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Abstract

Justin Robert Fletcher
IN Volvement Patterns of Campus Recreation Employees
2015-2016
Burton R Sisco, Ed.D.
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purpose of this study was to examine the patterns of involvement exhibited by student employees employed by Ashland University Department of Recreational Services during the 2015-2016 academic year. In addition to examining the involvement patterns, the study also examined any links between involvement in specific areas of employment and involvement in other areas on campus. These links of involvement and the amount of involvement were also examined in connection with the satisfaction of different areas of campus, leading to understand the level of satisfaction with the subjects collegiate experience.

The gap in research had not examined the demographics of campus recreation employees and the correlations between those demographics and involvement in other areas on campus. Over 90 campus recreation student employees were surveyed in attempt to gain demographic information and attain the level of involvement on campus these students had, both in number activities and level of involvement by hour on a weekly and monthly scale. There were significant relationships found between demographic information, including area of employment, and involvement in other areas on campus. The subjects also stated that they felt that academic involvement, social involvement, and campus environment were important, and they were satisfied with all three of those areas.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Colleges and universities have grown significantly from the days when they were solely academic institutions with classrooms as the only place of learning. Today, students learn both inside and outside of the classroom. Social, moral, and ethical situations provide opportunities for students to learn and become contributing members of society. These opportunities come from involvement in organizations, clubs, employment, and activities in higher education. Patterns of involvement have been described by Astin (1984) and continues to be a focal point of student development theory.

Research has shown that involvement outside the classroom improves student experiences and leads to higher retention rates in higher education institutions. Astin’s (1984) theory of student development supports the idea that increased involvement increases retention and achievement. Studies now focus on patterns of involvement in order to expand understanding and student satisfaction in college.

Statement of the Problem

Campus recreation is viewed by some as a luxury or auxiliary service, while others believe that campus recreation is an integral part of campus life. While arguments continue to shift due to reduced budgeting, campus recreation has been a major focal point of not only retaining students, but recruiting as well. Involvement theory has been used in many areas of campus life to support student involvement; limited research has
been done on employment in specific areas of campus recreation employment and the impact on student development and success.

There have been many studies done on campus recreation involvement, athletic involvement, sport club involvement, and recreation center employment. A study done by Griffith, Walker, and Collins (2011) examined the social effects and cohesiveness in recreation department employees. Hackett (2007) examined employment in recreational sports and academic success. However, the role of specific area employment in campus recreation areas and the correlation to academic success and satisfaction has not been examined in one location or in one study. Training, responsibilities, skill sets, and personal interactions differ greatly between specific areas of campus recreation. Many studies have been done on campus recreation employment and involvement, but campus recreation employment has been generalized. Due to that generalization, further examination into the patterns of employment in specific campus recreation programs, their academic success, and their collegiate satisfaction is needed.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine subjects in the different areas of campus recreation employment, such as aquatics, intramurals, and climbing wall, for example, and analyze the patterns and relationships of other involvement in campus organizations and activities as well as academic success and satisfaction. The study analyzed the involvement of student employees of Ashland University’s Recreational Services as well as their involvement in other programs on campus. Finding possible relationships could shed light into the patterns of involvement, specifically between employment areas in
recreation and other involvement on campus, and link that involvement to college experience satisfaction.

**Significance of the Study**

This study analyzed the employees of a recreational services department and determined links between employment areas and other involvement on campus. There have been limited studies on specific areas of campus recreation involvement. The results of this study, as well as a thorough examination of relevant literature, can help professionals and administrators determine the characteristics of different staff areas. They may utilize that information to build upon strengths of those areas, as well as seek to diversify staff components or modify training to fit students in different employment areas better.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

It was assumed in this study that all responses were truthful and that the instrument measured the appropriate factors. Another assumption was that the responses used to determine the frequency of participation in campus programs and events was consistent across the entire semester, rather than skewed by participation in a fraction of the semester. This study was distributed to all students employed with the Ashland University Department of Recreational Services during the fall of 2015.

This study was distributed to the entire population, preventing any limitation based on the sample representation. There is the possibility of researcher bias, as I am the direct supervisor to 69% of the subjects. To avoid any coercion and maintain the anonymity of the subjects, the surveys were distributed and collected by a third party.
Operational Definitions

1. Academic Year: The period of class offerings for all students according to the Ashland University Academic Calendar, from late August through early May; it is divided into two semesters with one in the fall and the other in the spring, to be used as the time frame for respondents of the survey.

2. Achievement: The perceived attainment of a goal, either academic or otherwise, by the campus recreation participant.

3. Campus Recreation: Used interchangeably with recreational or rec sports, or recreation center, or rec center; the department responsible for employing students in the areas of aquatics, climbing wall supervisors, customer service supervisor, equipment checkout supervisor, facility manager, fitness center supervisor, group fitness, and intramurals.

4. Cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA): Defined as the overall GPA for the individual’s college career at Ashland University as reported by the survey subjects.

5. Gender: Whether an individual reports to be male or female based on their perception of themselves. This may or may not be related to their biological sex.

6. Higher Education: The university or college level of instruction at Ashland University including undergraduate and graduate studies.

7. Involvement: The student’s participation and dedication in academic, social, and extracurricular activities during their college career at Ashland University.
8. Recreational Services Employee: All students employed by the Ashland University Department of Recreational Service during the 2015-2016 academic year, more specifically during the Fall 2015 semester at which point the study was conducted.

9. Student: Any full time student currently enrolled at Ashland University through the admissions office, regardless of class. Class status was determined by the university.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following questions:

1. What are the patterns of involvement of Recreational Services student employees?

2. What are the Recreational Services student employee’s attitudes toward the importance of social involvement, academic involvement, and the campus environment at Ashland University?

3. How satisfied are Recreational Services student employees as related to social involvement, academic involvement, and the campus environment at Ashland University?

4. What significance is there between differences in demographic variables and involvement in other areas of campus involvement? Are there any areas that students feel important but are not satisfied?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II provides a review of literature germane to the study. Sections of this chapter include background on campus recreation, an overview of student involvement theory developed by Alexander Astin, and the combination of campus recreation and involvement theory.
Chapter III outlines the methodology of the study including the context of the study and processes used to collect information. An overview of the research methods and data collection in combination with the data analysis are presented.

Chapter IV provides the findings of the study. The section is broken up based on the information found regarding each of the research questions, and provides relevant information regarding the outcome of the study.

Chapter V discusses the findings in relation to the research questions and literature review. Conclusions are made based upon the research, and suggestions for future research and practical application of this research is presented.
Chapter II

Review of Literature

In order to understand the benefits of involvement in campus recreation participation and its links to other areas of campus involvement, such as student government, athletics, and other campus life, it is important to understand what comprises campus recreation as well as student involvement theory and its role in higher education. The review of the literature associated with each of these areas increases the understanding of how they are all linked.

Campus Recreation

Campus recreation has grown significantly from its origination a century ago. According to Milton, Roth, and Fisher (2011), campus recreation may have started in the late eighteenth century with a footrace between two individual students, or it may have started with the freshmen and sophomore class of Princeton University playing each other in basketball in the mid nineteenth century. Campus recreation evolved from these school yard games to campus recreation programs that were overseen by student affairs, athletics, or physical education departments. Along with the growth of the programs that required funding and supervision from departments on campus, the number of programs grew to include aquatics, intramurals, group exercise and fitness, sport clubs, health and wellness initiatives, and open recreation. This growth in the field also resulted in a greater need for staffing for these programs and facilities, ranging from professionals to student employees.
Role of Campus Recreation in Today’s Higher Education Setting

The services that campus recreation departments provide benefit more than just the program itself. According to Hall (2006), extracurricular activities play a large role in the choice of students to stay at a college or university. Participation in recreational sports programs has been shown to enhance the college experience (Hackett, 2007). Students felt as if they belonged to something because of their participation in recreational programs. Bryant, Banta, and Bradley (1995) stated that campus recreation programs and their facilities were important in students’ decision to attend a particular school in the first place, citing that 30% of students factored this in their decision. In 2006, Lindsey and Sessoms noted that recreational sports has a profound influence on recruitment and retention within college campuses by increasing the satisfaction of the students. Henchy (2011) cited Tinto’s (1993) proposal that colleges are comprised of a social system as well as an academic system. This social system can be referenced in some campus recreation department missions, such as Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville’s mission statement from their website that includes the goals of enhancing the college experience, providing opportunities for social interaction and strengthening personal development (Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Campus Recreation, 2012).

Artinger et al. (2006) referenced in Henchy’s 2011 article divided up the social benefits of intramurals into five categories: social benefits, cultural social benefits, social group bonding, university integrations, and reliable alliance benefits. These five areas illustrate examples of how campus recreation and intramural sports programs provide
benefits such as inclusion, belonging, friendships, tolerance, and self-confidence.

Lindsey and Sessoms (2006) cited a study by Kovac and Beck (1997) that compared the difference between male and female benefits of participation in campus recreation, more specifically intramurals. Self-benefits were the main motivation for males, as social and community motivations were prevalent in females.

According to Henchy (2011), Astin’s (1984) involvement theory applies to campus recreation programs as activities that can contribute to creating more successful students at higher education institutions. Campus recreation programs are designed for inclusion and participation for students. Henchy also states that having a sense of belonging due to inclusion and participation in a community leads to continued retention in education and continued development. For example, Portland Community College Intramurals’ statement includes commitments to provide a place for any type of competitor and to make it a quality opportunity (Portland Community College Intramurals Mission Statement, 2012).

**Participation in Campus Recreation**

Hall (2006) states that 78% of students at the institution of his study utilized at least one area of the campus recreation program, making it the program with the highest participation rate of any student life programs on the campus. However, Cooper, Schuette, and Phillips (2012) reported that about 38% of college students perform vigorous physical activity and 20% perform moderate, totaling 58% of students performing vigorous or moderate activity, compared to the 78% that utilize a campus recreation program. These two studies show that there is a large percentage of students
participating in campus recreation through various forms, and as many students participating in light activity as moderate activity.

Cooper, Schuette, and Phillips’ (2012) study was done to determine the intrinsic motivations for students to participate in campus intramural sports. They cited four different motivational factors observed by Kanters and Forrester (1997) including intellectual, social, competence-mastery, and stimulus-avoidance. The results of Kanters and Forrester’s study showed similar results to Kovacs and Beck’s 1997 study that determined social and competence-mastery factors were the leading motivational factors. The results of the study done by Cooper et al. (2012) were consistent with those studies as well, showing that women had significantly higher motivations for campus intramural sports due to social factors, but additionally appearance factors as well. Astin (1984) claims that specifically intramural sports has a strong, positive impact on persistence, relating to retention in higher education. Campus recreation is also unique in that it employs a substantial number of student employees in many higher education institutions, and Astin (1984) also finds that part time employment is a significant factor in retention.

Employment is an integral factor in the success of recreational departments, and in some departments they consider employment a program in and of itself. Developing the whole student through recreation employment is one of the many ways student affairs professionals focus on employment as a program. According to Hackett (2007), participation in a department such as campus recreation encourages learning and experience in areas such as customer service, time management, communication,
collaboration, and leadership. The focus of employment in some departments is important not just to provide customers and patrons the best experience possible, but to develop the student employees as future professionals and contributing members of society. Hall (2013) found in a study that campus recreation employees were able to consciously recall learning transferrable skills, interpersonal skills, problem solving skills, and appreciation of diverse perspectives.

In a study done by Griffith, Walker, and Collins (2011), work cohesion was examined with the socialization of campus recreation employees. As part of holistic student development, social interactions, team work, and gaining experience working with diverse populations are areas the student affairs and campus recreation professionals focus on. This study examined socialization and cohesion based upon demographics such as gender, age, and ethnicities, as well as by areas the students were employed in. Interesting findings were produced that stated there were not differences in cohesion based on any of the demographics other than ethnicity, where African Americans had a lower level of work group cohesion than white and Hispanic employees. There were also significant differences in cohesion based on employment in different areas of employment.

**Student Involvement Theory**

In today’s modern academic society the focus of higher education has shifted from sole academics to the entire student college experience. The entire student college experience includes employment, belonging to an organization, attending events, participating in activities, and spending time on campus to interact with other students.
and faculty, in addition to attending classes, working on homework, and studying. Student government, athletics, fraternity and sorority life, student services and residential housing have all become focal points of the higher education experience. Astin (1984) uses the term student involvement to describe the culmination of all these activities.

The involvement in higher education has been studied as well, and no other article has been as profound and referenced as Alexander Astin’s 1984 article. In 1984, Astin described involvement as much more than taking classes and studying, but also time on campus, participating in organizations, and interacting with other members of the campus community. There was also a limitation on the achievements that were recognized, based on test scores or end results on paper. In actuality, the achievements and development of the students was an outcome that was desired and now strongly considered.

Astin also mentions that involvement is not only linked to retention, but also contributes to greater personal development and learning outside the classroom. Lindsey and Sessoms (2006) pointed out that out of all campus life and activities, participation in recreational sports held the highest participation percentage as well as the most satisfied. According to Elkins, Forrester, and Noel-Elkins (2011), knowing what the largest positive contributors to a strong sense of community are, such as campus recreation and other student involvement, is integral for policy makers in an economy such as now. In a previous study done at Rowan University, Stelzer (2012) found that establishing relationships with peers aside from participation was the most satisfying social activity.

The involvement theory Astin uses is focused on a behavioral meaning rather than feeling or thinking (1984). In one of his five postulates he states that whether the objects
of involvement are general or specific, the involvement is comprised of physical and psychological energy. It can be directed toward a very specific activity, or spread over a generalized goal. The second postulate mentions that the involvement takes place along a continuum, and such as the workload and seasons change throughout an academic year, so will that of a student’s involvement in various activities.

Astin’s third postulate states that the involvement is both qualitative and quantitative in nature, such as the amount of time committed to an activity or the amount of effort or understanding that is achieved from the involvement, regardless of the other. This is directly proportional to the amount of learning and development, as mentioned in the fourth postulate. There is a heavy emphasis on the effectiveness of policies and procedures due to the effects that they have on student involvement, and therefore recruitment and retention, according to the fifth postulate.

The student’s time is also seen as a resource that is limited. In economic terms, there is an opportunity cost for involvement in one area over another area. This opportunity cost could be detrimental to academic learning and development, but Tieu et al. (2010) highlight the opposite, and that involvement in extra-curricular activities fosters critical thinking, social, and leadership skills, as well as persistence to graduate. Conversely, the opportunity cost could play the other role, and provide more acceptable opportunities for involvement rather than those detrimental to the institution or oneself.

**Previous Studies**

In a similar study previously done by Stelzer (2012), research questions were asked to determine involvement of sport club members in other areas in higher education.
He found that there was a strong link between participation in sport clubs and intramurals, but not with many other organizations. He found this consistent with a previous study done in 2007 by Iacovone that found the time commitment of varsity and club athletes limits the amount of other time available for additional involvement.

Although participation in athletics may limit other involvement, a previous study done by Milsted (2012) found that the continued support of a program called Rowan After Hours provided evidence that the enjoyment and involvement of a program on campus is important to the administration. According to Milsted’s research, the Rowan After Hours program provides an opportunity for a diverse part of the population by offering regular activities that change week to week. This is similar to campus recreation in that it is consistently changing and offers a wide variety of programs and activities for a diverse population.

Stelzer (2012) finds that his research has findings similar to Lizza (2007) that support creating relationships with other students to satisfy their need for social interaction and own personal interests. This supports Elkins, Forrester, and Noel-Elkins’ (2011) claim that these activities provided a different peer group and were therefore able to broaden their social network and more likely to persist in their collegiate career.

**Involvement Effects**

The effects of involvement, or the outcomes, are potentially the most important aspect of the theory. Involvement can be linked to retention in a variety of ways. According to Astin (1984), involvement leads to positive outcomes in continuing higher education while a lack of involvement can lead to a student dropping out. Brazzell and
Reiser (1999), found that involvement in student government clubs, activities, and sorority and fraternity life find a sense of community and gain a better understanding of the society they belong to. Henchy (2011) refers to Tinto’s (1975) study that found low social commitment can stem from a lack of social awareness and could increase the possibility of drop out. Artinger et al. (2006) went as far as to say that campus recreation is very important in the integration of students in campus life.

The importance of involvement is linked to retention, a topic that Moffit (2010) examines and expands on. According to Moffit retention provides the validity of allocating resources to departments such as campus recreation. Moffit uses the Campus Recreation Participation Ladder to show how participation can lead to retention not just by involvement, but by investing into the organization even further, and ultimately integrate themselves into the programs and establishing belonging in the community.

Environmental factors were also included in Astin’s (1984) study. The residence of students was directly related to retention, and it was inferred that those students who live on campus have more time and opportunity to be involved. Students had more time to devote to and more ease of access to organizations and events instead of commuting to and from class. Also, some programs may require participation, such as residential life floor or hall programs. As stated before, being more involved leads to increased retention. Social fraternity or sorority involvement also leads to lower rates of drop out, just like participation in other activities. These groups typically have rules and regulations requiring active participation in events both within their specific organization as well as collaborating with other organizations. Banta, Bradley, and Bryant (1991),
referenced in Lindsey and Sessoms (2006) state that recreation sports has positive effects on recruiting, satisfaction with college, and institutional retention.

**Campus Recreation in Student Involvement**

Exercise and recreation has long been a positive influence on student life (Hackett, 2007). Campus recreation provides the environment outside the classroom to interact with faculty, staff, and other students in order to create a sense of community (Hackett, 2007). Coupled with Astin’s (1984) explanation that involvement is interactions outside the classroom, campus recreation has benefits physically, mentally, and this study explored the social aspect.

The Ashland University Recreation Center opened in 2006 and is open to all full time students as well as any faculty, staff, part time students, and Alumni. The department has since gone through multiple variations in staff structure. At its open there was a director, assistant director, and administrative assistant. At its highest level of professional employment there was one director, three assistant directors, one administrative assistant and one graduate assistant. In the 2015-2016 academic year there was one director, two assistant directors and one administrative assistant. The 105,000 square foot facility includes two intramural fields, two basketball courts, one multi-purpose activity court, aerobics rooms, one game room with two ping pong tables, three pool tables, and two televisions with video game systems, two racquetball courts, a natatorium with a swimming pool, diving well, and whirlpool, a climbing wall, indoor track, fitness center, one fitness assessment office, and offices for the professional staff. The programming areas that fall into the Rec Center include intramurals, group fitness
classes, sport clubs, fitness assessment and training, swim lessons, American Red Cross certification courses, fitness certification courses, special events, and student employment. The facility is a stop on many tours of campus to show potential students the programs and facilities offered to students, and provides space for open houses on the basketball courts throughout the academic year for potential students.

Campus recreation has many programs that allow students to become involved. Specifically within the department students can be involved in any of the programming areas. Campus recreation activities typically include aquatics, intramural sports, club sports, group fitness, open recreation such as basketball, racquetball, wallyball, table tennis, cardio exercise, resistance training, and events. Student employment is also a large focus of campus recreation and allows for opportunities of involvement. All employees are required to maintain a valid CPR certification and the Assistant Director for Aquatics and Student Development handles risk management for the building, including random safety audits of the staff.

Recruitment is just as important as retention for institutions, and campus recreation has played a factor in that as well. Employment in campus recreation as well as participation in campus recreation allows incoming freshman the opportunity to get involved in campus and enter into a community. Offering both work study and regular student employment to nearly five percent of the campus population can help attract students who will need employment in order to support their tuition and other costs of attending college. Campus recreation also provides opportunities for students previously
involved in athletics to continue their passion at a lower and less regulated level through club sports, intramurals, and open recreation (Stelzer, 2012).

**Summary of the Literature Review**

Campus recreation has grown exponentially since the first footrace that can be considered a competition between students. Campus recreation programs have grown from more than just intramurals between class levels as well. Campus recreation programs are now whole departments that include several different program areas with specialized facilities. From where the first intramurals started, according to Milton, Roth, and Fisher (2011), to the competitive and noncompetitive programs and facilities that exist now, campus recreation has grown into a focal point for some college and university recruiting strategies. Along with using campus recreation programs and facilities for recruiting they are also a factor in retaining students for the desired duration of higher education attendance.

The involvement theory links campus recreation to the outcomes desired, such as retention and more engaged students. The literature shows that involvement creates a sense of community, sense of belonging, integration into social aspects of campus, commitment to the university, additional learning experiences, and overall retention and satisfaction within the college experience.

Through Astin’s involvement theory and studies done related to that theory it can be seen that involvement has positive effects on student life in higher education. It can also be seen that campus recreation has grown into a complex department of programs and facilities that allow for involvement on campus. Though both have been studied
multiple times, few studies have been done to link participation in specific campus recreation student employment to other patterns of campus involvement. Previous studies have been done related to involvement in athletics or sport club members and involvement, but there is no research exploring the possible links between employment in specific areas of campus recreation programs and involvement in other areas on campus. The goal of this study was to investigate those potential links between those areas in order to gain a better understanding of how specific employment areas within one department can have different or similar participation areas to other involvement groups on campus.
Chapter III

Methodology

Context of the Study

This study was conducted at Ashland University in Ashland, Ohio. Ashland University is a four year private institution founded on the foundation of the Brethren Church. The total enrollment of the university is 5,428, with 3,768 of those students being undergraduate. The university boasts a 13:1 student/faculty ratio and has six colleges (Arts & Sciences, Business & Economics, Education, Nursing & Health Sciences, Graduate School, and School of Continuing Education). In addition to the university, the Ashland Theological Seminary is a division of the university with just over 600 additional students (www.ashland.edu).

The Rec Center is a 105,000 square foot facility that is open seven days a week and membership is included in the student fees for all full time undergraduate students (Rec Center, 2013). The building was opened in March 2006 and includes basketball courts, a multi-purpose activity court, a climbing wall and bouldering wall, racquetball courts, a pool with a diving well and whirlpool, a game room, a golf simulator, aerobics room, and a weight room that includes cardio equipment.

The Recreational Services department is a member of NIRSA: Leaders in Campus Recreation, the non-profit association for campus recreation professionals and students, and employs over 110 regular student workers, one director, one administrative assistant, and two assistant directors. The areas of the department are assigned to an appropriate assistant director. The Assistant Director for Programs oversees all intramural and sport
club programs, youth camps and community programs, group exercise programs, and the climbing wall. The Assistant Director for Aquatics and Student Development oversees all responsibilities related to the pool, including swim lesson programs, aquatic staff, and maintaining the pool facility as well as the coordination of all hiring processes and direct oversight of the areas of Customer Service, Equipment Checkout, Fitness Center, Lifeguards, Facility Managers, Certification Instructors, and Swim Instructors. The Director of Recreational Services has director duties in addition to responsibilities of the facility, including scheduling reservations and maintenance. The different employment areas overseen that were used in this study are: Climbing Wall Supervisors, Customer Services Supervisors, Equipment Checkout Supervisors, Facility Managers, Fitness Center Supervisors, Group X Instructors, Intramural Officials, Lifeguards, and Rec Sport Managers.

**Population and Sampling**

The target population for this study included all students that were employed by Recreational Services during the 2015-2016 year, specifically in the fall of 2015. The available population were those employees still employed at the time of the survey, totaling 113. As illustrated in Table 3.1, the largest areas of employment were Customer Service and Lifeguards with 19 employees, followed by Equipment Checkout at 18 and Fitness Center, Group Exercise, and Intramurals at 11 employees. Facility Managers had nine, Climbing Wall had eight, Rec Sports Managers had five and Lead Group X and Outdoor Pursuits Manager both had one.
Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Employment</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Wall</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Checkout</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Manager</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Exercise</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Group X Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pursuits Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Sports Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study used a total population sampling to select subjects for the survey. The distribution of the survey to all subjects in the population, as well as the electronic collection method, kept subject identity anonymous and removed any possible bias due to the absence of selecting a sample.

**Instrumentation**

The survey instrument titled *Rec Center Employees and Involvement Theory* was designed based on the instrument used previously by Iacovone’s (2007) study titled “Student Athlete Involvement Theory” pertaining to varsity athletes at Rowan University and Stelzer’s (2012) study titled “Student Involvement Theory: Patterns of Sport Club Participation at Rowan University,” pertaining to sport club athletes. The instrument originated from a study done at Ohio University pertaining to varsity athletes.
The instrument is divided into sections based on background and involvement information. The background section consists of checkboxes to answer demographic information and numerical questions stating how many hours per week were committed to different activities. The section pertaining to involvement is the most extensive and is divided into five sections. The first section of the involvement questions asked how often participation in group activities per month, followed by a question asking about the subject’s residence. The fourth section of involvement information pertained to the subject’s relationships with others on campus using a five option scale ranging from friendly and unsupportive to friendly and supportive. The final section consists of a Likert scale of five numbers pertaining to the importance of social involvement topics, academic involvement topics, and campus atmosphere topics, and the satisfaction of those topics. Strong positive feelings towards importance and satisfaction were labeled five, while strong negative feelings toward importance and satisfaction were labeled with a one.

The instrument (Appendix D) has been used before at Rowan University, but due to the change in location to Ashland University and variance in the population being targeted the instrument was pilot tested by two graduates recently employed by the department. Based on recommendations from previous studies and feedback from the pilot test, the adjustment was made regarding the Likert scale questions. The instrument received a Chronbach’s alpha measure of .913, identifying it as reliable and consistent. The range from right to left was changed from strong to weak range to a weak to strong range instead.
Data Gathering Procedures

Prior to the collection of any data, approval from the Rowan University Institutional Review Board was obtained through the eIRB application (Appendix A). Due to the study being done on another academic institution, approval was also obtained from the Ashland University Human Subject Review Board (Appendix B). As a full time employee at Ashland University, a faculty advisor was not necessary for approval through the Human Subject Review Board. The application was submitted for an exempt review. The rest of the application was similar to the eIRB process, requiring Social and Behavioral Research training, and permission was requested and given from the Ashland University Director of Recreational Services to collect data from current employees using the above instrument (Appendix C). The data collection was submitted electronically into a database, retaining no personal identifying information. At the onset of the data collection period the survey was placed at all employee workstations as well as sent via email to employees who did not have a concrete location with a computer workstation in the facility. Three weeks were given for the collection of data, with a reminder email sent via regular employee communication regarding the timeline of the data collection. At the end of the data collection period the survey was closed and accepted no other responses.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was achieved by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences computer software program. This program was used to obtain descriptive statistics in order to determine frequencies, averages, standard deviations, and
percentages based on the background information collected from the instrument.

Additional tests such as Pearson correlations were run to determine if there were any significant relationships between the background demographic information or recreational services student employment and other involvement on campus or student satisfaction.
Chapter IV

Findings

Profile of the Population

This study was conducted at the Ashland University Recreation Center, a department within Ashland University of Ashland, Ohio. A total population sampling of the students employed during the Fall of the 2015-2016 academic year consisted of 113 subjects. All 113 employees were asked to participate, and 92 responses were collected, yielding a response rate of 81.4%. After examining the results, one survey was found to be erroneous due to the fact that only one selection was made, which reduced the number of responses to 91, an 80.56% response rate.

The following six tables, 4.1 through 4.6, display descriptive information regarding the population. These tables include percentage breakdowns of male and female representations, academic status, race and ethnicity, area of employment, and grade point average (GPA). Table 4.1 describes the population of males and females that took part in the study, with 26.6% of the respondents reporting as male and 73.3% of the respondents reporting as female.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Campus Recreation Employees</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 describes the class status of the survey subjects. The class status is determined by the university according to accumulated credits. The highest representation by any class was juniors at 28.8%, followed by sophomores at 26.6%. Freshman were the third highest, representing 25.5% of the survey subjects, and seniors next representing 15.5%. Graduate students rounded out the final 3.3%.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Status of Campus Recreation Employees</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The racial and ethnic distribution is shown in Table 4.3. White/Caucasian respondents made up the largest number of all survey subjects, coming in at 90%. The second highest area was African American/Black at 4.4%, while Puerto Rican, Asian American/Asian, Mexican American/Chicano, Other/Latino, and Other all responded with 1.1%. American Indian/Alaskan Native and Pacific Islander was not represented at all.
Table 4.3

*Race and Ethnicity of Campus Recreation Employees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American/Chicano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows the breakdown of the survey subjects based on area of employment. The highest number of respondents reported they were employed in the areas of Customer Service and Lifeguards, both at 20%. Equipment Checkout was the third highest are represented with 17.7%, and Fitness Center fourth at 12.2%. Intramurals was next at 8.8%, followed by Facility Managers at 7.7%, Climbing Wall at 6.6%, and Group Exercise at 5.5%. Rec Sports Managers and Outdoor Pursuits Managers both reported lowest at 1.1%
Table 4.4

*Employment Areas of Campus Recreation Employees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Wall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Checkout</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Exercise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramurals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Sports Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pursuit Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 represents the breakdown of the cumulative GPA of the survey subjects.

The highest number of respondents stated their GPA was between a 3.4 and 3.6 at 36.6%.

Next was 3.7 to 4.0 at 26.6%, 3.0 to 3.3 at 21.1%, 2.7 to 2.9 at 13.3%, and 2.4 to 2.6 lowest at 3.3%.
Table 4.5

**GPA of Campus Recreation Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7 to 4.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 to 3.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 to 3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 to 2.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 to 2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of the Data**

**Research question 1:** What are the patterns of involvement of Recreational Services student employees?

The research question regarding involvement of Recreational Services student employees is outlined in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. Table 4.6 lists all of the selected involvement activities as part of the collegiate experience and the degree of involvement those participants invest each week. The area of involvement with the largest number of employees was being involved with a social fraternity or sorority at 36, followed by volunteer service with 31. The third, fourth, and fifth areas with the highest number of employees were religious organizations at 29, professional department or clubs at 22, and residence hall activities at 20. The lowest areas of participation in terms of number of participants were independent study with three participants, college production and performance with two participants, and student government and university publication, both with one participant. Table 4.6 also depicts the time invested in these involvement activities based on the amount of hours students participated. The activities that the
subjects participated the most in were varsity athletics at 20.91 hours per week and off-campus jobs with 11.31 hours per week. The activities that students participated the fewest amount of hours on average were leadership programs with 2.2 hours and volunteer service with 2.5 hours.
Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per Week of Involvement on Campus</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in on campus jobs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in a fraternity or sorority</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in volunteer service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in religious organizations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in club sports</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in professional department club</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in residence hall activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in social clubs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in off campus jobs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in varsity athletics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in a field experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in leadership programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in an internship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in study abroad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in independent study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in production and performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in student government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours a week spent in university publication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 lists all of the selected involvement activities as part of the collegiate experience and the degree of involvement those participants invest on a monthly basis.
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All subjects participated in on-campus jobs, as all subjects were employees with Recreational Services. The area with the most involvement was exercising or participating in physical activities with 85 subjects being involved. The second highest level of monthly involvement was working with a classmate outsides of class at 78, followed by discussing grades or assignments with an instructor at 62 subjects. The lowest levels of involvement on a monthly basis were tutoring or teaching other students at 23, attending an art exhibit, gallery, play or dance at 17 and participating in community-based projects as part of class at 16. Table 4.7 also shows the level of involvement invested into all of these areas of participation. Exercising had the highest level of participation with the mean number of times per month being 16, while working with classmates was second with a mean of 6.43. Attending an art exhibit, gallery, play, or dance was the lowest with a mean of 1.5 and discussing ideas with a faculty member was 3.2.
Table 4.7

*Times per Month of Involvement on Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercised or participated in physical activities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a classmate outside of class</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas with a faculty member</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in religious or spiritual activities</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, or dance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community-based projects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research question 2:** What are the Recreational Services student employee’s attitudes toward the importance of social involvement, academic involvement, and the campus environment at Ashland University?

Results related to research question two are illustrated in tables 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10. These tables are divided by information regarding attitudes of social involvement, academic involvement, and campus environment, respectively. Each table gives the mean scores of the results as well as the standard deviation. The attitudes of Recreational Service employees related to social involvement are depicted in Table 4.8. The most important social activity was establishing personal relationships with peers with a score of 4.6, followed by having a job while enrolled with a score of 4.52. The least important activities related to social involvement were getting involved in religious activities with a
score of 3.36 and attending cultural events on campus with a score of 2.74. The average score for all social involvement activities was 3.86.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes about the Importance of Social Involvement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing personal relationships with peers</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a job while enrolled</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in student organizations</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in campus activities</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with students of different races or cultures</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in religious activities</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending cultural events on campus</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 depicts the attitudes of Recreational Sports student employees toward the importance of academic involvement in their college experience. The strongest attitudes toward level of importance regarding academic involvement was both faculty availability outside of class and academic advising with a mean of 4.32, while social contact with facility was lowest in the academic area of involvement with a mean score of 3.98. The overall average of the academic areas of involvement was 4.21.
Table 4.9

*Attitudes about the Importance of Academic Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty availability outside of class</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact with faculty</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final section regarding Recreational Services student employee attitudes toward the importance of involvement on campus is the importance of the campus environment, illustrated in Table 4.10. The highest levels of importance in regards to campus environment were adequate academic atmosphere at 4.68 and adequate personal safety at 4.62. Fitting in to the campus community was next at 4.42 and adequate physical environment on campus after that at 4.4. The lowest level of importance was adequate social atmosphere at 4.39. The average attitude towards all areas of campus environment was 4.5.
Table 4.10

Attitudes about the Importance of Campus Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate academic atmosphere</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate personal safety</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting into the campus community</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate physical environment on campus</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate social atmosphere</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 3: How satisfied are Recreational Services student employees related to social involvement, academic involvement, and the campus environment at Ashland University?

Tables 4.11, 4.12, and 4.13 illustrate the Recreational Services student employees’ feelings toward their satisfaction regarding their social involvement, academic involvement, and the campus environment at Ashland University. Table 4.11 examines the satisfaction with social involvement. The areas with the highest level of satisfaction are having a job while enrolled at 4.45 and establishing personal relationships with peers at 4.36. Following those is getting involved in student organizations at 4.03, getting involved in campus activities at 4.00, and getting involved in religious activities at 3.65. Interacting with students of different races or cultures was the second-lowest at 3.48, while attending cultural events on campus is lowest at 3.09. The average score for satisfaction in all social involvement activities was 3.42.
Table 4.11

*Feelings about the Satisfaction of Social Involvement*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a job while enrolled</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing personal relationships with peers</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in student organizations</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in campus activities</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting involved in religious activities</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with students of different races or cultures</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending cultural events on campus</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feelings regarding satisfaction within the academic involvement for Recreational Services student employees is depicted in Table 4.12. Faculty availability outside of class ranked the most satisfied at 4.08, while academic advising was second at 4.00 and social contact with faculty was at the lowest with 3.96. The average score for feelings of satisfaction in all academic involvement activities was 4.01.

Table 4.12

*Feelings about the Satisfaction of Academic Involvement*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty availability outside of class</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact with faculty</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13 illustrates the subjects’ feelings regarding satisfaction with the campus environment. Adequate person safety was the highest level of satisfaction, with the mean score from respondents rating 4.48. Adequate academic atmosphere and adequate social atmosphere were both second at 4.27. Fourth was adequate physical environment on campus at 4.22 and fitting into the campus community was last at 4.21. The average score for feelings of satisfaction in all campus environment was 4.29.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate personal safety</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate academic atmosphere</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate social atmosphere</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate physical environment on campus</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting into the campus community</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 4: What significance is there between differences in demographic variables and involvement in other areas of campus involvement? Are there any areas that students feel important but are not satisfied?

Tables 4.14 through 4.18 aim to provide information for answering research question four. These tables portray the correlations between the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, academic class, and area of employment with the areas of involvement. Table 4.14 illustrates significant relationships with age and involvement at
Ashland University. Indicated in the table is a weak inverse correlation between the age of the Recreational Services student employee and involvement in varsity athletics \((r = -0.284, p = .007)\) at a \(p < .01\) level and a weak inverse correlations between the age of employees and participation in independent study \((r = -0.229, p = .030)\) at a \(p < .05\) level. The table also indicates a weak inverse correlation between age and studying abroad \((r = -0.212, p = .045)\) at a \(p < .05\) level.

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>(r) coefficient</th>
<th>(p)-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Athletics</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=13, M=1.86, SD=0.492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3, M=1.97, SD=0.180)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=7, M=1.92, SD=0.286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(*p = <.05, **p = <.01\)

Table 4.15 illustrates the significant correlations between gender and involvement in other areas of campus. There is a weak inverse relationship between age and volunteer service \((r = -0.213, p = .044)\) at a \(p < .05\) level.
Table 4.15

*Significant Correlations of Gender and Areas of Campus Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>r coefficient</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Service</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=31, M=1.66, SD=.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <.05

The relationships between class status and areas of campus involvement are depicted through the correlations shown in Table 4.16. The table shows that there is a weak inverse correlation between class status and participation in independent study (r = -.256, p = .015) at a p < .05 level, and a weak relationship with class status and physical activity (r = .211, p = .046) at a p < .05 level.

Table 4.16

*Significant Correlations of Class Status and Areas of Campus Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>r coefficient</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3, M=1.97, SD=.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=85, M=1.07, SD=.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <.05

Table 4.17 illustrates the correlations between race and ethnicity and areas of campus involvement. There is a weak correlation between race and ethnicity and participation in religious organizations (r = .218, p = .039) at a p < .05 level.
Table 4.17

*Significant Correlations of Race/Ethnicity and Areas of Campus Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>r coefficient</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in religious organizations</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=29, M=1.68, SD=.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <.05

The relationships or correlations shown in Table 4.18 are between areas of employment and other campus involvement. There is a weak correlation between the area of employment and residence hall activities ($r = .233, p = .026$) at a $p < .05$ level. In addition, the table illustrates there is a weak correlation between employment areas and other off campus employment ($r = .246, p = .019$) at a $p < .05$ level.

Table 4.18

*Significant Correlations of Employment Area and Areas of Campus Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>r coefficient</th>
<th>p-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall activities</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=20, M=1.78, SD=.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus employment</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=15, M=1.84, SD=.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <.05
Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study was performed at Ashland University during the 2015-2016 academic year and examined the involvement patterns of Recreational Services student employees in terms of their involvement in other areas of campus. In addition to determining their involvement patterns, relationships between demographics or area of employment and involvement in other areas on campus were identified, as well as the attitudes toward the satisfaction and importance of involvement in the areas of social involvement, academic involvement, and campus environment. The survey subjects consisted of 91 Recreational Services employees employed in the department in the fall of 2015.

The review of the literature illustrated the importance of involvement on campus and the effects of being involved on student satisfaction and success. Campus recreation has grown significantly into being a contributing area of involvement through its growth and development over time. With this growth and development, employment and focus on student development by campus recreation professionals has created a positive learning environment for student employees. The focus of employment is not solely about providing income for student employees and recreational opportunities for students, but also for providing an opportunity through employment for students to be involved in a different setting.

Based on the literature review, there is a gap in the knowledge of involvement in campus recreation employment and involvement on campus. Studies have been done
with varsity athletes, club sport athletes, and participants in campus recreation, but none on employees in campus recreation. Based on studies done by Iacovone (2007) and Stelzer (2012), a survey instrument was used to focus on student employment rather than participation. The instrument included demographic information, employment information, involvement on campus and to what degree, and attitudes of importance and satisfaction.

The results of the study were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 21 computer program. This program provided descriptive statistics and frequencies of the demographics and levels of involvement. Correlations were also used to determine any significant relationships between demographic information and levels of involvement in other areas of campus life.

**Discussion of the Findings**

The results of this study show the amount of involvement that campus recreation employees participate in as well as the degree of involvement in each area, answering specifically to research question one. There were two different survey questions asked in this section. The first was based on involvement on a weekly scale, while the second was based on involvement on a monthly scale. The findings of the first question illustrate that more employees participate in sorority and fraternity life more than any other area, with 36 employees involved. The majority of respondents (59%) were involved between one and five hours per week, while 25% were involved six to ten hours per week. On the monthly basis, working with a classmate outside of class was the area the most employees were involved in, with 78 employees indicating involvement. Involvement
levels of one to eight hours was indicated by 71.7% of employees, while 17.9% indicated nine to sixteen hours.

While these areas did not have the highest number of employees participating, the areas of varsity athletics, off campus jobs, and field experiences had the highest level of involvement in terms of hours per week. This supports Astin’s (1984) findings that athletes have a much larger time commitment than non-athletes. Participating in exercise or physical activity and working with a classmate outside of class had the highest level of involvement in terms of times per month. The findings show that the lowest levels of participation were student government, university publication, production and performance, and independent study on the weekly basis.

These findings are consistent with the studies done by Iacovone (2007) and Stelzer (2012) in the fact that athletes seldom have time for other involvement on campus due to their time commitment, thus there are very few varsity athletes who were employees that took part in this study. This study did differ from those studies in terms of participation in religious organizations and social fraternities and sororities, which could be caused by the difference in institutions as this study was done at a private, religious institution.

In terms of the importance of social involvement identified in research question two, the findings indicated that there is an overall feeling that social involvement is important with a mean score of 3.86. The most important part of social involvement is establishing personal relationships with peers with a mean score of 4.6. This high score indicates that students employed by campus recreation departments desire opportunities
to develop peer groups, supporting Elkins, Forrester, and Noel-Elkins’ (2011) claim that these groups broaden social network and encourage students to persist in college. The mean score of employees’ attitudes towards the importance of academic involvement was 4.21. The strongest feelings of importance were towards faculty availability outside of class and academic advising, both with a mean score of 4.32. The findings also indicated that the strongest feelings of importance were felt about the importance of the campus environment, with a mean score of 4.5. Adequate academic atmosphere had the strongest score of 4.68.

These findings indicate that campus recreation employees feel that the most important part of involvement is the campus environment, followed by academic involvement and lowest with social involvement. It is interesting to see that social involvement is the least important, while participating in a fraternity and sorority is the most involved area of employees. However, the number of those indicating they work with a classmate outside of class and discusses grades with an instructor do support the attitude of importance regarding academic atmosphere.

The satisfaction of campus recreation employees was found in response to research question number three. The findings indicated that the highest level of satisfaction was regarding the campus environment with a mean score of 4.29, followed by academic involvement with a mean score of 4.01. Satisfaction of social involvement was lowest with a mean score of 3.42, which is still a feeling of moderate satisfaction. The highest level of satisfaction related to social involvement was having a job with a mean score of 4.45, while the highest level of satisfaction regarding academic
involvement was faculty availability outside of class with a mean score of 4.08. The highest level of satisfaction overall, as well as in the campus environment, was adequate personal safety with a mean score of 4.48. These findings show higher satisfaction than those in the study done by Stelzer (2012), and there are different specific areas that had the highest levels of satisfaction. The areas of high satisfaction related to social factors supports the study by Kovacs and Beck (1997) claiming social involvement was a leading factor for participation in recreational sports.

The fourth research question sought to identify any correlations or relationships between demographic areas and involvement in other areas of campus. There were multiple correlations found through this study. Within the demographic area of age and campus involvement, varsity athletics, independent study, and study abroad all indicated weak inverse correlations. The same was found in gender and volunteer service. There was a weak correlation between class status and physical activity, while a weak inverse correlation between class status and independent study. The correlations between race/ethnicity and participation in religious organizations shows a weak correlation. This supports a study by Griffith, Walker, and Collins (2011) that found that ethnicity factored into cohesion among coworkers, which could be linked to the negative correlation. There were also significant correlations between area of employment and involvement, with weak correlations of employment and participating in residence hall activities. This is neither supported nor refuted by previous studies included in the literature review as this is the first with campus recreation student employees as subjects.
Conclusions

The results of this study identified patterns of involvement of campus recreation employees in a small, private, four year school setting. There are high levels of campus recreation employees involved in multiple different areas on campus, with an average of each employee involved in over six different areas. The highest level of involvement is in fraternities and sororities, which is consistent with the campus environment of 19% of the total student population (Ashland University Greek Life Grade Report, 2015). Recreational Services employees are actually more involved in sororities and fraternities than the campus average, with 39.5% of employees involved. This furthers the argument that students that are involved in one area on campus are more likely to be involved in multiple areas on campus. It can be concluded that these students are satisfied with their college experience based on their involvement on campus as highly involved students.

There are also other similarities between the involvement on campus and results of the study. Three of the more-involved areas, participation in religious organizations, participation in religious or spiritual activities, and participation in volunteer service, fall in line with the campus environment, as the university is affiliated with the Brethren Church. With a 105,000 square foot recreation center that is less than 10 years old, participation in exercise or physical activities is also expected to be one of the more involved areas of campus involvement.

Another pattern that was found in this study is the importance and satisfaction of campus environment, academic involvement, and social involvement. The campus environment was both the most important and most satisfying area of the study, with the
mean scores of both over 4. The findings showed that in all areas, the employees
surveyed found that all areas of campus involvement were important, and that they were
satisfied with all of those areas. It can be concluded that opportunities for involvement
are important for students and on this campus the adequate opportunities have led to high
levels of satisfaction.

Overall, there were significant relationships found between demographic
information and involvement based on the survey information. The most specific
question to this study, relationships between areas of employment and involvement on
campus, showed to be the area with the most significant correlations. These areas
included residence hall activities, religious organizations, religious or spiritual activities,
off campus employment, and internships. Class status and involvement was another area
with multiple significant correlations, including independent study, physical activity,
varsity athletics, and field experience. The number of significant correlations based on
employment area and class status could provide useful information when hiring practices
are put in place. It can be concluded that there are specific areas of employment that are
more suitable or applicable for students involved in different areas on campus, which
could lead negatively to unbalanced hiring practices, or positively to great team cohesion
and sense of community.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, the following suggestions
are presented for future practice:
1. Encourage higher education professionals to promote on campus employment not just as a source of income but as a way of becoming involved, leading to satisfaction.

2. Suggest on campus employers identify ideal areas of involvement that work beneficially with the area of their employment in order to encourage a strong campus experience through involvement.

3. Encourage campus recreation professionals to examine demographics of current student employees and determine what areas of employment have the strongest relationships with other areas of involvement on campus.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. Conduct a similar study in other employment areas of employment in the Student Affairs division in order to compare results within the same campus setting.

2. Conduct a similar study on other college campuses of similar and different sizes in order to compare results.

3. Examine the overall level of involvement of all students on campus to compare their patterns to those reported in this study.
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--
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Appendix D

Recreational Services Employees and Involvement Theory

This survey is being administered as part of a master’s degree research project. The purpose of this research is to determine Recreational Services employees’ involvement patterns at Ashland University. While your participation is voluntary and you are not required to answer all of the questions herein, your reoperation and participation are important to the success of the project and are greatly appreciated. If you choose to participate and are at least 18 years of age, please understand that all responses are anonymous and no personally identifiable information is being requested.

For any questions please contact Justin R. Fletcher at jfletch1@ashland.edu or 440-371-9110 or Dr. Burton Sisco at sisco@rowan.edu or 856-256-4500 ext. 3717

Background Information

What is your age?

- [ ] 18 & Under
- [ ] 19 to 20
- [ ] 21 to 22
- [ ] 23 & Older

What is your gender?

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

What class are you in?

- [ ] Freshman
- [ ] Sophomore
- [ ] Junior
- [ ] Senior
- [ ] Graduate

Are You:

- [ ] White/Caucasian
- [ ] African American/Black
- [ ] American Indian/Alaskan Native
- [ ] Asian American/Asian
- [ ] Pacific Islander
- [ ] Mexican American/Chicano
- [ ] Puerto Rican
- [ ] Other Latino
- [ ] Other

What areas of Recreational Services are you currently employed?

- [ ] Climbing Wall
- [ ] Customer Service
- [ ] Equipment Checkout
- [ ] Facility Manager
- [ ] Rec Sports Manager
- [ ] Lead Group X Instructor
- [ ] Fitness Center
- [ ] Group Exercise
- [ ] Intramurals
- [ ] Lifeguard
- [ ] Outdoor Pursuits Manager

What is your cumulative GPA?

- [ ] 4.0 to 3.7
- [ ] 3.6 to 3.4
- [ ] 3.3 to 3.0
- [ ] 2.9 to 2.7
- [ ] 2.6 to 2.4
- [ ] 2.3 to 2.0
Involvement Information

SECTION I
In your experience at Ashland University, have you participated in any of these activities: If so, check “yes” and write in how many hours you participated in the activity each week on average?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Member of a social fraternity or sorority
2. Varsity Athletics
3. Student Government
4. University Publication
5. College Productions or Performance
6. Professional or Department Clubs
7. Social Clubs
8. Residence Hall Activities
9. Religious Organizations
10. Volunteer Service
11. Leadership Programs
12. Off-Campus Part Time Job
13. On-Campus Part Time Job
14. Internship
15. Field Experience
16. Participated in Independent Study
17. Participated in Study Abroad Program
18. Participated in Club Sports

SECTION II
In your experience at Ashland University, on average how frequently do you participate monthly in each activity below? (give total number for each category below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Worked with classmates outside of class
2. Tutored or taught other students
3. Participated in community-based projects as part of class
4. Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, or dance
5. Exercised or participated in physical activities
6. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
7. Discussed ideas with a faculty member
8. Participate in religious or spiritual activities

SECTION III
Which of the following best describes where you are living? (check one)

[ ] Dormitory or other campus housing
[ ] Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within walking distance
SECTION IV
Mark the box that best represents your relationship with people at Ashland University

a. Relationships with other students
Unfriendly, Unsupportive
[ ] [ ]

b. Relationships with faculty members
Unfriendly, Unsupportive
[ ] [ ]

SECTION V
The following questions have two parts. First rate how important each item is to you by circling one of the numbers from 1-5. Second, rate how satisfied you are with each item by circling one of the numbers from 1-5. Use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Satisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Involvement

1. Establishing Personal Relationships w/ Peers at Ashland 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
2. Getting Involved in Student Organizations 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
3. Getting Involved in Campus Activities 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
4. Attending Cultural Events On Campus 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
5. Interacting with Students of Different Races or Cultures 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
6. Getting Involved in Religious Activities 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
7. Having a Job While Enrolled 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

### Academic Involvement

1. Faculty Availability Outside of Class 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
2. Social Contact with Faculty 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
3. Academic Advising 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5

### Campus Atmosphere

1. Adequate Personal Safety 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5
2. Adequate Physical

60
| Environment on Campus | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Adequate Social Atmosphere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Adequate Academic Atmosphere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Fitting into Campus Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
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11/29/2015  RE: Permission Request - Fletcher, Justin R.

RE: Permission Request

Stelzer, Brian <Stelzerb@uncw.edu>

Fri 1/16/2015 6:58 PM

to:Fletcher, Justin R. <fletcherj@rowan.edu>;

Justin,

By all means! Go ahead. Good luck!

Brian

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: "Fletcher, Justin R." <fletcherj@rowan.edu>
Date:01/16/2015 10:32 AM (GMT-07:00)
To: "Stelzer, Brian" <Stelzerb@uncw.edu>
Subject: Permission Request

Brian,

I am writing this email to request permission to use the instrument you used in your thesis project, Student Involvement Theory: Patterns of Sport Club Participation at Rowan University. I plan on modifying the instrument to include all users of the Rec Center.

Thank you for your consideration,

Justin Fletcher

https://exchange.rowan.edu/owa/ FWwmlW model=ReadMessageItem&ItemID=AAWdK2NjYjM3ZjMTYyLThmZjU5NjGEMyYjO4MWQzLWZmOW83MGE2MGGyZ... 1/1