

CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS' LEADERSHIP TO
PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE TO HELP STUDENTS OBTAIN
PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE ASSISTANT POSITIONS

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
TAKESHI FUJII

Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts, Dissertation Committee Chair

DECEMBER, 2010

© Copyright by Takeshi Fujii 2010

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS' LEADERSHIP TO PROVIDE
PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE TO HELP STUDENT EMPLOYEES OBTAIN
PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE ASSISTANT POSITIONS

Presented by Takeshi Fujii

A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Ruth Ann Roberts

Associate Professor Paul Watkins

Associate Professor Jan Ward

Professor Kenneth Heischmidt

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts and for her support and encouragement throughout the process, and Dr. Paul Watkins, Dr. Jan Ward, and Dr. Kenneth Heischmidt for their assistance as a part of my dissertation committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... ii

LIST OF TABLES..... ix

ABSTRACT..... xi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

 Introduction.....1

 Statement of the Problem and Research Questions3

 Purpose of the Study4

 Rational and Justification for the Study.....5

 Definition of Terms.....6

 Campus Recreation

 National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)

 Graduate Assistants

 Student Employees

 Assumptions.....7

 Limitations8

 Delimitations.....8

 Subsequent Chapters8

2. LITERATURE REVIEW9

 Introduction.....9

 Background.....9

Campus Recreation	
National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)	
Professional Development Opportunities	
Mentoring	
Experiential Learning	
Involvement	
On-Campus Employment	
Association	
Networking	
Organizational Analysis.....	19
Organizational Theories	
Higher Education Institutions as Organizations	
Campus Recreation Departments as Organizations	
Leadership.....	23
Contingent Leadership Theory in Higher Education	
Campus Recreation Leadership	
Campus Recreation Director Educational Background	
Areas of Assistance for Students	27
Qualification for Employment	
Communication Skills	
Preparedness for Interview	
Education	
Involvement in Professional Organizations	

Campus Recreation Directors' Preference for a Job Candidate.....	32
Summary	34
3. METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction.....	36
Research Question	36
Purpose of Study	37
Sample.....	38
Instrumentation	39
Rational for Utilization of the Instrument.....	40
Quantitative Approach	
Survey Method	
Self-Administered Survey	
Survey Content	
Online Survey	
Reliability and Validity.....	45
Method of Presenting and Processing Data	46
Summary	48
4. FINDINGS.....	49
Introduction.....	49
Presentation and Description of Data	49
Study Overview	
Response Rate	
Participant Demographics	

Research Questions	
Analysis of Data.....	55
Type	
Frequency	
Perceived Importance	
Differences in Frequency and Perceived Importance Based on Participant Demographics	
Differences in Frequency Based on Director Demographics	
Differences in Frequency Based on Department Demographics	
Differences in Frequency Based on Institution Demographics	
Differences in Perceived Importance Based on Director Demographics	
Differences in Perceived Importance Based on Department Demographics	
Differences in Perceived Importance Based on Institution Demographics	
Differences in Frequency between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees	
Differences in Perceived Importance between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees	
Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance for Graduate Assistants	
Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance for Student Employees	
Availability of Academic Majors and Assistance	
Availability of Academic Majors	

Difference in Frequency and Perceived Importance Based on
Availability of Academic Majors for Graduate Degree

Difference in Frequency and Perceived Importance Based on
Availability of Academic Majors for Undergraduate Degree

Reliability.....	80
Summary	81
5. DISCUSSION.....	82
Introduction.....	82
Study Summary.....	82
Findings.....	85
Participant Demographics	
Type	
Frequency	
Perceived Importance	
Differences in Frequency Based on Participant Demographics	
Differences in Perceived Importance Based on Participant Demographics	
Differences of Assistance between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees	
Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance Availability of Academic Majors and Assistance	
Conclusions.....	93
Implications.....	96
Study Limitations.....	96
Recommendations for Future Study	98
Summary.....	100

APPENDIX

A. E-MAIL MESSAGE FOR PILOT TESTING PARTICIPANTS103

B. PILOT TESTING FEEDBACK FORM104

C. ONLINE SURVEY.....105

D. INITIAL E-MAIL MESSAGE117

E. FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL REMINDER.....118

F. ADDITIONAL STATISTICAL DATA119

REFERENCES121

VITA.....126

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participants' Education Level.....	51
2. Participants' Area of Study.....	51
3. Division for Which Participants' Campus Recreation Departments Operate.....	52
4. Participants' Enrollment Size.....	53
5. Participants' Region.....	54
6. Mean Frequency Ranking for Graduate Assistants.....	55
7. Mean Frequency Ranking for Student Employees.....	56
8. Frequency for Career Counseling.....	57
9. Frequency for Résumé Workshop/Class.....	58
10. Frequency for Résumé Advice.....	59
11. Frequency for Mock Interview.....	59
12. Frequency for Taking/Sending to State and/or Regional Conferences.....	60
13. Frequency for Taking/Sending to NIRSA Annual Conference.....	61
14. Frequency for Encouraging to Attend State, Regional, or National Conferences.....	62
15. Frequency for Teaching about A Job Search Process.....	63
16. Perceived Importance for Career Counseling.....	64
17. Perceived Importance for Résumé Workshop/Class.....	64
18. Perceived Importance for Résumé Advice.....	65

19. Perceived Importance for Mock Interview	66
20. Perceived Importance for Taking/Sending to State and/or Regional Conference	66
21. Perceived Importance for Taking/Sending to NIRSA Annual Conference	67
22. Perceived Importance for Encouraging to Attend State, Regional, or National Conferences.....	68
23. Perceived Importance for Teaching about a Job Search Process.....	69
24. Availability of Academic Majors.....	78
25. Significant Difference on Assistance Based on Academic Majors for Graduate Degree	80
F1. Number of Cases, Means and Standard Error of Means for Frequency.....	119
F2. Number of Cases, Means and Standard Error of Means for Perceived Importance	120

CAMPUS RECREATION DIRECTORS' LEADERSHIP TO
PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE TO HELP STUDENTS OBTAIN
PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE ASSISTANT POSITIONS

Takeshi Fujii

Dr. Ruth Ann Roberts, Dissertation Committee Chair

ABSTRACT

Over the years, the Campus Recreation field has become a dynamic and exciting area with a variety of job and career opportunities. This study attempted to examine the type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for students to obtain a professional or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field. This study found career counseling and résumé advice were the most popular type of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for both graduate assistants and student employees. Frequency varied from every other year to every semester/quarter depending on assistance. Campus Recreation directors perceived all the assistance items ranging from somewhat important to essential. Most of the participants' demographics did not make a difference in frequency or perceived importance of assistance. Overall perceived importance was placed more on graduate assistants than on student employees although there was no difference in frequency between graduate assistants and student employees. Finally, Campus Recreation directors provided assistance for students at the frequency based on their perceived importance most of the time.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Seventy percent of students participate in Campus Recreation programs on higher education campuses where programs are offered. This means 5.4 million students regularly utilize established recreational programs and facilities (Blumenthal, 2009). Campus Recreation has been a part of higher education institutions for a long time. Since the 1930s, the value of Campus Recreation has been widely recognized (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006). The field of Campus Recreation has evolved over the years from offering only intramural sports programs to offering a variety of fitness, wellness and sports programs with multi-million dollar facilities. The value of Campus Recreation has been brought into discussion, especially in recent years, for its significant impact on student success (Blumenthal). Campus Recreation is not only contributing to student health and wellness, but it is also positively associated with student satisfaction rate and retention rate (Astin, 1993; NIRSA, 2004).

As the field of Campus Recreation grows and expands, the need to employ skilled and motivated professionals has increased (Blumenthal, 2009). Campus Recreation employs professionals in various specialized areas, such as facility management, aquatics, fitness and wellness, intramural sports, sport clubs, youth and family, and outdoor adventure. In addition to professional staff, graduate assistants and student employees working in Campus Recreation are an integral part of daily operation. Over the years, the Campus Recreation field has become a dynamic and exciting area with a variety of job and career opportunities (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006; Ross, 2006). Every year,

undergraduate and graduate students look for a graduate assistant or professional position in the Campus Recreation field. According to the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (n.d. a), 400 candidates utilized their Career Opportunities Center at the 2009 NIRSA Annual Conference.

As the Campus Recreation field offers increasingly more opportunities for employment for undergraduate and graduate candidates, a few researchers conducted studies focusing on candidates' qualifications for employment in Campus Recreation. Ross (1998) suggests job applicants need appropriate work experiences to be competitive. Ross and Blackman (1998) concluded professional experience and good communication skills are the most important qualifications for job applicants. Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006) state, "Professional experience, related work experience and communication skills were the most sought after qualifications in a job candidate" (p. 143).

Who is providing career guidance and assistance for undergraduate and graduate students who seek employment in the field? According to Bower, Hums, and Keedy (2005), it is important for leaders in Campus Recreation to provide guidance to students interested in the field. However, what directors of Campus Recreation do to provide assistance for students to obtain a position in the field remains an open question. There are no studies conducted which focus on Campus Recreation directors' role of providing career guidance and assistance. This study contributes to the knowledge base in the Campus Recreation field by exploring the types of assistance and the frequency of assistance provided by recreation directors to help students to obtain a position in

Campus Recreation. This study also explores the perceived importance of providing assistance among Campus Recreation directors.

Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

As the field of Campus Recreation grows and expands, and with a growing demand for qualified and motivated professionals (Blumenthal, 2009), an increasing number of students who work in a Campus Recreation department may decide to become professionals in that field. These students may need guidance in their job search process from current professionals in the field, especially the ones for which they work. Ross (1998), Ross and Blackman (1998), and Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006) concluded Campus Recreation directors prefer candidates with appropriate experiences and good communication skills, including résumé quality and interview skills.

Campus Recreation directors are leaders who oversee the operation of a Campus Recreation department and manage professional staff, graduate assistants and student employees. Bower, Hums, and Keedy (2005) state it is important for leaders in Campus Recreation to provide guidance to students interested in the field. No study was found that describes the assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for those future professionals.

The problems of this study included the type of assistance given to students by Campus Recreation directors, the frequency of assistance and the perceived importance placed on providing assistance by the recreation director. The research questions this paper focused on are: 1) what type of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field

through Campus Recreation directors' leadership, 2) how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance, 3) what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing those assistances, 4) do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance provided for students, and 5) how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general?

Answering the research questions determined what type of assistance was provided and what importance Campus Recreation directors placed on providing such assistance. Further, answering the research questions helped examine if there was a gap between the qualifications Campus Recreation directors sought among job candidates and how they provided assistance to help students obtain those qualifications to become qualified job candidates. The results of this study may help Campus Recreation directors and other professionals offer assistance effectively to students who are interested in pursuing a career in the Campus Recreation field.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the type and frequency of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for students, including both graduate assistants and student employees. Further, Campus Recreation directors' perceptions regarding the importance of assistance to help students obtain a position in the field were also examined.

In order to investigate any characteristics that impact on assistance provided for students, participant demographic information was used as variables. The variables included director demographics, such as gender and educational background; department demographics, such as division and size of the department; and institutional

demographics, such as enrollment size and location. The statistical analysis of type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance based on these independent variables was important for the study to identify characteristics that impact on how Campus Recreation directors provide assistance for students.

Additionally, this study was to identify differences of assistance provided between graduate assistants and student employees to explore how differently Campus Recreation directors offered assistance between them. The study investigated relationships between frequency and perceived importance of assistance to discover whether Campus Recreation directors put their efforts into providing assistance when they thought the assistance is important for students. Finally, differences in assistance based on availability of academic majors were examined because Campus Recreation directors may be willing to provide more assistance for students who work in their department if the students are in a major such as Recreation Management and Athletic Administration, which are related to Campus Recreation.

Rational and Justification for the Study

The value of Campus Recreation in higher education institutions has been recognized as an important factor contributing to students' health and wellness, satisfaction with the institution, retention rate, and success (Astin, 1993; NIRSA, 2004; Blumenthal, 2009). Over the years, the field of Campus Recreation has grown and expanded to become a dynamic and exciting area with many career opportunities (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006; Ross, 2006). Therefore, the field of Campus Recreation is expected to hire qualified and motivated personnel to meet the needs (Blumenthal).

Graduate assistants and student employees who work in a Campus Recreation department are a great target population for Campus Recreation professionals to recruit into the field. Campus Recreation provides a wide range of opportunities for graduate assistants and student employees to gain hands-on skills, leadership practice, and working experience. As a part of higher education institution, it is important to prepare students for the real world by assisting students beyond providing on-campus employments. This study attempted to examine the type of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for students to obtain a professional or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field, the frequency of assistance they provide, and the level of importance they place on providing such assistance. Because there was no research available that examines the assistance provided for students (type, frequency, and perceived importance) to obtain a position in the Campus Recreation field, the results of this study will be helpful for Campus Recreation directors and other professionals to offer assistance effectively to students who are interested in pursuing a career in the Campus Recreation field.

Definitions of Terms

Campus Recreation

Campus Recreation is a department in a higher education institution that provides facilities and programs for recreational purposes. A Campus Recreation department may offer programs such as intramural sports, sports club, fitness and wellness programs, aquatic programs, youth and family programs, and outdoor adventure programs. A Campus Recreation department may house a variety of indoor facilities such as basketball

courts, weight rooms, group fitness studios, pools, as well as outdoor facilities such as intramural fields and rope courses.

National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)

National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) is a professional organization that provides student, professional and institutional memberships for those in the recreation field. Their memberships include students, professionals, and institutions in higher education, parks and recreation, and military settings. The association provides educational workshops and conferences both regionally and nationally.

Graduate Assistants

Graduate assistants are graduate students who work approximately 20 hours per week, performing various tasks in a Campus Recreation department in higher education institutions. They are often compensated with a tuition waiver and stipend. Graduate assistants are typically in a supervisory position that oversees student employees.

Student Employees

Student employees are college students who are employed by a Campus Recreation department. They are hourly waged employees in various positions, such as facility attendant, fitness instructor, lifeguard, and camp counselor.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. The participants understood the intent and meaning of the questions and answered them honestly and completely.
2. The survey was completed by a director or equivalent who had a leadership role in Campus Recreation departments.

3. The participants' responses reflected their current practices and opinions.

Limitations

The following limitations were applicable for this study:

1. The researcher had no control over the response rate of the survey.
2. The researcher had no control over who actually completed the survey.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to:

1. Campus Recreation directors (or equivalent) who were registered as contact persons with National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association Institutional Membership.
2. Campus Recreation directors (or equivalent) who were employed at a 4-year institution in North America.

Subsequent Chapters

Chapter Two will discuss literature related to the research question. The topics include Campus Recreation, NIRSA, professional development opportunities, mentoring, experiential learning, involvement, organizational analysis, leadership, and areas of assistance for students. Chapter Three focuses on instrumentation and methodology that were used for this study. Purpose of the study, sample, instrumentation, rationale for utilization of the instrument, reliability and validity, and method of presenting and processing data are discussed. In Chapter Four, the results of statistical analysis are presented and described. In Chapter Five, findings are discussed along with answers to the research questions, implication for practice, and recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER TWO

Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on topics related to the research question for this study. The research questions this paper focuses on are: 1) what type of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field through Campus Recreation directors' leadership, 2) how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance, 3) what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing those assistances, 4) do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance provided for students, and 5) how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general? The topics in this chapter include Campus Recreation, National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA), professional development opportunities, mentoring, experiential learning, involvement, organizational analysis, leadership, and areas of assistance for students. Reviewing related literature provides theoretical foundations as well as guidelines for this study.

Background

Campus Recreation

Campus Recreation has been a part of higher education for a long time. In the United States, Campus Recreation started as competitive sporting events and athletic college contests (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006). According to Mittelstaedt, et al., the first professional staff was hired to direct intramural programs in 1913. Over time, the field of Campus Recreation, evolving from intramural sports, has increased participation and

diversified its programs tremendously. Campus Recreation has been established as an essential entity to enhance student life on campus. “Any campus recreation program serves a diverse population” (Mittelstaedt, et al., p. 200). The range of participants Campus Recreation serves may include traditional and non-traditional students, campus organizations, international students, staff and faculty, and alumni and local community members.

Campus Recreation provides many benefits to universities: increased recruitment and retention, holistic wellness, personal and social diversity enhancement, and competence and mastery of leadership skills (Haines, 2001). In *the Value of Recreational Sports in Higher Education*, NIRSA (2004) concluded participation in Campus Recreation activities is contributing to college satisfaction, success, and retention. Haines and Fortman (2008) suggest students who are highly involved in Campus Recreation are expected to gain a great amount of learning. “Universities are becoming more accustomed to thinking of recreational sports programs as providers of positive activities for students” (Hackett, 2007, p. 72). Participation in intramural sports is positively associated with satisfaction with campus life, physical and emotional health, and attainment of a bachelor’s degree (Astin, 1993).

Participation in recreational sports provides many benefits to students as well. According to Miller (2000), Campus Recreation programs “provide quality and healthy opportunities...to experience tremendous personal growth” (p. 62). Ross (2006) lists several benefits such as personal, community and organization benefits. Personal benefits include improved health and self-esteem, learning to tolerate differences and increased interpersonal skills. Community benefits include employment, engaging diverse

populations, and increased community cohesion and interaction. Organization benefits include improved productivity and teamwork, increased morale, and skill development.

One of the major questions currently addressed in higher education is how university staff can help more students become involved in leadership opportunities, thus empowering them to lead lives as leaders beyond the college environment (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Campus Recreation offers many leadership opportunities. Students have the opportunities to gain valuable skills through leadership positions (Daprano, Coyle, & Titlebaum, 2005). Pack, Jordan, Turner, and Haines (2007) note, “although university recreation departments are under the direction of professional staff, student employees often assume supervisory roles and, thus, are responsible for monitoring and directing their peers” (p. 96). Through employment in Campus Recreation, students may learn leadership skills by working in teams, supervising other students, and managing special events. Through student organizations such as sport clubs, students may learn administrative skills and understand what it takes to be a leader among their peers by serving in administrative positions, such as president and treasurer. Hall, Forrester, and Borsz (2008) suggest student leaders in Campus Recreation identify their leadership skill development in organizing, planning and delegating; balancing academic, personal and professional roles; motivating and influencing others and being a mentor/role model; problem solving and decision making; communication skills; working with others/diversity; and giving and receiving feedback. Additionally, students gains communication skills, in both public speaking and writing, through leadership positions in Campus Recreation (Hall, Forrester, and Borsz).

As the recognition of values in Campus Recreation has increased, many higher education institutions have built new recreational facilities and have offered new recreational programs to accommodate a wide variety of populations in their campus communities. Many higher education institutions often use Campus Recreation facilities and programs as recruiting tools (Haines, 2001). A comprehensive Campus Recreation department typically offers diverse facilities, such as climbing walls and multipurpose activity spaces, and variety of programs, such as intramural and club sports, fitness and wellness classes, and youth camps and sport skill clinics. With increasing needs for Campus Recreation, the Campus Recreation field has become a dynamic and exciting area with a variety of job and career opportunities (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006; Ross, 2006).

National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)

In Campus Recreation, many professionals and students are members of NIRSA. NIRSA is a non-profit organization that provides educational and networking opportunities to thousands of members from colleges, universities, armed forces, correctional facilities and community recreation departments throughout the United States, Canada and other countries (Mittelstaedt, at el., 2006). The association was established in 1950 by Dr. William Wasson of Dillard University in New Orleans, LA., as the National Intramural Association (NIA), after a meeting with 22 African-American men and women intramural directors from historically black colleges. (Mittelstaedt, at el.; NIRSA, n.d. b; Jennings, 1984) Since then, the association has grown tremendously. “In 1975 the National Intramural Association changed its name to The National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) reflecting the change in membership and program areas” (Jennings, p. 25). According to NIRSA, its membership includes 4,000

members representing more than 700 campuses and universities as well as other institutions and companies. Additionally, nearly 11 million college students utilize recreational facilities operated by its members (NIRSA). Further, more than \$1.5 billion has been spent recently to renovate, or build collegiate recreational facilities (NIRSA).

Professional Development Opportunities

Campus Recreation provides professional development opportunities to enhance students' learning through hands-on experiences. These opportunities include graduate assistantships, internships, employment, and practicum student placements. NIRSA (2007b) suggests Campus Recreation programs should “provide graduate assistant and/or internship opportunities to enhance professional preparation experiences” (p. 8)

According to Renn and Jessup-Anger (2008), these opportunities are essential for a student's preparation for a full-time position in Campus Recreation.

Providing graduate assistantship opportunities is common practice in Campus Recreation. “In the field of campus recreation, the best way to begin is through a Graduate Assistantship that pays for college and also provides a possible route for a position in campus recreation following graduation” (Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2005, p. 67). Through graduate assistantships, students learn management, programming, and leadership skills, which are essential to prepare for full-time positions. According to Waple (2006), graduate assistantships provide a laboratory-type setting that provides opportunities for students to bridge theory to practice and gain practical skills.

An internship is an opportunity for students to learn new skills and test theories and concepts taught in the classroom (Ross & Beggs, 2007). According to Ross and Beggs, an internship experience helps students find employment by gaining a competitive

edge for a job search and an internship is one of the most career-enhancing experiences. Haines and Fortman (2008) suggest students' learning will be the greatest when their environment is structured, like an internship setting, to encourage students to participate actively.

Furthermore, professional development opportunities are important to jump-start a student's career in the field. Professional development opportunities may include attending national, regional, state conferences, presenting at those conferences, and obtaining specific credentials and certifications. Campus Recreation administrators even continue to improve themselves by attending conferences and becoming involved in committee work (London, 2002). Professional development opportunities can enhance a student's leadership skills, improve understanding of the field, and offer networking with other students and professionals. Thus, students become marketable for job opportunities through professional development experiences. Bower, Hums and Keedy (2005) note, "professional development opportunities for students [are] important organizational factors that [facilitate] the mentoring relationship. Since professional development is so important, Campus Recreation professionals who are mentoring need to be aware of the trends of the various segments in the field" (p. 75).

Mentoring

Mentoring is one of many professional development opportunities in which Campus Recreation directors can partake. "Mentors can provide letters of reference, as well as career and professional advice regarding graduate education and assistantships, membership in professional organizations, attendance at industry conferences, and most importantly, networking opportunities through their own professional contacts" (Daprano

& Titlebaum, 2005, p. 115). Through mentoring, Campus Recreation directors can nurture and help students to develop professional skills, obtain practical experience and prepare themselves for job opportunities. According to Bower, Hums, and Keedy (2005), benefits of mentoring for trainees include enhanced organizational commitment, lower turnover, increased employee productivity, professional advancement, and development of network. Mentoring may help to open new doors of opportunity for students (Faircloth & Cooper, 2007).

Mentoring is important for a Campus Recreation director's professional career as well. Ross and Schurger (2007) found the majority of Campus Recreation directors believed mentoring of future or current recreation professionals was an important professional experience. Reasons for directors to mentor students are to help students learn and grow (Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2005). According to Bower, Hums and Keedy, it is important for Campus Recreation directors to want to help students and "[provide] leadership in guiding, nurturing, and encouraging students to the next step in their lives" (p. 69).

Furthermore, Campus Recreation directors may increase students' commitment and support to the department through mentoring. By mentoring, Campus Recreation directors may provide the sense of caring for the students. Student employees who feel supported by the department "will have a greater sense of purpose and meaning through their affective commitment to the department" (Pack, Jordan, Turner & Haines, 2007, p. 101). In other words, the students who feel well supported by the department are more likely to be committed to the department, satisfied with their job, and most importantly, less likely to leave (Pack, Jordan, Turner & Haines).

Experiential Learning

Students can learn and develop skills through experience. “Learning is most effective if it incorporates many modes of learning into many different contexts. It is impossible to separate learning, development and context” (Haines & Fortman, 2008, p. 53). According to Hall, Forrester and Borsz (2008) students see a direct connection between what they learn in an academic class and what they do in their leadership positions in Campus Recreation.

Students may experience, learn, and develop skills in various aspects of Campus Recreation. Haines and Fortman (2008) mention, “Many of the skills needed to be successfully employed are practiced and learned from recreational sports participation” (p.57). Through recreational sports participation, students may learn teamwork, intrapersonal skills, time management skills and leadership skills. Additionally, club sport officers in Campus Recreation indicated they gained leadership skills specifically from their experience and not from intentional training provided for them (Hall-Yannessa & Forrester, 2004).

In addition to participation in recreational sports, students may learn through employment. Participating in group activities, working along with others, working with clients, and tackling challenging tasks are main types of work activities that contribute to learning (Eraut, 2004). Although workplace contexts are rarely structured with learning in mind, a wide range of more or less structured workplace context provides an environment for informal learning (Eraut). For example, students who work as intramural officials may develop “a variety of skills from...experience, including improving their communication skills, becoming more self-confident and self-reliant, working better as a

member of a team, and understanding how to handle difficult situations more effectively” (Schuh, 1999, p. 51) even though the reason they become officials have nothing to do with learning and development (Schuh). A student may obtain a position in Campus Recreation as an undergraduate employee, student supervisor, intern, or graduate assistant. Their experiences, especially in a supervisory position such as graduate assistant, may provide a plethora of learning opportunities in planning, programming, and managing personnel. According to Ross and Schurger (2007), Campus Recreation directors “strongly believe that experience is the best teacher of administrative leadership and that they learned about leading from real work and life experiences” (p. 153).

Involvement

Involvement is an important concept in higher education institutions to help students succeed in their campus life. “Student involvement, whether academic or extracurricular, can enhance the collegiate experience and increase academic success” (Hackett, 2007, p. 73). According to Astin (1993), student involvement, such as academic involvement, involvement with faculty, and involvement with student peer groups, is positively associated with learning, academic performance, and retention. “[T]he greater the student’s degree of involvement, the greater the learning and personal development” (Astin, 1996, p.124).

The more engaged a student is with the campus environment, the more opportunities there are for learning to occur (Haines & Fortman, 2008). According to Haines and Fortman, students who are highly involved in Campus Recreation are expected to gain a great amount of learning. Campus Recreation provides various opportunities to interact with peers. According to Astin (1996), the peer group is

powerful because it has the capacity to involve students more intensely in the educational experience. Furthermore, students may get involved in the field of Campus Recreation not only through on-campus employment, but also by joining a professional association and networking with other students and professionals in the field.

On-campus employment. As mentioned earlier, Campus Recreation offers many employment opportunities for students. According to Furr and Elling (2000), employment on campus appears to have a positive effect on campus involvement, such as clubs and organizations, which can lead to enhanced learning experiences. Further, having a part-time job on campus is positively associated with attainment of a bachelor's degree, and cognitive and affective growth (Astin, 1993).

Astin (1993) explains involvement is the reason having a part-time job on campus has positive effect on student's life. "Employment with a recreational sports department appears to conform to the basic criteria for involvement since it fosters a connection to the university by providing opportunities for students to interact with their peers and university personnel" (Hackett, 2007, p.71). In other words, students who are employed on campus are in contact with other students, staff, and faculty more frequently than students who spend a same amount of time working off campus (Astin). In his study to explore the relationship between recreational sports employment and academic success, Hackett found there was a positive relationship between part-time employment in Campus Recreation and GPA.

Association. In Campus Recreation, many professionals and students are members of National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). NIRSA offers memberships to institutions, professionals, and students, which helps students to get

involved with the association. According to Ross and Schurger (2007), Campus Recreation directors suggest that young professionals get involved in Campus Recreation organizations and associations by participating on committees, boards, and elected positions.

Involvement in professional organizations while in college shows an early commitment to the field. Even for professionals in Campus Recreation, Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006) emphasize the importance of staying current in their particular area of expertise through participation in professional organizations.

“Affiliation and active participation as a member in [professional organizations] is a career responsibility” (Mull, Bayless, & Jamieson, 2005, p. 53). Involvement in professional organizations not only helps students in learning, but also helps students network with other students and professionals (Mull, Bayless, & Jamieson).

Networking. “Networking is vital to career growth” (Ross & Schurger, 2007, p. 154). Aspiring professionals need to work on networking with professionals in the field by actively participating in volunteer, committee, and social opportunities in the Campus Recreation field (Ross & Schurger). These opportunities may be associated with professional organizations, various agencies, or local communities. Students may foster mentoring relationships with professionals by officiating for extramural sports events in their community (Faircloth & Cooper, 2007).

Organizational Analysis

Organizational Theories

To understand a part of an organization, it is important not only to focus on the part but also to look at the organization as a whole. For example, Campus Recreation is a

department in a higher education institution. To study the Campus Recreation department, one must look at the department itself as well as at its reporting division and the institution as a whole to see the entire picture.

Understanding organizations are challenging because organizations are complex, surprising, deceptive and ambiguous (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Bolman and Deal offer frames to learn about organizations by offering multiple perspectives. Frames are “maps that aid navigation, and tools for solving problems and getting things done” (Bolman & Deal, p. 18). Their frames include the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. The structural frame focuses on the architectural aspects of organizations, such as designs of goals, units and subunits, and rules and roles. The human resources frame provides an emphasis on the understanding of people, including their strengths and weaknesses, and emotions and reasons. The political frame views organizations as competitive entities, motivated by scarce resources, competing interests and struggles for power. The symbolic frame focuses on meaning and beliefs, involving rituals, ceremonies, and culture. These frames are helpful and enable us to see the same organization from multiple angles so we can understand the organization better.

Morgan (2006) also offers metaphors for reading and understanding organizations. These metaphors provide distinctive and partial ways to see, manage, and understand organizations. Morgan states an interesting aspect of metaphor is that it always produces one-sided insight and creates distortions. He adds, “In recognizing theory as metaphor, we quickly appreciate that no single theory will ever give us a perfect or all-purpose point of view. We realize that the challenge is to become skilled in the art of using metaphor” (p. 5). His list of metaphors includes machines, organisms, brains, cultures, political

systems and domination. These metaphors, like Bolman and Deal's (2003) frames, provide different perspectives to see the same organization from multiple angles.

Higher Education Institutions as Organizations

There are many factors and characteristics that influence the operation of higher education institutions when attempting to understand the institutions as organizations. Institutional size is an example. Small size institutions may provide a flexible, adaptable organizational structure and an environment where students have numerous opportunities to work and play together through cooperative relationships (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). At the same time, a small size institution may lack in diversity of people, programs and services, and lack resources such as a library with a large collection and comprehensive health services for students. Large institutions, on the other hand, may have more diversity, more resources, and more opportunities for students. Simultaneously, they may have a more rigid structure, lacking flexibility and adaptability (Chickering & Reisser).

Another example is locations of institutions. Locality of institutions provides a variety of culture, common beliefs, and customs. Each region of the United States has a distinctive and unique culture. The National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) has six regions for the United States. Region I is the Northeast area, Region II the Southeast area, Region III the Midwest area, Region IV the Central South area, Region V the Central North area, and Region VI the West Coast area. Differences among regions are evident in terms of leadership, involvement, participation through national and regional conferences, and involvement in committees and other opportunities.

Furthermore, the reporting division of Campus Recreation department is another example. A Campus Recreation department under student affairs division may focus

heavily on student development like Bolman and Deal's human resources frame (2003). On the other hand, a Campus Recreation department under business operation may work like Morgan's machine metaphor (2006) as the department goals may focus on creating revenues.

Campus Recreation Departments as Organizations

Campus Recreation departments can be also viewed as organizations in an environment called higher education. As organizations, Campus Recreation departments vary in types of the operation, structures, and goals based on the context. One of the influencing factors is the type of divisions to which the department reports. According to NIRSA's (2007a) *Comprehensive Member Survey Results*, which included a "Director's Only Section" with responses from 201 Campus Recreation directors, 75 percent of the respondents report to student affairs/services, 14 percent to athletics, 6 percent to academics, 4 percent to business administration, and 1 percent to an associated student body. The focus and goals of a Campus Recreation department may be influenced by the type of divisions to which the department reports. Thus, the type of divisions may indirectly influence directors' decisions and commitment to provide assistance to help students to obtain a position in the field. For example, a Campus Recreation department under an academic division may not put a priority on providing opportunities for students to obtain practical competencies required for entry-level positions in the field. They may be rather "more focused on importance of [students] acquiring an increasing body of professional knowledge and less focused on preparing students with the readiness to apply their professional knowledge to practice" (Kuk, Cobb & Forrest, 2007, p. 680).

Leadership

Contingent Leadership Theory in Higher Education

Leadership is often dependent on the context. The contingent theory of leadership is valuable in studying organizations that have many layers of factors influencing their structures and operations. Especially, studying leadership in the setting of higher education institutions requires a consideration of the contexts. In contingent leadership theory, what is effective is dependent upon the context. This leadership perspective emphasizes the importance of situational and contextual factors, such as the nature of the task to be performed, the types of relationship among those involved, and the nature of the environment (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Yukl, 2006). Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (2000) state, “Truly productive leadership depends not only on engaging in commonly helpful practices, it also depends on recognizing and responding to the unique challenges and features presented by particular types of organizational contexts” (p. 23).

Higher education institutions face many challenges within their context. Environmental factors such as students’ parents, community, legislature, and local and national economy influence tremendously the operation and decision making of the institutions. The environment is continuously changing to require the institutions to be flexible and adaptable. It is important for the institutions to be “sensitive to what is occurring in the world beyond” (Morgan, 2006, p. 39) by performing necessary tasks, forming relationships, and adapting to changes according to the environment.

The tasks that leaders perform depend on the context. There are several tasks leaders often perform to make their leaderships effective. Leaders are primarily

concerned with accomplishing tasks in a reliable way (Yukl, 2006). Leaders also perform certain tasks or functions that are essential to accomplish purposes of a group (Gardner, 2000). In higher education settings, a department can be considered as a group and the director for the department serves as the leader for the group. Depending on the purpose of the department, the department director makes a plan after considering many factors in the context, ensuring the tasks are accomplished in a reliable way to meet the purpose.

Leaders engage themselves in tasks “to improve or maintain internal efficiency and coordination in a team or organization” (Yukl, 2006, p. 442). Yukl states, “A high level of coordination is especially important when the team performs a complex task under rapidly changing conditions” (p. 326). To improve internal efficiency and coordination, leaders often arrange sections of an organization so “[t]he relationship between the roles and offices is expressed in an organization chart that attempts to relate form to function” (Davis, 2003, p. 35). Simultaneously, leaders may move their staff with various skills and expertise into positions suitable to their strengths (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Furthermore, leaders may adjust their activities “to be consistent with the activities of interdependent units inside or outside the organization” (Yukl, p. 326). Organizational structures of various sorts are essential when analyzing leadership practice in an organization (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001) because the structure and its efficiency are dependent on the context.

Types of relationships leaders build are dependent on the context as well. According to Ogawa and Bossert (1995), “[l]eadership is relational” (p. 236) because “[t]he medium by which leadership is exerted is social interaction” (p. 237). Leaders build relationships with their members within the organization as well as with local

organizations and businesses, and community members that exist outside the organization. Building relationship both internally and externally is important in order to “acquire an adequate supply of the resources necessary [for an organization] to sustain existence” (Morgan, 2006, p. 59). Thus, any change in relationships may influence styles of leadership in order for leaders to obtain and maintain resources.

Working with changes is an important factor in contingent leadership theory. Leaders may face changes from outside of organizations. On the other hand, leaders may create changes from within organizations to adapt to the needs of the environment. The adaptation may include modifications and alterations in the organization or its components so balance between the organization and the environment is restored (Cameron, 1984).

Campus Recreation Leadership

Campus Recreation leadership usually resides in a director. The director’s tasks and relationships depend on the environment. The director manages all aspects of recreation facilities, programs and services to meet the needs of members and users through their leadership to manage and supervise the staff, including professionals and students. According to London (2000), Campus Recreation directors must work with an increasingly demanding environment filled with fast communication, turbulence and intense economic pressures. “Working with scarcer resources and...[a] multicultural participant base are two issues currently confronting Campus Recreation departments. Dealing with these challenges requires unusual modes of leadership and followers” (London, p. 61). He further states creating a highly committed and willing workforce is a goal of Campus Recreation directors (London).

Providing professional development opportunities for professionals and student employees in the department is one way for Campus Recreation directors to exercise their leadership. According to NIRSA (2007b), Campus Recreation programs should “provide appropriate professional development opportunities” (p. 8). The directors may provide guidance to students interested in the field (Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2005), incorporate specific hands-on experience as a part of leadership training (Hall-Yannessa & Forrester, 2004), and “enhance the support of student leaders by providing students additional resources to assist them with challenging aspects of being a student leader” (Hall, Forrester & Borsz, p.138).

It is also important for Campus Recreation directors to understand the importance of the higher education institution’s role to prepare students to become a part of quality work force. According to Yorke and Harvey (2005), higher education lacks attention in the development of practical, work-related skills and appropriate personal qualities. Alssit et al. (2005) suggests all sectors of higher education must be involved in workforce development despite the typical notion of community colleges being the ones providing it. Thus, it is essential for Campus Recreation directors to take initiative to provide support and meet the needs of the students for their professional development. Campus Recreation directors may consider working with academic departments to facilitate professional preparation opportunities for students (NIRSA, 2007b). By providing support and meeting the needs of the students, their job satisfaction may increase (Pack, Jordan, Turner, & Haines, 2007; Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006), which could lead to overall organizational effectiveness (Pack, Jordan, Turner, & Haines).

Campus Recreation Director Educational Background

According to Ross (1998), Campus Recreation directors think job applicants need to obtain an appropriate educational background along with work experience and other qualifications. Campus Recreation professionals often come from a wide variety of educational backgrounds. According to NIRSA's (2007a) *Comprehensive Member Survey Results* with 740 respondents, 11 percent have Bachelor's degrees, 81 percent have Master's degrees and 6 percent have Doctoral degrees. Their fields of study vary from sports management, recreation education and administration, physical education, to business, leisure studies, and health education.

Areas of Assistance for Students

Qualification for Employment

Campus Recreation offers a wide array of employment opportunities. Due to a variety of recreational programs and diverse facilities, Campus Recreation hires professionals, graduate assistants, and student employees in various areas. Undergraduate students may start their career by working as intramural sports officials. Before they apply for professional positions in the field, they may obtain a graduate assistantship with responsibilities to manage officials and coordinate sport events in order to enhance their learning and obtain experiences to become marketable.

There are quite a number of studies focusing on career development and employment in Campus Recreation, as the field offers employment and development opportunities for college graduates and students. Several studies examined what qualifications were sought in the Campus Recreation field. Those studies offer listings of preferred qualifications for student employees, interns, graduate assistants and

professional positions. Professionals in the field most valued experiences and communication skills in job candidates for graduate assistant and professional positions (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006; Ross, 1998; Ross & Blackman, 1998). Thus, college students interested in pursuing a career in Campus Recreation need to foster their communication skills and gain experiences to be marketable along with other qualifications. In addition to required practicum and internships, on-campus employment is an opportunity for students to improve their communication skills, gain practical experiences, and obtain other qualifications.

Experience

Experience is a valued qualification in candidates, especially for professional positions (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006; Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding & Haines, 2006; Ross, 1998; Ross & Blackman, 1998). This may be due to the fact that employers are looking for candidates who will be effective in organizations (Harvey, 2005) soon after hiring. Employers expect entry-level practitioners to be able to perform on the job and able to apply the knowledge into practice (Kuk, Cobb & Forrest, 2007). The more experienced candidates are, the less time and effort organizations spend in training them. Due to the increased competition and number of applicants, candidates must obtain the appropriate work experiences (Ross). Schneider, et al. emphasizes the importance of gaining experience in the field. The important factor for student development is in the active context of student lives (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association, 2004). Campus Recreation offers many opportunities for students to gain practical experiences in their active context. “Individuals wishing to gain a full-time professional position in college

Campus Recreation should take every advantage in gaining experience in the many facets of a college campus recreation program” (Schneider, et al., p.151).

Further, a student may gain diversified experiences by thinking outside of a college Campus Recreation program. Faircloth and Cooper (2007) note, “Student officials who participate in external officiating are exposed to more diverse experiences and enhance their professional development” (p. 44). According to Mull, Bayless, and Jamieson (2005), a critical aspect of career background is having hands-on experiences. They explain,

These experiences can prove extremely valuable because so much about recreational sport needs to be experienced. Pursuing meaningful experiences that contribute to your career cannot be overemphasized, whether such experiences occur during college and university studies or during summer work as an official, coach, supervisor, lifeguard, ranger, instructor, or program assistant (p. 56).

Work experience is not only important for a student’s job search process. Work experience contributes to student’s learning while gaining hands-on skills. Additionally, it helps students to transition into their first year of working in the real world (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). Harvey (2005) notes, “Work experience provides a foretaste of work place culture as well as contributing to learning” (p. 19).

Experience as a qualification is not limited to a job experience in the Campus Recreation field. Daprano, Coyle, and Titlebaum (2005) note volunteer and internship positions offer students experiences that have direct application to their career through development of professional skills. “Even working outside of the field as a waiter or waitress, parking attendant, or construction worker demonstrates a work ethic that can work on [a student’s] behalf” (Mull, Bayless, & Jamieson, 2005, p.56). Ross and

Schurger (2007) state, “Aspiring professionals should gain as much experience as possible in various positions at multiple levels and institutions and learn, adapt, and model as much as possible from the diverse leadership and management styles” (p. 153).

Communication Skills

Communication is another valued qualification among candidates by Campus Recreation directors (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006; Barcelona, 2004; Ross, 1998; Ross & Blackman, 1998). Schneider, et al. concluded Campus Recreation directors ranked excellent communication skills as one of the most highly sought after qualifications. This is a parallel to Waple’s (2006) study that found effective written and oral communication skills were ranked as the most necessary skills for entry-level student affairs positions. A student’s communication skills may be assessed at the time of the interview. “The interview provides the employer the initial experience to assess the candidate’s language/speaking skills” (Schneider, et al., p. 150). The résumé plays an important role to demonstrate a candidate’s written communication skills. Quality of the résumé is essential because it is the first step in the job search process. Without a good résumé, a candidate may not even have an opportunity to interview for a job. “Assessing a job applicant’s [résumé] is the first opportunity the potential employer has to critique the applicant’s skill in written communication (Schneider, et al., p. 150).

The value in communication skills is not limited to job candidates. Barcelona (2004) reported communication and public relations were perceived to be highly important competencies for both upper-level and entry-level position in both Campus Recreation and public recreation agencies. Furthermore, Campus Recreation professionals placed more emphasis on communication and public relations competencies

for entry-level personnel than public recreation professionals (Barcelona). This may be due to the nature of the job environment where constant communication is required to offer effective programs, manage diverse facilities and to ensure participants' safety.

Preparedness for Interview

Preparedness for interview was another characteristic Campus Recreation directors highly valued (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006; Ross & Blackman, 1998) along with experience and communication skills. According to Ross and Blackman, job candidates for an entry-level position should search Web pages and request printed materials from institutions they are applying for "to access pertinent preparation information" (p. 34). According to the findings of their study, "the most prevalent mistake made by [a candidate] is being unprepared" (Ross & Blackman, p. 36).

Additionally, appropriate attire for an interview is an important factor for job candidates (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2006; Ross & Blackman, 1998). For both professional and graduate assistant positions, overall neat appearance was a highly ranked characteristic sought in new hires (Schneider, et al.). Further, Ross and Blackman concluded 77 percent of their study responses indicated Campus Recreation directors "prefer the candidate be dressed nicer [for an interview] than they would be expected to dress if they were employed at their institution" (p.34).

Education

Campus Recreation directors value the education level of a candidate. "The master's degree is generally required for entry-level positions in campus recreation" (Barcelona, 2004, P. 59). Barcelona notes 86.6 percent of Campus Recreation directors possessed a Master's degree, compared to 29.5 percent of administrators in public

recreation settings. Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006) reported 66 percent of Campus Recreation directors preferred candidates with a graduate degree for entry-level positions. Mull, Bayless, and Jamieson (2005) explain education is fundamental to a career in recreational sports. They continue to note,

One of the most important aspects of a professional career is formal study at a college or university that offers a degree in leisure recreational or sport management with an emphasis in recreational sport. Completing such degree programs proves your grasp of required knowledge, with an accredited program being more valuable than an unaccredited program (p. 56).

Involvement in Professional Organizations

Involvement in professional organizations shows a student's commitment to the field. NIRSA offers many opportunities for students interested in the field to get involved. State and regional conferences may be the first step for students to delve into professional organization experiences. Multiple leadership opportunities, such as state representative positions and various committee positions, are available for students. Ross (1998) found recreational sports administrators prefer active involvement in professional organizations among job candidates. Moreover, according to Jamriska (2004), Campus Recreation professionals who hire graduate assistants rate high importance on memberships in professional organizations and professional conferences attended.

Campus Recreation Directors' Preference for a Job Candidate

As a higher education institution where Campus Recreation typically resides, it is important to prepare students for the real world by training students to become marketable by obtaining appropriate qualifications and experiences. There has been no

research conducted to investigate what assistance is provided for students in Campus Recreation to become qualified candidates, which is the topic of this study.

Ross (1998) conducted an empirical study of résumé content preferences among collegiate recreational sports administrators. He utilized a survey instrument with 71 Likert-scale statements regarding résumé content and nine statements about general information on résumé construction. He concluded, “Because of the increased competition and number of applicants for collegiate recreational sports positions, applicants must obtain the appropriate work experiences and educational background, as well as the necessary qualifications, certifications and credentials to be competitive” (Ross, p. 20). Additionally, he stated recreational sports administrators preferred less personal information and more information of prior work experiences both related and not related to the recreational sports field, and valued an applicant’s involvement in professional organizations while in college.

Ross and Blackman (1998) conducted an empirical study of interview preferences among collegiate recreational sports administrators. They designed a survey instrument to identify preference before an interview, during an interview, and after the interview, and to ask for administrators’ recommendations. Their results suggest interviewees should conduct research about an institution of their interest as a preparation for an interview, have good professional experience, communication skills and related work experience, and focus discussion during the interview on their hands-on leadership skills and initiative for the job.

Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006) used a mailed questionnaire to determine the characteristics, attributes, and competencies preferred in new hires for

professional positions, graduate assistant positions, and student employee positions. Their findings showed Campus Recreation directors preferred excellent language/speaking skills, prior experience in Campus Recreation, neat overall appearance, excellent writing skills, and possession of a graduate degree for professional positions. For graduate assistant positions, Campus Recreation directors valued neat overall appearance, excellent writing skills, and prior experience in Campus Recreation. The directors ranked the possession of certification in first aid and CPR highly for student employee positions.

Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006) utilized a survey instrument to identify the hiring practices, policies, and procedures of Campus Recreation directors for professional positions, graduate assistant positions, and student employee positions in Campus Recreation programs in North America. They concluded two-thirds of respondents indicated someone from their campus contacted other people who were not provided as a reference by candidates for professional positions, and 40 percent of respondents revealed someone contacted individuals not on a reference list for graduate assistant positions. Further, they concluded the majority of their respondents preferred candidates for professional positions to have a graduate degree.

Summary

This chapter reviewed available literature related to the research questions of this study. There have been several studies to investigate qualifications among job candidates that Campus Recreation directors value. According to the results of those studies, Campus Recreation directors seek candidates with excellent communication skills and experiences working in Campus Recreation. Additionally, Campus Recreation directors

think interview preparedness, education and leadership skills are important for job candidates. These results led the researcher to the basis for the research questions.

Students learn through experiencing hands-on skills as well as in classrooms. Campus Recreation offers a variety of opportunities for student employment and participation. These opportunities help students to gain leadership skills, communication skills and time management skills. Furthermore, students may see the benefit of getting good grades, not dropping out of college, and increased learning from getting involved through employment and participation in Campus Recreation.

Campus Recreation directors are in the position to lead other professionals, graduate and undergraduate students who work in their department. Additionally, as a part of a higher education institution, it is essential to understand the importance of preparing students for the real world. It is beneficial for Campus Recreation directors to establish a mechanism of support for student employees such as providing resources and training (Pack, Jordan, Turner, & Haines, 2007).

CHAPTER THREE

Introduction

Students who work in a Campus Recreation department may decide to go into the Campus Recreation field after obtaining work experiences and leadership skills. The students need to develop the practical skills and leadership skills as they work under the guidance of the recreation director. The students need guidance in their job search process from the professionals in the field, especially from the ones for which they work. There are several studies that indicate what types of job candidates Campus Recreation directors prefer. There was, however, no study found to show, what type of assistance is provided, how often Campus Recreation directors provide assistance for those future professionals and what importance they place on providing such assistance.

Research Question

The research questions this paper focused on are: 1) what type of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field through Campus Recreation directors' leadership, 2) how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance, 3) what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing those assistances, 4) do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance provided for students, and 5) how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general? The research questions were constructed based on the previous studies, such as ones by Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006), Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006), Ross

(1998), and Ross and Blackman (1998), that investigated what qualifications Campus Recreation directors value among job candidates.

Answering the research questions determined what type of assistance was provided, how frequently assistance was provided and what importance Campus Recreation directors placed on providing assistance. Further, answering the research questions helped examine if there were any characteristics that influenced type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance, and how Campus Recreation directors provided assistance for students in general. The results of the study should help Campus Recreation directors and other professionals to effectively offer assistance to students who are interested in pursuing a career in the Campus Recreation field.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the type, frequency, and perceived importance of assistance that Campus Recreation directors provided for students, including both graduate assistants and student employees, to assist the students in the process of obtaining a position in the field. In order to investigate any characteristics that impact the assistance provided for students, participant demographic information was used as variables. The variables included director demographics, such as gender and educational background; department demographics, such as division and size of the department; and institutional demographics, such as enrollment size and location. The statistical analysis of type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance based on these independent variables was important for the study to identify characteristics that impact how Campus Recreation directors provide assistance for students.

Additionally, this study identified differences in assistance provided between graduate assistants and student employees to explore how differently Campus Recreation directors offer assistance between the graduate assistants and student employees. The study investigated relationships between frequency and perceived importance of assistance to discover whether Campus Recreation directors' efforts to provide assistance paralleled their perceived importance. Finally, differences in assistance based on availability of academic majors was examined to determine if Campus Recreation directors may be willing to provide assistance more for students who work in their department if the students are in a major such as Recreation Management or Athletic Administration, which are related to Campus Recreation.

Sample

The study sample was randomly chosen from Campus Recreation directors registered as contact persons for the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) Institutional Member. Criteria used to select the study sample were that they were 1) registered as contact persons for the NIRSA Institutional Member, in the hope that they were in a director or equivalent position that oversees an entire Campus Recreation department, who typically make financial and departmental decision for the Institutional Membership, and 2) working for a 4-year higher education institution in North America. In the NIRSA database, 572 Campus Recreation directors met the criterion. Three hundred Campus Recreation directors were chosen randomly from the pool.

Among 300 Campus Recreation directors, five of them were in Canada while the rest were in the United States. There were seven e-mail addresses that were undeliverable

and two e-mail addresses indicated out of town for the duration of the study, which made nine e-mail addresses unusable. Out of 291 Campus Recreation directors who were invited to participate in the study, 120 started the online survey by agreeing to the consent form, and 116 completed the online survey.

Instrumentation

This study utilized an online survey with multiple-choice questions and short answers for the questions that required numbers (i.e. years of tenure). The original survey consisted of 39 questions. The researcher picked five Campus Recreation directors who are members of NIRSA to pilot test the survey. The researcher contacted them via e-mail (Appendix A) to request them to complete the online survey and provide feedback using a form (Appendix B). The use of pilot testing was intended to yield any ambiguousness of the survey instructions and questions to be clarified, check the structure of the survey for its ease of navigation, and help to ensure the survey questions will collect the information the researcher needs (Fink, 2006; Gonyea, 2005; Fowler, 2002). A Campus Recreation director from the pilot study suggested encouragement for students to attend professional conferences could be considered as a professional assistance, regardless of financial support for students. Another director indicated majors and degrees available for students would influence the professional assistance, such as providing financial assistance for students to attend conferences, because it would not be beneficial for students to attend recreation-specific conferences if there were no major in the related field. These suggestions were considered before finalizing on the 47 survey questions (Appendix C).

To increase response rate of the survey, multiple contacts were made with the participants (Porter, 2004b; Umbach, 2004). An initial e-mail message (Appendix D) was sent to the participants requesting them to complete an online survey. A follow-up reminder e-mail (Appendix E) was sent to nonrespondents three and seven days after the initial message for an increased response rate (Umbach).

Rationale for Utilization of the Instrument

Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006); Stier, Schneider, Kampf, and Haines (2006); Ross (1998); and Ross and Blackman (1998) used surveys via mail to collect quantitative data in their studies. The topics of their research questions were related to job candidate's qualifications Campus Recreation directors valued through résumé content, interview preferences, and hiring practices.

Quantitative Approach

A quantitative approach was chosen because the researcher wanted to make a generalization from studying a sample within a population. The population for this study was Campus Recreation directors who work for 4-year higher education institutions in North America. Generally, researchers question if what they see in a small group of people would apply to the larger population from which the sample was drawn for a quantitative approach. Through surveys, interviews, and experiments, researchers study a sample, which leads them to findings that "are generalizable using aggregated data" (Stage, 2007, p. 9).

Additionally, the researcher chose a quantitative approach to keep his focus limited on a specific topic: Campus Recreation directors' leadership to provide assistance for students to obtain a position in the field. According to Neuman (2006), researchers

“must narrow [a topic] down to, or focus on, a specific *research question* that can be addressed in the study” (p. 14, emphasis in original). It is important for researchers to ask specific questions about a specific topic. For example, Ross (1998) describes the purpose of his study as “to identify the résumé content preferences of collegiate recreational sports administrators for college graduates applying for entry level professional positions” (p. 17). The purpose of the study conducted by Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006) was “to determine campus recreation directors’ hiring practices related to the hiring of professional employees, graduate assistants, and student employees in campus recreation programs throughout North America” (p. 104).

Survey Method

There were several reasons the researcher selected a survey method. First, the survey method was chosen for its ease, low cost and quickness of getting information directly from participants (Fink, 2006; Gonyea, 2005; Fowler, 2002). With the use of a survey method, the researcher could ensure uniformity in data collection methods and procedures, which is important in a quantitative approach. Creswell (2003) speaks of using surveys and experiments with the same questions to keep procedures consistent from a participant to participant. Researchers “[generalize] or [make] claims about the population” (Creswell, p. 153) using data collected from a sample. A quantitative data may be used to make a comparison as well. Thus, collecting data with consistency is crucial.

Second, the researcher was interested in collecting quantitative data to make a generalization of a population. Information is collected from a fraction of the population, rather than every member of the population (Fowler, 2002). Fowler states, “The purpose

of the survey is to produce statistics, that is, quantitative or numerical descriptions about some aspects of the study population” (p. 1).

Finally, the survey method was chosen to collect self-reported information directly from people, instead of using other sources (Gonyea, 2005), about their behavior and values. According to Fink (2006), “Surveys are used to collect information from or about people to describe, compare, or explain their knowledge, feelings, values, and behavior” (p.1). It would be challenging to determine the director’s perceived importance of providing assistance for students through observation or experiments.

Self-Administered Survey

A form of self-administered survey, instead of using interviewers, was selected for several reasons. First, a self-administered survey was used for its ease and low cost (Fowler, 2002). Second, with a self-administered survey, the participants did not need to share the information with the interviewer, which may have decreased social desirability effect, along with a statement about confidentiality of the study and the non-sensitive nature of the questions (Fowler; Gonyea, 2005). With a self-administered survey, the participants would be more likely to answer questions honestly if they do not feel the need to impress the interviewer or feel worried about how the information they provide would be used. Third, to study a population located across the North America with a limited budget, the self-administered survey was the most practical form to obtain quantitative information from the participants (Gonyea).

Survey Content

The questions on the survey for this study were mostly closed questions with multiple choices, which are easier to score than open-ended, short answers, or essay

questions (Fink, 2006; Fowler 2002). In addition, the questions were close to the study participants' experience and constructed to ask for information the participants would know or could easily find out (Fink). Further, the survey was pilot tested to ensure clarity of the questions so the participants understood them easily and interpreted them in the same way while completing the survey without any in-person assistance (Fink; Gonyea, 2005). The survey was kept short to keep participants motivated enough to finish it and to increase the response rate (Umbach, 2004; Porter, 2004a; Porter, 2004b).

Online Survey

The researcher chose the online administration of the survey for a few reasons. Online surveys have advantages of low cost, high speed returns, simple and quick data entry, fewer data entry errors and design flexibility (Fowler, 2002; Porter, 2004a; Porter, 2004b; Umbach, 2004). Use of the online survey cost the researcher a relatively low monthly fee for a few months for the duration of the study. The data collection was completed in three weeks after the pilot testing. The Campus Recreation directors who pilot tested the survey reported it took less than ten minutes to complete the survey.

The disadvantages of online surveys include the requirements of keeping correct and frequently used e-mail addresses, limiting samples to Internet users, and inconsistent viewing capabilities of various browsers (Fowler, 2002; Porter, 2004a; Porter, 2004b; Umbach). Among 300 e-mail addresses used to contact Campus Recreation directors, only seven were unusable. Additionally, it was less likely for Campus Recreation directors who work for a 4-year higher education institution not to have an access to the Internet and a computer. Even in circumstances to prevent them from accessing the online survey, such as power failure, server malfunctions, and computer hardware

problems, Campus Recreation directors would have resources such as on-campus Informational Technology staff and access to other computers to fix those issues. Thus, it seemed the advantage of using the online survey outweighed the disadvantages.

Response Rate

Response rate is an important issue to consider with a survey. According to Porter (2004b), there is no definitive conclusion as to whether paper or online surveys produce a better response rate. He states the results are mixed from numerous studies that compared response rates between paper and online surveys (Porter).

High response rates are important to make study results significant. Porter (2004b) states, “[response] rates have been falling not only because it has become more difficult to contact people, but also because refusals to participate are also increasing” (p. 5). Several strategies to increase response rates were incorporated in this study. First, multiple reminders were sent to nonrespondents to increase the response rate (Fink; Porter; Umbach, 2004). Second, the initial e-mail message (Appendix D) and follow-up e-mail reminder (Appendix E) had a sentence assuring the confidentiality for the study, which was included to encourage participants to complete the survey (Fink). Third, the survey for the study contained only 47 questions and was kept short to encourage increased response rates (Porter, 2004a; Porter, 2004b, Umbach). Fourth, all the correspondences (Appendix D and E) included a sentence asking for participant’s help for the researcher’s dissertation. Porter (2004b) states, “People may respond positively to a request not because of reciprocal behavior but because the person has simply requested their assistance” (p.8).

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are important safeguards for a study's credibility. Gonyea (2005) states, "Validity and reliability are important indicators of the quality of survey information" (p. 77). Reliability refers to consistency of information you obtain from a survey and validity refers to accuracy of information (Fink, 2006). Further, social desirability effect was hopefully decreased in this study because the survey was self-administered and the researcher informed participants regarding confidentiality (Fowler, 2002).

There were several steps taken to ensure reliability and validity in this study. First, the survey provided multiple-choice answers for the survey questions. With multiple-choice questions, all participants had uniform options for their responses. Further, each question was written clearly and kept short to ask for specific information, and to be interpreted in the same way for all participants (Fowler, 2002).

Second, a pilot test for the survey questions was conducted by five Campus Recreation directors that the researcher chose, as Fink (2006) suggests. A sample e-mail message for participants in the pilot test and the pilot test feedback form were included in Appendix A and B. The participants for the pilot testing included some from private higher education institutions and some from public institutions. The researcher considered the diversity of their departments' reporting structures. The researcher asked the pilot testing participants to examine each question's relevance and appropriate wording, and to offer any suggestions to improve the survey questions as well as the instructions. By pilot testing the survey, the researcher hoped his personal bias was

eliminated from wording and questions on the survey, and the questions were understood easily and meant the same thing to all participants (Fowler, 2002).

Third, coefficient alpha or Cronbach's alpha was computed to check internal consistency (Fink, 2006) and test reliability (Ross & Beggs, 2007). Coefficient alpha or Cronbach's alpha describes "how well different items complement each other in their measurement of the same quality or dimension" (Fink, pp. 38-39). Further, informing participants regarding confidentiality for the study hopefully encouraged research participants to answer the questions honestly, which in turn contributed to internal consistency.

Method of Presenting and Processing Data

After the online survey was completed, the data was entered into PASW Statistics 17 (formerly SPSS Statistics) program from SPSS Inc. to run statistical analysis. To begin the analysis, the choices for the frequency questions were converted to scores (4 = every month or more frequent, 3 = every semester/quarter, 2 = every year, 1 = every other year or less frequent, 0 = never). The choices for the importance questions were also converted to scores (4 = essential, 3 = very important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important, 0 = of no value). Additionally, means of frequency for graduate assistants, frequency for student employees, perceived importance for graduate assistants, and perceived importance for student employees were calculated.

First, the researcher generated information about the demographics of the participants, including director, department and institution demographics. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the frequency and perceived importance of each assistance for students. Further, the percentage and number of responses in each group of

answers were computed. Coefficient alpha or Cronbach's alpha was computed to check internal consistency (Fink, 2006) and test reliability (Ross & Beggs, 2007). For all the computations, the researcher set the significance level at 0.05.

Secondly, utilizing *t*-test, ANOVA, and correlation statistical procedures, the researcher examined if there was any difference in frequency and perceived importance of assistance provided for students based on variables. The variables included director demographics, such as gender and educational background; department demographics, such as division and size of the department; and institutional demographics, such as enrollment size and location.

Thirdly, the researcher compared the means with *t*-test for each assistance item between graduate assistants and student employees. The result from this analysis identified if the participants offer assistance with different frequency between graduate assistants and student employees. The result also identified whether the participants perceived importance of assistance differently between graduate assistants and student employees.

Fourth, the researcher computed the correlation coefficient to examine if there was any correlation between the perceived importance and frequency for each assistance item. The results of this analysis showed whether the participants put their perceived importance for assistance into an action and actually provided the assistance for students.

Fifth, the researcher compared the mean for each assistance item based on availability of academic majors for both graduate and undergraduate degrees. The result of this analysis demonstrated whether the availability of a specific academic major influenced frequency and perceived importance of assistance provided for students.

Summary

This chapter outlined the methodology the researcher utilized and the process the researcher followed. The sample was chosen randomly from the NIRSA's list of contact persons for the Institutional Membership and an online survey with 47 questions was used to collect data. The method of survey was chosen for its ease, cost and quickness of obtaining information directly from participants (Fink, 2006; Gonyea, 2005; Fowler, 2002). The researcher incorporated several safeguards for the study's reliability and validity to make the results from the study significant. With the methodology and the process described in this chapter, the researcher attempted to answer the research questions to investigate the type and frequency of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide, their perceived importance of assistance for students to obtain a position in Campus Recreation, any difference in frequency and perceived importance based on the participants' demographic variables, and how the participants provide assistance for students in general.

CHAPTER FOUR

Introduction

The need to hire qualified individuals for positions in Campus Recreation is increasing as the value of Campus Recreation in higher education institutions has been recognized. There was no previous study to indicate what types of assistance is provided for graduate assistants and student employees in Campus Recreation, how often Campus Recreation directors provide assistance for those future professionals, and what importance they place on providing such assistance. In this chapter, the study participants' demographic data is presented, and statistical information is described. Data collected from the survey is analyzed in order to answer the research questions.

Presentation and Description of Data

Study Overview

During this study, the online survey was utilized to collect data. A pilot study was conducted with five Campus Recreation directors in the field to ensure the validity of the survey questions. The survey questions and structure were modified according to the feedback from the pilot study. Once the survey was online and ready, an e-mail message was sent to 300 randomly selected Campus Recreation directors. Reminder e-mail messages were sent three and seven days later. The researcher did not have access to who received the invitation to participate in the study, and who actually completed the survey as a staff at the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)'s office made all the correspondences for the study.

Response Rate

The study participants were randomly chosen from Campus Recreation directors registered in the NIRSA database as contact persons for Institutional Member, working for a 4-year higher education institutions in North America. In the database, 572 Campus Recreation directors were registered as contact persons for the Institutional Membership. Three hundred Campus Recreation directors were selected randomly from the pool and received the invitation to participate in the study.

Among 300 Campus Recreation directors, five of them were in Canada while the rest were in the United States. There were seven e-mail addresses that could not be delivered and two e-mail addresses indicated out of town for the duration of the study, which made nine e-mail addresses unusable. Out of 291 Campus Recreation directors who were invited to participate in the study, 116 completed the online survey. Thus, the return rate of this study was 39.9 percent.

Participant Demographics

There were 116 participants who completed the survey. Regarding the availability of graduate assistants and student employees, 60 (51.7%) participants reported they have graduate assistants in their department. On the other hand, 116 (100%) participants reported they have student employees, which exclude graduate assistants, in their department. Among the participants who provided the information, 78 (67.8%) were male, and 37 (32.2%) were female. As shown in Table 1, seven (6.0%) participants have Bachelor's degrees as their highest education level, 92 (79.3%) Master's degrees and 11 (9.5%) Doctorate degrees. Six participants indicated other, such as having Education

Specialist certificates or having taken some doctorate courses. Table 2 shows the participant's area of study for their highest degree.

Table 1

Participants' Education Level

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's	7	6.0%
Master's	92	79.3%
Doctorate	11	9.5%
Other	6	5.2%

Table 2

Participants' Area of Study

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Recreation Management/Leisure Studies	31	27.2%
Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Education Leadership	28	24.6%
Athletic Administration/Sport Management	18	15.8%
Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness	10	8.8%
Business/Human Resources	7	6.1%
Public Administration	1	0.9%
Other	19	16.7%

Among 114 who provided the answer regarding their area of study, Recreation Management/Leisure Studies with 31 (27.2%) participants and Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership with 28 (24.6%) participants were the most popular areas of study. The mean years of tenure among the participants was 20.18 (n = 115) years and the standard deviation was 20.18, ranging from one year to 41 years.

In terms of their Campus Recreation department, most of the participants (83 participants, 72.2%, n = 115) were in the division of Student Affairs/Services. Athletics (14 participants, 12.2%) and Business Administration/Auxiliary (7 participants, 6%) followed. Table 3 shows the details. The mean number of professional staff in the participants' department was 10.99 (n = 116) and standard deviation was 12.88, ranging from one to 100. The mean number of graduate assistants in the participants' department

Table 3

Division for which Participant's Campus Recreation Department Operates

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Student Affairs/Services	83	72.2%
Athletics	14	12.2%
Business Administration/Auxiliary	7	6.1%
Academics	2	1.7%
Associated Student Body	2	1.7%
Other	7	6.1%

was 2.58 (n = 116) and standard deviation was 3.87, ranging from zero to 20. The mean number of student employees in the participants' department was 161.59 (n = 116) and standard deviation was 148.74, ranging from three to 900.

In terms of the participant's institutions, 37 (31.9%) indicated their institution size is between 10,000 and 19,999; 21 (18.1%) indicated between 5,000 and 9,999; and 20 (17.2%) indicated between 20,000 and 29,999, as shown in Table 4 (n = 116). Only four (3.4%) indicated 40,000 and above, and two (1.7%) indicated below 999. In regard to the participant's locations, NIRSA's Region II got the most participation (30 participants, 25.9%), and Region V got the least (11 participants, 9.5%) shown in Table 5. 85 (73.9%) participant's institutions were public while 30 (26.1%) were private (n = 115).

Table 4

Participants' Enrollment Size

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Below 999	2	1.7%
1,000-2,999	9	7.8%
3,000-4,999	12	10.3%
5,000-9,999	21	18.1%
10,000-19,999	37	31.9%
20,000-29,999	20	17.2%
30,000-39,999	11	9.5%
40,000 and above	4	3.4%

Table 5

Participants' Region

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Region I (Northeast)	20	17.2%
Region II (Southeast)	30	25.9%
Region III (Midwest)	16	13.8%
Region IV (Central South)	21	18.1%
Region V (Central North)	11	9.5%
Region VI (West)	18	15.5%

Research Questions

The research questions were constructed based on the previous studies, such as ones by Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006), Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006), Ross (1998), and Ross and Blackman (1998), that investigated what qualifications Campus Recreation directors value among job candidates. The research questions this paper focused on are: 1) what type of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field through Campus Recreation directors' leadership, 2) how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance, 3) what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing those assistances, 4) do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance provided for students, and 5) how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general?

Analysis of Data

To begin statistical analysis, the choices for the frequency questions were converted to scores (4 = every month or more frequent, 3 = every semester/quarter, 2 = every year, 1 = every other year or less frequent, 0 = never). The choices for the importance questions were also converted to scores (4 = essential, 3 = very important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important, 0 = of no value).

Type

Table 6 shows a ranking of assistance for graduate assistants based on each variable's mean. Among 60 participants who indicated they have graduate assistants in their department, "career counseling," such as providing suggestions on what experiences, certifications, qualifications the students need to obtain, ranked the highest ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.069$) and "résumé workshop/class" initiated by the department ranked the lowest ($M = 1.37$, $SD = 1.426$). As shown in Table 7, the highest ranked assistance for student

Table 6

Mean Frequency Ranking for Graduate Assistant

Rank	Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Career counseling	3.10	1.069
2	Résumé advice	2.67	1.084
3	Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences	2.60	0.764
4	Teaching about job search process	2.40	1.153

Table 6 continued

Mean Frequency Ranking for Graduate Assistant

Rank	Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
5	Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences	2.03	0.843
6	Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference	1.68	0813
7	Mock interview	1.55	1.227
8	Résumé workshop/class	1.37	1.426

Table 7

Mean Frequency Ranking for Student Employees

Rank	Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Résumé advice	2.70	0.916
2	Career counseling	2.64	0.806
3	Teaching about job search process	2.36	0.927
4	Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences	2.17	0.851
5	Mock interview	1.83	1.110
6	Résumé workshop/class	1.78	1.141
7	Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences	1.77	0.873
8	Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference	1.54	0.874

employees was “résumé advice” ($M = 2.70, SD = 0.916$) while the lowest was “taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference” ($M = 1.54, SD = 0.874$) which is offering partial or full financial assistance, including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, and a form of room share or car pooling.

Frequency

On the study survey, the participants were asked to identify how frequently they offer assistance for graduate assistants and student employees. The number of cases, means and standard error of means for each assistance item are summarized in table F1 in the appendix F. Their options for the frequency included “every month or more frequent,” “every semester/quarter,” “every year,” “very other year or less frequent,” and “never.” Table 8 shows the frequency of offering career counseling. “Every semester”

Table 8

Frequency for Career Counseling

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	24	40.0%	12	10.3%
Every semester/quarter	27	45.0%	59	10.9%
Every year	4	6.7%	39	33.6%
Every other year or less frequently	1	1.7%	3	2.6%
Never	4	6.7%	3	2.6%

has the highest percentage (45.0%) for graduate assistants, and “every year” has the highest percentage (33.6%) for student employees.

Table 9

Frequency for Résumé Workshop/Class

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	3	5.0%	3	2.6%
Every semester/quarter	15	25.0%	31	26.7%
Every year	12	20.0%	45	38.8%
Every other year or less frequently	1	1.7%	12	10.3%
Never	29	48.3%	25	21.6%

Table 9 indicates the frequency of résumé workshop/class offered for graduate assistants and student employees. Résumé workshop/class was defined as a class initiated by the department. Approximately half of the respondents (48.3%) who have graduate assistants in their department reported “never” for graduate assistants. Close to 39 percent of the respondents reported “every year” for student employees. “Never” for graduate assistants and “every year” for student employees received the highest percentages of responses.

For résumé advice, the majority of the respondents answered “every year” or higher frequency for both graduate assistants (90%) and student employees (93.2%) as

Table 10

Frequency for Résumé Advice

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	14	23.3%	20	17.2%
Every semester/quarter	22	36.7%	53	45.7%
Every year	18	30.0%	35	30.2%
Every other year or less frequently	2	3.3%	4	3.4%
Never	4	6.7%	4	3.4%

Table 11

Frequency for Mock Interview

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 115)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	2	3.3%	4	3.5%
Every semester/quarter	13	21.7%	29	25.2%
Every year	19	31.7%	46	40.0%
Every other year or less frequently	8	13.3%	15	13.0%
Never	18	30.0%	21	18.3%

shown in Table 10. The participants reported higher frequency percentage for graduate assistants (23.3%) than for student employees (17.2%) for the “every month or more frequently” option.

Table 11 indicates the frequency of mock interview provided for graduate assistants and student employees. “Every year” received the highest percentage for both graduate assistants (31.7%) and student employees (40.0%). The second highest for graduate assistants was “never” (30.0%) while for student employee was “every semester/quarter.”

Table 12

Frequency for Taking/Sending to State and/or Regional Conferences

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 114)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	1	1.7%	1	0.9%
Every semester/quarter	15	25.0%	17	14.9%
Every year	33	55.0%	64	56.1%
Every other year or less frequently	7	11.7%	19	16.7%
Never	4	6.7%	13	11.4%

The frequency of assistance to take or send students to state and/or regional conferences is shown in Table 12. For both graduate assistants (55.0%) and student employees (56.1%), more than half of the respondent indicated “every year” as their

frequency. The second highest percentage for graduate assistant was “every semester/quarter” (25.0%) and “every other year or less frequently” was the second highest for student employees (16.7%).

Table 13

Frequency for Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 114)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	1	1.7%	2	1.8%
Every semester/quarter	2	3.3%	6	5.3%
Every year	42	70.0%	61	53.5%
Every other year or less frequently	7	11.7%	28	24.6%
Never	8	13.3%	17	14.9%

Table 13 demonstrates the frequency of assistance to take or send students to the NIRSA Annual Conference. Approximately 80% of the responses were “every year” and “every other year or less frequently” for both graduate assistants and student employees. The highest percentage for graduate assistants was 70.0 percent for “every year” while 53.5 percent for student employees in the same response.

The frequency of assistance to encourage students to attend state, regional, or national conferences is shown in Table 14. The highest percentage of responses was “every year” for both graduate assistants (46.7%) and student employees (59.1%).

Although the second highest percentage for both graduate assistants and student employees was “every semester/quarter,” the percentage of graduate assistants (40.0%) was higher than that of student employees (22.6%).

Table 14

Frequency for Encouraging to Attend State, Regional, or National Conferences

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 115)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	7	11.7%	7	6.1%
Every semester/quarter	24	40.0%	26	22.6%
Every year	28	46.7%	68	59.1%
Every other year or less frequently			8	7.0%
Never	1	1.7%	6	5.2%

Table 15 shows the frequency of assistance to teach students about a job search process, which may include interview attire and preparedness for interviews. The majority of the respondents for both graduate assistants (83.3%) and student employees (88.0%) indicated they teach students about a job search process every year or more frequently.

Table 15

Frequency for Teaching about a Job Search Process

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Every month or more frequently	10	16.7%	8	6.9%
Every semester/quarter	20	33.3%	47	40.5%
Every year	20	33.3%	47	40.5%
Every other year or less frequently	4	6.7%	7	6.0%
Never	6	10.0%	7	6.0%

Perceived Importance

On the survey, the participants were asked to rate the importance for assistance provided for graduate assistants and student employees. The number of cases, means and standard error of means for each assistance item is summarized in table F2 in the appendix F. Approximately half of the respondents for both graduate assistants (48.3%) and student employees (49.1%) perceived career counseling as “very important,” as shown in Table 16. The second popular response was “essential” for both graduate assistants (45.0%) and student employees (31.9%). There were no responses for “not important” and “of no value” for both graduate assistants and student employees.

Table 16

Perceived Importance for Career Counseling

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	27	45.0%	37	31.9%
Very important	29	48.3%	57	49.1%
Somewhat important	4	6.7%	22	19.0%

Table 17

Perceived Importance for Résumé Workshop/Class

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	15	25.0%	19	16.4%
Very important	15	25.0%	45	38.8%
Somewhat important	23	38.3%	41	35.3%
Not important	6	10.0%	9	7.8%
Of no value	1	1.7%	2	1.7%

Table 17 indicates the perceived importance of a résumé workshop/class for graduate assistants and student employees. For graduate assistants, 38.3 percent of the

respondents who have graduate assistants in their department reported “somewhat important”. For student employees, 38.8 percent of the respondents reported “very important.” “Somewhat important” for graduate assistants and “very important” for student employees received the highest percentages of responses.

The perceived importance of résumé advice is listed in Table 18. The “very important” response was the most popular for both graduate assistants (46.7%) and student employees (60.3%). The second highest percentage for graduate assistants in “essential” (40.0%) was higher than that for student employees (26.7%) in the same response. There were no responses for “not important” or “of no value” for both graduate assistants and student employees.

Table 18

Perceived Importance for Résumé Advice

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	24	40.0%	31	26.7%
Very important	28	46.7%	70	60.3%
Somewhat important	8	10.0%	15	12.9%

Table 19

Perceived Importance for Mock interview

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 115)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	11	18.3%	18	15.7%
Very important	25	41.7%	43	37.4%
Somewhat important	18	30.0%	47	40.9%
Not important	6	10.0%	6	5.2%
Of no value			1	0.9%

Table 20

Perceived Importance for Taking/Sending to State and/or Regional Conferences

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 112)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	11	18.3%	10	8.9%
Very important	35	58.3%	60	53.6%
Somewhat important	13	21.7%	39	34.8%
Not important	1	1.7%	2	1.8%
Of no value			1	0.9%

Regarding mock interviews, the highest percentage for graduate assistance was with the “very important” response (41.7%) while it was with the “somewhat important” response for student employees (40.9%) as shown in Table 19. No respondent reported “of no value” for graduate assistants and only one respondent (0.9%) reported “of no value” for student employees.

Table 20 indicates the perceived importance of assistance to take or send students to state and/or regional conferences. The majority of respondents reported “somewhat important” or more importance for both graduate assistants and student employees. Very small percentages of the respondents thought taking or sending students to state and/or regional conferences as “not important” or “of no value.”

Table 21

Perceived Importance for Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 59)		Student Employees (n = 114)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	14	23.7%	14	12.3%
Very important	31	52.5%	57	50.0%
Somewhat important	14	23.7%	38	33.3%
Not important			4	3.5%
Of no value			1	0.9%

The perceived importance of assistance to take or send students to the NIRSA Annual Conference is shown in Table 21. For both graduate assistants (52.5%) and student employees (50.0%), the “very important” response received the highest percentage. The second highest percentage for graduate assistants was both “essential” and “somewhat important (23.7%), while “somewhat important” was the second highest response (33.3%) for student employees. There were no “not important” or “of no value” responses for graduate assistants.

Table 22

Perceived Importance for Encouraging to Attend State, Regional, or National Conferences

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 115)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	21	35.0%	27	23.5%
Very important	31	51.7%	58	50.4%
Somewhat important	8	13.3%	28	24.3%
Not important			1	0.9%
Of no value			1	0.9%

Table 22 demonstrates the perceived importance of assistance to encourage students to attend conferences. Almost all participants indicated encouraging students to attend conferences as at least “somewhat important” for both graduate assistants and

student employees. The half of the responses for both graduate assistants (51.7%) and student employees (50.4%) was “very important.” The second highest percentage of the responses was “essential” for both graduate assistants (35.0%) and student employees (23.5%).

Table 23

Perceived Importance for Teaching about a Job Search Process

Option	Graduate Assistants (n = 60)		Student Employees (n = 116)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Essential	27	45.0%	37	31.9%
Very important	23	38.3%	60	51.7%
Somewhat important	10	16.7%	18	15.5%
Of no value			1	0.9%

In terms of teaching students about a job search process, the highest percentage of responses was “very important” for both graduate assistants (38.3%) and student employees (51.7%). The order of ranking based on the percentage was the same for both graduate assistants and student employees. The second highest was “essential” (45%, 31.9% respectively) and the third “somewhat important” (16.7%, 15.5% respectively).

Differences in Frequency and Perceived Importance Based on Participant Demographics

To analyze differences in frequency and in perceived importance based on the participant demographics, the following items were calculated: mean frequency for

graduate students, mean frequency for undergraduate students, mean perceived importance for graduate students, and mean perceived importance for student employees. Participant demographics were also divided into three categories: director demographics, department demographics, and institution demographics. The director demographics included gender, highest education level, area of study, and years of tenure. The department demographics included division, number of professionals, number of graduate assistants, and number of student employees. The institution demographics included enrollment size, region, and public/private information.

Differences in frequency based on director demographics. An independent *t*-test was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on gender. There was no significant difference based on gender. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on the participants' highest educational level. There was no significant difference in frequency for graduate assistants based on the participants' highest educational level. However, there was a significant difference in frequency for student employees, $F(3, 112) = 2.884, p < .05$. Because sample sizes were very different among variables, Hochberg's GT2 *post hoc* procedure was used to determine among which variables the difference lie (Field, 2005). The Hochberg's GT2 indicated there was a significant mean difference between "Bachelor's" ($M = 1.55, SE = 0.35$) and "Other" ($M = 2.48, SE = 0.33$) at the significant level, $p < .05$. A one-way ANOVA was also used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on the participants' area of study. There was no difference in frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the participants' area of study. To analyze the relationship between the participants' years of

tenure in Campus Recreation and frequency, the Spearman's correlation coefficient was used as the data for frequency was ordinal, not interval (Field, 2005). Additionally, the assumption of normal distribution of data was violated, which was another reason for the researcher to use the Spearman's correlation coefficient, instead of the Pearson's correlation coefficient. For both graduate assistants and student employees, there was no significant relationship between years of tenure and frequency.

Differences in frequency based on department demographics. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on a division to which a Campus Recreation department reports. There was no significant difference in frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the division. From calculating the Spearman's correlation coefficient, there was a significant relationship between frequency and number of professional staff in the participants' department. Frequency for graduate assistants was significantly correlated with number of professional staff ($r = .262, p < .05$). Frequency for student employees was also significantly correlated with number of professional staff ($r = .184, p < .05$). Further, there was a significant relationship between frequency for graduate assistants and number of graduate assistants ($r = .488, p < .01$). However, there was no significant relationship between frequency for student employees and number of graduate assistants. There was no significant relationship between frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees and number of student employees.

Differences in frequency based on institution demographics. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on the institution's student enrollment. There was a significant difference in frequency for

graduate assistants, $F(6, 53) = 2.349, p < .05$. However, Hochberg's GT2 *post hoc* procedure was not available due to a group in variables having only one case. There was a significant difference in frequency for student employees based on the enrollment size, $F(7, 108) = 2.709, p < .05$. According to Hochberg's GT2 *post hoc* procedure, there was a significant mean difference between the participants' institutions with the student enrollment between 10,000 and 19,999 ($M = 2.29, SE = 0.106$) and ones with the student enrollment between 20,000 and 29,999 ($M = 2.41, SE = 0.126$) at the significant level, $p < .05$. Additionally, Hochberg's GT2 test indicated the participant's institutions with the student enrollment between 10,000 and 19,999 ($M = 2.29, SE = 0.106$) was significantly different from ones with the student enrollment between 30,000 and 39,999 ($M = 1.58, SE = 0.201$). A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on locations using the NIRSA regions. There was no significant difference in frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the region. An independent *t*-test was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in frequency based on the public/private status of the participants' institutions. There was no significant difference between public and private institutions.

Differences in perceived importance based on director demographics. An independent *t*-test was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on gender. There was no significant difference in perceived importance for both graduate assistants and student employees based on gender. The Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between years of tenure and perceived importance. There was no significant relationship between years of tenure and perceived importance for graduate assistants. However, there was a significant

relationship between perceived importance for student employees and years of tenure ($r = -.211, p < .05$). A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on the participants' highest educational level. There was no significant difference in perceived importance for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the highest educational level. A one-way ANOVA was also used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on the participants' area of study. There was no significant difference in frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees based on their area of study.

Differences in perceived importance based on department demographics. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on a division to which a Campus Recreation department report. There was no significant difference in perceived importance for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the division. From calculating the Spearman's correlation coefficient, there was no significant relationship between perceived importance and number of professional staff, between perceived importance and number of graduate assistants, and between perceived importance and number of student employees, for both graduate assistants and student employees.

Differences in perceived importance based on Institution demographics. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on a student enrollment size of the participants' institutions. There was no significant difference in perceived importance for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the student enrollment. A one-way ANOVA was also used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on locations

using the NIRSA regions. There was no significant difference in perceived importance for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the region. An independent *t*-test was used to analyze if there was any significant difference in perceived importance based on whether the participants work at a public institution or private one. There was no significant difference between public and private institutions.

Differences in Frequency between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees

A paired *t*-test was utilized to make comparisons between graduate assistants and student employees for frequency among the participants who have both graduate assistants and student employees in their department. The participants offered career counseling more frequently to graduate assistants ($M = 3.10, SE = 0.138$) than to student employees ($M = 2.55, SE = 0.117, t(59) = 4.064, p < .01, r = 0.47$). For résumé workshop, the participants offered less frequently ($t(59) = -2.067, p < .05, r = 0.26$) to graduate assistants ($M = 1.37, SE = 0.184$) than to student employees ($M = 1.67, SE = 0.168$). There was no significant difference between graduate assistants ($M = 2.67, SE = 0.14$) and student employees ($M = 2.63, SE = 0.132$) for résumé advice ($t(59) = 0.293, p > .05$). Mock interview was offered not differently ($t(58) = -1.182, p > .05$) between graduate assistants ($M = 1.54, SE = 0.161$) and student employees ($M = 1.71, SE = 0.16$). There was a significant difference ($t(57) = 2.214, p < .05, r = 0.28$) between graduate assistants ($M = 2.02, SE = 0.111$) and student employees ($M = 1.76, SE = 0.133$) for taking/sending them to state and/or regional conferences. There was no significant difference between graduate assistants ($M = 1.66, SE = 0.106$) and student employees ($M = 1.48, SE = 0.133$) for taking/sending them to the NIRSA Annual Conference ($t(57) = 1.237, p > .05$). Encouraging students to attend conferences was offered more frequently to graduate

students ($M = 2.59, SE = 0.1$) than to student employees ($M = 2.27, SE = 0.116, t(58) = 2.877, p < .01, r = 0.35$). There was no significant difference between graduate assistants ($M = 2.40, SE = 0.149$) and student employees ($M = 2.35, SE = 0.138$) for teaching about a job search process ($t(59) = 0.364, p > .05$). Comparing overall average frequency, there was no significant difference ($t(59) = 0.765, p > .05$) between graduate students ($M = 2.18, SE = 0.952$) and student employees ($M = 2.12, SE = 0.97$).

Differences in Perceived Importance between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees

The researcher utilized paired t -tests to make comparisons between graduate assistants and student employees for perceived importance among the participants who have both graduate assistants and student employees in their department. The participant placed more importance on career counseling ($t(59) = 3.752, p < .01, r = 0.44$) for graduate assistants ($M = 3.38, SE = 0.079$) than for student employees ($M = 3.10, SE = 0.097$). For résumé workshop, there was no significant difference ($t(59) = 0.34, p > .05$) between graduate assistants ($M = 2.62, SE = 0.133$) and student employees ($M = 2.58, SE = 0.129$). Résumé advice did not have a significant difference ($t(59) = 1.351, p > .05$) between graduate assistants ($M = 3.27, SE = 0.089$) and student employees ($M = 3.17, SE = 0.083$). There was no significant difference for mock interview ($t(58) = 1.836, p > .05$) between graduate assistants ($M = 2.68, SE = 0.117$) and student employees ($M = 2.53, SE = 0.117$). The participants placed more importance on graduate assistants ($M = 2.95, SE = 0.09$) than on student employees ($M = 2.62, SE = 0.098$) for taking/sending them to state and/or regional conferences ($t(57) = 3.640, p < .01, r = 0.47$). Taking/sending students to the NIRSA Annual Conference had more importance placed on graduate assistants ($M =$

3.00, $SE = 0.094$) than on student employees ($M = 2.54$, $SE = 0.103$, $t(56) = 4.546$, $p < .01$, $r = 0.55$). For encouraging students to attend conferences, more importance ($t(59) = 3.543$, $p < .01$, $r = 0.42$) was placed on graduate assistants ($M = 3.22$, $SE = 0.086$) than on student employees ($M = 2.88$, $SE = 0.107$). The participants placed more importance on graduate assistants ($M = 3.28$, $SE = 0.095$) than on student employees ($M = 3.03$, $SE = 0.104$) for teaching about a job search process ($t(59) = 2.505$, $p < .05$, $r = 0.31$). Comparing overall average perceived importance, there was significant difference ($t(59) = 4.197$, $p < .01$, $r = 0.48$) between graduate students ($M = 3.05$, $SE = 0.63$) and student employees ($M = 2.8$, $SE = 0.77$), placing more importance on providing assistance for graduate assistants.

Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance for Graduate Assistants

The Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to analyze relationships between frequency and perceived importance for graduate assistants. There was a significant relationship between frequency and perceived importance ($r = .391$, $p < .01$) for career counseling. Frequency of résumé workshop was significantly correlated with perceived importance of résumé workshop ($r = .634$, $p < .01$). Frequency of résumé advice was significantly correlated with perceived importance of résumé advice ($r = .401$, $p < .01$). There was a significant correlation between frequency and perceived importance for mock interview ($r = .648$, $p < .01$). Frequency to take/send graduate assistants to state and/or regional conferences was significantly correlated to perceived importance of the assistance ($r = .443$, $p < .01$). Frequency to take/send graduate assistants to the NIRSA Annual Conference was not significantly correlated to perceived importance. There was no significant relationship between frequency and perceived importance for encouraging

graduate assistants to attend conferences. Frequency of teaching graduate assistants about a job search process was significantly correlated to perceived importance of the assistance ($r = .38, p < .01$). On overall average, frequency of assistance provided for graduate assistants was significantly correlated with perceived importance ($r = .58, p < .01$).

Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance for Student Employees

The Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to analyze relationships between frequency and perceived importance of assistance for student employees. For student employees, there was a significant relationship between frequency and perceived importance of career counseling ($r = .467, p < .01$), résumé workshop ($r = .641, p < .01$), résumé advice ($r = .461, p < .01$), mock interview ($r = .585, p < .01$), taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences ($r = .455, p < .01$), taking/sending to the NIRSA Annual Conference ($r = .571, p < .01$), encouraging to attend conferences ($r = .44, p < .01$), and teaching about a job search process ($r = .565, p < .01$). On overall average, frequency of assistance provided for student employees was significantly correlated with perceived importance ($r = .625, p < .01$).

Availability of Academic Majors and Assistance

Availability of academic majors. Table 24 illustrates the percentages of participants indicating availability of academic majors at their institutions for both graduate and undergraduate degrees. The researcher was interested in this information because Campus Recreation vastly utilizes students for their operations alongside professional staff, and frequency and perceived importance of assistance for students may be affected by the availability of academic majors. Among the participants who have

graduate assistants in their department, 53.3 percent offer a major in Recreation Management/Leisure Studies, 73.3 percent in Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership, 58.3 percent in Athletic Administration/Sport Management, 75 percent in Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness, 56.7 percent in Public Administration, and 58.3 percent in Business/Human Resources for graduate degree in their institutions. 1.7 percent of the participants reported they do not have any of those majors. Among the participants who have student employees in their department, 42.2 percent offer a major in Recreation Management/Leisure Studies, 35.3 percent in Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership, 54.3 percent in

Table 24

Availability of Academic Majors

Option	Graduate (n = 60)	Undergraduate (n = 116)
Recreation Management/ Leisure Studies	53.3%	42.2%
Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership	73.3%	35.3%
Athletic Administration/Sport Management	58.3%	54.3%
Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness	75.0%	83.6%
Public Administration	56.7%	47.4%
Business/Human Resources	58.3%	75.0%
None of the above	1.7%	5.2%

Athletic Administration/Sport Management, 83.6 percent in Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness, 47.4 percent in Public Administration, and 75 percent in Business/Human Resources for undergraduate degree in their institutions. 5.2 percent of the participants reported they do not have any of those undergraduate majors.

Differences in frequency and perceived importance based on availability of academic majors for graduate degree. An independent *t*-test was utilized to investigate whether there was any difference in frequency and perceived importance between the participants who offer a specific major and those who do not. Table 25 summarizes which major had significant difference on frequency and perceived importance for graduate degree. There was a significant difference in frequency ($t(58) = 3.562, p < .01, r = 0.42$) between the participants who offer a major in Recreation Management/Leisure Studies ($M = 2.46, SE = 0.117$) and those who do not ($M = 1.84, SE = 0.13$). With the same major, there was a significant difference in perceived importance ($t(58) = 3.436, p < .01, r = 0.41$) between the participants who offer the major ($M = 3.24, SE = 0.084$) and those who do not ($M = 2.83, SE = 0.08$). There was a significant difference in frequency ($t(58) = 2.348, p < .05, r = 0.29$) between the participants who offer a major in Athletic Administration/Sport Management ($M = 2.36, SE = 0.1$) and those who do not ($M = 1.92, SE = 0.17$), although there was no significant difference for perceived importance. For Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership, Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness, Public Administration, and Business/Human Resources, there was no significant difference in frequency or perceived importance between the participants who offer the specific major and those who do not.

Table 25

Significant Difference on Assistance Based on Academic Majors for Graduate Degree

Option	Frequency	Perceived Importance
Recreation Management/ Leisure Studies	Yes	Yes
Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership	No	No
Athletic Administration/Sport Management	Yes	No
Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness	No	No
Public Administration	No	No
Business/Human Resources	No	No

Differences in frequency and perceived importance based on availability of academic majors for undergraduate degree. An independent *t*-test was utilized to investigate whether there was any significant difference in frequency and perceived importance between the participants who offer a specific major and those who do not. For all of the majors, there was no significant difference for undergraduate degree.

Reliability

Coefficient alpha or Cronbach’s alpha was computed to check internal consistency (Fink, 2006) and test reliability (Ross & Beggs, 2007). According to Field (2005), values around 0.8 are good for the overall reliability of a questionnaire.

Cronbach’s alpha for all the items in frequency for graduate assistants was 0.843.

Cronbach’s alpha for all the items in perceived importance for graduate assistants was

0.801. Cronbach's alpha for all the items in frequency for student employees was 0.819. Cronbach's alpha for all the items in perceived importance for student employees was 0.862. Thus, internal consistency for all the groups was very good.

Summary

In this chapter, the study participants' demographic data was presented, including their individual demographics, department demographics and institutions demographics. Then, the results from the survey were presented with number of cases and percentage of each response for frequency and perceived importance of assistance offered for graduate assistants and student employees in their Campus Recreation department. The results of statistical analyses were presented to identify the differences and relationships between frequency and perceived importance based on the participants' demographics. Thereupon, displayed were the results of analyses to investigate relationships between frequency and perceived importance, between assistance for graduate assistants and for student employees, and any difference in frequency and perceived importance based on availability of academic majors. In Chapter Five, major findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations for future study is discussed.

CHAPTER FIVE

Introduction

As the Campus Recreation field offers increasingly more opportunities for employment for undergraduate and graduate candidates, a few researchers conducted studies focusing on job candidates' qualifications for employment in Campus Recreation. This study was to examine the type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide to assist students to obtain a position in the field of Campus Recreation. In this chapter, the study process is summarized to review steps the researcher took. Then, the major findings are discussed. After the findings, conclusions are drawn by answering the research questions, and implications for practice are discussed. Finally, limitations and recommendations for future study are outlined.

Study Summary

There have been several studies to investigate qualifications among job candidates that Campus Recreation directors value. According to the results of those studies, Campus Recreation directors seek candidates with excellent communication skills and experiences working in the Campus Recreation field. Additionally, Campus Recreation directors think interview preparedness, education, and leadership skills are important for job candidates. There was no prior study found to show what type of assistance is provided, how often Campus Recreation directors provide assistance for those future professionals and what importance they place on providing such assistance. Therefore, this study provides a new knowledge base.

Campus Recreation directors are in the position to lead other professionals, graduate and undergraduate students who work in their department. Further, it is essential for the directors, as a part of a higher education institution, to understand the importance of preparing students for the real world. It is beneficial for the Campus Recreation directors to establish a mechanism of support for students such as providing resources and training (Pack, Jordan, Turner, & Haines, 2007). This may be accomplished by offering professional development opportunities, networking opportunities, and experiential learning opportunities.

An online survey was used to collect quantitative data for this study because of its low cost, high speed returns, simple and quick data entry, and fewer data entry errors. A pilot study was conducted with five Campus Recreation directors in the field to ensure the validity of the survey questions. The five directors provided feedback on the survey content and its organization. The survey questions and structure were modified according to the feedback from the pilot study.

The study samples were randomly chosen from Campus Recreation directors who are registered as contact persons for the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) Institutional Member. In the NIRSA database, 572 Campus Recreation directors were registered as contact persons for the Institutional Membership, working for 4-year higher education institutions in North America. Three hundred Campus Recreation directors were chosen randomly from the pool and received the invitation to participate in the study.

Once the survey was ready, a staff at the NIRSA office sent an e-mail message to the 300 randomly-selected Campus Recreation directors. Reminder e-mail messages were

sent three and seven days later from the NIRSA office. The researcher did not have access to the information regarding who received the invitation to participate in the study, and who actually completed the survey as the NIRSA office made all the correspondences for the study to protect the member's personal information.

Among the 300 Campus Recreation directors, five of them were in Canada while the rest were in the United States. There were seven e-mail addresses that were undeliverable and two e-mail addresses indicated out of town for the duration of the study, which made nine e-mail addresses unusable. Out of 291 Campus Recreation directors who were invited to participate in the study, 116 completed the online survey. Thus, the return rate of this study was 39.9 percent.

Research Questions

The research questions were constructed based on the previous studies, such as ones by Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2006), Stier, Schneider, Kampf, Wilding and Haines (2006), Ross (1998), and Ross and Blackman (1998), that investigated what qualifications Campus Recreation directors value among job candidates. The research questions this paper focused on are: 1) what type of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field through Campus Recreation directors' leadership, 2) how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance, 3) what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing such assistance, 4) do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance provided for students, and 5) how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general?

Findings

Participant Demographics

As expected, the majority of the participants was male and had a Master's as their highest degree. In Campus Recreation, the Master's degree is often preferred even for entry-level positions and most professionals that stay in the field are expected to have a Master's degree (Barcelona, 2004). Regarding the participants' area of study, the result validated the diversity in the area of study, including recreation management/leisure studies, higher education/education leadership, athletic administration/sport management, exercise science/fitness/wellness, and business. The response for years of tenure included a range from one year to 41 years.

As expected, the majority of the participant's Campus Recreation departments report to the division of student affairs, some to athletics, and some to business/auxiliary. The demographic results for number of professional staff, number of graduate assistants, and number of student employees demonstrated a variety and range. The results regarding the institution demographics such as enrollment size, region, and public/private category were as expected.

Type

In terms of type of assistance provided, career counseling and résumé advice were the top two choices of both graduate assistants and student employees. Career counseling was offered to graduate assistants at least once a semester or quarter. On the other hand, career counseling was offered to student employees at least once a year. For both graduate assistants and student employees, teaching about a job search process,

encouraging them to attend conferences, and résumé advice, which is initiated by students, were offered at least once a year.

Mock interviews and résumé workshop/classes initiated by a Campus Recreation department were not offered as frequently as others. The assistance to take/send students to state and/or regional conferences was offered at least once a year for both graduate assistants and student employees, although the assistance offered for student employees was less frequent. The assistance to take/send students to the Annual NIRSA Conference was offered less frequently than once a year for both graduate assistants and student employees.

Frequency

Career counseling was offered more frequently to graduate students than to student employees. This makes sense because Campus Recreation departments often invest in graduate assistants more than student employees because graduate assistants generally have more responsibilities and more critical involvement in the operation of their facilities and programs. Additionally, graduate assistants are often interested in the field of Campus Recreation and invested themselves by getting involved through professional associations and networking. Therefore, Campus Recreation directors may be more inclined to offer the career counseling for graduate assistants, knowing their commitment to the department as well as to the field of Campus Recreation.

Graduate assistants had larger percentage of “never” responses in frequency for both mock interviews and résumé workshop/classes than student employees. This may be because the assistances require preparation and planning. This may be possibly due to the fact that graduate assistants are considered to have been through a hiring process with an

interview and a résumé to become graduate assistants, and to already have experiences with interviewing and creating résumés.

Résumé advice, encouraging attendance at conferences and teaching about a job process had the majority of responses in “once a year” or higher frequency, similarly for both graduate assistants and student employees. These assistances do not require pre-planning and financial commitment from Campus Recreation departments. Further, they are easier to provide frequently because students prepare themselves for a job search process before they graduate, which occurs regularly in higher education institutions.

Graduate assistants had a slightly higher frequency for the assistances of taking/sending students to state/regional conferences and the NIRSA Annual Conference than student employees. “Every year,” however, was the most popular response for graduate assistants and student employees for both taking/sending students to state/regional conferences and the NIRSA Annual Conference.

Perceived Importance

For career counseling, over 80 percent of the participants either scored “essential” or “very important” for both graduate assistants and student employees. It was the same with résumé advice. For both career counseling and résumé advice, there was no response for “not important” or “of no value.” Thus, Campus Recreation directors place high importance on counseling regarding students’ careers and helping students with their résumés.

For all other assistances, most of the responses were in “essential,” “very important,” and “somewhat important.” Small percentages of the responses were in “not important” and “of no value” options.

Differences in Frequency Based on Participant Demographics

Frequency of assistance was analyzed based on the participants' demographics. There was a significant difference in frequency only for student employees based on the participant's highest education level, between those with Bachelor's degrees and those with "other" degrees such as double Master's and specialist certificates after Master's degrees. Thus, student employees, who had a Campus Recreation director with a Bachelor's degree, received assistance much less frequently than from a director with "other" degrees. However, this information is very difficult to interpret and possibly does not mean much as the numbers in those cases were small.

There were significant correlations between frequency of assistance for graduate assistants and the number of professional staff, and between frequency of assistance for student employees and the number of professional staff, although the effect was relatively small for both cases ($r = .262$, $r = .184$, respectively). This makes sense because larger numbers of professional staff could provide more opportunities to assist students more frequently, especially when students anticipate a job search process in the near future.

There was a significant relationship between frequency of assistance for graduate assistants and the number of graduate assistants. This could be expected because if the more students are in need of assistance when they face a job search, the more frequently the assistance would be provided for them.

There was a significant difference in frequency for graduate assistants based on the student enrollment size, although there was no *post hoc* test was available to determine where the difference is. However, the mean frequency for the institutions with the student enrollment between 30,000 and 39,999 was the lowest. For student employees,

there were significant differences between participant's institutions with the student enrollment between 10,000 and 19,999 and ones with the student enrollment between 20,000 and 29,999, and between ones with the student enrollment 10,000 and 19,999 and ones with the student enrollment between 30,000 and 39,999. The institutions with the student enrollment between 30,000 and 39,999 scored the lowest for frequency of assistance for both graduate assistants and student employees. It is nearly impossible for the researcher to determine or estimate the cause of the lowest score for institutions with these specific enrollment sizes from the set of data collected in this study. Further, it may not be essential for the researcher to interpret these differences because these differences may have no practical use.

There was no significant difference in frequency of assistance based on the participants' gender, area of study, years of tenure, division, number of graduate assistants, number of student employees, regions and public/private status of the institutions. The researcher's anticipated outcome of Campus Recreation directors with a higher education/higher education administration/educational leadership degree offering the assistance more frequently than ones with other degrees was proven incorrect.

Differences in Perceived Importance Based on Participant Demographics

Perceived importance of assistance was also analyzed based on the participant's demographics. There was a significant relationship between perceived importance of assistance for student employees and the participants' years of tenure. According to the statistical analysis ($r = -.211$), the longer the participants' years of tenure was, the less importance was placed for student employees. This may be possibly because the participants, who are in the director position or equivalent, do not have direct day-to-day

contacts with student employees, and consequently may not see much importance of providing assistance directly for student employees. There was no significant relationship between perceived importance for graduate assistants and the years of tenure.

There was no significant difference or relationship for the participants' gender, the participants' highest education level, the participants' area of study, division, the number of professional staff, the number of graduate assistants, the number of student employees in the participants' Campus Recreation departments, their institution's student enrollment, regions, and public/private status. Once again, the researcher's original anticipated outcome of Campus Recreation directors with a higher education/higher education administration/educational leadership degree perceiving the assistance for students more important than ones with other degrees was proven incorrect.

Differences of Assistance between Graduate Assistants and Student Employees

Frequency and perceived importance of assistance between graduate assistants and student employees were compared. In terms of frequency, graduate assistants received assistance more frequently through career counseling, taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences, and encouragement to attend conferences, than student employees. On the other hand, graduate assistants received a résumé workshop/class less frequently than student employees. There was no significant difference between graduate assistants and student employees for résumé advice, mock interview, taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference, and teaching about a job search process.

In terms of perceived importance of assistance, more importance was placed for graduate assistants than for student employees on career counseling, taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences, taking/sending to the NIRSA Annual Conference,

encouraging students to attend conferences, and teaching about a job search process.

There was no significant difference for résumé workshop/class, résumé advice, and mock interview between graduate assistants and student employees.

On overall average, there was no significant difference in frequency of assistance between graduate assistants and student employees. However, there was a significant difference in perceived importance of assistance on overall average, placing more importance on providing assistance for graduate assistants than for student employees. This may mean Campus Recreation directors perceive providing assistances to help graduate assistants to obtain a job is more important than to student employees, even though they may not provide assistance more frequently to graduate assistants than to student employees. Lack of financial resources, personnel, time, and direct contact may be possible reasons to explain no difference in frequency of assistance despite the significant difference in perceived importance.

Relationship between Frequency and Perceived Importance

Frequency and perceived importance were compared to see if Campus Recreation directors offer assistance as frequently as they perceive it to be important. For graduate assistants, there were significant correlations between frequency and perceived importance for all assistances with two exceptions. The exceptions were for taking/sending graduate assistants to the NIRSA Annual Conference and encouraging graduate assistants to attend conferences. In both cases, the participants rated relatively high for perceived importance and rated lower for frequency. This may be possibly due to financial constraints many higher education institutions are currently facing. Taking students to the NIRSA Annual Conference requires a significantly large amount of

financial resources. Because of the financial constrain, the participants may not have been able to take graduate assistants to the NIRSA Annual Conference and consequently may have been hesitant to encourage them to attend conferences in general. Except for the above exceptions, the participants would provide assistance frequently if they perceive the assistance is important, and provide assistance less frequently if they do not perceive the assistance is not important.

For student employees, there were significant correlations for all assistance items. Thus, the participants would provide assistance with frequency according to their perceived importance.

Availability of Academic Majors and Assistance

Both frequency and perceived importance of assistance were analyzed based on the availability of academic majors. There was a significant difference in frequency and perceived importance for graduate assistants based on availability of a major in Recreation Management/Leisure Studies. Thus, Campus Recreation directors offer assistance more frequently and place more importance on providing assistance for graduate assistants at institutions where a major in Recreation Management/Leisure Studies is available than at ones without the major. There was significant difference in frequency for graduate assistants based on availability of a major in Athletic Administration/Sport Management. Therefore, the participants would offer assistance more frequently for graduate assistants at institutions where the major is available than at ones without it. There was no significant difference in frequency or perceived assistance for graduate assistants for all other assistance items. This may mean Campus Recreation directors place more importance on providing assistance for graduate assistants who are

majoring in either Recreation Management/Leisure Studies or Athletic Administration /Sport Management because those graduate assistants are considered to be committed academically to the field in addition to being graduate assistants in a Campus Recreation department. There was no significant difference in frequency or perceived assistance for student employees for all assistance items based on availability of academic majors.

Conclusions

In the following, answers to the research questions are discussed as conclusions. For the first research question “what kind of assistance is provided for students to obtain a professional position or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field,” career counseling and résumé advice which is offered after being initiated by students were the most popular assistance for both graduate assistants and student employees. Mock interview and résumé workshops/class were the least popular assistance for graduate assistants while taking/sending students to state and/or regional conferences and also to the NIRSA Annual Conference were the least popular assistance for student employees.

For the second research question “how often do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance?” the findings indicate it varies. Career counseling for graduate assistants is provided at least every semester/quarter. Résumé advice, taking/sending students to state and/or regional conferences, encouraging students to attend conferences, and teaching about a job search process were offered for graduate assistants more frequently than every year but less frequently than every semester/quarter. Résumé workshop/class, mock interview and taking/sending students to the NIRSA Annual Conference were offered for graduate assistants less frequently than every year. For

student employees, career counseling, résumé advice, encouraging students to attend conferences, and teaching about a job search process were offered more frequently than every year but less frequently than every semester/quarter. Résumé workshop/class, mock interview, taking/sending students to state and/or regional conferences and also to the NIRSA Annual Conference were offered less frequently than every year.

For the third research question “what importance do the Campus Recreation directors place on providing those assistances?” the findings indicate Campus Recreation directors perceived all the assistance items between somewhat important to essential on average. On the survey, a perceived importance ranking was used as follows: essential, very important, somewhat important, not important, and of no value. For graduate assistants, career counseling, résumé advice, taking/sending students to NIRSA Annual Conference, encouraging students to attend conferences, and teaching about a job search process were rated between very important and essential, while résumé workshop/class, mock interview, taking/sending students to state and/or regional conferences were rated between somewhat important and very important. For student employees, career counseling, résumé advice, and teaching about a job search process were rated between very important and essential, while résumé workshop/class, mock interview, taking/sending students to state and/or regional conferences, also to the NIRSA Annual Conference, and encouraging students to attend conferences were rated between somewhat important and very important.

For the fourth research question “do any of the participant demographics make difference in assistance for students?” the findings indicate most of the participants’ demographics did not make difference in frequency or perceived importance. Exceptions

include differences in frequency for student employees based on Campus Recreation director's highest education level, frequency for both graduate assistants and student employees based on the number of professional staff, frequency for graduate assistants based on the number of graduate assistants, frequency for graduate assistants based on the student enrollment size, and perceived importance for student employees based on Campus Recreation directors' years of tenure.

For the fifth research question "how do Campus Recreation directors provide assistance in general?" there were a few highlights. Although there was no difference in overall frequency of assistance between graduate assistants and student employees, overall perceived importance was placed more on graduate assistants than on student employees. Similarly, career counseling, taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences, encouraging students to attend conferences were ranked higher for graduate assistants for both frequency and perceived importance. Therefore, Campus Recreation directors seemed to place more importance on providing assistance for graduate assistants than for student employees.

Additionally, Campus Recreation directors seemed to provide assistance for both graduate assistants and student employees at the frequency based on their perceived importance most of the time. In other words, the more importance they place on certain assistance, the more frequently they provide the assistance. Similarly, the less importance they place on certain assistance, the less frequently they provide the assistance. The exceptions are for taking/sending to the NIRSA Annual Conference and encouraging students to attend conferences for graduate assistants. Although Campus Recreation directors place relatively high importance on these assistances, they are not providing

them as frequently. This may be due to some financial constraints that could prohibit them from being able to take/send graduate assistants to the NIRSA Annual Conference, and thus they do not even encourage them to attend conferences.

Implications

From these findings of the study, there are several implications for practice for professionals, especially for Campus Recreation directors in the field. First, continuing to provide career counseling and résumé advice is important as means to assist both graduate assistants and student employees. Other assistance, besides career counseling and résumé advice, should be continued as well, along with a focus to explore other creative ways to provide assistance for students to obtain a job in the field.

Secondly, the effectiveness of assistances that are currently provided should be explored and examined. Now we know the type, frequency and perceived importance of assistances Campus Recreation directors provide. Just because Campus Recreation directors offer assistance to students, it does not mean the assistance is effective, or that students successfully obtain a job in the field with the assistance provided. Some types of assistance may be revisited, the frequency of providing assistance may need to be modified to enhance the effectiveness of the assistance, and innovation of new types of assistance could be developed.

Study Limitations

There were several limitations to the study. First, among 116 participants who responded, 60 participants reported they have graduate assistants in their department. The small number of cases among the variables out of the 60 participants made less power in the statistical analysis. Additionally, variances were very different from each other with

the small number of cases, which compromised the assumption of homogeneity of variance. In addition, the assumption of normal distribution was often violated.

Secondly, some data among the participant's responses were missing. The researcher intentionally did not put the function on the online survey to require a response for all the questions in order to protect the participant's decisions not to disclose information. Whether it was the participants' intention not to disclose the information or simple oversight due to having several survey questions listed with the same sets of choices, some data were missing, which made the number of available responses smaller.

Thirdly, some participants' responses seemed inaccurate, possibly because they misread the questions or did not understand the intent of the questions. For example, the NIRSA Annual Conference occurs only once a year. Some participants responded with "every month or more frequently" and "every semester/quarter" for the question of frequency, regarding the assistance of taking/sending students to NIRSA Annual Conference. Consequently, the accuracy of statistical analysis may have been compromised.

Fourthly, the study sample may not be a good representation of the Campus Recreation director population in North America. The NIRSA's Institutional Membership requires a membership fee for a year of the membership. If a Campus Recreation director did not value the Institutional Membership, especially in addition to paying for his/her own Professional Membership, or was not able to afford it possibly because of his/her department's small budget or spending limitation imposed by his/her institution, the Campus Recreation directors would not have been included in the pool to be possible candidates for this study.

Fifthly, the participants who are in the position of director or equivalent in their Campus Recreation department may not accurately grasp the actual practice of providing assistance for students. Depending on a Campus Recreation department, a Campus Recreation director could have two associate directors, who oversee a total of eight assistant directors, who could possibly have coordinators and graduate assistants under them. In such cases, the amount of contact the Campus Recreation director has with graduate assistants and student employees would be very limited and accurately understanding the practice of providing assistants for students might be very difficult.

Finally, the participants who completed the survey may possibly have been more willing to provide assistance for students or more interested in assisting students in general, than non-participants. This could have skewed the result data to a positive direction to some extent. Thus, the finding of this study may be more positive than actual behavior and perception of Campus Recreation directors.

Recommendations for Future Study

There were several limitations to this study, without which the study could have been improved. First, a future researcher could involve a larger number of the study samples, to make statistical analysis more powerful. For the NIRSA Institutional Membership, 572 NIRSA members are currently listed as contact persons working for 4-year higher education institutions in North America. All of them could be contacted to participate in a study instead of randomly selecting a specific number of samples from the population or the study sample could include 2-year institutions as well.

Secondly, a future researcher could use another method, such as the published NIRSA Member Directory to collect the contact information, so that he or she could have

a direct access to their e-mail address, and possibly mailing address. By having the direct access, the future researcher could keep track of which participants completed an online survey and effectively send them reminders which could possibly include a mailed reminder and paper survey for those who do not complete an online survey.

Thirdly, a future researcher could conduct a study utilizing Campus Recreation professionals in the Campus Recreation field to investigate types and frequency of assistance provided for students, instead of solely relying on the information provided by Campus Recreation directors. Further, a future study could also be conducted utilizing graduate assistants and student employees as study participants. Depending on a campus, a Campus Recreation director's involvement in providing assistance, and their knowledge and perception of assistance that is actually offered may vary. On some campuses, Campus Recreation directors may have day-to-day contacts with graduate assistants and student employees. On the other hand, they may rarely have direct contact with them on other campuses because of their department structure. Thus, the results and findings from this study may be skewed from the reality as the study relied on the information provided by only Campus Recreation directors. A future study involving other professionals, graduate assistants, and student employees could offer more comprehensive findings.

Fourthly, a future researcher could conduct a study by following students for certain duration before and after their job search process to investigate the effectiveness of assistance provided by Campus Recreation departments for which they work. He or she may utilize multiple surveys to keep track of type and frequency of assistance provided for students and to discover whether students successfully obtain a position in

the field or not. Qualitative study may be incorporated to investigate what assistance at what frequency students perceived was effective for them to obtain a job in the field.

Finally, with the use of an online survey, a future researcher could use a function that requires an answer for all the questions on the survey to decrease the amount of missing data. He or she may add an instruction to close an Internet browser for participants to quit their participation if they choose to do so. A future researcher should consider pros and cons of having this function because this could lead to fewer numbers of the participants who complete the survey.

Summary

Campus Recreation has been a part of higher education institutions for a long time. Since the 1930s, the value of Campus Recreation has been widely recognized (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006). The field of Campus Recreation has evolved and the value of Campus Recreation has been discussed for its significant impact on student success (Blumenthal, 2009). As the field of Campus Recreation grows and expands, the need to employ skilled and motivated professionals has increased (Blumenthal). Campus Recreation employs professionals, graduate assistants and student employees who are an integral part of daily operation. Over the years, the Campus Recreation field has become a dynamic and exciting area with a variety of job and career opportunities (Mittelstaedt, et al., 2006; Ross, 2006).

As the Campus Recreation field offers increasingly more opportunities for employment, a few researchers conducted studies focusing on candidates' qualifications for employment in Campus Recreation. According to the results of these studies, Campus Recreation directors seek candidates with excellent communication skills and experiences

working in Campus Recreation. Additionally, Campus Recreation directors think interview preparedness, education and leadership skills are important for job candidates. There are no studies, however, conducted which focus on Campus Recreation directors' role of providing career guidance and assistance.

This study attempted to examine the type, frequency and perceived importance of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for students to obtain a professional or graduate assistant position in the Campus Recreation field. An online survey was used to collect data from the participants. The participants were selected randomly from Campus Recreation directors who were registered as contact persons for the Institutional Membership of National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association, working for 4-year higher education institutions in North America. Out of 291 Campus Recreation directors who were invited to participate in the study, 116 completed the online survey and the return rate of this study was 39.9 percent.

According to this study, career counseling and résumé advice which is offered after being initiated by students were the most popular types of assistance Campus Recreation directors provide for both graduate assistants and student employees. Frequency varied from every other year to every semester/quarter depending on assistance. Campus Recreation directors perceived all the assistance items between somewhat important to essential. The study findings indicated most of the participants' demographics did not make a difference in frequency or perceived importance of assistance. Further, overall perceived importance was placed more on graduate assistants than on student employees although there was no difference in overall frequency of assistance between graduate assistants and student employees. Finally, Campus

Recreation directors seemed to provide assistance for both graduate assistants and student employees at the frequency based on their perceived importance most of the time.

The results of this study are hoped to be helpful for Campus Recreation directors and other professionals to offer assistance effectively to students who are interested in pursuing a career in the Campus Recreation field. Campus Recreation directors should motivate staff by having a professional-personal relationship with staff to identify their needs (Nunes & Baker, 2002). There is a need for well-educated, well-trained, competent, and diverse recreational sports administrators (Ross & Schurger, 2007), especially to help students prepare for their job search process. “With well-planned preparation and practice, applicants can master the necessary skills for being effective at the interview, and hopefully, become a new hire” (Ross & Blackman, 1998, p.37).

APPENDIX A

E-mail Message for Pilot Test Participants

Dear Colleagues;

My name is Takeshi Fujii. I am currently pursuing a Doctorate of Education degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from University of Missouri-Columbia, while working as Assistant Director of Fitness and Wellness at Southeast Missouri State University.

I would like to ask for your help in pilot testing a survey for my dissertation. The topic of my dissertation is “A Study of Campus Recreation Directors’ Leadership to Provide Professional Assistance to Help Students Obtain Professional and Graduate Assistant Positions.”

This research project has been approved by the NIRSA Research Committee and has met the Research Guidelines that are posted on the NIRSA Members Only section of the website.

The survey is to gather information about how frequently Campus Recreation directors provide assistance and perception of importance for assistance to help graduate assistants and student employees to obtain a position (graduate assistant or professional position). Your feedback would be very helpful and appreciated.

Instruction:

1. Complete the survey (Please visit http://surveymonkey.com/s/fujii_t to complete) and answer as you would to participate in a study.
2. Complete the attached feedback form to provide suggestions or opinions.

Once you complete these materials, please e-mail them back to tfujii@semo.edu. I appreciate your help in pilot testing the survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Takeshi Fujii

Assistant Director-Fitness & Wellness
Department of Recreation Services
Southeast Missouri State University
One University Plaza, MS 7100
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
Phone: (573) 651-2367, Fax: (573) 651-5190
E-mail: tfujii@semo.edu
Web site: www.semo.edu/recservices

APPENDIX B

Pilot Testing Feedback Form

Please answer the following questions after completing the survey.

1. How many minutes did it take for you to complete the survey?
2. Please list questions that you did not understand the intent or purpose for asking the questions and offer alternative or suggestion for each question.
3. Please list questions that you found unclear or did not understand the meaning and offer alternative or suggestion for each question.
4. Did you encounter any issues accessing the online survey? If so, please describe.
5. Please write feedback related to construction, design, sequence of the online survey.
6. Please write any feedback related to the study and the survey.

Thank you for your help. Please save this document and e-mail back to me along with the survey to tfujii@semo.edu.

APPENDIX C

Online Survey

A Study of Campus Recreation Directors' Leadership to Provide Professional Assistance to Help Students Obtain Professional and Graduate Assistant Positions

I. CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey is to investigate Campus Recreation directors' (or equivalent) leadership to provide professional assistance to help graduate assistants and student employees obtain professional and graduate assistant positions in Campus Recreation at a 4-year institution in the United States. You have been randomly selected to participate in this study.

Procedures

You have been selected randomly to participate in this study. You will complete a survey. The survey includes 47 questions and takes less than ten minutes to complete.

Potential Risks and Discomforts

The risks and discomforts of this study are minimal. If you feel uncomfortable, you may decline to answer any or all questions and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Potential Benefits

There will be no direct benefit to you for your participation in this study. However, you will be contributing to knowledge about Campus Recreation director's leadership to provide professional assistance to help students obtain professional and graduate assistant positions. The information obtained from this study will hopefully benefit future professionals and the Campus Recreation field.

Compensation for Participation

There is no monetary compensation to you for your participation in this study.

Confidentiality

Your response to this survey will be kept strictly confidential. Your IP address will be used for tracking purposes only. Only the researcher will see your individual survey responses. Information from this study will be used solely for the purpose of this study and any publications that may result from this study. Participants involved in this study will not be identified and their anonymity will be maintained.

Participation and Withdrawal

Your participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. If you do decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to read and agree to a consent form. If you decide to decline or withdraw your participation, you may simply not complete the survey or leave the online survey site.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the researcher at tfujii@semo.edu or (573) 651-2367.

Consent

By clicking “Agree” on the online consent form or signing the paper consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without penalty. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

II. DEFINITIONS

Graduate Assistants

Graduate Assistants are graduate students who work approximately 20 hours per week, performing various tasks in a Campus Recreation department at higher education institutions. They are often compensated with a tuition waiver and stipend. Graduate Assistants are typically in a supervisory position that oversees student employees.

1. Does your Campus Recreation department currently employ graduate assistants?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

III. AVAILABILITY OF GRADUATE STUDY MAJORS

2. Which of the following are available in graduate studies for graduate assistants? (You may choose multiple items.)
 - a. Recreation Management/Leisure Studies
 - b. Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership
 - c. Athletic Administration/Sport Management
 - d. Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness
 - e. Public Administration
 - f. Business/Human Resources
 - g. None of the above

IV. DIRECTOR'S LEADERSHIP IN PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

To help graduate assistants employed in your Campus Recreation department obtain a professional position in the Campus Recreation field, how often do you provide the following assistance, through your department?

3. Career counseling (e.g., providing suggestions on what experiences, certifications, qualifications the students need to obtain)
 - a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
4. Résumé workshop/class (initiated by the department)
 - a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
5. Résumé advice (as requested by the students)
 - a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
6. Mock interview
 - a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
7. Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)
 - a. Every month or more frequently

- b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
8. Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
9. Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences regardless of financial assistance available from your department
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
10. Teaching about job search process (e.g., interview attire, preparedness for interviews, etc.)
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never

V. PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

To help graduate assistants employed in your Campus Recreation department obtain a professional position in the Campus Recreation field, how important do you think it is to provide the following assistance?

11. Career counseling (e.g., providing suggestions on what experiences, certifications, qualifications the students need to obtain)
- a. Essential
 - b. Very important

- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

12. Résumé workshop/class (initiated by the department)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

13. Résumé advice (as requested by students)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

14. Mock interview

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

15. Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

16. Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important

- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

17. Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences regardless of financial assistance available from your department

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

18. Teaching about job search process (e.g., interview attire, preparedness for interviews, etc.)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

VI. DEFINITIONS

Student Employees

Student employees are college students who are employed by a Campus Recreation department. They are hourly waged employees and in various positions such as facility attendant, fitness instructor, lifeguard, or camp counselor.

19. Does your Campus Recreation department currently employ student employees?

- a. Yes
- b. No

VII. AVAILABILITY OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

20. Which of the following are available in undergraduate studies for student employees? (You may choose multiple items.)

- a. Recreation Management/Leisure Studies
- b. Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership
- c. Athletic Administration/Sport Management
- d. Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness
- e. Public Administration
- f. Business/Human Resources
- g. None of the above

VIII. DIRECTOR'S LEADERSHIP IN PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENT EMPLOYEES

To help student employees (excluding graduate assistants) employed in your Campus Recreation department obtain a job (either a graduate assistant position or professional position) in the Campus Recreation field, how often do you provide the following assistance, through your department?

21. Career counseling (e.g., providing suggestions on what experiences, certifications, qualifications the students need to obtain)

- a. Every month or more frequently
- b. Every semester/quarter
- c. Every year
- d. Every other year or less frequently
- e. Never

22. Résumé workshop/class (initiated by the department)

- a. Every month or more frequently
- b. Every semester/quarter
- c. Every year
- d. Every other year or less frequently
- e. Never

23. Résumé advice (as requested by students)

- a. Every month or more frequently
- b. Every semester/quarter
- c. Every year
- d. Every other year or less frequently
- e. Never

24. Mock interview

- a. Every month or more frequently
- b. Every semester/quarter
- c. Every year
- d. Every other year or less frequently
- e. Never

25. Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
26. Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never
27. Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences regardless of financial assistance available from your department
- f. Every month or more frequently
 - g. Every semester/quarter
 - h. Every year
 - i. Every other year or less frequently
 - j. Never
28. Teaching about job search process (e.g., interview attire, preparedness for interviews, etc.)
- a. Every month or more frequently
 - b. Every semester/quarter
 - c. Every year
 - d. Every other year or less frequently
 - e. Never

IX. PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENT EMPLOYEES

To help student employees (excluding graduate assistants) in your Campus Recreation department obtain a job (either a graduate assistant position or professional position) in the Campus Recreation field, how important do you think it is to provide the following assistance?

29. Career counseling (e.g., providing suggestions on what experiences, certifications, qualifications the students need to obtain)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

30. Résumé workshop/class (initiated by the department)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

31. Résumé advice (as requested by students)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

32. Mock interview

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

33. Taking/sending to state and/or regional conferences by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

34. Taking/sending to NIRSA Annual Conference by offering partial or full financial assistance (including registration fee, lodging and traveling fee, which can be a form of room share or car pooling)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

35. Encouraging to attend state, regional, or national conferences regardless of financial assistance available from your department

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

36. Teaching about job search process (e.g., interview attire, preparedness for interviews, etc.)

- a. Essential
- b. Very important
- c. Somewhat important
- d. Not important
- e. Of no value

X. DIRECTOR'S BACKGROUND INFORMATION

37. What is your gender?

- a. Male
- b. Female
- c. Transgender

38. What is your highest degree?

- a. Bachelor's
- b. Master's
- c. Doctorate
- d. Other (Specify: _____)

39. What area of study is your highest degree in?

- h. Recreation Management/Leisure Studies
- i. Higher Education/Higher Education Administration/Educational Leadership
- j. Athletic Administration/Sport Management
- k. Exercise Science/Fitness/Wellness
- l. Public Administration
- m. Business/Human Resources
- n. Other (Specify:_____)

40. How many years (accumulative, does not have to be consecutive, excluding graduate assistant experiences) have you worked in the field of Campus Recreation?

XI. DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION

41. Under what division is the Campus Recreation department structured at your institution?

- a. Student Affairs/Services
- b. Athletics
- c. Academics
- d. Business Administration/Auxiliary
- e. Associated Student Body
- f. Other (Specify:_____)

42. How many professional employees (including full-time and part-time, excluding graduate assistants, and clerical and janitorial staff) work in your Campus Recreation department?

43. How many graduate assistants work in your Campus Recreation department?

44. How many student employees (excluding graduate assistants) work in your Campus Recreation department?

XII. INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

45. What is the total student enrollment (undergraduate and graduate students) of your institution?

- a. Below 999
- b. 1,000-2,999
- c. 3,000-4,999
- d. 5,000-9,999
- e. 10,000-19,999
- f. 20,000-29,999

- g. 30,000-39,999
- h. 40,000 and above

46. In what NIRSA region is your institution located?

- a. Region I (Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont)
- b. Region II (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia)
- c. Region III (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)
- d. Region IV (Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas)
- e. Region V (Colorado, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming)
- f. Region VI (Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington)

47. What classification is your institution?

- a. Public
- b. Private

APPENDIX D

Initial E-mail Message

Dear Colleagues;

My name is Takeshi Fujii. I am currently pursuing a Doctorate of Education degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from University of Missouri-Columbia, while working as Assistant Director of Fitness and Wellness at Southeast Missouri State University.

I would like to ask for your help in completing a survey for my dissertation. The survey includes 47 questions and it takes **less than ten minutes** to complete. You have been selected randomly to participate in this study. The topic of my dissertation is “A Study of Campus Recreation Directors’ Leadership to Provide Professional Assistance to Help Students Obtain Professional and Graduate Assistant Positions.” Your response to this survey will be kept confidential and there is no penalty for not participating or terminating your participation after starting.

This research project has been approved by the NIRSA Research Committee and has met the Research Guidelines that are posted on the NIRSA Members Only section of the Web site.

Please visit <http://surveymonkey.com/s/fujiidissertation> to complete the survey. I appreciate your help in completing the survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Takeshi Fujii

Assistant Director-Fitness & Wellness
Department of Recreation Services
Southeast Missouri State University
One University Plaza, MS 7100
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
Phone: (573) 651-2367, Fax: (573) 651-5190
E-mail: tfujii@semo.edu
Web site: www.semo.edu/recservices

APPENDIX E

Follow-up E-mail Reminder for Nonrespondents

Because NIRSA is very protective of our member's email addresses, the survey reminders come from the NIRSA National Center, and as such, we are unable to cross-reference the respondents to the actual electronic survey. So if you have already completed the survey, thank you very much, and you may disregard this reminder.

Dear Colleagues;

I would like to remind you about my request to complete a survey for my dissertation. Your help would be greatly appreciated. The survey includes 47 questions and it takes **less than ten minutes** to complete.

You have been selected randomly to participate in this study. The topic of my dissertation is "A Study of Campus Recreation Directors' Leadership to Provide Professional Assistance to Help Students Obtain Professional and Graduate Assistant Positions." Your response to this survey will be kept confidential and there is no penalty for not participating or terminating your participation after starting.

This research project has been approved by the NIRSA Research Committee and has met the Research Guidelines that are posted on the NIRSA Members Only section of the Web site.

Please visit <http://surveymonkey.com/s/fujii-dissertation> to complete the survey. I appreciate your help in completing the survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Takeshi Fujii

Assistant Director-Fitness & Wellness
Department of Recreation Services
Southeast Missouri State University
One University Plaza, MS 7100
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
Phone: (573) 651-2367, Fax: (573) 651-5190
E-mail: tfujii@semo.edu
Web site: www.semo.edu/recservices

APPENDIX F

Additional Statistical Data

Table F1

Number of Cases, Means and Standard Error of Means for Frequency

Assistance	Graduate Assistants			Student Employees		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>
Career Counseling	60	3.10	0.138	116	2.64	0.075
Résumé Workshop/Class	60	1.37	0.184	116	1.78	0.106
Résumé Advice	60	2.67	0.14	116	2.7	0.085
Mock Interview	60	1.55	0.158	115	1.83	0.104
State and/or Regional Conferences	60	2.03	0.109	114	1.77	0.082
NIRSA Annual Conferences	60	1.68	0.105	114	1.54	0.082
Encouraging to Attend Conferences	60	2.60	0.099	115	2.17	0.079
Teaching a Job Search Process	60	2.40	0.149	116	2.36	0.086

Table F2

Number of Cases, Means and Standard Error of Means for Perceived Importance

Assistance	Graduate Assistants			Student Employees		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>
Career Counseling	60	3.38	0.079	116	3.13	0.065
Résumé Workshop/Class	60	2.62	0.133	116	2.6	0.085
Résumé Advice	60	3.27	0.089	116	3.14	0.057
Mock Interview	60	2.68	0.115	115	2.62	0.079
State and/or Regional Conferences	60	2.93	0.089	114	2.68	0.066
NIRSA Annual Conferences	59	3	0.09	114	2.69	0.072
Encouraging to Attend Conferences	60	3.22	0.86	115	2.95	0.072
Teaching a Job Search Process	60	3.28	0.95	116	3.14	0.068

REFERENCES

- Alssit, J. L., Gruber, D., Jenkins, D., Mazzeo, C., Roberts, B. & Stanback-Stroud, R.. (2005). Engaging institutions in workforce development: Career pathways for disadvantaged adults. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 128, 83-97.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1996) Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development*. 37(2), 123-133.
- Barcelona, B. (2004). Examining the importance of recreational sports management competencies based on management level, agency type, and organizational size. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 28, 45-63.
- Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A. & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The 'L' word in higher education. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Blumenthal, K. J. (2009). Collegiate recreational sports: Pivotal players in student success. *Planning for higher education*. 37(2), 52-62.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., & Keedy, J. L. (2005). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor students within campus recreation. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 29, 108-116.
- Cameron, K. S. (1984). Organizational adaptation and higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 55(2), 122-144.
- Chickering, A.W. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Daprano, C. M., Coyle, M. L., & Titlebaum, P. J. (2005). Student employee recruitment and retention through campus partnerships. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 29, 108-1116.

- Davis, J. R. (2003). *Learning to lead: A handbook for postsecondary administrators*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers.
- Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2), 247-273.
- Faircloth, S., & Cooper, N. (2007). Communities of practice in campus recreation: A framework for developing student intramural officials. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 31, 43-50.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London, Sage Publications.
- Fink, A. (2006). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Furr, S. R., & Elling, T. W. (2000). The influence of work on college student development. *NASPA Journal*. 37, 454-470.
- Gardner, J. W. (2000). The nature of leadership. In *Educational Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonyea, R. M. (2005). Self-reported data in institutional research: Review and recommendations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 127, 73-89.
- Hackett, M. W. (2007). Exploring the relationship between recreational sports employment and academic success. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 31, 69-74.
- Haines, D. J. (2001). Undergraduate student benefits from university recreation. *NIRSA Journal*. 25(1), 25-33.
- Haines, D. J., & Fortman, T. (2008). The college recreational sports learning environment. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 32, 52-61.
- Hall, S. L., Forrester, S., & Borsz, M. (2008). A constructivist case study examining the leadership development of undergraduate students in campus recreational sports. *Journal of College Student Development*. 49, 125-140.
- Hall-Yannessa, S. L., & Forrester, S. (2004). Differences in leadership development of club sport officers. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 28, 7-18.
- Harvey, L. (2005). Embedding and integrating employability. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 128, 13-28.

- Jamriska, J. T. (2004). *Recreation professionals' preference for resume content for prospective graduate assistants*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.
- Jennings, M. W. (1984). *Entry level competencies for recreational sports personnel as identified by chairs of preparatory institutions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.
- Kuk, L., Cobb, B. & Forrest, C. (2007). Perceptions of competencies of entry-level practitioners in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*. 44(4), 664-691.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2000). Changing leadership: A menu of possibilities. In Leithwood, K. et al. (Eds.). *Changing leadership for changing times*, (pp. 21-39). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- London, C. (2000). Taking your campus recreation department above and beyond through transformational leadership. *NIRSA Journal*. 24(2), 61-69.
- Miller, R. D. (2000). Customer service for the new millennium. *NIRSA Journal*. 24(1), 60-66.
- Mittelstaedt, R., Russell, K., Robertson, B. J., Byl, J., Temple, J., & Ogilvie, L. (2006). Unique groups. In *Introduction to recreation and leisure*. (pp. 197-227). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mull, R., Bayless, K. G., & Jamieson, L. M. (2005). *Recreational sport management*. (4th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Retrieved on April, 6. 2009, from <http://www.myacpa.org/pub/documents/LearningReconsidered.pdf>.
- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (2004). *The value of recreational sports in higher education: Impact on student enrollment, success, and buying power*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (2007a) *Comprehensive Member Survey Results*. Retrieved on November 12, 2009 from <http://www.nirsa.org/AM/MemberOnly.cfm?ContentFileID=5425>.

- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (2007b). Recreational sports programs: CAS standards and guidelines. Retrieved on April, 6, 2009, from http://www.nirsa.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Research_Central&Template=/MembersOnly.cfm&ContentFileID=1890.
- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (n.d. a) NIRSA Foundation Career Opportunities Center: Information for Employers. Retrieved on November 6, 2009, from http://www.nirsa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ConferenceExpo/CareerOpportunityCenterCOC/Information_for_Employers/coc_employers.htm.
- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (n.d. b). *NIRSA's rich history*. Retrieved on April 19, 2009, from <http://www.nirsa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/AboutUs/History/History.htm>.
- Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Pearson.
- Nunes, C. M. & Baker, R. E. (2002). A blueprint for effective recreational sport leadership. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 26, 65-73.
- Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 31 (2), 224-243.
- Pack, S. M., Jordan, J. S., Turner, B. A., & Haines, D. (2007). Perceived organizational support and employee satisfaction and retention. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 31, 95-106.
- Porter, S. R. (2004a). Pros and cons of paper and electronic surveys. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 121, 91-97.
- Porter, S. R. (2004b). Raising response rates: What works? *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 121, 5-21.
- Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing new professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the National Study of New Professionals in Student Affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*. 49, 319-335.
- Ross, C. M. (1998). Résumé content preferences: Empirical study of collegiate recreational sports administrators. *NIRSA Journal*. 22(2), 7-21.
- Ross, C. M. (2006). Recreational sports management. In *Introduction to recreation and leisure*. (pp. 271-288). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Ross, C. M., & Beggs, B. A. (2007). Campus recreational sports internships: A comparison of student and employer perspectives. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 31, 3-13.
- Ross, C. M., & Blackman, R.J. (1998). Interview preferences: An empirical study of collegiate recreational sport administrators. *NIRSA Journal*. 22(3), 32-37.
- Ross, C. M., & Schurger, T. (2007). Career path of campus recreational sports directors. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 31, 146-155.
- Schneider, R. C., Stier, W. F., Kampf, S., Haines, F., & Wilding, G. (2006). Characteristics, attributes, and competencies sought in new hires by campus recreation directors. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 30, 142-153.
- Schuh, J. H. (1999). Student learning and growth resulting from service as an intramural official. *NIRSA Journal*. 23(2), 51-61.
- Shertzer, J. E. & Schuh, J. H. (2004). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs. *NASPA Journal*. 42(1), 111-131.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.
- Stage, F. K. (2007). *Using quantitative data to answer critical questions*. In Stage, F. K. (Ed.), *Using quantitative data to answer critical questions* (pp. 5-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stier, W. F., Schneider, R. C., Kampf, S., Wilding, G., & Haines, S. (2006). Current hiring practices of campus recreation directors of NIRSA Institutions. *Recreational Sports Journal*. 30, 100-115.
- Umbach, P.D. (2004). Getting back to the basics of survey research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 121, 23-38.
- Waple, J. N. (2006). An assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs work. *NASPA Journal*. 43(1), 1-18.
- Yorke, M. & Harvey, L. (2005). Graduate attributes and their development. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 128, 41-58.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations* (6th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

VITA

Takeshi Fujii was born in Oita, Japan to Yuki Yoshi and Toshiko Fujii. He has received a Bachelor of Science degree in Exercise Science with minors in Adapted Physical Education and Aquatics from Ball State University (Muncie, Indiana) in August, 1999. He continued his education at Ball State University to receive a Master of Science in Wellness Management with a minor in Business in May, 2002. He also received a Post-Baccalaureate Degree Certificate in Digital Design in Media Arts from Tulane University (New Orleans, Louisiana) in May, 2006.

He has been involved in Fitness and Campus Recreation through professional certifications and memberships since his undergraduate days. He has provided numerous professional presentations at regional and national conferences.