh, & Hall, 1993, p. 100). The extent to which values are commonly shared by all members of an institutional culture or subculture varies by institutional type and other demographic factors. Amey (2002) stated that, “Greatest agreement [between values] may exist at smaller, private liberal arts colleges where frequent interactions among faculty and staff reinforce a set of beliefs, values and traditions (reflecting a stronger organizational culture) while the greatest disparity may occur at the large research university where multiple sets of

beliefs, values and traditions likely exist” (p. 21). Kotter (1996) stated, “over time, a group functioning around common assumptions and like behaviors will create shared values and behavioral norms” (pp. 118-119). These values and norms are said to persist, even as membership changes over time. Shared values, held by organizational members, are said to be more difficult to address in times of change as they become ingrained in the belief systems of the organizational culture (Kotter, 1996).

Supervisors, intentionally or unintentionally, serve as transmitters of an institution’s espoused values. Winston and Hirt (2003) stated that supervisors have a moral responsibility to be explicit in communicating the institutions espoused values. This is even more important in actively guiding decision making processes for students, faculty, and staff (Winston, & Hirt, 2003). They further described the most successful supervisors as being transparent and explicit about both their own values and those of their employing institution. The role of supervisors as transmitters is even more significant when socializing new professionals within the organization. McWhertor (2002) stated:

new professionals do not arrive at their institutions unformed, tabula rasa, nor do they live within the profession as if other aspects of life do not exist or never existed. Rather, they bring certain values to their jobs and to the profession that have been forged through life circumstances and experiences (p. 33).

Those new to organizations should examine the ways in which their own backgrounds and commitments fit with the essential values of their employing institutions, profession, and social arenas (McWhertor, 2002). Supervisors should pay particular attention to this notion when recruiting and socializing new staff. Value

shaping begins in the recruiting process and is carried through the hiring and training processes in the ways in which a supervisor interacts with employees daily, (Desimone, Werner, & Harris, 2002; Winston, & Creamer, 1997). Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins (1989) found that value congruence between employees and their supervisors was related to their satisfaction and commitment.

After a review of the student affairs, higher education, and management literature regarding P-O fit and values congruence; researchers developed the following questions to guide their research:

1. To what extent would the frequencies of student affairs administrators' chosen values be found to be similar or dissimilar between institutional types?
2. To what extent would the frequencies of student affairs administrators' chosen values match those outlined in previous research on values in student affairs administration?
3. To what extent would the frequencies of student affairs administrators chosen values be consistent with those of their employing institutional types and demographic characteristics examined in the study?
4. What character values would be chosen most frequently by student affairs administrators' among the three aspects of affective, cognitive, and behavioral?
5. How would the identified values differ by demographic characteristics examined in the study?

METHOD

Participants

Data gathered from 953 members of Region III and Region IV-West of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) were examined to

determine the frequency of chosen values for both institutional categories and those of the student affairs profession at large. All current members of Region III and Region IV-West who were found to have usable email addresses, obtained through the NASPA membership directory, were asked to participate in the study. There were 3,291 members of NASPA found to meet the above criteria, with 2,948 usable addresses. These NASPA members were contacted through email, with a link to an online survey website containing the Character Values Scales (CVS), described below. Of those, 2,948 who were sent messages, 953 responded for a response rate of 32.32%. Administrators who participated in the study represented a variety of types of institutions including: public, private sectarian, and private non-sectarian schools. Administrators also represented both 2-year and 4-year institutions and many functional areas of employment, described below.

Among administrators who participated, females composed the largest group by gender at 64.8 %, with males at 35.2%. The largest group by race and/or ethnicity was white or Caucasian at 78.6%, and the lowest was Native American at .3%. Most administrators (59.8%) had completed a masters degree, and (28.2%) reported they had completed a doctorate. For those who completed a masters, the highest (44.2 %) reported that the curriculum type was Student Affairs, with the lowest being Community College Leadership (.1%). Some administrators (22.5%) obtained a masters degree in another field not provided as a choice on the survey. For those who completed a doctorate, the highest (56.3%) reported the curriculum type was Higher Education Administration, with the lowest being Interdisciplinary Studies (.3%). Some administrators (21.0%) also

obtained a doctorate in another field not provided as a choice on the survey (See Table 1. for complete demographic data).

[Place Table 1 About Here]

The highest percentage (18.9%) of administrators reported working in the area of Residence Life. Many reported working in the following areas: Admissions, Advising, Career Planning and Placement, Disabled Student Services, Greek Life, International Students and Scholars, Judicial Affairs, Leadership Development Programming, Multicultural Center, Orientation, Service Learning/Community Service, and Student Union/Activities.

Instrument

The Character Values Scale (CVS) was developed by Chen (2005) to measure three aspects of character (cognitive, affective, and behavioral). The CVS consists of a list of forty-four character values developed as a byproduct of the Character Education Values and Practices Inventory (CEVPI) also developed by Chen. The CEVPI was developed after a review of 100 randomly selected college and university mission statements, as well as a review of current literature in the areas of character development, character education, character values and student development.

Administrators were asked to choose ten character values, from the CVS that they believe are most important to their work. Researchers then tabulated frequencies for both the 44 individual values and the three aspects of cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Character values that make up the three aspects included: Affective (caring, chaste, compassionate, courageous, devout, empathetic, faithful, forgiving, generous, humble, loving, loyal, modest, obedient, optimistic, patient, patriotic, polite, prudent, self-

controlled, and trusting); Behavioral (altruistic, civic-minded, compassionate, cooperative, empathetic, fair, generous, honest, just, open-minded, reflective, respectful, responsible, tolerant, and trustworthy); and Cognitive (ambitious, committed, daring, imaginative, independent, introspective, open-minded, optimistic, patriotic, persevering, proud, prudent, purposeful, rational, and reflective).

Procedure

Because the study was regional in scope, those identified as members of Region III and IV-West, described earlier, were asked to complete the survey instrument online. This method of survey completion was designed to maximize the response rate for this study. Those administrators described earlier were sent an email which included a description of the study and a link to the online survey website.

Data Analysis

Frequencies were tabulated for all survey responses including demographic characteristics. In this study, the researchers examined the frequency of chosen values selected from the Character Values Scale (CVS), with previously identified common values for the profession of student affairs and with selected demographic variables. The statistical program SPSS was used for making data comparisons across survey responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results for each of the research questions developed to guide this research are presented below.

Values of Student Affairs Administrators by Institutional Type

The degree to which any differences were found for chosen character values between institutional types (public, private sectarian, and private non-sectarian) was examined (see Table 2).

[Place Table 2 About Here]

Eleven total character values were chosen among the top ten most chosen across the institutional type categories included in the study. Honest was chosen most frequently among respondents from all institutional type categories. Each of the same character values appeared on each institutional type lists, although with different frequency, with the exception of: cooperative appeared only on the list for public and private sectarian (chosen 9th and 10th respectively) and empathetic appeared only on the list for private non-sectarian (chosen 10th). The degree to which any differences were found for chosen character values between institutional types (2 year and 4 year) was also examined. The same ten character values were chosen for both institutional types, although not in the same frequency order. These included (in alphabetical order): caring, committed, compassionate, cooperative, fair, honest, open, purposeful, respectful, and trustworthy.

Perhaps it was no coincidence that honest was chosen most frequently by administrators for each institutional type. The Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs (1996) outline honesty as an important commitment present in effective learning communities. Young and Elrink (1991) included honest in their identification of truth and defined it as “faithfulness to fact or reality,” (p. 53). Honesty is a character value that is commonly expected of students in the learning process and is almost always found to be a part of: principles, ethics and/or values statements, student rights and responsibilities, honor codes or pledges and judicial codes used at institutions of higher education.

Values Comparisons of Student Affairs Administrators to Previous Research

The frequency to which student affairs administrator's chose character values, in the present study and Young and Elfrink's (1991) study, measuring cardinal values for student affairs was examined. Sixteen values from Young and Elfrink's cardinal values of students affairs were found to be measured by the CVS. Researchers examined the frequency to which those common values were chosen by administrators in the present study. These values and the frequencies to which they were chosen by administrators in the present study are indicated as percentages in Table 3.

[Place Table 3 About Here]

The findings of the present study indicated that many current administrators continue to identify the cardinal values outlined by Young and Elfrink as important to their work fifteen years after these appeared in the student affairs literature. The percentages at which these were chosen are important to note, as only sixteen of the forty-four were measured by the CVS. The probability of the sixteen being chosen was less, making those chosen more frequently (honest, fair, caring, committed, compassionate, cooperative, and empathetic) worth noting.

Common Values of Student Affairs Administrators by Characteristics as Compared to Institutional Type

The degree to which any differences were found for chosen character values between student affairs administrators and institutional type was examined. This analysis was conducted to best determine the level of values congruence that existed or not as a measure of P-O fit. Thirteen functional employment areas (59.5 % of total respondents) that had 10 or more administrator responses were compared with each of the 3

institutional types (public, private-sectarian, and private non-sectarian). No functional employment area matched all ten top character values frequencies for any of the 3 institutional types. Out of a possible 39 analyses, between functional employment areas and institutional types, 26 analyses produced matches for 8 of 10 top frequent character values, while 13 analyses produced matches for 9 of 10 top frequent character values.

The above process was also conducted for both gender of administrators and the curriculum type of their graduate degrees earned. Males chose the same ten top character values that were selected for both public and private sectarian institutions. They shared 9 of 10 common character values with private non-sectarian institutions. Females shared 9 of 10 common character values with each of the institutional types. An examination of administrator responses from those who obtained masters degrees found that those who obtained masters in student affairs chose the same ten top character values that were selected for both public and private sectarian institutions. They shared 9 of 10 common character values with private non-sectarian institutions. Those who obtained masters in counseling shared 9 of 10 common character values with each of the 3 institutional types. Those who obtained a masters degree in higher education chose the same ten top character values that were selected for both public and private sectarian institutions. They shared 9 of 10 common character values with private non-sectarian institutions.

An examination of administrator responses from those who obtained doctoral degrees found that those who obtained a doctoral degree in student affairs chose the same ten top character values that were selected for both public and private sectarian institutions. They shared 9 of 10 common character values with private non-sectarian institutions. Those who obtained a doctoral degree in counseling shared 8 of 10 common

character values with each of the 3 institutional types. Those who obtained a doctoral degree in higher education shared 9 of 10 common character values for both public and private sectarian institutions and 8 of 10 common character values with private non-sectarian institutions.

Affective, Behavioral and Cognitive Values of Student Affairs Administrators

The degree to which chosen character values were affective, behavioral, or cognitive oriented was examined for administrators' by demographic characteristics. This was done by examining the ten most frequently chosen values by each demographic characteristic. In each case there were between eleven and thirteen values chosen as some were chosen equally by administrators to make up their ten most frequently chosen. Behavioral character values were chosen most frequently by administrators (See Table 4.), with both affective and cognitive chosen about as frequently by administrators. The only exception to this was only 5 character values chosen in the areas of behavioral and cognitive respectively by those in Greek affairs. Those employed in counseling did not chose any cognitive character values within their ten top frequently chosen values, while those in judicial affairs only chose one.

[Place Table 4 About Here]

The present study found that behavioral oriented character values were chosen more frequently by administrators. A review of the behavioral oriented character values found that these are more often emphasized as learning outcomes by institutions of higher education. They may also appear as more tangible and/or achievable outcomes of the learning process by each institutional type. It could also be argued that these underlie the

learning process and that success in higher education may be more dependent upon the acceptance of these character values.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the present study are important for understanding the character values that administrators in student affairs find important to their work. This has positive implications for those entering student affairs work through graduate preparation programs or other points of entry. New professionals may gain a clearer understanding of the character values that are present within their functional area of employment and at their type of institution. New professionals might also detect any disconnects that exist between espoused values of their organizations and those values evident in practice. This might ultimately lead to greater P-O fit or attrition. Those faculty involved in preparing professionals to enter student affairs work may have an opportunity to better communicate the character values important for work in student affairs. Current student affairs administrators can find worth in the present study as they can more clearly examine the character values they employ for work in their functional area or employing institution. They may further take these into account when recruiting, hiring, training, and supervising staff. Further research is recommended on the level of values congruence present within other professions outside of student affairs and higher education. Pre and post test research would be beneficial for determining the effect of graduate preparation on the development of values important for work in student affairs administration. This research would address the question of whether those within student affairs administration encourage those with similar values systems to enter the profession, thus perpetuating a self-selection process, even if unconsciously.

LIMITATIONS

The generalizability of the findings of this study are limited because those student affairs administrators surveyed only represent members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and further are members of only Regions III and IV-W. The character values discovered through this and previous studies represent those of only student affairs professionals, differences may exist between those values considered important by others employed at institutions, not in student affairs administration.

CONCLUSION

Compatibility between student affairs administrators and their employing organizations is important for the achievement of both personal and organizational outcomes. An examination of values congruence is one method for understanding the impact a work environment may have on its' administrators or visa versa. Values congruence can lead to easier socialization, heightened job performance, increased job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and tenure. Those who possess an understanding of the character values they hold important to their work in student affairs can better identify the employment environments they will be successful in. Those preparing and hiring professionals to enter work in student affairs can better communicate the character values present in the workplace to insure P-O fit.

REFERENCES

- A Perspective on Student Affairs: A Statement Issued on the 50th Anniversary of The Student Personnel Point of View* (1987). American Council on Education and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Adkins, C.L., Russell, C.J., & Werbel, J.D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 605-623.
- Amey, M. J. (2002). Unwritten rules: Organizational and political realities of the job. In *Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals in student affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Amiot, C.E., Vallerand, R.J., & Blanchard, C.M. (2006). Passion and psychological adjustment: A test of the person environment fit hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(2), 220-229.
- Boxx, W.R., Odom, R.Y., & Dunn, M.G. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 20(1), 195-205.
- Bretz, R.D., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32-54.
- Chatman, J.A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Chen, P. D. (2005). *College and character: A study of the differences in character values*

- and character education practices between American four-year private faith based and private nonsectarian colleges and universities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Chickering, A. W. (2006). Authenticity and spirituality in higher education: My orientation. *Journal of College and Character*, 8(1), 1-5.
- Choi, J.N. (2004). Person-environment fit and creative behavior: Differential impacts of supplies-values and demands-abilities versions of fit. *Human Relations*, 57(5), 531-552.
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2001). *Organization Development and Change* (7th Ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Dalton, J. C. (1999). Helping Students Develop Coherent Values and Ethical Standards. In Blimling, G. S., & Whitt, E. J. & Associates (1999). *Good Practice in Student Affairs: Principles to Foster Student Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Desimone, R. L., Werner, J. M., & Harris, D. M. (2002). *Human Resource Development* (3rd Ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt
- Edwards, J. R. (1996). An examination of competing versions of the person-environment fit approach to stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 292-339.
- Fritzsche, B.A., Powell, A.B., & Hoffman, R. (1999). Person-environment congruence as a predictor of customer service performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 59-70.
- George, J. M. (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and Evidence. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 185-213.
- Gustafson, S.B., & Mumford, M.D. (1995). Personal style and person-environment fit: A

- pattern approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46, 163-188.
- Holland, J. L. (1992). *Making Vocational Choices: A Theory of Vocational Personalities and Work Environments* (2nd Ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. In Hamrick, F. A., Evans, N. J., & Schuh, J. H. (2002). *Foundations of Student Affairs Practice: How Philosophy, Theory, and Research Strengthen Educational Outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hult, C. (2005). Organizational commitment and person-environment fit in six western countries. *Organization Studies*, 26(2), 249-270.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996) *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard of Applied Business School Press.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49.
- Kuh, G. D. & Hall, J. E. (1993). Using cultural perspectives in student affairs. In G.D. Kuh (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work* (pp. 1-20). Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Association.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Livingstone, L.P., Nelson, D.L., & Barr, S.H. (1997). Person-environment fit and creativity: An examination of supply-value and demand-ability versions of fit. *Journal of Management*, 23(2), 119-146.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1350). Chicago: Rand McNally.

- McWhertor, T. E., & Guthrie, D. S. (2002) Toward and ethic for the profession. In *Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals in student affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Meglino, B.M., Ravlin, E.C., & Adkins, C.L. (1992). The measurement of work value congruence: A field study comparison. *Journal of Management*, 15(1), 33-43.
- Meglino, B.M., Ravlin, E.C., & Adkins, C.L. (1989). The influence of the value of achievement on individual job performance and attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington, DC. In Meglino, B.M., Ravlin, E.C., & Adkins, C.L. (1992). The measurement of work value congruence: A field study comparison. *Journal of Management*, 15(1), 33-43.
- Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs* (1996). The American College Personnel Association and The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Quinn, R. E., O'Neill, R. E., & Debebe, G. (1996). Confronting the tensions in an academic career. In P. J. Frost & M. S. Taylor (Eds.), *Rhythms of Academic Life: Personal Accounts of Careers in Academia* (pp. 421-427). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sims, R.L., & Keon, T.L. (1997). Ethical work climate as a factor in the development of person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 1095-1105.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus Environments that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Strange, C. C. (2003). Dynamics of campus environments. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodward, Jr., & Associates, *Student services: A Handbook for the Profession* (3rd ed., pp. 297-316). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Strange, C. C. (1996). Dynamics of campus environments. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodward, Jr., & Associates, *Student services: A Handbook for the Profession* (3rd ed., pp. 244-268). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Toma, J. D., & Grady, K. A. (2002). Reconciling life and work for the new student affairs professional. In *Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals in student affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
- Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2000). Person-organization fit: The match between newcomers' and recruiters' preferences for organizational cultures. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 113-149.
- Wagner, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2002). *Organizational Behavior: Securing Competitive Advantage (4th Ed.)*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Westerman, J.W., & Cyr, L.A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(3), 252-261.
- Winston, R. B., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving Staffing Practices in Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R. B., & Hirt, J. B. (2003). Activating synergistic supervision approaches: Practical suggestions. In S. M. Janosik, D. G. Creamer, J. B. Hirt, R. B. Winston, S. A. Saunders, and D. L. Cooper (eds.). *Supervising new professionals in student affairs*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Young, R. B. (1997). *No neutral ground: Standing by the values we prize in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, R. B. (Ed.). (1993a). Identifying and implementing the essential values of the

profession. *New Directions for Student Services, No. 61*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Young, R. B. (1993b). The essential values of the profession. In R. B. Young (Ed.). *Identifying and Implementing the Essential Values of the Profession. New Directions for Student Services, No. 61*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Young, R., & Elfrink, V. (1991). Essential values of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 47-55.

Table 1.

Background and Employment Characteristics of Student Affairs Administrators (n = 953)

Gender	%	Highest Educational Level Completed	%
Female	64.8	Doctoral	28.2
Male	35.2	Masters	59.8
		Bachelors	7.7
		Associates	.2
Race	%	Technical School/College Certificate	%
White or Caucasian	78.6	High School	.1
Black or African American	11.5		.7
Hispanic or Hispanic American	4.5		
Bi-Racial or Multicultural	2.5	Years in Field	%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7	0 – 5	36.7
Native American	.3	6 – 10	18.4
Other	.8	11 – 15	12.7
		16 – 20	11.0
Age	%	21 – 25	9.7
20-25	6.5	26 +	11.4
26-30	18.5		
31-35	14.8	Type of Institution Employed By	%
36-40	12.5	Public	72.8
41-45	10.5	Private Sectarian	16.3
46-50	8.5	Private Non-Sectarian	10.9
51-55	9.5	Two-Year	5.4

56-60	6.8	Four-Year	94.6
61-65	2.0		
65+	.4		

Table 2.

Ten Most Chosen Character Values With Percentages by Institutional Type

Frequency	Public	Private Sectarian	Private Non-Sectarian
1	Honest (70.4)	Honest (67.7)	Honest (68.9)
2	Open (68.3)	Trustworthy (61.2)	Trustworthy (66.9)
3	Trustworthy (67.7)	Open (60.0)	Open (66.0)
4	Respectful (55.2)	Respectful (59.3)	Caring (58.2)
5	Fair (54.5)	Committed (52.2)	Compassionate (56.3)
6	Committed (48.4)	Fair (46.4)	Respectful (49.5)
7	Caring (48.2)	Caring (43.2)	Fair (48.5)
8	Compassionate (43.9)	Compassionate (43.2)	Committed (42.7)
9	Cooperative (38.7)	Purposeful (43.2)	Purposeful (41.7)
10	Purposeful (36.4)	Cooperative (33.5)	Empathetic (39.8)

Table 3.

Values Comparisons to Previous Values Research

Cardinal Student Affairs Values Young & Elfrink (1991)	Character Values Scale Tull & Medrano (2006)
Value	%
Honest	70.0
Fair	52.7
Caring	48.9
Committed	48.5
Compassionate	45.3
Cooperative	37.9
Empathetic	32.7
Imaginative	29.4
Reflective	24.1
Tolerant	20.4
Rational	19.0
Independent	18.6
Courageous	15.0
Generous	13.4
Altruistic	11.1
Hopeful	9.8

Table 4.

Affective, Behavioral and Cognitive Values of Student Affairs Administrators

Demographic Characteristic	Affective	Behavioral	Cognitive
Institutional Type			
Public (n = 691)	2	7	2
Private Sectarian (n = 155)	2	7	2
Private Non-Sectarian (n = 103)	2	7	2
2 Year (n = 51)	1	7	2
4 Year (n = 889)	1	5	3
Gender			
Male (n = 333)	2	7	2
Female (n = 612)	3	7	2
Graduate Curriculum			
Masters	2	7	2
Higher Education (n = 133)	2	7	2
Student Affairs (n = 378)	2	7	2
Counseling (n = 134)	3	7	1
Doctoral			
Higher Education (n = 166)	3	7	1
Student Affairs (n = 35)	2	7	2
Counseling (n = 15)	4	7	0
Student Affairs Function			

Residence Life (n = 180)	2	6	4
Student Union/Activities (n = 99)	2	6	4
Advising (n = 47)	3	8	2
Career Planning and Placement (n = 43)	3	8	2
Leadership Development Programming (n = 36)	2	7	4
Greek Life (n = 34)	2	5	5
Judicial Affairs (n = 27)	3	8	1
Multicultural Center (n = 25)	3	6	3
Orientation (n = 20)	2	6	4
Admissions (n = 17)	2	6	4
Service Learning/Community Service (n = 15)	2	7	4
Disabled Student Services (n = 12)	3	8	2
International Students and Scholars (n = 11)	4	7	2