

2010

# Job satisfaction for campus recreation professionals within NIRSA institutions

William F. Stier

*The College at Brockport*, bstier@brockport.edu

Robert C. Schneider

*The College at Brockport*, rschneid@brockport.edu

Stephen Kampf

*Bowling Green State University - Main Campus*, skampf@bgsu.edu

Brady P. Gaskins

*Bowling Green State University - Main Campus*, gaskins@bgsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes\\_facpub](https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_facpub)

 Part of the [Life Sciences Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Stier, William F.; Schneider, Robert C.; Kampf, Stephen; and Gaskins, Brady P., "Job satisfaction for campus recreation professionals within NIRSA institutions" (2010). *Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education Faculty Publications*. 35.

[https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes\\_facpub/35](https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_facpub/35)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact [kmyers@brockport.edu](mailto:kmyers@brockport.edu).

## **Job Satisfaction for Campus Recreation Professionals Within NIRSA Institutions**

**William F. Stier, Jr., Robert C. Schneider,  
Stephen Kampf, and Brady P. Gaskins**

An international investigation was conducted to determine the overall job satisfaction of college campus recreation employees who are members of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). Demographic information was gathered to provide statistical analysis based on (a) region; (b) size of school; (c) private versus public; (d) four-year versus two-year schools; (e) rural, suburban, and urban location; (f) years in the profession; and (g) reporting structure. The following work related areas were examined to determine if NIRSA members were satisfied with their job environment: (a) personal/individual satisfaction, (b) staffing and organizational structure, (c) financial support, (d) salary and professional development, (e) department and individual expectations, (f) campus recreation facilities, and (g) campus collaboration and communication. The study found that overall the respondents indicated they were satisfied with their job situation/environment with greater satisfaction being shown by those with loftier job titles when compared with those with lesser job titles. Differences in job satisfaction were noted in terms of (a) supervisor's expectations of them, salary, and hours worked (based on amount of experience); (b) salary (based on title held); (c) budget allocation (based on reporting structure); and (d) a desire to leave their present position/job (in terms of job title held, experience/length of service and reporting structure).

**Keywords:** campus recreation, job satisfaction, NIRSA Institutions, jobs

People want to work where they are appreciated (Energized staff!, 2002). Appreciated employees are more satisfied with their jobs. And satisfied employees are more productive (Chen, Chang, & Yeh, 2004). A study conducted by J.D. Power and Associates (2007) found that employee satisfaction and retention are absolutely critical to the employing entity. The fact that satisfied employees are more likely to attract other high performing employees, as well as more likely to be motivated to engage in professional development (learning new skills), resulting in greater productivity, speaks to the importance of having personnel who are satisfied with their jobs and work environments.

---

Stier and Schneider are with the Dept. of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education at the College at Brockport, State University of New York. Kampf and Gaskins are with Bowling Green State University (Ohio). To receive a copy of the research instrument, contact Stier at bstier@brockport.edu.

In recent years there has been a dearth of research on the topic of job satisfaction of college campus recreation employees. In an attempt to fill this void, a sample of employees of campus recreation programs of four-year colleges and universities in North America, who were members of the National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA), were selected to participate in this study conducted through an on-line survey. There are real benefits to having satisfied employees. The campus recreation community as a whole will benefit from this study that seeks to ascertain job satisfaction of employees within NIRSA institutions.

One recent study that investigated the job satisfaction of collegiate campus recreation directors was conducted by Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines, and Wilding (2005). This study concluded that overall job satisfaction was generally high, due to clear identification of job definition/expectations, organizational performance, management efforts involving staff in decision making, positive interpersonal relationships with coworkers, all of which are factors that lead to job satisfaction. However, this same study revealed significant dissatisfaction in terms of existing facilities and marketing opportunities.

## **Definitions of Job Satisfaction**

The concept of job satisfaction is considered by some as one of the most challenging concepts to fully understand in the practice and the science of work behavior (Job Satisfaction Changes, 1999). That statement notwithstanding, job satisfaction has been described in many ways. One definition defines it as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one’s job as fulfilling or allowing fulfillment of one’s important job values, providing these values are compatible with one’s needs” (Locke, 1976, p. 1342). Locke (p. 1307) also provides an alternative definition which states “. . . job satisfaction results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one’s important job values.”

Another definition states that it is “the result of the individual’s perception of what is expected and what is received from different facets of the work situation. The closer the expectation is to what is actually received, the greater the job satisfaction” (Francis & Milbourn, 1980, p. 70). And, Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) indicate that it is the extent to which workers are satisfied with their jobs or how they feel about different aspects of their work or employment situation.

## **Factors Increasing Job Satisfaction**

Clarity, work environment, and employees’ evaluation of managers are three elements that play a real role in creating job satisfaction. Employees who successfully comprehend their role within the organization/business, who have opportunities to assess/evaluate their superiors or employers, as well as feel as if their employment situation is a positive one, are more likely to enjoy job satisfaction (Arnett, Lavarie, & McLane, 2002). Another factor closely associated with job satisfaction is one’s own level of motivation. Those who are highly self-motivated also tend to have a high level of job satisfaction (Pool, 1997).

In terms of compensation/money, one's actual salary is not always the most important factor in terms of job satisfaction as long as the compensation is adequate (J.D. Power and Associates, 2007). This belief was reinforced by the study conducted by Koremans (2007), who found that executives were more motivated by job satisfaction than money when looking for new jobs/positions; and, that the features and benefits of a job mattered more than the company itself. Similar findings were revealed by a study of employees in Japan in which it was found that such factors as the number of hours worked, the working environment, workplace relationships and the nature of the job (instead of wages) become even more important relative to the level of job satisfaction to the typical employee as one becomes older (Ohashi, 2005).

Organ and Hamner (1978) studied organizational behavior and job satisfaction in the general work force and concluded that a very large portion of the working population enjoy their work and have high job satisfaction. In addition, between 65 and 86% of those employed were generally satisfied with their jobs and job situations while only 10–25% would be classified as actually dissatisfied/discontented with their jobs and job situation/environment.

Iiaqua, Schumacher, and Li (1995) revealed that job satisfaction tends to increase as a result of high intrinsic values found in the workplace. And, extrinsic rewards tend to affect job satisfaction among employees when intrinsic awards are not available for these same individuals. They concluded that such demographic factors such as age, gender, etc., typically have minimum or no significant impact on job satisfaction.

Moss and Rowles (1997) found that job satisfaction clearly improves as the management style nears the participative management style. Connolly and Myers (2003) suggested employers and supervisors need to develop and implement strategies that will enhance job satisfaction of those employed.

Other factors reported to play a role in job satisfaction include attainable work-related achievements, a sense of accomplishment, progress, growth, autonomy, role clarity, lack of role conflict, performance feedback, freedom from physical strain, and drudgery. Supervisors who are fair, considerate, competent, recognize and reward good performance, and allow some participation in decision making, are viewed as acting in a way that enhances the level of job satisfaction of their employees (Henne & Locke, 1985). Reducing workload (in an effort to retain employees) also facilitates job satisfaction (Davolt, 2006). Reducing staff turnover by the creation of a work environment in which staff are happy and see themselves as growing professionally is seen both as a method of reducing employee turnover and increasing job satisfaction (Jasper, 2005).

Higgins (2003) reported that employees with good or adequate compensation, meaningful work, supportive and cooperative coworkers, and freedom and resources to do their jobs were very satisfied with their job. Judge, Thoresen, and Bono (2001) indicated that high autonomy jobs produce greater satisfaction and improved performance. De Cuyper and De Witte, (2006) agreed that low autonomy lessened job satisfaction both in terms of temporary and permanent employees. Houston, Meyer, and Paewai (2006) found university academic teachers were moderately to very satisfied with the freedom (autonomy) to choose their own method of work, their level of responsibility, and the amount of variety in their job. However, they were also indifferent in terms of the recognition received for good work and indifferent or moderately dissatisfied with their salaries and chances for advancement.

Becze (2007) in a study involving nurses found that nonmonetary factors such as flexible work schedules, institutional support for continuing education, and respect from managers and coworkers played a major role in job satisfaction. In another study of teaching faculty, Brewer, Carnes, and Garner (2007) found that an improved work environment, including new facilities, as well as a sense of collegiality and identity, and integration of new technology, can all lead to an increase in job satisfaction. In a study of job satisfaction in Taiwan, Chen et al. (2004) found that employees who felt comfortable with their career development programs had increased levels of job satisfaction. Finally, a study conducted by Robert, Young, and Kelly (2006) revealed a positive and significant relationship between both spiritual and religious well-being and general job satisfaction. These studies reveal that the topics of job satisfaction work environment, work schedules, and institutional support is not only international in nature but transcends professions and types of jobs.

## **Factors Lessening Job Satisfaction**

Those factors that are reported to reduce or decrease job satisfaction include: job stress, conflicts with other departments and lack of participation in policy making decisions (Gellis, Kim, & Hwang, 2004). In addition, high pressure, stress, low pay, small or no pay increases, reduced benefits, low rewards, poor communication with management, team and staff, politics, fear of layoffs, boredom, lack of autonomy and authority, overly managed, micromanaged, petty company politics, long hours, poor production planning, and heavy workloads also contribute to poor job satisfaction (Higgins, 2003; De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006).

Stress has been cited as a source of poor job satisfaction and can be attributed to many factors including coworkers not doing their job, inadequate salary, presence of crisis situations, excessive paper work, lack of opportunity and competition for advancement, lack of recognition for good work, lack of supervisory support, and poor relation with one's supervisor (Gellis, Kim, & Hwang, 2004).

Outside factors or influences can also have a significant impact upon job satisfaction. For example, Grandey, Cordeiro, and Crouter (2005) suggested job satisfaction decreases when employment is felt to be interfering with what is needed at home in terms of time and energy, or in the case of working women, time needed at home with children.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the overall job satisfaction of college campus recreation employees who are members of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). Specifically, seven work related areas were examined to determine if NIRSA members were satisfied with their job environment. Data for this study are based on the review of literature and testimony/responses to survey items from respondents who were all employed and members of NIRSA in North America.

One of the objectives of this investigation was to add to the body of knowledge (professional literature) in the area of collegiate recreation sport programs relative

to the determination of the satisfaction levels of NIRSA members. It is anticipated that the findings of this research will provide information and insight into areas of high and low satisfaction on a number of areas affecting employment and job satisfaction.

## Methods

The content of the on-line questionnaire was based on the collaborative efforts of the four authors/researchers and the existing current literature as it relates to various areas of job satisfaction including staffing and organizational structure, financial support, salary and professional development, department and individual expectations, facilities, campus collaboration and communication, as well as various policies, practices, and procedures relating to campus recreation programs. To help establish content validity through expert feedback, the initial draft of the survey was forwarded to five directors who met the “expertise” criteria of having 20 or more years of experience in campus recreation programs. Minor changes were made to the instrument as a result of this pilot study.

In addition, submission for approval of the on-line survey document was provided to the NIRSA Research Committee. Minor changes were recommended and the document was approved by this committee. The questions were dichotomous yes/no, closed-end multiple-choice where respondents were asked to select the best response, and several open ended questions.

## Sample

A random sample of 1,000 NIRSA members was obtained from the NIRSA National Office, Corvallis, Oregon, with the approval of the NIRSA Research Committee. The subjects were campus recreation professionals who held memberships in NIRSA and were employed at four year colleges/universities in North America. An initial e-mail request was sent through NIRSA, with a follow-up e-mail sent three weeks after initial contact.

A total of 283 people responded to the survey requests for a 28.3% response rate, an acceptable rate of return for this type of research. Responses were received from a variety of titles (Director to Associate Director to Assistant Director to Coordinator to Staff Member), public and private institutions, and all six NIRSA regions. Procedures to ensure subject and institutional anonymity were confirmed to be appropriate by one of the researcher’s institution’s internal review board. Specifically, all information provided was kept confidential and maintained in a secure location. To preserve anonymity of respondents, no identifying characteristics of the subjects (i.e., name, address, and place of employment) were included on the returned surveys. For the purpose of tracking responses, an on-line survey program was used (SNAP) and an internal numeric code was created for each returned survey that could not be linked to the respondents’ e-mail addresses, thus preserving their anonymity.

Demographic information was gathered to provide statistical analysis based on the respondents’ region within NIRSA, type of institution, locale of institution,

and total size, to include undergraduate and graduate student population, etc. See the seven items below.

1. Region
2. Size of school
3. Private versus public
4. Four-year versus two-year schools
5. Rural, suburban, and urban location
6. Years in the profession
7. Reporting structure.

The final form of the on-line survey contained 27 questions, 18 questions for respondents plus nine demographic/background questions, dealing with the following specific areas/topics.

1. Personal/individual satisfaction
2. Staffing and organizational structure
3. Financial support
4. Salary and professional development
5. Department and individual expectations
6. Campus recreation facilities
7. Campus collaboration and communication.

## Results

### Demographics

Respondents to the survey identified the locations of their respective institutions as (a) rural (24%), (b) urban (54%), and (c) suburban (22%). The size of the institution identified by respondents was found to be 22% small (5,000 or less), 27% medium (5,001–15,000), 23% large (15,001–25,000), and 28% extra large (25,001 and above). Respondents were asked to identify the specific region of the country where their institution is located based on regions labeled by NIRSA. The NIRSA regional locations were identified as Region 1, 15%; Region 2, 24%; Region 3, 14%, Region 4, 24%; Region 5, 11%; and Region 6, 13%. Of the institutions that responded to the survey, 75% were public and 25% were private.

Additional personal demographic information was provided by the respondents including years of overall professional campus recreation experience, reporting structure, current job title, and gender. Overall, 33% of the respondents indicated their years of experience being less than six years, 24% were between 6 and 10 years, 12% were between 11 and 15 years, 11% were between 16 and 20 years, and 20% indicated having more than twenty years of experience. Respondents to the survey identified their department's reporting structure as 75%

student affairs, 14% intercollegiate athletics, 2% academic affairs, 4% business or finance, and 5% other. Respondents identified their current job title as 34% Director or equivalent, 15% Associate Director or equivalent, 26% Assistant Director or equivalent, 23% Coordinator or equivalent, and 2% other (staff member). Finally, 60% of the respondents indicated they were male and 40% identified themselves as being female.

### Satisfaction by Job Title

Respondents were asked specific questions relating to their jobs. Overall, 93% of the respondents indicated they were satisfied with their job. Table 1 shows the various types of satisfaction examined in this study. The data suggest that employees working within a campus recreation department are satisfied; however, the higher an individual's job title equates to a higher level of satisfaction. This is evident by the respondents reporting a 97% overall degree of satisfaction by Directors versus 87% overall degree of satisfaction by Coordinator positions. This was particularly apparent when comparing the degree of satisfaction regarding salary held by Directors (73%) and Associate Directors (80%) versus Assistant Directors (54%) and Coordinators (40%). Similarly, Directors (87%) and Associate Directors (90%) were more satisfied in their hours of work when compared with Assistant Directors (72%) and Coordinators (67%).

**Table 1 Satisfaction by Job Title**

Job title	Overall degree of satisfaction	Salary	Budget allocation	Hours of work	Supervisor's expectations of you
Director	97%	73%	69%	87%	94%
Associate Director	95%	80%	67%	90%	90%
Assistant Director	91%	54%	78%	72%	93%
Coordinator	87%	40%	69%	67%	84%

### Satisfaction by Years of Experience

Respondents were asked specific questions related to their job satisfaction in light of their experience, see Table 2. Overall, individuals with more than 20 years of experience are more satisfied with their job (98%), salary (74%), and hours of work (95%). However, these individuals were not as satisfied with their supervisor's expectations of them (82%) when compared with those with less experience. Respondents with more experience were more satisfied with their salary when compared with those with lesser experience. Those with more than 20 years experience (74%) and 16–20 years experience (74%) were more satisfied with their salary than those with 11–15 years (55%), 6–10 years (56%), and those with less than six years (56%) experience.

**Table 2 Satisfaction by Years of Experience**

Years of experience	Overall degree of satisfaction	Salary	Budget allocation	Hours of work	Supervisor's expectations of you
Fewer than 6 years	88%	56%	72%	74%	85%
6–10 years	92%	56%	71%	76%	91%
11–15 years	94%	55%	71%	74%	97%
16–20 years	94%	74%	76%	81%	94%
More than 20 years	98%	74%	69%	95%	82%

### Satisfaction Based on Reporting Structure

Individual satisfaction was examined when compared with the reporting structure of the campus recreation department, see Table 3. Overall, most respondents are satisfied with their current positions. However, respondents who report to intercollegiate athletics expressed displeasure in their budget allocation. Of these respondents, 45% were satisfied with their current budget allocation. Conversely, individuals who report to student affairs, 75% were satisfied with their budget allocation.

**Table 3 Satisfaction by Reporting Structure**

Reporting structure	Overall degree of satisfaction	Salary	Budget allocation	Hours of work	Supervisor's expectations of you
Student Affairs	92%	61%	75%	80%	91%
Intercollegiate Athletics	95%	61%	45%	83%	83%
Academic Affairs	100%	60%	60%	80%	100%
Business and/or Finance	100%	73%	82%	64%	91%

### Desire to Leave Current Position: Job Title, Years of Experience, and Reporting Structure

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had a desire to leave their current position. For the purpose of this study, Table 4 represents the desire to leave a job based on the respondents' job titles, years of experience, and reporting structures. Overall, individuals in the positions of Director and Associate Director had a lesser desire to leave their current position as compared with those in the positions of Assistant

Director and Coordinator. Furthermore, Table 5 represents the effect of years of experience on a person's desire to leave their current position. Individuals with 20 or more years were least likely to want to leave their current position with only 7% indicating such a desire. Conversely, individuals with 6–10 years experience expressed a greater desire (43%) to leave their current position as compared with others. Finally, Table 6 reflects the effect an individual's reporting structure has on an individual's desire to leave one's current position. Individuals who reported to the Business and/or Finance area (46%) expressed a higher desire to leave their current position when compared with those who report to Athletics, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs.

**Table 4 Desire to Leave Current Position Based on Job Title**

<b>Job title</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Director	20%	80%
Associate Director	20%	80%
Assistant Director	40%	60%
Coordinator	34%	66%
Other	50%	50%

**Table 5 Desire to Leave Current Position Based on Years of Experience**

<b>Years of experience</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Fewer than 6 years	36%	64%
6–10 years	43%	57%
11–15 years	29%	71%
16–20 years	17%	83%
More than 20 years	7%	93%

**Table 6 Desire to Leave Current Position Based on Reporting Structure**

<b>Reporting structure</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Student Affairs	28%	72%
Intercollegiate Athletics	25%	75%
Academic Affairs	25%	75%
Business and/or Finance	46%	54%
Other	36%	64%

## Satisfaction With Supervisor's Expectations Based on Years of Experience

Respondents were asked specific questions related to their satisfaction with their supervisor's expectations of the campus recreation department. Table 7 represents responses made based on an individual's years of experience. Overall, individuals with more than 20 years of experience expressed being very satisfied with their supervisor's expectations (57%) versus those with 11–15 years who revealed a lower level of being very satisfied (20%). Overall, dissatisfaction of a supervisor's expectations of a department was seen at a lesser extent. Specifically, individuals with 16–20 years of experience indicated a very small amount of dissatisfaction with their supervisor's expectations of the department (3%). Conversely, respondents with 6–10 years experience expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction (16%).

**Table 7 Satisfaction With Supervisor's Expectations of Department Based on Experience**

Years of experience	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Fewer than 6 years	36%	48%	10%	2%	4%
6–10 years	27%	57%	16%	0%	0%
11–15 years	20%	67%	3%	0%	10%
16–20 years	36%	55%	0%	3%	6%
More than 20 years	57%	36%	6%	2%	0%

## Satisfaction With Supervisor's Expectations Based on Job Title

Table 8 represents respondents' satisfaction with their supervisor's expectation of the campus recreation department based on job title. Overall, individuals with the title of Director (91%) and Associate Director (92%) were more satisfied with their supervisor's expectations of the department. Dissatisfaction with one's supervisor's expectations of the department varied slightly in regard to job title. Assistant Director (14%) and Coordinator (13%) positions recorded slightly higher overall dissatisfaction levels with their supervisors' expectations of their departments.

## Satisfaction With Maintenance of Outdoor Facilities Based on Geographical Location

Satisfaction, based on NIRSA geographical region, with the quality of the maintenance of the respondents' outdoor facilities is revealed in Table 9. Overall, respondents from Region 1 (40%) and Region 6 (40%) expressed the lowest level of satisfaction with the maintenance quality of their outdoor facilities. In addition,

individuals in Region 1 (27%) and Region 6 (25%) expressed being very dissatisfied with the maintenance quality of their outdoor facilities at a higher level compared with other regions. Conversely, individuals residing in Region 2 (66%) and Region 5 (72%) expressed the highest level of satisfaction with the quality of the maintenance of their outdoor facilities.

**Table 8 Satisfaction With Supervisor's Expectations of Department Based on Experience Based on Job Title**

Job title	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Director	45%	46%	6%	2%	1%
Associate Director	21%	71%	3%	3%	2%
Assistant Director	40%	45%	13%	1%	0%
Coordinator	30%	49%	13%	0%	8%

**Table 9 Satisfaction With the Maintenance Quality of Outdoor Facilities, Based on NIRSA Geographical Region**

NIRSA region	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Region 1	8%	32%	22%	27%	11%
Region 2	8%	58%	20%	3%	10%
Region 3	19%	33%	25%	11%	11%
Region 4	15%	42%	33%	7%	3%
Region 5	17%	55%	21%	7%	0%
Region 6	9%	31%	28%	25%	6%

### Satisfaction With Maintenance of Indoor Facilities Based on Geographical Location

Table 10 represents the respondents' satisfaction with the maintenance quality of their indoor facilities, based on their NIRSA geographical region. Overall, respondents from Region 3 (81%) and Region 5 (90%) revealed the greatest level of satisfaction with the maintenance quality of their indoor facilities. Individuals residing in Region 1 (49%) expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction of maintenance of their indoor facilities, whereas, individuals from Region 5 expressed the lowest level of dissatisfaction with the maintenance of indoor facilities (10%).

**Table 10 Satisfaction With the Maintenance Quality of Indoor Facilities Based on NIRSA Geographical Region**

NIRSA region	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Region 1	19%	32%	30%	19%	0%
Region 2	18%	53%	23%	2%	5%
Region 3	17%	64%	17%	3%	0%
Region 4	23%	47%	23%	5%	2%
Region 5	17%	73%	10%	0%	0%
Region 6	16%	56%	19%	9%	0%

**Satisfaction With the Working Relationship With One’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics**

Table 11 summarizes responses, based on years of experience, relative to the degree of satisfaction with the working relationship with each of the respondents’ Departments of Intercollegiate Athletics. Overall, respondents with more experience, 16–20 years (80%) and more than 20 years (81%), expressed the highest level of satisfaction with the working relationship with their institution’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Conversely, respondents with 6–10 years experience (35%) and 11–15 years experience (26%) expressed the highest level of dissatisfaction with their working relationship.

**Table 11 Satisfaction With the Working Relationship With One’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics Based on Years of Experience**

Years of experience	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Fewer than 6 years	13%	62%	13%	3%	9%
6–10 years	22%	35%	25%	10%	8%
11–15 years	7%	58%	26%	0%	10%
16–20 years	20%	60%	10%	7%	3%
More than 20 years	20%	61%	6%	7%	6%

## Satisfaction With One's Personal Relationship With Others Outside One's Department

The respondents' degree of satisfaction with their personal working relationship with others outside one's department, based on years of experience, is presented in Table 12. Overall, there was little difference among the responses, based on years of experience, as it relates to one's satisfaction with the personal working relationship with others outside one's department. Overall, the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with this relationship with the highest levels seen of those with 11–15 years experience (100%) and 16–20 years of experience (97%).

**Table 12 Satisfaction With One's Personal Relationship With Others Outside One's Department Based on Years of Experience**

Years of experience	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No opinion
Fewer than 6 years	24%	66%	8%	0%	2%
6–10 years	27%	66%	7%	0%	0%
11–15 years	39%	61%	0%	0%	0%
16–20 years	42%	55%	0%	3%	0%
More than 20 years	52%	39%	7%	2%	0%

## Conclusions

Although a vast majority of respondents revealed an overall high level of job satisfaction with their present job (93% of the respondents were satisfied), there were definite areas of dissatisfaction or less satisfaction when one considers specific categories or job situations of those employees responding to the survey instrument. For example, those with more experience (20+) had greater satisfaction with their salary and hours of work and less job satisfaction with how their supervisors *evaluated them*.

This might be because those with more experience had greater job responsibilities (commensurate with higher salaries) and assumed the role of *boss*. In addition, these same seasoned and experienced employees might react negatively to their own supervisors assessing their performance and decision making insofar as the evaluating superiors might not have the benefit of current experience with the campus recreation program as the individuals whom they are evaluating.

There was more dissatisfaction by those who reported to intercollegiate athletics, in terms of their budget allocation, than those who reported to the office of student affairs. This might be explained by the fact that the primary concern or emphasis of departments of intercollegiate athletics is that of competitive, interschool sports and not the internal campus recreational/competitive activities. Conversely, when an office of student affairs administers the campus recreation

budget, the major concern is not *outside* athletic competition but rather the resulting budget allocation typically reflects an emphasis on *internal* campus recreation and sport activities.

It might be considered quite natural that those with less experience, less important or imposing job titles (and hence less responsibility and authority), might have a greater desire to leave their present position (and seek greener pastures elsewhere) than those who had much greater longevity in their present positions and had loftier job titles and higher salaries. Similarly, those who report to business or finance superiors (who in turn might not have commonality with campus recreation) might be looking for improved working conditions and job placement, more so than if they reported directly to student affairs.

In terms of the desire to leave one's present place of employment, it is natural to assume that less experienced employees would have a greater desire for upward mobility within the profession (i.e., at an institution with a vacancy). Those more experienced employees (typically with higher salaries, loftier titles and significant responsibility) are more likely to be more satisfied and even less employable in the open marketplace. Whereas the far less experienced personnel, who earn less salary, possess less impressive titles and less responsibility, are not only more marketable elsewhere (where there might exist one or more vacancies) but have the motivation to explore other avenues and venues where they can advance professionally in terms of salary, areas of responsibility and titles.

The fact that employees who report to the business and/or finance departments (rather than student services) are less satisfied with their job situation and have a greater desire to leave their employment venue may reveal a lack of mutual understanding and respect between the campus recreation personnel and those superiors working in the business or finance arena. In addition, the fact that the reporting structure can have a significant impact upon some employees' job satisfaction might be due to a lack of a common understanding or compatible philosophy(ies) toward campus recreation.

Dissatisfaction with one's supervisor's expectations of the *department* varied slightly in regard to job title and years of experience. Specifically, those with higher job titles (loftier positions) and with more experience expressed greater satisfaction than those with lesser titles and fewer years of experience. The data might be explained by the fact that those with greater longevity and therefore loftier titles (with greater responsibility) have received positive feedback from superiors. Conversely, those with lesser titles (less responsibility) and less experience might be more critical (less satisfied) in light of a perceived "ceiling" (in the form of expectations/evaluations) that might hamper or hinder their rapid advancement in terms of titles and responsibilities.

## Implications and Recommendations

Since less experienced employees revealed less job satisfaction school administrators should do all that they can to satisfy these younger, less experienced professionals so that they become more satisfied with their current employment venue/situation *and* with their future opportunities. These younger, less experienced employees should be provided (motivated) with opportunities for continued

professional growth, assumption of more responsibilities and authority (and more impressive titles) commensurate with their abilities and growth potential. Finally, campus recreation offices should be organized in such a fashion as to report to student affairs rather than to intercollegiate athletics, or other entities within the institution.

However, it might be natural for less experienced, younger workers to be somewhat dissatisfied with any job situation in which they have been employed for some time when they see little opportunity for advancement in terms of salary, title(s), and increased responsibilities. This is especially true for those highly motivated professionals who are eager for rapid advancement. And, this feeling might be further exacerbated when these same less experienced employees see their immediate superior(s) in the campus life arena not interested in moving out of their own positions of responsibility and authority either by means of securing new positions (at the same or different institution) or through retirement.

In this light, departments of campus recreation should nevertheless be thankful that they have enjoyed the benefits (and services) of these highly motivated and qualified, but less experienced, employees while on staff—even if these same individuals elect to leave the institution's employment for greener pastures and better career opportunities elsewhere. For what department would want to be saddled with employees who could not get a job elsewhere or were not attractive to other institutions? Having employees who are highly attractive to other institutions is a high compliment indeed. However, having employees who are not wanted by other institutions as potential employees is a sad state of affairs and can be an indictment on the hiring competency/process of the institution with employees no one else wants to hire (Stier, 2008).

Finally, further research is needed to determine the underlying cause(s) for such satisfaction and dissatisfaction in terms of the respondents' dissatisfaction with the maintenance of indoor and outdoor facilities in Region 1 and 5. Specifically, what are the reasons behind the fact that Region 1 had the greatest dissatisfaction among respondents in terms of maintenance of both indoor and outdoor facilities and respondents within Region 5 had the greatest level of satisfaction regarding the maintenance of both indoor and outdoor facilities?

## References

- Arnett, D.B., Lavarie, D.A., & McLane, C. (2002). Using job satisfaction and pride as an internal marketing tool. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 87–97.
- Becze, E. (2007). Job satisfaction involves more than money. *ONS Connect*, 22(2), 34.
- Brewer, P., Carnes, L., & Garner, S.J. (2007). The potential impact of the physical work environment on business teachers' productivity and job satisfaction. *Business Education Digest*, 16, 29–46.
- Chen, T.Y., Chang, P.L., & Yeh, C.W. (2004). An investigation of career development programs, job satisfaction, professional development and productivity: the case of Taiwan. *Human Resource Development International*, 7(4), 441–463.
- Connolly, K.M., & Myers, J.E. (2003). Wellness and mattering: the role of holistic factors in job satisfaction. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 40(4), 152–160.

- Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.S., & Stone, E.F. (Eds.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Davolt, S. (2006). Lightening workload heightens job satisfaction, productivity. *Employee Benefit News*, 20(5), 19.
- De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2006). Autonomy and workload among temporary workers: Their effects on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, and self-related performance. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13, 441–459.
- Energize staff! Raise job satisfaction! 20 ways to boost morale (2002, October). *Accounting Department Management Report*, pp. 5–7.
- Francis, G.J., & Milbourn, G., Jr. (1980). *Human behavior in the work environment: A managerial perspective*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co.
- Gellis, Z.D., Kim, J., & Hwang, S.C. (2004). New York State case manager survey: Urban and rural differences in job activities, job stress, and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 31(4), 430–440.
- Grandey, A.A., Cordeiro, B.L., & Crouter, A.C. (2005). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work-family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 305–323.
- Henne, D., & Locke, E.A. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 221–240.
- Higgins, K. (2003). 24th annual salary & job satisfaction survey. *Food Engineering*, 75(12), 30–34.
- Houston, D., Meyer, L., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(1), 17–30.
- Iiaqua, J.A., Schumacher, P., & Li, H.C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*, 116(1), 51–56.
- J.D. Power and Associates. (2007). *Edward Jones ranks highest in inaugural financial Advisor satisfaction study*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from the J.D. Power and Associates Web site: <http://www.jdpower.com/corporate/news/releases/pressrelease.aspx?ID=2007065>
- Jasper, M. (2005). Editorial. Keeping our staff—the links between job satisfaction, recruitment and retention. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13, 279–281.
- Job satisfaction changes by the hour (1999, August 27–September 2). *Long Island Business News*, 46 (35), p. 27A.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., & Bono, J.E. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407.
- Koremans, S. (2007, October 5). Job survey: execs choose satisfaction over money. *B&T Weekly*, 57(2631), p. 6.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1342–1352). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Moss, R., Rowles, C.J. (1997, January). Staff nurse job satisfaction and management style. *Nursing Management*, 28(1), pp. 32, 34
- Ohashi, I. (2005). Wages, hours of work and job satisfaction of retirement-age workers. *The Japanese Economic Review*, 56, 188–209.
- Organ, D.W., & Hamner, W.C. (1978). *Organizational behavior: An applied psychological approach*. Plano, TX: Business Publications.
- Pool, S.W. (1997). The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131(3), 271–283.

- Robert, T.E., Young, J.S., & Kelly, V.A. (2006). Relationships between adult workers' spiritual well-being and job satisfaction: A preliminary study. *Counseling and Values, 50*(3), 165–175.
- Schneider, R.C., Stier, W.F., Jr., Kampf, S., Haines, S., & Wilding, G.E. (2005). Reporting structures and job satisfaction of collegiate campus recreation directors. *Recreational Sports Journal, 29*(1), 33–41.
- Stier, W.F., Jr. (2008). *Sport management: The business of sport*. Boston, MA: American Press.

Copyright of Recreational Sports Journal is the property of Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.