

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9012027

**An evaluation of the internship program offered by the
Department of Recreation and Park Administration, Central
Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan**

Lutz, Donald Fred, Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1939

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN EVALUATION OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM OFFERED BY THE
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARK ADMINISTRATION,
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY,
MOUNT PLEASANT, MICHIGAN

By

Donald F. Lutz

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of College and University Administration

1989

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM OFFERED BY THE
DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARK ADMINISTRATION,
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY,
MOUNT PLEASANT, MICHIGAN

By

Donald F. Lutz

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the quality and extent to which former undergraduate students and cooperating agency supervisors perceived the 30-week internship experience offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. The study was conducted during winter and spring 1988. Questionnaires were mailed to 360 Recreation and Park agencies in and outside of Michigan that supervised and evaluated the former student interns during the 30-week internship experience. Questionnaires were also mailed to all the 600 former students who participated in the internship program since its inception in 1975 until the study was conducted in 1988.

Procedure of the Study

The chi-square statistic was employed to determine relationship between the groups. A minimum confidence level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance of the interpretation of the data.

Conclusions of the Study

1. The former student interns generally agreed that the major contributions of the internship program were the gaining of experience, the making of professional contacts, and employment opportunities. The cooperating agency supervisors did not agree that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the program. Those findings are logical, considering the interests of the groups involved.

2. The internship program offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University is perceived as a valuable educational tool, and it is meeting the goals and objectives as outlined by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully recognize the contributions of others who were instrumental in producing this study. A debt of thanks is extended to:

Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker for his wise counsel and direction given as Chairman of the Guidance Committee, and who was most willing to interrupt a very busy schedule to open new horizons of learning.

Dr. Louis F. Hekhuis, Dr. Max R. Raines, and Dr. James L. Bristor, who gave encouragement and counsel throughout the study.

The faculty members and secretaries in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University, who gave their support.

Janet, my wife, who was willing to make some significant sacrifices to share in this undertaking. This husband says: "Thank you so very much."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Value of the Study	5
Objective of the Study	6
Limitations of the Study	6
Hypotheses	7
Definition of Terms	7
Previous Research on Internship in Recreation and Parks	9
Population	9
Questionnaire Design	10
Follow-Up Procedures on Nonrespondents	11
Treatment of Data	11
Overview of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
The Need for Evaluation	13
Dissertations Relating to Evaluation of Student Internships	14
Studies Published Relating to Evaluation of Student Internships	21
Unpublished Studies Relating to Evaluation of Student Internships	22
Summary	29
III. PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY	31
Introduction	31
Population	31
Questionnaires	32
Analyzing the Data	34
Summary	35

	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	36
Introduction	36
Basic Student Considerations for a Quality Internship Program	36
Perceptions of Students Regarding the Intern- ship Experience	37
Summary	68
Basic Agency Considerations for a Quality Internship Program	69
Perception of Quality by Internship Site Super- visors and All Interns Concerning the Inter- ship Program at Central Michigan University . .	71
Summary	79
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	81
Introduction	81
The Problem	81
Procedure of the Study	82
Summary of Findings	84
Hypothesis 1	84
Hypothesis 2	86
Conclusions	89
Suggestions for Further Research	92
Reflections	93
APPENDICES	
A. COVER LETTER, FOLLOW-UP LETTER, AND STUDENT INTERN QUESTIONNAIRE	95
B. COVER LETTER, FOLLOW-UP LETTER, AND INTERNSHIP AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Respondents by Concentration Area	38
2. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to gain experience?"	39
3. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . peer pressure?"	41
4. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to make professional contacts?" . . .	43
5. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . variety of experience?"	45
6. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . required for curriculum?"	47
7. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to expand background (program)?" . . .	49
8. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . drawn by personnel in a given department?"	51
9. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to test the desirability of the field?"	53
10. Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . explore special interest area?" . . .	55
11. Responses to Question 20b: "Have you received any job offers since your internship based on the fact you were an intern?"	57
12. Responses to Question 26: "Did the variety of experi- ences during the internship meet your needs in preparing you to enter the profession?"	62

	Page
13. Responses to Question 34: "Do you have any reason to think that accepting the internship was not a good idea in your situation?"	63
14. Responses to Question 38: "Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at CMU prepared you for the internship?"	65
15. Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . on-the-job experience?"	72
16. Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . employment opportunities?"	73
17. Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . professional contacts?"	74
18. Responses to Question 11b/Question 20b: "To your knowledge, has the former intern received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern?"	75
19. Responses to Question 16/Question 26: "Did the variety of the experience during the internship meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession?" . . .	76

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

McCuskey (1961) commented that the internship, as a point in a training sequence, is a terminal phase in a series of academic and professional experiences provided by formalized programs. It is also an initial experience that provides the kinds of problems and conditions the intern will recognize as typical of professional practice. It is not a place to learn the basic skills, disciplines, or principles of a professional field. These should have been acquired before the internship. It is a place where the intern puts these skills and learnings into practice. It is a place where attitudes and professional behavior are learned.

The goal of the internship program, as perceived by faculty in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration, is to provide a structured and systematic theory to practical experience in accordance with the students' growing professional knowledge, outlook, and self-awareness. It is experience combined with academic preparation. The internship is that phase of professional preparation that enables students to assume leadership in a variety of settings and programs and to progress to management

responsibilities under the supervision of experienced agency and university supervisors.

The following major objectives of the internship program were developed by this researcher and approved by the faculty and staff in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration and Central Michigan University:

1. To allow each student to become an integral and participating member of the agency's staff.
2. To help the student gain an understanding and appreciation of the management responsibilities of a full-time professional.
3. To provide the student with experiences that will aid in developing a sound recreation and parks philosophy.
4. To provide the student opportunities to develop supervisory, administrative, and management skills in a realistic setting.
5. To treat students individually according to their career goals, strengths and weaknesses, and their preparedness for the intern experiences.
6. To assess the relevance and quality of classroom work with practical experience.
7. To assist the student for future employment by providing professional experience.
8. To cooperate with and strengthen relationships between the recreation and parks agencies and the university.
9. To prepare the student by providing him/her with experience in letter writing, preparing resumes, job interviews, and applying for positions.

10. To allow each student to take a major role and responsibility in his/her internship placement, career goals, and development.

In 1975, the Leisure Services and Studies Curriculum was adopted by the faculty in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration and approved by the administration at Central Michigan University. The curriculum included a continuous supervised 30-week internship at one location. Each student who successfully completed the internship received 30 semester hours of credit. The internship was designed to provide students the opportunity to relate theory to practice through observation and experience.

On an individual basis, students were given the choice of selecting one of four approved academic concentrations. These were:

1. Community Recreation and Park Administration. The intent of this concentration is to develop managerial, supervisory, and administrative skills that will enable graduates to function in a variety of settings, including, but not restricted to, municipal park and/or recreation departments, county park systems, state park systems, quasi-public agencies (such as the YMCA), and community education programs.

2. Private and Commercial Recreation and Facility Management. The Commercial Recreation and Facility Management concentration is directed primarily toward employment in the private sector of leisure delivery systems or toward the revenue-generation portion of the public sector. It includes, but is not limited to, resort and

hospitality services, amusement parks, and a substantial amount of course work in the School of Business Administration.

Employee Services and Recreation (private) provides training for professional recreation in leadership programming for employees and families of business and industry. Programs range from sports and social events to managing costly facilities such as athletic complexes, community centers, and vacation resorts.

3. Therapeutic Recreation. This concentration focuses on three primary areas: the traditional clinical/institutional programs, transitional programs (including group-living facilities apart from the institution), and community recreation programs for the handicapped. The recreation therapist works with a variety of special populations, including the mentally impaired, emotionally impaired, physically impaired, and possibly geriatric, correctional, and so on.

4. Outdoor and Environmental Recreation. This concentration is designed primarily for those students wishing to be involved in camp administration; city, county, or township parks; outdoor education; or environmental interpretation. It emphasizes face-to-face leadership skills, but also involves program management and administrative-level competencies.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to assess both the quality and the extent to which former undergraduate students and agency supervisors perceive the 30-week internship experience as meeting

the goals and objectives of the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University.

Value of the Study

During the fall semester of 1981, the Recreation and Park Administration Department went through a thorough accreditation study sponsored by the National Recreation and Park Association and the American Association of Leisure and Recreation. This entailed a detailed study of the department's mission, courses, and faculty expertise. During the following semester, the department was notified of complete acceptance for accreditation.

Since the inception of the internship program, 600 students have graduated after fulfilling their internship requirements within agencies in Michigan and out-of-state settings such as Xerox Corporation (employee services and recreation) in New York and Virginia, South Seas Plantation (commercial recreation) in Florida, Rocky Mountain National Park (outdoor recreation) in Colorado, the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago (therapeutic recreation) in Illinois, and the Sacramento Department of Recreation and Parks (community recreation) in California.

The National Recreation and Park Association and the American Association of Leisure and Recreation, along with the administration of the Central Michigan University Recreation and Park Administration Department, had expressed the desire that an evaluation of the internship program was needed to determine if it was meeting the needs of the student for professional development.

It was this researcher's intention to undertake an in-depth study to accomplish such an evaluation.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study was to determine the perceived quality of the internship experience from former students and cooperating agency supervisors. The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the quality of the internship program as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors?
2. Do cooperating agency supervisors and former students have differing perceptions of the internship experience?
3. What suggestions are commonly mentioned for improving the internship experience as a training device as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors?

Limitations of the Study

Any conclusions that may be projected from the study should be interpreted in light of the limitations that apply to this research.

1. This study was limited by factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire. These included the difficulties in securing complete cooperation of the sample selected, the bias and interest of the respondents, the time involved in completing the instruments, and the fact that some individuals might be unable to adequately reflect their true perceptions of the internship program.
2. The findings of this research project were limited to the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park

Administration at Central Michigan University. Other institutions of higher learning using this same method and instrumentation might find this to be very useful in researching their internship programs, even though the obtained results would always reflect the uniqueness of the institution involved.

3. Since the internship program is relatively new to the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University, people who have graduated recently might not have had enough seniority in their positions to have given an accurate accounting of the internship program.

Hypotheses

It was important to establish some fundamental assumptions for this study in order to analyze the data to be gathered. These assumptions were hypothesized in null form as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference in the scores of the mail survey between former interns of the four student concentrations as to their perceptions about the quality of the internship program.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference in the scores of the mail survey between cooperating agency supervisors and the former interns as to their perceptions about the quality of the internship program.

Definition of Terms

In an effort to clarify and prevent misunderstanding of terms used in recreation and park administration, the following terms are defined:

Perception. A perception refers to the importance allocated to, and the conscious opinion and knowledge the respondent has,

regarding the internship program. In this study, perceptions were determined by both personal experience and secondary sources of information about the internship program.

Quality. Quality is defined as the degree of excellence perceived by the former student interns and cooperating agencies in meeting the goals and objectives of the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University.

The internship program is an approach in preparing students to become professionals in recreation and park administration. The distinctive contribution of the internship is that it is academic preparation coupled with experience, enabling students to develop professional behavior, applying theory to practice while being placed for 30 weeks with a cooperating agency.

An intern is a student in the Leisure Services and Studies curriculum with a major concentration in recreation and park administration who has the necessary requirements and has gone through a screening process to become accepted into the internship.

A cooperating agency may be located in or outside of Michigan. The intern is exposed to the managerial resources of the cooperating agency, which includes administration, programming, and the use and planning of facilities.

The agency supervisor is an executive officer and employee with a cooperating agency, given the responsibility of supervising the intern through his/her internship at that particular agency. The intern will be evaluated at the termination of the internship.

An internship experience is a comprehensive experience that includes most, if not all, of the possible aspects of a significant professional experience.

Previous Research on Internship in Recreation and Parks

It was found during the search for studies relating to internships that a considerable body of literature does exist with respect to the value and evaluation of internship experiences. It appears that the internship is advocated and used most frequently within those professions in which the practitioner is expected to perform services of direct contact and interaction with people. According to Hayes (1960), theology, education, law, sociology, and government service seem to be the fields in which the internship is most frequently employed.

Very little research has been done with respect to evaluations of recreation and park internships. A 1971 dissertation at Indiana University by Richard A. Bunch provided some parallels to the present study. Entitled "An Evaluation of Selected Internship Programs Sponsored by the National Recreation and Park Association," this dissertation embraced some of the same considerations included in the present research.

Population

The subjects of this study included the cooperating agency supervisors representing 360 various agencies in and outside of Michigan who supervised and evaluated the students during the

30-week internship and the 600 former students who took part in the internship program since its inception in 1975 to 1988. The students were graduates of Central Michigan University with majors in recreation and park administration in the Leisure Services and Studies curriculum.

With respect to possible respondent differences (as they affect response rate) on gender, economic status, and educational level, the former students of this study were relatively homogeneous on these variables. All students held a bachelor's degree from the same program in the same university. Data on parent occupation and income for students at the university indicated their socioeconomic status as middle class.

An important factor affecting response rates is the "interests" of the group being studied in the sponsoring organization and the topic under consideration (Parten, 1966). Since all students surveyed were trained as "professionals in recreation and parks," interest in the study was assumed. Moreover, interest in the sponsoring agency, Central Michigan University, was also assumed.

Questionnaires were mailed to the entire population of 600 former interns and the 360 cooperating agency supervisors where the former students had done their internships.

Questionnaire Design

The procedures for selecting questions for the mail survey were based on the goals and objectives of the internship program. Information for the mail survey came from related literature and the

results of the accreditation study sponsored by the National Recreation and Park Association and the American Association of Leisure and Recreation. Other questions were derived from the researcher's experience as a former practitioner in recreation and parks administration and from experience teaching courses taken by the former interns.

The draft version of the mail questionnaire was pilot tested on a small group of former interns and supervisors of cooperating agencies in Michigan. The results of the interview and questionnaire were examined and changes, where necessary, were made and a final draft was prepared.

Follow-Up Procedures on Nonrespondents

The follow-up procedures used in this study were based on a model by Galfo and Miller (1970). This model is a three-cycle plan, with the first cycle consisting of the initial mailing of the questionnaire followed by a tabulation of data and a percentage computation on returns. The second cycle consists of a follow-up by nonrespondents with a new deadline, which is followed by a tabulation of data and percentage computation of responses.

Treatment of Data

Because this study involved particular groups, former student interns and cooperating agency supervisors, the choice of descriptive analysis was made. The following methods were employed:

1. Asked the individual how he/she felt about the internship. This technique employed a schedule or questionnaire of the open or closed form.

2. Asked the individual to check the statements in a list with which he/she was in agreement.

3. Asked the individual to indicate his/her degree of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements about the internship program.

Answers of each respondent were recorded on an OpSCAN form. Data were analyzed by the Statistical Consulting Group at the Computer Services Department at Central Michigan University using SPSSX Statistical Package on the IBM 3090 computer system.

To test the null hypotheses, the chi-square statistic was employed to determine relationship between the groups. A minimum confidence level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance in the interpretation.

Overview of the Study

This study is developed in a format of five chapters. In Chapter II the literature relevant to this study is reviewed. A detailed report of the methodology used in the development of the instruments and the procedures of analyzing the data are contained in Chapter III. The findings of the study are reported in Chapter IV, and the conclusions and implications for further study appear in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Need for Evaluation

It is important to define evaluation as it relates to this study. According to Lundegren and Farrell (1985), evaluation may be defined as:

. . . a process of ascertaining value by comparing results with objectives and judging how well objectives have been met in both a qualitative and quantitative sense. The results of evaluation contribute to decision making.

Krause and Curtis (1982) stated the purpose of evaluation as:

. . . not simply to provide a score, with respect to the success or quality of any individual or program. Instead, it is to give a picture of strengths and weaknesses that can be used to bring about improvement. To the extent to which specific standards or objectives are not being met, it permits an agency or supervisor to pinpoint steps that must be taken to upgrade professional performance.

There are a number of different approaches to the process of evaluation, which have been drawn from education or other human service professions. Howe (1980) identified several of these:

1. Evaluation as professional judgment, which is carried on through critical review by an individual or visiting panel, and which results in subjective judgment of an agency or program.
2. Evaluation as scientific, quantitative measurement, carried on through such methods as PPBS, MBO, cost-benefit analysis, or statistical treatment of data, resulting in feedback used in decision-making.

3. Evaluation measuring success in achieving objectives, carried on through criterion-referenced tests, which provide accurate measures of accountability and productivity.
4. Decision-oriented evaluation, which uses surveys, questionnaires, interviews or document analysis, to provide data leading to desirable decisions and a higher level of effectiveness.
5. Transaction-observation evaluation, which employs case-study interviews, and participation observation, and yields an overall picture of a process and the dynamics involved in it.

According to Krause and Curtis (1982), if a program is to be evaluated, it needs to go beyond just gathering information. It is important to determine the extent of progress toward specific goals and objectives. It is used to measure objectively what a program is trying to accomplish. The end result should consist of a set of conclusions or recommendations.

Dissertations Relating to Evaluation of Student Internships

It was found during the search for studies relating to internships that a considerable body of literature does exist with respect to the value and evaluation of internship experiences. It appears that the internship is advocated and used most frequently within those professions in which the practitioner is expected to perform services of direct contact and interaction with people. According to Hayes (1960), theology, education, law, sociology, and government service seem to be the fields in which the internship is most frequently employed.

Very little research has been done with respect to evaluations of recreation and park internships. Bunch (1971) did a doctoral

study evaluating the internship programs sponsored by the National Recreation and Park Association in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Oak Park, Illinois; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Baltimore, Maryland.

Participants in the internship programs in the four cities between 1965 and 1969 were administered a questionnaire to secure their evaluation of the internship experience and to assess the relationship of the internship to the intern's professional career. Interviews were conducted with the internship supervisor in each of the four cities to determine the methods and procedures employed by each agency in conducting the internship program. Representatives of college and university faculties at institutions from which interns graduated were administered a questionnaire to identify their attitudes toward the internship program.

Findings in the study were as follows:

1. Sixty percent of the participants in the internship program were introduced to the program through college and university personnel.
2. Eighty-six percent of the professional positions held by interns after the internship were administrative or supervisory in nature.
3. Approximately 70% of the interns remained in the recreation profession.
4. Each individual agency acted independently in establishing procedures for its internship program.

5. Sixty percent of the park and recreation directors considered communications fair to poor between the national organization and students and faculty.

Bunch concluded that the internship was of value to the participants and exerted a positive influence in preparing interns for entry into the profession of recreation and parks.

Several doctoral dissertations in higher education administration have been written, evaluating student internships. Geren (1981) did a doctoral study to evaluate the educational administration internship at East Texas State University. The major conclusions of the study were that the internship program was effective and should be continued. Second, supervision of the intern was viewed as one of the strengths of the program. Rossey (1958), Norsted (1974), O'Brien (1963), and Simonds (1965) also concluded that the internship in educational administration is an effective technique for training school administrators.

Kole (1978) focused her study on the inadequacy and divergence of criteria for evaluation of interns in educational administration. In spite of the overall endorsement of the theoretical framework for intern evaluation by the respondent group, its universal acceptability as a model for intern evaluation is inconclusive. The most that can be said is that this research has moved a step closer to the theory of intern evaluation.

A model internship program that would propose critical elements to facilitate integration of theoretical knowledge with practical administrative skills for prospective human service administrators

was designed by Anderson (1980). The model was specifically designed to assist human service agencies and universities in the vital tasks of setting standards and in determining activities that internship programs should provide. Another model administrative program was developed by Wright (1984). The study included a review of planned organization change models and recommended a change model for the systematic implementation or modification of a new or existing internship program.

Two dissertations relating to community colleges and evaluating student internships were done by Hutkins (1971) and Mauke (1965). Hutkins did a study to evaluate the internship activities for teacher preparation. The team approach employed in evaluating the performance of interns was a highly effective technique. Mauke evaluated the internship program (a four-week, off-campus work project) at Endicott Junior College, Weberly, Massachusetts, by making a comparison of student expectations of their work experience and student achievements during the work period. The conclusion was that the internship experience met the student expectations and that it exerted a positive influence in preparing interns for entry into the teaching profession.

Wideman (1975) divided his dissertation into two sections. The first was a detailed description of the undergraduate internship in student development. The second part was an initial study of effects of this program on the students who became involved as interns during the 1973-74 academic year. One of the conclusions

that grew out of this study was that it was important for the training aspect of the program to focus further on the individual and his/her interpersonal style. These findings led to the conclusion that the internship program was meeting its stated objectives and should be considered effective.

Suggestions for improving the residential internship as a training device for generalist student personnel administrators was developed by O'Donnell (1967). The following were his conclusions:

1. Improved immediate supervision.
2. Improved and more relevant academic work.
3. Broader base of practical experience beyond the residence internship.
4. Improved integration of the academic and work experience.
5. Greater degree of responsibility for interns.
6. Better-quality interns.

Eyler (1980) investigated the effect of political internships on the level of students' political knowledge, political efficacy, and political skills. As hypothesized, the interns did indicate a significant increase was found for the applicant or classroom student.

A doctoral thesis to ascertain the effectiveness of the internship in vocational-technical education as viewed by the cooperating agencies and offered by Rutgers University was executed by Sakiey (1973). The findings of the study were as follows:

1. Cooperating agencies were likely to offer the same type of experience regardless of the type of internship being offered.

2. On the average, 63% of the tasks studied were being made available by the cooperating agencies, to approximately half of the interns.

3. When the internship experiences were examined from the viewpoint of those task statements assigned a more important designation, results indicated that the cooperating agencies were providing more than half of the experiences designated more important to half of the interns.

A number of other dissertations in higher education administration evaluating internships have been written. Geren (1981) conducted a doctoral study to evaluate the educational administration internship at East Texas State University by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data provided by the intern relative to the value of his internship experience. The data for the study were secured through separate questionnaires developed by the writer. An acceptable sample of 290 responses was obtained from questionnaires mailed to 525 randomly selected former interns who had completed the internship during the years 1972 through 1979. The 103 interns who were currently enrolled in the 1980 spring semester internship course were surveyed, with 82 of the current interns responding. The major conclusions of the study were that the educational administration internship program at East Texas State University had been effective and should be continued. Second, supervision of the intern was viewed as one of the strengths of the internship program as practiced.

Eden (1965) evaluated the educational administration internship programs of colleges and universities in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The researcher concluded that the internship in educational administration, as administered by the colleges and universities in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, was an effective technique for training school administrators.

Rossey (1958) investigated the problems of evaluating the internship in educational administration as it had been used in the Middle Atlantic Region of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration during the five years from 1949 to 1954. One hundred thirty-nine individuals participated in internships within the region during the five-year period covered. Data were collected by means of a detailed questionnaire and personal interviews.

Certain implications for the improvement of the internship were indicated. Individual needs of the intern must be more closely identified and met, sponsoring agencies must be most carefully selected, cooperating administrators must be more ably suited for the task they are called on to perform, and interns must be subjected to continuous and individualized evaluation. With these improvements in effect, there is no limit to the future of the internship program for it possesses the very basic ideals of the learning opportunity.

Melvin (1974) analyzed the University of Minnesota's Internship Program in Educational Administration. The major focus of this study was an attempt to determine whether the University of

Minnesota Internship Program in Educational Administration had produced educational administrators who were significantly different from those administrators who had not interned. Without question, the findings showed that the internship in educational administration had many positive effects.

Studies Published Relating to Evaluation of Student Internships

Morris (1984) formulated a method for evaluating undergraduate field experiences in psychology that took into account attainment of individual goals and quality of supervision. Results showed that the most satisfactory field placements were those in which there was a well-organized, explicitly structured training program. Suggestions for implementing and monitoring internship programs were described by Hanson (1984) in the communication arts.

An overview of a 16-step internship model was presented by Lanese (1983). The steps ranged from the initial contact between the company and university representatives, project coordinator, and student intern examine to what extent their objectives and expectations have been met.

Haviland (1983) described an internship program that involved liberal arts students in a career-development process in the sophomore or junior year. Components of the program included a liberal arts career internship program, a career resource center, and career planning workshops. The importance of evaluation for students was discussed, and suggestions were given for evaluation standards.

Unpublished Studies Relating to Evaluation
of Student Internships

During 1985, the Center for Professional Development of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory identified and supported five internships in various aspects of educational research and development work. To assess the effect of these internships, a formal interview schedule incorporating the five evaluation questions delineated in the program's work statement was used. The evaluation found the following:

1. The capability of the interns to pursue educational research and development (R & D) work increased because the skills needed were acquired or strengthened.

2. The job placement and promotion activities of the internships have increased the employment of women and minorities in R & D work.

3. The project has assisted interns in obtaining credentials, although this was not a major need, since interns were already well-versed in such procedures.

4. Information on internship activities was publicized in several media sources.

5. The internships were a positive experience for both interns and sponsoring agencies.

A number of other authors discussed the importance of evaluating student interns. Rubin (1982) reported the first step is deciding what should be measured, such as interns' personal characteristics, job performance, and results. The most useful form

of performance appraisal for student interns is based on behaviors the student displays when accomplishing a particular task. A 34-item checklist for improving the quality of student internships was designed by Lapan (1982). The content of the checklist was based on comprehensive evaluation results gathered from post-internship students, agency personnel, and field supervision.

Stauffer (1975) did an evaluation study of 391 living participants in the 10-year-old Academic Internship Program (AAIP); 320 or 82% completed the questionnaire, which became the basis for this evaluation. Sixty percent rated the AAIP internship program as very positive.

Goebel (1971) prepared for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) a report entitled "Evaluation of the WICHE Intern Program in the State of Oregon." In this evaluation, Goebel pointed out a number of deficiencies as well as strengths of the program. He made a number of suggestions and recommendations as to how the program could be modified so as to make it even more useful for potential as well as actual sponsoring agencies and interns. Goebel (1972) did a paper on an analysis of the WICHE internship program directed by the Urban Studies Center at Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. The methodology used for evaluating the internship program was carried out primarily through the use of two questionnaires. Both intern and agency reported believing that the program was worthwhile.

A series of essays contained in a monograph was designed by Profughi (1976) to prove analytically some of the major concerns associated with internships. Discussed in the first section are the components of the internship triangle: Colleges and universities, sponsoring agencies, and students. The probable future prospects and trends.

An internship study designed to relate all model training project (MTP) student responses, as well as responses from the 1972-73 non-MTP (Faculty of Educational Development) research associates, on a 50-item internship questionnaire was developed by Wegner (1978). The conclusion was that coursework completed before the internship experience improved the competence of interns and that the internship experience was the most beneficial aspect of their program of study.

Bangar and others (1973) did an internship study designed to relate all Model Training Project (MTP) student responses, as well as responses from the 1972-73 non-MTP (Faculty of Educational Development) research associates, on a 50-item internship questionnaire. The majority of MTP and non-MTP interns believed they gained practical knowledge from their internship that would be useful in relation to their career goals and that the internship experience was the most beneficial aspect of their program of study.

A booklet to inform and advise students applying for or just beginning internships was prepared by Sigmon (1972). The following year, Sigmon (1973) developed and mailed questionnaires to Summer 1973 state government interns and their supervisors to gather

information that might provide some clues to the perceptions of supervisors and interns. Results indicated that: (a) both intern supervisors and interns overwhelmingly believed that the interns served well the people of North Carolina, and (b) both intern supervisors and interns had a high degree of satisfaction with the program.

Background information on the organization and operation of an internship program at California State University, San Diego, was presented by Heiges (1972). Students found the work/learn experiences had a greater effect than hours of professional lecturing. A second study by Heiges (1977) described changes and improvements in a geography internship program at San Diego State University since its inception in 1969.

Two different models for internships were developed by Adkison (1980) and Fevinger (1984). Adkison (1980) produced a monograph as a part of the project known as internships, certification, equity-leadership, and support (ICES). The Kansas Project successfully field-tested a model for mobilizing statewide resources to prepare women for administrative careers and to place them in appropriate positions. The crucial component of the training program was a year-long internship in school administration. A model for planning, monitoring, and evaluating human service internships and field experiences was described by Fevinger. The model was organized around work roles and could be easily adopted for general job evaluations beyond intern placement.

The educational and personal effects of the New York State College intern programs, designed to provide college students with first-hand knowledge of the legislative process and functions, were examined by Balutis (1977). The internship experience had no significant influence on students' patterns of interest and values.

Recommendations to help student interns in administrative positions maximize their educational opportunities vis-a-vis the "real world" and also to help them avoid certain placement-associated problems were made by Oldfield (1984). The suggestions may be helpful to both new and established intern directors, as well.

In the discipline of speech communication, three studies involving internships by Konsky (1976) and Masson (1985) were completed. Konsky noted that little systematic attention had been devoted to research on the development, administration, and effects of student internship programs in speech communication. A practical guide to internships described how to develop and administer such a program. Masson surveyed 197 college and speech communication departments concerning their speech internship programs. Results were:

1. There was little agreement concerning the number of hours interns should work per week to earn credit, with just over half agreeing that the student should put in ten hours of work to three hours of credit.

2. Interns generally received between one and six hours of academic credit.

3. A faculty member designated as coordinator supervised the program.

4. Students were usually evaluated by both the on-site supervisor and the intern coordinator.

5. Most coordinators required the interns to document their experience and write a final report or give some particular presentation.

In a second study, Masson (1985) advised several things should be taken into account when establishing an internship program. Issues to be considered were whether the position should be a paid one, how many credit hours should be allowed, the number of hours a week and the number of weeks the intern should work, prerequisites, and whether grades should be given.

A study of the goals and achievements of the ACE (American Council of Education) Internship in Academic Administration was developed by Creager (1971). The purpose of the Academic Administration Internship Program was to enlarge the number and improve the quality of persons available to fill key positions in academic administration. The results indicated that there was a high intrinsic correlation between selection and experience as a Fellow and early attainment of a career position as an academic administrator.

A paper to assist interested faculty members in designing, developing, and evaluating political internships so as to produce the best learning experience possible was introduced by Ball (1976).

Recommendations emphasized that the internship program should complement and enhance the classroom experience rather than merely be a job-training program.

The results of a national survey on undergraduate intern programs in sociology were reported by Satariano (1979). He discussed criteria used for and problems found with internships and recommended strengthening the programs by formally integrating them into the curriculum. A more recent study by Mares and others (1984) provided results of a national study of college student internships in the humanities. The focus was attitudes and practices of 1,621 departments and central offices on U.S. campuses concerning internships in the following majors: English, American studies, history, art history, philosophy, classics, and modern foreign languages.

Scheckels (1986) presented a paper describing several administrative dimensions of a successful internship program in the English Department of a four-year private college in Virginia. A paper asking 74 participants to evaluate a liberal arts internship program, using a 73-item questionnaire, was prepared by Fagon (1985). The evaluation indicated that the program was successful in teaching students about working with different people (especially cross-cultural experiences), learning about the urban environment and urban problems, and participating in a living-learning community. The program was less successful in helping students apply sociological concepts and theories to the urban situation. Guidelines for implementing field placement in social gerontology

courses were presented by organization, execution, and evaluation of field placements.

A manual intended for community agency personnel who supervised students in undergraduate internships was completed by Bowler (1982). The importance of evaluations for students was discussed, and suggestions were given for evaluation standards. A more recent manual by McDonald (1983) provided information needed by students serving in professional internships as a part of the Vocational Education Studies Program at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Ivy (1983) described the internship at the University of Minnesota, Duluth. Thirty-five students in the Department of Home Economics completed internships from 1979 through 1982. Each internship was at least ten weeks in length, and each student worked from 90 to 150 hours on the job. Before starting the internship, the students completed a statement of their own goals and objectives for their internships. Intern supervisors also submitted evaluations of student performance.

Summary

In this chapter a review of the pertinent literature regarding evaluation of student internship programs was presented. Supporting evidence indicated that institutions must give high priority to the evaluation of student internships. This is essential so that each college or university may assess the degree to which program goals and objectives are being maintained.

According to the literature, several techniques and instruments have been developed and used to evaluate student internship programs.

Two benefits of these internship programs have been identified: Students benefit from their exposure to real problems, and graduates entering the job market believe their internships have made them stronger competitors for employment.

In Chapter III the design and methodology of the study are discussed in depth.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The objective of this research was to determine the quality of the internship experience in the Recreation and Park Administration program at Central Michigan University as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors. The research was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What was the quality of the internship program as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors?
2. Did cooperating supervisors and former students have differing perceptions of the internship experience?
3. What suggestions were commonly mentioned for improving the internship experience as a training device as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors?

This chapter is concerned with the composition of the population, the instrumentation used in the study, the method used for collecting the data, and the procedures used for analyzing the data.

Population

The population of this research consisted of cooperating agency supervisors representing 360 various agencies in and outside of

Michigan who supervised and evaluated the students during the 30-week internship and the 600 former students who took part in the internship program since its inception in 1975 to 1988. The students were graduates from Central Michigan University with majors in Recreation and Park Administration in the Leisure Services and Studies Curriculum.

With respect to possible respondent differences (as they affect response rate) on gender, economic status, and educational level, the former intern students of this study were relatively homogeneous. All former students held a bachelor's degree from the same program in the same university.

An important factor affecting response rates is the "interests" of the group being studied in the sponsoring organization and the topic under consideration (Parten, 1966). Since all former students surveyed were trained as "professionals in recreation and park administration," interest in the study was assumed. Moreover, interest in the sponsoring agency, Central Michigan University, was assumed.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were mailed to the entire population of former students and to all agency supervisors at the site of their internships. (See Appendices A and B, respectively, for student and agency supervisor questionnaires.)

The procedures for selecting questions for the mail survey were based on the goals and objectives of the internship program. Items

included in the mail survey came from related literature and the results of the accreditation study sponsored by the National Recreation and Parks Association and the American Association of Leisure and Recreation. Other questions were derived from the researcher's experience as a former practitioner in recreation and park administration and from experience teaching courses taken by the former student interns.

The draft version of the mail questionnaire was pilot tested on a small group of former student interns and supervisors of cooperating agencies in Michigan. The results of the questionnaires were examined. Where necessary, changes were made and a final draft was prepared.

There were 43 questions or statements for former student interns and 30 questions or statements for agency supervisors to respond to. A majority of the faculty members in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University agreed, after a survey, that 8 of the 43 questions on the survey instrument for the former student interns and 7 of the 30 questions for the cooperating agency supervisors were relative to the perceptions of quality.

The following methods were employed:

1. The individual was asked what he/she thought about the internship. This employed a schedule or questionnaire of the open and closed form.

2. The individual was asked to prioritize items from a list with which he/she was in agreement.

3. The individual was asked to check statements in a list with which he/she was in agreement.

The cover sheet for the questionnaires contained directions for completing them. The letter, cover sheet, and questionnaires appear in Appendices A and B.

Analyzing the Data

It was important to establish some fundamental assumptions for this study in analyzing the data to be accumulated. For statistical purposes, the assumptions were developed into the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference in the responses to the mail survey between former interns of the four concentrations as to their perceptions about the internship program.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference in the responses to the mail survey between cooperating agency supervisors and the former student interns as to their perceptions about the internship program.

Answers of each respondent were recorded on an Opscan form. Data were analyzed by the Statistical Consulting Group at the Computer Services Department at Central Michigan University using SPSSX Statistical Package on the IBM 3090 computer system.

The chi-square statistic was employed to determine relationship between the groups. The minimum confidence level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance in the interpretation of the data.

Results from questionnaires as to the perceptions held by the former intern students and cooperating agency supervisors, and

comparison of the perceptual relationship between the two groups, were analyzed. The results were obtained by using frequency distributions for each variable. In addition, means and standard deviations for some variables were obtained.

Summary

This research consisted of cooperating agency supervisors representing 360 various agencies in and outside of Michigan who supervised and evaluated the students during the 30-week internship and the 600 former students who took part in the internship program since its inception in 1975 to 1988. The students were graduates from Central Michigan University with majors in Recreation and Park Administration in the Leisure Services and Studies Curriculum.

Questionnaires were mailed to the entire population of the former students and to all agency supervisors at the site of the internships. Respondents were asked to respond to their perceived value of the 30-week internship experience as meeting the goals and objectives of the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University.

Responses were compared by chi-square analysis to determine the degree of similarity or difference in the perceptions held by agency supervisors and former student interns. The minimum confidence level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance in the interpretation of the data.

In Chapter IV, results of the analysis of data are presented.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter is presented in two major sections. The first section includes the responses of former student intern participants in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration Internship Program regarding their perceptions of the quality of their internship experience. The data were analyzed separately for each major concentration offered in the Leisure Services and Studies curriculum. The second section includes an analysis of the data from all cooperating internship site supervisors with respect to their perceptions of the quality of the internship program offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration, as well as all former student interns' perceptions of quality concerning the program.

Basic Student Considerations for a Quality Internship Program

It was important to determine relevant data on the former student intern questionnaire (see Appendix A), which would indicate former student interns' perceptions of quality regarding the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. The faculty members

in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University agreed that 8 of 43 questions on the former student intern questionnaire were relative to the former student interns' perceptions of quality.

The relevant questions on the former student intern questionnaire relating to quality were as follows:

Question 4: Why did you accept an internship?

Question 9: What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student?

Question 20b: To your knowledge, have you received any job offers since the internship based on the fact you were an intern?

Question 26: Did the variety of experiences during the internship meet your needs in preparing you to enter the profession?

Question 34: Do you have any reason to think that accepting the internship was not a good idea in your situation?

Question 38: Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at CMU prepared you for the internship?

Question 42: Would you recommend other students take the internship program?

Question 43: What suggestions do you have for improving the internship program?

Perceptions of Students Regarding the Internship Experience

The above questions were all compared to Question 3 on the intern questionnaire (What is your concentration area?) in order to determine perceptions of quality by individual concentration. Table 1 illustrates the number of respondents included in the survey from each of the four major areas of concentration. It also

includes a percentage of the total respondents by individual concentration.

Table 1.--Number of respondents by concentration area.

Concentration Area	N	% of Total
(1) Commercial	47	23.9
(2) Outdoor	14	7.1
(3) Community	55	27.9
(4) Therapeutic	81	41.1
Total	197	100.0

The former interns were asked to prioritize the reasons they accepted the internship option offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. They were given nine reasons and were asked to prioritize them on a sliding scale from 1 to 9 (1 being the highest and 8 being the lowest). Tables 2 through 10 indicate the student responses. The chi-square statistic was employed to determine significance at the .05 level.

To gain experience. According to the data in Table 2, differences in perceptions of the gaining of experience as a high priority among the students were not significant. Students acknowledged that the gaining of experience was very important. This is indicated by the fact that 110 of 188 (58.5%) respondents chose the gaining of experience as the number 1 priority. An

additional 52 (27.7%) chose it as their number 2 priority. Only 12 students (6.4%) placed the gaining of experience on the lower end of the scale. Only one student placed the gaining of experience as his/her number 7 priority.

Table 2.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to gain experience?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1	27 60.0	11 24.4	4 8.9	1 2.2	1 2.2		1 2.2			45 23.8
2	9 64.3	4 28.6	1 7.1							14 7.4
3	32 61.5	15 28.8	3 5.8	1 1.9			1 1.9			52 27.5
4	42 53.8	22 28.2	6 7.7	5 6.4	3 3.8					78 41.3

Chi-square test: p-value = .91558 Not Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 45 former interns responding in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 43 (95.6%) placed the gaining of experience in the top half of the priority scale. Twenty-seven (60%) respondents placed it in the number 1 priority position. One former intern (2.2%) placed it in the middle of the scale at the number 5 priority

position. One respondent (2.2%) placed the gaining of experience in the lower half of the priority scale. No respondents placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 14 (100%) placed the gaining of experience in the top half of the priority scale. Nine (64%) placed the gaining of experience in the number 1 priority position.

Of 52 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 51 (98.1%) placed the gaining of experience in the top half of the priority scale. Thirty-two (61.5%) respondents placed the gaining of experience in the number 1 priority position. One respondent (1.9%) placed the gaining of experience in the lower half of the priority scale at the number 7 priority position.

Of 78 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 75 (96.2%) placed the gaining of experience in the top half of the priority scale. Forty-two (53.8%) placed the gaining of experience in the number 1 priority position. Three (3.8%) placed the gaining of experience in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. No respondents in Concentration 4 placed the gaining of experience in the lower half of the priority scale.

Peer pressure. As indicated in Table 3, the student respondents perceived peer pressure as a low priority for accepting an internship. This is indicated by the fact that only 3 of 107 (2.8%) respondents prioritized peer pressure in positions 2 through 4. Eighty-three of 107 respondents (77.6%) placed peer pressure as

their number 9 priority. Fourteen of 107 respondents (13.1%) placed peer pressure in the number 8 priority position.

Table 3.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . peer pressure?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1			1 3.2	1 3.2		1 3.2	2 6.5	3 9.7	23 74.2	31 29.0
2							1 33.3		2 66.6	3 2.8
3						1 3.4	2 6.9	5 17.2	21 72.4	29 27.1
4	1 2.3							6 13.6	37 84.1	44 41.1

Chi-square test: p-value = .50633 Not Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 31 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 2 (6.4%) placed peer pressure as a priority consideration for accepting an internship in the top half of the priority scale. No respondents placed peer pressure in the number 1 priority position. Twenty-nine (93.5%) placed peer pressure in the lower half of the priority scale, with 23 (74.2%) of the Concentration 1 respondents placing peer pressure in the number 9 priority position.

All 3 respondents (100%) in Concentration 2 (Outdoor) placed peer pressure in the lower half of the priority scale, with 2 (66.6%) placing peer pressure in the number 9 priority position.

Of 29 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 29 (100%) placed peer pressure in the lower half of the priority scale. Twenty-one respondents (72.4%) placed peer pressure in the number 9 priority position.

Of 44 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 1 (2.3%) placed peer pressure in the top half of the priority scale at the number 1 priority position. Forty-three (97.7%) placed peer pressure in the lower half of the priority scale, with 37 (84.1%) placing peer pressure in the number 9 priority position.

Professional contacts. According to the data in Table 4, students placed making professional contacts on the high end of the priority scale. Of 154 respondents, 110 (71.4%) ranked making professional contacts in the top five positions. Forty-four (28.6%) ranked making professional contacts in the 6 through 9 priority positions. Among the various concentrations, this was significant at the .05 level.

Of 37 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 20 (54.1%) placed making professional contacts in the top half of the priority scale. Two (5.4%) placed making professional contacts in the number 1 priority position. Five respondents in Concentration 1 (13.5%) placed making professional contacts in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 position. Twelve respondents (32.4%) placed making professional contacts in the lower half of the priority

scale. No respondents in Concentration 1 placed making professional contacts in the number 9 priority position.

Table 4.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to make professional contacts?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1	2 5.4	10 27.0	5 13.5	3 8.1	5 13.5	6 16.2	2 5.4	4 10.8		37 24.0
2		1 10.0	3 30.0	2 20.0	3 30.0				1 10.0	10 6.5
3	1 2.1	4 8.9	16 35.6	12 26.7	5 11.1	2 4.4	3 6.7	1 2.2	1 2.2	45 29.2
4		7 11.3	8 12.9	13 21.0	10 16.1	15 24.2	5 8.1	4 6.5		62 40.3

Chi-square test: p-value = .00990 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 10 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 6 (60%) placed making professional contacts in the top half of the priority scale. No respondents placed it in the number 1 priority position. Three respondents (30%) placed making professional contacts in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. One respondent (10%) placed making professional contacts in the lower half of the priority scale at the number 9 position.

Of 45 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 33 (73.3%) placed making professional contacts in the top half of the priority scale. One respondent (2.2%) placed making professional contacts in the number 1 priority position. Five (11.1%) placed making professional contacts in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 position. Seven respondents (15.6%) in Concentration 3 placed making professional contacts in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 respondent (2.2%) placing the making of professional contacts in the number 9 priority position.

Of 62 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 28 (45.2%) placed making professional contacts in the top half of the priority scale. Ten (16.1%) placed making professional contacts in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Twenty-four (38.7%) placed making professional contacts in the lower half of the priority scale.

Variety of experience. According to the data in Table 5, differences in perceptions of gaining a variety of experience as an important consideration for accepting an internship were not significant. This is indicated by the fact that 153 respondents (86.4%) out of a total of 177 placed gaining a variety of experience in the top 5 priority positions, with 24 (13.6%) placing the gaining of a variety of experience in the lower half of the priority scale.

Of 40 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 25 (62.5%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the top half of the priority scale, with 3 (7.5%) placing the gaining of a variety of

experience in the number 1 priority position. Five respondents (12.5%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Ten (25%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the lower half of the priority scale. No respondents in Concentration 1 placed gaining a variety of experience in the number 9 priority position.

Table 5.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . variety of experience?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1	3 7.5	7 17.5	7 17.5	8 20.0	5 12.5	8 20.0	2 5.0			40 22.6
2		6 50.0	1 8.3	4 33.3	1 8.3					12 6.8
3	3 6.1	16 32.7	11 22.4	9 18.4	5 10.2	1 2.0	3 6.1		1 2.0	49 27.7
4	11 14.5	18 23.7	20 26.3	12 15.8	6 7.9	9 11.8				76 42.9

Chi-square test: p-value = .11510 Not Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 12 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 11 (91.7%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the top half of the priority scale. No respondents placed gaining a variety of

experience in the number 1 priority position. One (8.3%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. No respondents in Concentration 2 placed gaining a variety of experience in the lower half of the priority scale.

Of 49 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 39 (79.6%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the top half of the priority scale, with 3 respondents (6.1%) placing the gaining of a variety of experience in the number 1 priority position. Five (10.2%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Five (10.2%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 respondent (2%) placing the gaining of a variety of experience in the number 9 priority position.

Of 76 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 61 (80.3%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the top half of the priority scale, with 11 (14.5%) placing the gaining of a variety of experience in the number 1 priority position. Six respondents (7.9%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Nine (11.8%) placed gaining a variety of experience in the lower half of the priority scale at the number 6 priority position.

Required for curriculum. According to the data in Table 6, the acceptance of an internship because it was required for the curriculum was significant at the .05 level. Of 168 total respondents, 76 (45.2%) placed curriculum requirements in the top

half of the priority scale. Twenty (11.9%) placed curriculum requirements in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 position. Sixty-one (36.3%) placed curriculum requirements in the lower half of the priority scale, with 5 (3%) placing curriculum requirements in the number 9 priority position.

Table 6.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . required for curriculum?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1	9 21.4	5 11.9	5 11.9	4 9.5	3 7.1	3 7.1	3 7.1	8 19.0	2 4.8	42 25.0
2			3 30.0	2 20.0	2 20.0	1 10.0		1 10.0	1 10.0	10 6.0
3	12 26.7	10 22.2		1 2.2	8 17.8	7 15.6	4 8.9	3 6.7		45 26.8
4	21 29.6	8 11.3	5 7.0	2 2.8	7 9.9	6 8.5	13 18.3	7 9.9	2 2.8	71 43.9

Chi-square test: p-value = .01399 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 42 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 14 (33.3%) placed the importance of curriculum requirements in the number 1 and number 2 priority positions. Sixteen of the 42 respondents (38%) placed it in the 6 through 9 priority positions.

Of 10 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 5 (50%) placed curriculum requirements in the top half of the priority scale. Two (20%) placed curriculum requirements in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Two (20%) placed curriculum requirements in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 (10%) placing curriculum requirements in the number 9 priority position.

Of 45 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 22 (48.9%) placed it in the number 1 and number 2 priority positions. Of the 45 respondents, 14 (31.1%) placed it in the 6 through 9 priority positions.

In Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 29 respondents out of a total of 71 (40.8%) placed the fact that the internship was a curriculum requirement in the number 1 and number 2 priority positions. Seven (9.9%) placed curriculum requirements in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Of the 71 respondents, 28 (39.4%) placed it in the 6 through 9 priority positions.

To expand background (program). According to the data in Table 7, the perception of the importance of expanding the intern's background was significant at the .05 level. Of 167 total respondents, 97 (58.1%) placed expansion of their background in the top half of the priority scale, with 5 (3%) placing it in the number 1 priority position. Forty-three (25.7%) placed expansion of background in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Seventy respondents (41.9%) placed expansion of

background in the lower half of the priority scale; no respondents placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Table 7.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to expand background (program)?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1	2 5.1	3 7.7	2 5.1	7 17.9	16 41.0	5 12.8	4 10.3			39 23.4
2	3 25.0	1 8.3	4 33.3	1 8.3	2 16.7	1 8.3				12 7.2
3		3 6.4	13 27.7	18 38.3	6 12.8	5 10.6	1 2.1	1 2.1		47 28.1
4		7 10.1	20 29.0	13 18.8	19 27.5	6 5.8	4 5.8			69 41.3

Chi-square test: p-value = .00022 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 39 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 7 (17.9%) placed expansion of background in the number 1 and 2 priority positions. Sixteen respondents (41.0%) placed it exactly in the middle of importance at the number 5 priority position. Nine respondents (23%) placed it in the lower half of the priority scale.

Of 12 former interns in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 9 (75%) placed the expansion of their background in the upper half of the

scale. Two (16%) placed it exactly in the middle at the number 5 position. Only 1 respondent (8.3%) placed it in the lower half of the scale at the number 6 position.

Of 47 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 34 (72.3%) placed expansion of their background in the top half of the scale, although none placed it in the number 1 priority position. Six respondents (12.8%) placed it exactly in the middle at the number 5 priority position. Seven respondents (14.9%) placed importance of expanding their background as a reason for accepting an internship in the lower half of the scale. No respondent placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Forty of 69 former Concentration 4 (Therapeutic) interns (57.1%) placed the importance of the expansion of their background in the top half of the scale, although none placed it in the number 1 priority position. Nineteen (27.5%) placed it in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 position. Ten respondents (14.5%) placed it in the lower half of the priority scale, although no respondent placed it as his/her number 9 priority.

Drawn by personnel in a given department. According to the data in Table 8, the perception that the former interns placed the importance of accepting an internship because they were drawn into the program by personnel in a given department was significant at the .05 level. Of 123 total intern respondents, 14 (11.4%) former interns placed importance on this question in the top half of the scale. Sixteen (13%) placed it in the middle priority position at number 5. Ninety-three (75.6%) placed it in the lower half of the

scale. Eight (6.5%) of the total respondents placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Table 8.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . drawn by personnel in a given department?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1			2 6.1	2 6.1	4 12.1	4 12.1	6 18.2	12 36.4	3 9.1	33 26.8
2	1 12.5			1 12.5	2 25.0	1 12.5	1 12.5	2 25.0		8 6.5
3			3 8.6	1 2.9	8 22.9		9 25.7	11 31.4	3 8.6	35 28.5
4		1 2.1		3 6.4	2 4.3	3 6.4	14 29.8	22 46.8	2 4.3	47 38.2

Chi-square test: p-value = .04531 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 33 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 4 (12.1%) placed being drawn into the program by personnel in a given department at the top half of the scale. Four (12.1%) placed it in the middle at the number 5 priority position. Twenty-five (75.8%) placed it in the lower half of the scale. Three (9%) placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 8 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 2 (25%) placed acceptance of the program because they had been drawn by department personnel in the top half of the scale. One intern placed it in the number 1 priority position. Two (25%) placed it in the middle at the number 5 position. Three (37.5%) placed it in the lower half of the scale, whereas none placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 35 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 4 (11.4%) placed importance of accepting the internship program because they had been drawn by department personnel in the top half of the scale. No respondent placed it in either the number 1 or 2 priority position. Eight (22.9%) placed it in the middle at the number 5 priority position. Twenty-three (65.7%) of the former interns in Concentration 3 placed it in the lower half of the scale. Three (8.6%) placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 47 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 4 (8.5%) placed priority concerning this question in the top half of the scale. Two respondents (4.3%) placed it in the middle at priority position 5. Forty-one (87.2%) placed priority in the lower half of the scale. Two (4.3%) placed it in the number 9 priority position.

To test desirability of the field. According to the data in Table 9, the perception that the respondents placed the importance on testing the desirability of the field was not significant at the .05 level. Of 150 respondents, 71 (47.3%) placed testing the desirability of the field as an important consideration for accepting an internship in the top half of the priority scale. Six respondents (19.6%) placed it in the number 1 priority position.

Seventeen former interns (11.3%) placed it in the number 5 priority position. Sixty-two (41.3%) of the former interns placed it in the lower half of the priority scale. Four respondents (17.2%) placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Table 9.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . to test the desirability of the field?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
1		8 19.0	7 16.7	11 26.2	5 11.9	4 9.5	4 9.5	2 4.8	1 2.4	42 28.0
2	1 9.1	2 18.2		1 9.1	1 9.1	3 27.3	1 9.1	1 9.1	1 9.1	11 7.3
3	2 5.7	4 11.4	3 8.6	2 5.7	5 14.3	7 20.0	5 14.3	5 14.3	2 5.7	35 23.3
4	3 4.8	3 4.8	10 16.1	14 22.6	6 9.7	10 16.1	11 17.7	5 8.1		62 41.3

Chi-square test: p-value = .31297 Not Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 42 responding former interns in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 26 (61.9%) placed importance of testing desirability of the field in the top half of the priority scale. No respondents placed it in the number 1 priority position. Five respondents (11.9%) placed it in the middle priority position. Eleven (26.2%)

placed it in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 former intern (2.4%) placing it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 11 responding former interns in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 4 (36.4%) placed testing desirability of the field in the top half of the priority scale. One (9.1%) placed it in the middle at the number 5 priority position. Six (54.5%) of the former Concentration 2 interns placed it in the lower half of the priority scale. One (9.1%) placed it at the bottom in the number 9 priority position.

Of 35 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 11 (31.4%) placed testing the desirability of the field in the top half of the priority scale. Five (14.3%) placed it in the middle at the number 5 priority position. Nineteen (54.3%) placed it in the lower half of the priority scale. Two respondents (5.7%) placed it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 62 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 30 (48.4%) placed testing the desirability of the field in the top half of the priority scale. Six (9.7%) placed it in the number 5 priority position. Twenty-six (41.9%) placed it in the lower half of the priority scale. No respondents in Concentration 4 placed testing the desirability of the field in the number 9 priority position.

Explore special interest area. According to the data in Table 10, the perception that former student interns placed priority on accepting the internship to explore special interest areas was significant at the .05 level. Of 158 responding former interns, 75 (47.5%) placed exploring special interest areas in the top half of

the priority scale, with 10 (6.3%) placing it in the number 1 priority position. Twenty (12.7%) placed it at the number 5 priority position. Sixty-three (39.9%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the lower half of the priority scale, with 2 (1.3%) placing it in the number 9 priority position.

Table 10.--Responses to Question 4: "Why did you accept an internship . . . explore special interest area?"

Concentration	High 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Low 9	Total
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1	2 5.0	2 5.0	13 32.5	8 20.0	1 2.5	3 7.5	8 20.0	2 5.0	1 2.5	40 25.3
2			1 9.1	3 27.3		2 18.2	4 36.4	1 9.1		11 7.0
3	3 7.1	2 4.8	3 7.1	4 9.5	7 16.7	14 33.3	3 7.1	5 11.9	1 2.4	42 26.6
4	5 7.7	13 20.0	9 13.8	7 10.8	12 18.5	9 13.8	7 10.8	3 4.5		65 41.1

Chi-square test: p-value = .00175 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 40 responding former interns in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 17 (42.5%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the top half of the priority scale, with 2 (5%) placing it in the number 1 priority position. One respondent (2.5%) placed the

exploration of special interest areas in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Fourteen (35%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 (2.5%) placing it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 11 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 4 (36.4%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the top half of the priority scale. No respondents placed it at the number 5 priority position. Seven (63.6%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the lower half of the priority scale, with no respondents placing it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 42 responding former interns in Concentration 3 (Community), 12 (28.6%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the top half of the priority scale, with 3 (7.1%) placing it in the number 1 priority position. Seven respondents (16.7%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Twenty-three respondents (54.8%) placed it in the lower half of the priority scale, with 1 (2.4%) placing it in the number 9 priority position.

Of 65 responding former interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 35 (53.8%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the top half of the priority scale, with 5 (7.7%) placing it in the number 1 priority position. Twelve respondents (18.5%) placed the exploration of special interest areas in the middle of the priority scale at the number 5 priority position. Nineteen respondents (29.2%) placed the exploration of special interest areas

in the lower half of the priority scale; no respondents in Concentration 4 placed it in the number 9 priority position.

The former interns of the four concentration offerings within the Leisure Studies and Services Curriculum were asked if, to their knowledge, they had received any job offers since the internship based on the fact they were involved in the internship program. The perception that they had been offered jobs based on the internship experience was significant at the .05 level. According to the data in Table 11, 109 (58.9%) responding former interns from a total of 185 respondents perceived that they had been offered jobs as a result of their internship experience. Seventy-six (41.1%) of the respondents believed they had not received job offers based on the fact they had been former interns.

Table 11.--Responses to Question 20b: "Have you received any job offers since your internship based on the fact you were an intern?"

Concentration									
1		2		3		4		Total	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
30	13	11	3	34	18	34	42	109	76
69.8	30.2	78.6	21.4	65.4	34.6	44.7	55.3	58.9	41.1

Chi-square test: p-value = .00914 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 43 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 13 (30.2%) believed they had not been offered employment based on the fact they were former interns. Conversely, 30 (69.8%) believed they had received offers based on the fact they had completed an internship.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 3 (21.4%) believed they had not received employment opportunities because they had been interns. Eleven (78.6%) of the respondents in Concentration 2 believed they had received offers based on this fact.

Of 52 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 18 (34.6%) believed they had not received job offers because of their internship experience. Thirty-four (65.4%) believed they had received employment opportunities based on the internship.

Of 76 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 42 (55.3%) believed they had not received job offers based on the fact they had been former interns. Thirty-four (44.7%) believed they had received employment opportunities due to the fact that they had been former interns.

The former interns of the four concentration offerings were asked what they thought were the three major contributions of the internship program to the student (Question 9). The respondents identified three topics they believed were significant contribution areas. The areas were on-the-job experience, employment opportunities, and professional contacts.

One hundred eighty-seven respondents from a total of 197 (94.9%) indicated that on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship to the student. One hundred seventy-eight (90.4%) indicated that employment opportunities were also a major contribution of the program. One hundred fifty-eight (80.2%) thought professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program.

Of 47 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 45 (95.7%) believed on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the program. Two (4.3%) did not respond to the question.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 13 thought on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship program. One (7.1%) did not respond to the question.

Of 55 former interns in Concentration 3 (Community), 54 (98.2%) believed on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the program. One (1.8%) did not respond to this option.

Of 81 responding former interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 75 (92.6%) believed on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship program. Six (7.4%) did not respond to this option.

The perception among respondents from the four concentrations that on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship was not significant at the .05 level.

Forty-two respondents (89.4%) in Concentration 1 (Commercial) indicated employment opportunities were a major contribution of the

program. Five (10.6%) of the respondents did not respond to this option.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 13 (92.9%) indicated that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the program. One (7.1%) did not respond to the employment-opportunity option on the questionnaire.

Of 55 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 50 (90.9%) believed that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program. Five (9.1%) did not respond to the employment-opportunity option.

Of 81 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 73 (90.1%) indicated that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program. Eight (9.9%) did not respond to this option on the questionnaire.

The perception among respondents from the four major concentrations that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program was not significant at the .05 level.

Of 47 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 32 (68.1%) perceived professional contacts as a major contribution of the internship program. Fifteen (31.9%) did not respond to this option on the questionnaire.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 12 (85.7%) believed that professional contacts were a major contribution of the program. Two (14.3%) did not respond.

Of 55 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 51 (92.7%) thought professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program. Three (5.5%) did not respond to the professional-contacts option.

Of 81 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 63 (77.8%) perceived professional contacts as a major contribution of the internship program. Eighteen (22.2%) did not respond to the professional-contacts option on the questionnaire.

The perception among respondents in the four major concentrations that professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program was significant at the .05 level (.02439).

The former interns were asked if they thought the variety of experiences during the internship met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession (Question 26). Of 191 total responding former interns, 152 (79.6%) thought the variety of experiences during the internship met their professional-preparation needs. Thirty-nine (20.4%) did not think the variety of experiences met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession.

According to the data in Table 12, perceptions among respondents in the four major concentrations were not significant at the .05 level. Of 46 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 32 former interns (69.6%) thought the variety of experiences during the internship had met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession. Fourteen (30.4%) thought the variety of experiences had not met their needs.

Table 12.--Responses to Question 26: "Did the variety of experiences during the internship meet your needs in preparing you to enter the profession?"

Concentration									
1		2		3		4		Total	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
32	14	12	1	43	12	65	12	152	39
69.6	30.4	92.3	7.7	78.2	21.8	84.4	15.6	79.6	20.4

Chi-square test: p-value = .154049 Not Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 13 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 12 (92.3%) of the former interns thought the variety of experiences had met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession. One (7.7%) thought the variety of experiences had not met his/her preparation needs.

Of 55 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 43 (78.2%) thought the variety of experiences had met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession. Twelve (21.8%) of the former interns believed the variety of experiences had not met their needs in preparing them for the profession.

Of 77 responding former interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 65 (84.4%) indicated that the variety of experiences had met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession.

Twelve (15.6%) indicated that the variety of experiences had not met their needs in preparing them to enter the profession.

According to the data in Table 13, the perception among the interns that accepting the internship was not a good idea in their situation was significant at the .05 level. Of 191 responding former interns, 19 (9.9%) believed the internship had not been a good idea in their situation. One hundred seventy-one (89.5%) thought the internship experience had been a good idea in their situation.

Table 13.--Responses to Question 34: "Do you have any reason to think that accepting the internship was not a good idea in your situation?"

Concentration									
1		2		3		4		Total	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
5	41	2	10	8	46	4	74	19	171
10.9	89.1	15.4	76.9	14.8	85.2	5.1	94.9	9.9	89.5

Chi-square test: p-value = .00670 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 46 responding former interns in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 5 (10.9%) thought the internship had not been a good idea in their situation. Forty-one (89.1%) thought it had been a good idea in their situation.

Of 13 responding interns in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 2 (15.4%) had reason to believe the acceptance of an internship had not been a good idea in their situation. Ten (76.9%) had no reason to believe the internship had not been a good idea in their situation.

Of 54 responding former interns in Concentration 3 (Community), 8 (14.8%) believed that accepting the internship had not been a good idea in their situation. Forty-six (85.2%) had no reason to believe that the acceptance of an internship had not been a good idea in their situation.

Of 78 responding interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 4 (5.1%) had reason to believe that accepting an internship had not been a good idea in their situation. Seventy-four (94.9%) had no reason to believe that accepting an internship had not been a good idea in their situation.

The former interns were asked if they thought the Park and Recreation courses at Central Michigan University had prepared them for the internship (see Table 14). Of 189 responding former interns, 170 (89.9%) answered positively, while 18 (9.5%) thought that the coursework at CMU had not prepared them for the internship. This was significant at the .05 level (.00652).

Of 46 responding former interns in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 39 (84.8%) thought they had been prepared by the coursework at CMU. Seven (15.2%) believed they had not been prepared.

Table 14.--Responses to Question 38: "Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at CMU prepared you for the internship?"

Concentration									
1		2		3		4		Total	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
39	7	11		49	4	71	7	170	18
84.8	15.2	91.7		92.5	7.5	91.0	9.0	89.9	9.5

Chi-square test: p-value = .00652 Significant at .05

Key: Concentration 1 = Commercial, Concentration 2 = Outdoor,
Concentration 3 = Community, Concentration 4 = Therapeutic

Of 12 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 11 (91.7%) thought they had been prepared for the internship by the coursework at CMU. One (8.3%) chose not to answer the question.

Of 53 responding former interns in Concentration 3 (Community), 49 (92.5%) thought they had been prepared by the coursework, whereas 4 (7.5%) believed they had not been prepared.

Of 78 respondents in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 71 (91.0%) believed they had been prepared for the internship by the coursework at CMU. Seven (9.0%) thought they had not been prepared by their coursework.

The former interns were asked if they would recommend other students take the internship program (Question 42). Of 168 responding former interns, 100% indicated they would recommend other students take the internship program.

The former interns were asked what suggestions they had for improving the internship program (Question 43). The respondents were given three areas of concern and asked to indicate the areas they thought would improve the internship program. The three improvement areas were: more communications with the CMU supervisor, better screening of internship agency, and the internship should be shorter than 30 weeks.

Of 197 total respondents, 90 (45.7%) thought that more communication with the CMU supervisor would improve the internship program, whereas 107 did not think this area would improve the experience.

Sixteen of 197 respondents (8.1%) thought better screening of the internship agency would improve the program, whereas 181 (91.9%) did not believe this would improve the internship experience.

None of the 197 respondents thought an internship shorter than 30 weeks would improve the internship program.

The perception of students among the four major concentrations that more communications with CMU supervisors would improve the internship experience was not significant at the .05 level. Of 47 respondents in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 32 (68.1%) did not think this would improve the internship experience. Fifteen (31.9%) believed that more communications would improve the internship program.

Of 14 respondents in Concentration 2 (Outdoor), 7 (50.0%) thought more communications would improve the internship program.

Conversely, 7 (50.0%) did not believe that more communication with the CMU supervisor would improve the internship experience.

Of 55 respondents in Concentration 3 (Community), 29 (52.7%) did not believe that more communications with the CMU supervisor would improve the program. Twenty-six (47.3%) thought more communication would improve the internship program.

Of 81 responding former interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 39 (48.1%) thought more communications with the CMU supervisor would not improve the internship program. Forty-two (51.9%) perceived more communication with the CMU supervisor as improving the internship program.

The perception among students from the four major concentrations that better screening of the internship agency would improve the internship program was not significant at the .05 level. Of 47 responding former interns in Concentration 1 (Commercial), 45 (95.7%) believed that better screening would not improve the internship program, while 2 (4.3%) thought better screening of the internship agency would improve the program.

All 14 respondents (100%) in Concentration 2 (Outdoor) did not believe that better screening would improve the internship program.

Of 55 responding former interns in Concentration 3 (Community), 49 (89.1%) did not think better screening would improve the internship program. Six (10.9%) thought better screening would improve the internship experience.

Of 81 responding former interns in Concentration 4 (Therapeutic), 73 (90.1%) believed better screening of the

internship site would not improve the internship program. Eight (9.9%) thought better screening would improve the internship experience.

The perception among respondents from the four major concentrations that an internship shorter than 30 weeks would improve the internship program could not be computed using the chi-square statistic because all of the 197 respondents did not think a shorter internship period would improve the program.

Summary

The data analyzed in the preceding section were related to Hypothesis 1, in which it was stated that there will be no significant difference in the scores of the mail survey between former interns of the four student concentrations as to their perceptions concerning the internship program.

Of the eight questions on the intern questionnaire relating to perceptions of quality of the internship program by the former interns, the following were found to be significant at the .05 confidence level:

1. Question 4/3: Why did you accept an internship? To make professional contacts? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00990$.
2. Question 4/5: Why did you accept an internship? Required for curriculum? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .01399$.
3. Question 4/6: Why did you accept an internship? To expand background? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00022$.

4. Question 4/7: Why did you accept an internship? Drawn by personnel in a given department? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .04531$.

5. Question 4/9: Why did you accept an internship? To explore special interest areas? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00175$.

6. Question 9c: What do you feel are major contributions of the internship program? Professional contacts? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .02439$.

7. Question 20b: Have you received any job offers since your internship based on the fact you were an intern? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00914$.

8. Question 34: Do you have any reason to think that accepting the internship was not a good idea in your situation? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00670$.

9. Question 38: Do you feel the Recreation and Park Administration courses at CMU prepared you for the internship? Significant at $p\text{-value} = .00652$.

Basic Agency Considerations for a Quality Internship Program

As in the preceding section, it was important to determine relevant data on the agency questionnaire (see Appendix B) that would indicate the agency supervisor's perception of quality regarding the internship program at Central Michigan University. The faculty members in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University agreed that 7 of 30 questions on the agency survey instrument were relative to the agency supervisor's perception of quality.

The relevant questions on the agency questionnaire related to quality are as follows:

- Question 5: What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student?
- Question 11b: To your knowledge, has the former intern received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern?
- Question 16: Did the variety of the experiences during the internship meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession?
- Question 24: Do you have any reason to think that accepting an intern was not a good idea in your situation?
- Question 27: Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at Central Michigan University prepared the intern for the internship?
- Question 29: Would you recommend other students take the internship program in the Recreation and Park Department at Central Michigan University?
- Question 30: What suggestions do you have for improving the internship program?

The above-listed questions on the agency questionnaire were all compared to corresponding questions on the intern questionnaire in order to compare all agency supervisors' and all former students' perceptions of quality concerning the internship program in the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University. The corresponding questions on both questionnaires are as follows:

AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 5

Question 11b

Question 16

INTERN QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 9

Question 20b

Question 26

Question 24

Question 27

Question 29

Question 30

Question 34

Question 38

Question 42

Question 43

Perception of Quality by Internship
Site Supervisors and All Interns
Concerning the Internship Program
at Central Michigan University

The agency supervisors were asked what they thought were the three main contributions of the internship program to the student (Question 5). The respondents were given three suggested topics and were asked to identify the topics they thought were significant contribution areas. The areas were: on-the-job experience, employment opportunities, and professional contacts.

The agency supervisors were asked if they thought that on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship program. Their responses were compared to the total student intern responses on Question 9 of the intern questionnaire. According to the data in Table 15, the perceptions of the agency supervisors and the former student interns regarding on-the-job experience as a major contribution of the internship program were not significant at the .05 level.

Of 121 total responding agency supervisors, 117 (96.7%) thought on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship program. Four (3.3%) did not think such experience was a major contribution of the program.

Of 197 responding former interns, 187 (94.9%) thought on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship program. Nine (4.6%) thought on-the-job experience was not a major contribution of the program.

Table 15.--Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . on-the-job experience?"

Agency Supervisors			Student Interns			
No	Yes	Total	No	Yes	Total	Total
N	N	N	N	N	N	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
4	117	121	9	187	197	318
3.3	96.7	38.1	4.6	94.9	61.9	100.0

Chi-square test: p-value = .62777 Not Significant at .05

The agency supervisors were asked if they thought employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program. Their responses were compared to the total student responses on Question 9 of the intern questionnaire. According to the data in Table 16, the perception that employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program by the agency supervisors and the former student interns was significant at the .05 level (.00000).

Of 121 total responding agency supervisors, 83 (68.6%) thought employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship

program. Thirty-eight (31.4%) thought employment opportunities were not a major contribution of the program.

Of 197 responding former student interns, 178 (90.4%) thought employment opportunities were a major contribution of the internship program. Eighteen (9.1%) thought employment opportunities were not a major contribution of the program.

Table 16.--Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . employment opportunities?"

Agency Supervisors			Student Interns			
No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	Total N %
38 31.4	83 68.6	121 38.1	19 9.6	178 90.4	197 61.9	318 100.0

Chi-square test: p-value = .00000 Significant at .05

The agency supervisors were asked if they thought professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program. Their responses were compared to the total student responses to Question 9 on the intern questionnaire. According to the data in Table 17, the perception that professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program by the agency supervisors and the former student interns was significant at the .05 level (.00000).

Table 17.--Responses to Question 5/Question 9: "What do you feel are the main contributions of the internship program to the student . . . professional contacts?"

Agency Supervisors			Student Interns			
No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	Total N %
74 61.1	47 38.8	121 38.1	39 19.8	158 80.2	197 61.9	318 100.0

Chi-square test: p-value = .00000 Significant at .05

Of 121 responding agency supervisors, 47 (38.8%) thought professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program. Seventy-three (61.1%) thought such contacts were not a major contribution of the program.

Of 197 responding former interns, 158 (80.2%) thought professional contacts were a major contribution of the internship program. Thirty-eight (19.8%) believed professional contacts were not a major contribution of the program.

The agency supervisors were asked if, to their knowledge, the former intern had received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern (Question 11b). According to the data in Table 18, the perception among the agency supervisors and the former student interns that the intern had received a job offer since the internship based on the fact he/she had been an intern was significant at the .05 level.

Table 18.--Responses to Question 11b/Question 20b: "To your knowledge, has the former intern received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern?"

Agency Supervisors			Student Interns			
No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	Total N %
76 76.8	23 23.2	99 34.9	76 41.1	109 58.9	185 65.1	284 100.0

Chi-square test: p-value = .00000 Significant at .05

Of 99 total responding agency supervisors, 76 (76.8%) thought the former intern had not received a job offer based on the fact he/she had been an intern. Twenty-three (23.2%) thought the intern had received a job offer since the internship based on the fact he/she had been a former intern.

Of 185 responding former interns, 76 (41.1%) believed they had not received job offers based on the fact they had been interns. One hundred nine former interns (58.9%) thought they had received a job offer since their internships based on the fact they had been interns.

The agency supervisors were asked if they thought the variety of experience during the internship met the needs in preparing the intern for the profession (Question 16). The responses were compared to the total student intern responses to Question 26 on the intern questionnaire. According to the data in Table 19, the

perceptions of the agency supervisors and the former student interns were significant at the .05 level.

Table 19.--Responses to Question 16/Question 26: "Did the variety of the experience during the internship meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession?"

Agency Supervisors			Student Interns			
No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	No N %	Yes N %	Total N %	Total N %
5 4.4	109 95.6	114 37.4	39 20.4	152 79.6	191 62.6	305 100.0

Chi-square test: p-value = .00012 Significant at .05

Of 114 total responding agency supervisors, 109 (95.6%) thought the variety of experience met the needs in preparing the intern for the profession. Five (4.4%) thought the variety of experience did not meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession.

Of 191 responding former interns, 152 (79.6%) thought the variety of experience met the needs in preparing the intern for the profession. Thirty-nine (20.4%) thought the variety of experience did not meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession.

The agency supervisors were asked if they had any reason to think that accepting an intern was not a good idea in their situation (Question 24). The responses were compared to the total student intern responses to Question 34 on the intern questionnaire. According to the data, the perceptions of the agency supervisors and

the former student interns regarding the acceptance of an intern/ internship program were not significant at the .05 level.

Of 113 total responding agency supervisors, 107 (94.7%) thought that accepting an intern was a good idea in their situation. Six (5.3%) thought that accepting an intern was not a good idea in their situation.

Of 190 total responding former interns, 171 (89.5%) thought that accepting an internship was a good idea in their situation. Nineteen (9.9%) thought that accepting an internship was not a good idea in their situation.

The agency supervisors were asked if they believed the coursework at Central Michigan University prepared the intern for the internship (Question 27). The responses were compared to the total student intern responses on Question 38 of the intern questionnaire. According to the data, the perceptions of the agency supervisors and the former student interns regarding the coursework at CMU preparing the intern for the internship were not significant at the .05 level.

Of 48 responding agency supervisors, 34 (70.8%) thought the coursework at CMU prepared the intern for the internship. Fourteen (29.2%) believed the coursework did not prepare the intern for the internship. It should be noted here that there were 73 missing observations by the agency supervisors.

Of 189 responding former interns, 170 (89.9%) thought the coursework at CMU had prepared them for the internship. Nineteen

(10.1%) thought the coursework had not prepared them for the internship experience.

The former agency supervisors were asked if they would recommend other students take the internship program in the Recreation and Park Department at Central Michigan University (Question 29). The responses were compared to the total former student intern responses to Question 42 on the intern questionnaire. According to the data, the perceptions concerning the recommendation of the internship program to other students were not significant at the .05 level.

Of 111 total responding agency supervisors, 80 (72.1%) stated they would recommend the internship program to other students. Thirty-one (27.9%) indicated they would not recommend the internship program to other students.

Of 168 responding former interns, 100% stated they would recommend the internship program to other students.

The agency supervisors were asked what suggestions they had for improving the internship program. They were asked if they thought more communications with the Central Michigan University supervisor would improve the program (Question 30). The responses were compared to the total former student intern responses to Question 43 on the intern questionnaire. According to the data, the perception that more communication with the intern supervisor would improve the program was significant at the .05 level (.00000).

Of 121 responding agency supervisors, 22 (18.2%) that more communication would improve the internship program. Ninety-nine (81.8%) thought more communication would not improve the program.

Of 197 total responding former student interns, 90 (45.7%) thought more communication with the CMU supervisor would improve the internship program. One hundred seven (54.3%) thought more communication would not improve the program.

Summary

The data analyzed in the preceding section were related to Hypothesis 2, which stated that there will be no significant difference in the scores of the mail survey between cooperating agency supervisors and the former student interns as to their perceptions concerning the internship program.

Of the seven questions on the agency questionnaire relating to perceptions of quality of the internship program by the agency supervisors and the former student interns, the following were found to be significant at the .05 level:

1. Question 5/2: What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student? Employment opportunities? Significant at p-value = .00000.

2. Question 5/3: What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student? Professional contacts? Significant at p-value = .00000.

3. Question 11b: To your knowledge, has the former intern received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern? Significant at p-value = .00000.

4. Question 16: Did the variety of experience during the internship meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession? Significant at p-value = .00000.

5. Question 30: What suggestions do you have for improving the internship program? More communication with CMU supervisor? Significant at p-value = .00000.

A summary of the findings of this investigation, as well as the conclusions and implications for further research, is presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, the problem and the procedure of the study are summarized. Conclusions of the study are stated and discussed in detail. Finally, implications for further research are explored.

The Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the quality and extent to which former undergraduate students and cooperating agency supervisors perceived the 30-week internship experience offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan. (Quality was defined as the degree of excellence perceived by the former student interns and cooperating agencies in meeting the goals and objectives of the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University.)

Specifically, this study was undertaken to evaluate the internship experience as it related to the satisfactory attainment of the goals and objectives of the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. The findings were presented in two major sections. The first section included the responses from former student intern participants in the Leisure

Services and Studies curriculum. The data were analyzed separately for each of the four major concentrations offered in this program of study: Commercial Recreation, Outdoor Recreation, Community Recreation, and Therapeutic Recreation. The second section was a comparison between cooperating internship agencies and all of the combined former student intern concentrations as to their perceptions of the quality of the internship program.

The study was conducted during winter and spring 1988. Questionnaires were mailed to 360 Recreation and Park agencies in and outside of Michigan that supervised and evaluated the former student interns during their 30-week internship experience. Questionnaires were also mailed to all the 600 former students who participated in the internship program since its inception in 1975 until the study was conducted in 1988.

Procedure of the Study

The procedures for selecting questions for the mail survey were based on the goals and objectives of the internship program. Items included in the mail survey came from related literature and the results of the accreditation study sponsored by the National Recreation and Parks Association and the American Association of Leisure and Recreation. Other questions were derived from the researcher's experience as a former practitioner in recreation and from experience teaching courses taken by the former student interns.

The draft version of the mail questionnaire was pilot-tested on a small group of former interns and supervisors of cooperating agencies in Michigan. The results were examined and changes, where necessary, were made. A final draft was prepared and mailed to the cooperating agencies and former interns involved in the study. Total usable responses for this study included 197 from the former student interns and 121 from supervisors of cooperating agencies.

The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What was the quality of the internship program as perceived by former interns and cooperating agency supervisors?
2. Did cooperating agency supervisors and former student interns have differing perceptions of the internship experience?
3. What suggestions were commonly mentioned for improving the internship experience as a training device as perceived by former students and cooperating agency supervisors?

It was important to establish some fundamental assumptions for this study in analyzing the data to be gathered. For statistical purposes, the assumptions were developed into null hypotheses and were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference in the responses to the mail survey between former interns of the four concentrations as to their perceptions concerning the internship program.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference in the responses to the mail survey between cooperating agency supervisors and the former interns as to their perceptions concerning the internship program.

Each respondent's answers were recorded on an Opscan form. The data were analyzed by the Statistical Consulting Group at the

Computer Services Department of Central Michigan University, using the SPSSX Statistical Package on the IBM 3090 computer system.

The chi-square statistic was employed to determine relationship between the groups. A minimum confidence level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance of the interpretation of the data.

Results from questionnaires as to the perceptions held by the former student interns, agency supervisors, and comparison of the perceptual relationships between the two groups were analyzed.

Summary of Findings

Hypothesis 1

Significant differences were found in the perceptions of quality concerning the internship program between the former interns from the four concentration areas. Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant difference in the former students' perception of the quality of the internship program among the four major concentrations.

A major focus of the study concerned why the former interns accepted the internship option in the Leisure Services and Studies curriculum. The former interns were given nine reasons and asked to prioritize them on a sliding scale from 1 to 9, with 1 being the highest. The majority of the former student interns agreed that gaining experience was their most important consideration for accepting the internship option. The former student interns in the four major concentrations disagreed significantly concerning the

following reasons for accepting the internship option: to make professional contacts, the fact that it was required on the curriculum, to expand their background, the fact they were drawn into the internship program by personnel in a given department, to explore special interest areas, and to make professional contacts.

The former student interns were also asked to define the three major contributions of the internship experience to the student. The majority of the students perceived job experience as most important in order of priority, followed by employment opportunities and professional contacts, in that order.

As far as job opportunities being presented to the intern based on the fact he/she had been an intern are concerned, the former student internship participants disagreed significantly with agency supervisors. The majority of the students believed they had been offered jobs based on the fact they had been former interns.

The majority of the former student interns believed the variety of experiences involved in the internship program helped prepare them for entry into the recreation and park profession. However, enough former student respondents disagreed in their perception to make the results of this question significant at the .05 level.

The perception among the former interns from the four major concentration areas differed significantly as to whether or not accepting the internship had been a good idea in their situation. The majority of the students agreed that accepting the internship

had been a good idea in their situation, but enough disagreed to be significant at the .05 level.

The majority of the students thought the coursework in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University had prepared them adequately for the internship experience. Enough of the former students disagreed to be significant at the .05 level.

All the former student interns agreed that they would recommend the internship option to other students.

The majority of the former student interns suggested two areas for improving the internship program. They believed that more communication with the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University would improve the program. The majority also indicated that a better screening of the internship agency before allowing interns to be assigned there would improve the internship experience.

Hypothesis 2

Significant differences were found in the perceptions of quality concerning the internship program between the agency supervisors and the former student interns. Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant difference in the perception of quality between the agency supervisors and the former student interns.

A major focus area of this study dealt with what the agency supervisors believed were the three major contribution areas of the

internship program. The three areas were: on-the-job experience, employment opportunities, and professional contacts. The agency supervisors as well as the former student interns agreed that on-the-job experience was a major contribution of the internship experience. The perception that employment opportunities and professional contacts were a major contribution area of the internship experience was perceived differently by the two groups. The interns believed that employment opportunities and professional contacts were a major contribution, whereas the agency supervisors disagreed to the point where the perceptions were statistically significant.

The agency supervisors were asked if, to their knowledge, the intern had received a job offer based on the fact that the student had been an intern. The agency supervisors believed the former student interns had not received job offers based on this fact while, comparatively, the interns disagreed in significant numbers. This perception was statistically significant.

The agency supervisors were asked if they believed the variety of experiences offered during the internship experience met the needs in preparing the intern for the profession. The responses were compared to the responses by the former student interns. The majority of the former student interns believed the variety of experiences prepared them for entry into the profession; however, enough disagreed to make the perception statistically significant at the .05 level. The agency supervisors agreed that the variety of

experience did, in fact, prepare the intern for entry into the recreation and park profession.

The agency supervisors were asked if they had any reason to think that their acceptance of an intern had not been a good idea in their situation. Their responses were then compared to the interns' perception concerning their acceptance of the internship experience. The majority of both groups agreed that the acceptance of an intern/internship had been a good idea in their particular situation.

The agency supervisors were asked if they believed the Recreation and Park Administration courses at Central Michigan University prepared the intern for the internship experience. The responses were then compared to the responses of the former student interns as to their perception of the coursework preparing them for the experience. The majority of both groups perceived the coursework as adequately preparing the student intern for the experience; therefore, the perceptions were not statistically significant at .05. Caution should be exercised concerning this finding because 60% (73) of the 121 agency supervisors did not respond to this question on the agency questionnaire.

The agency supervisors were asked if they would recommend other students take the internship program in the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University. The majority of the agency supervisors stated they would recommend the program. The responses were then compared to the student intern responses, and the results were not statistically significant.

The agency supervisors were asked if they believed more communication with the student interns and the Department of Recreation and Park Administration and recent intern supervisors would improve the program. The majority of the cooperating agency supervisors agreed that more communication would not improve the experience. The responses were then compared to those of the former student interns. Enough former student interns believed that more communication would improve the internship program that this comparison was statistically significant.

Conclusions

1. There were significant differences in the perceptions of quality concerning the internship program between and among the former interns from the four concentrations as well as between the former interns and the agencies involved. Due to the small number of respondents in the Outdoor Recreation concentration, caution should be exercised when reviewing statistical significance concerning perceptions between the four concentrations.

2. There were significant perceptual differences concerning why the interns accepted the internship program in Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. The researcher concluded that this is due to the fact that concentrations differ in basic philosophy and focus. Other perceptual differences may be attributed to misinterpreting the questionnaire instrument used.

3. The former student interns generally agreed that the major contributions of the internship program were the gaining of

experience, the making of professional contacts, and employment opportunities. The cooperating agency supervisors did not agree that the employment opportunities were a major contribution of the program. Those findings are logical, considering the interests of the groups involved.

4. The fact that the former student intern was involved in the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University did not insure job placement. While the student intern believed that employment opportunities were a major contribution, the data do not warrant that involvement with the internship program insured job placement.

5. Perceptions regarding the variety of experience offered during the internship program preparing the former student interns for entry into the recreation and park profession were significantly different between and among the former student interns and the cooperating agency supervisors. The cooperating agency supervisors believed the variety of experience did prepare the student for entry into the recreation and park profession. Overall, both the cooperating agency supervisors and former student interns believed the variety of experience was beneficial.

6. There were significant differences in perception among the former student interns in the four concentration areas regarding the coursework in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration adequately preparing the former student interns for the internship

program. This is largely due to the wide variety and scope of courses offered in each individual concentration.

7. A number of former student interns (90 or 45.7%) believed the internship program would be improved by more communication between the intern and the Department of Recreation and Park Administration supervisor. The communication problems alluded to in this conclusion should be investigated in the future to determine reasons for them.

8. The former student interns and cooperating agency supervisors believed the internship experience was a positive one and would recommend it as a valuable learning experience to other students considering the internship program.

9. The internship program offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University is perceived as a valuable educational tool and is meeting the goals and objectives as outlined by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration.

10. Throughout the study, the researcher has implied or pointed out concerns about the data-gathering instrument. Certainly, if the project were to begin again, some changes would be made in the instrument. Nonetheless, the findings based on the instrument's internal consistency do appear to be logically sound in view of the information gained from this study.

Suggestions for Further Research

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the quality and extent of contribution to professional preparation of undergraduate students enrolled in the internship experience offered by the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. A secondary purpose of the study was to assess the value of involvement of cooperating agencies and leadership personnel in assisting the Department of Recreation and Park Administration in the development and revision of its program.

Based on the data obtained in this study and the information acquired from reviewing relevant literature, the following suggestions for further research are made:

1. A number of former student interns (90 or 45.7%) believed the internship would be improved by more communication between the intern and the Department of Recreation and Park Administration supervisor. The communication problems alluded to in the conclusion should be investigated in the future to determine reasons for them.

2. Further research should be conducted concerning the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University. Specifically, significant differences in perceptions of the goals and objectives among the four student concentrations should be investigated. An expanded instrument using interviews in a case study procedure with a select number of student interns would provide specific information with which to effectively evaluate the goals and objectives of the

internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration.

The study, generally speaking, affirmed the quality of the internship program as a component of the Department of Recreation and Park Administration.

After conducting this study of the internship program in the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University, the researcher believes that other institutions of higher learning offering an internship program in recreation and park administration will find the same method and instrument an effective means of evaluating the goals and objectives of their individual internship program.

Reflections

Based on the data obtained in this study and from information acquired from reviewing the literature, the following reflections emerged:

1. Records and addresses for former graduates from the internship program are necessary to insure a larger number of responses.
2. If a mail questionnaire survey is to be considered, it should be kept short and simple to insure a larger number of responses.
3. An area of concern that was a result of this study is that there should have been more communication between the student intern and the Department of Recreation and Park Administration supervisor. Possible solutions might be:

a. Encourage intern students to do their internships in Michigan to insure better communications with the Department of Recreation and Park Administration supervisor.

b. The Department of Recreation and Park Administration could hold workshops with the department supervisors to point out the importance of better communication between the intern and department supervisors.

c. Administration planning should include sufficient resources, such as personnel, materials, funding, and so on, to operate the internship program based on the number of student interns enrolled at a given time.

4. These reflections may be helpful to other researchers using the same method of instrumentation. However, the results obtained from this survey will always reflect the uniqueness of the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER, FOLLOW-UP LETTER, AND
STUDENT INTERN QUESTIONNAIRE



January 11, 1988

Dear Former Intern:

The Visitation Team from the National Council on Accreditation, along with the administration of the Central Michigan University Recreation and Park Administration Department, have expressed the desire that an evaluation of the internship program is needed to determine if it is meeting the needs of the student for professional development. In addition, the results will be used as a part of my Ph.D. dissertation at Michigan State University.

The study has been undertaken in two directions. The first is to contact all former interns to gain their reactions as to their intern experience and to note their career progress and present status. The second is to contact the agencies where the interns completed their internship and have the supervisors assess the abilities of the interns as to the professional preparation for the internship. It will take approximately ten minutes or so to fill out the questionnaire.

All the results will be treated with strict confidence and you will remain anonymous. Upon request and within these restrictions, results will be made available to you. The number on the form is merely an indicator in the event follow-up is needed. There is no penalty for declining to participate.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Donald F. Lutz, Associate Professor
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
Telephone - (517) 774-7307



February 8, 1988

DID YOU FORGET? We need the recreation intern/agency questionnaire returned that was sent to you in January. This information is necessary to complete our recreation study at CMU.

If it's already in the mail, thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald F. Lutz

Donald Lutz
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
Finch 109

INTERN QUESTIONNAIRE

INTERN EXPERIENCE:

1. Where did you do your internship?
 - 1) ☐ In state
 - 2) ☐ Out-of-state
 - 1a. What is your gender?
 - 1) ☐ Male
 - 2) ☐ Female
 - 1b. What year did you graduate?
 - 1) ☐ 1975-1980
 - 2) ☐ 1981-1986
 - 3) ☐ 1987
2. What was the agency's concentration area?
 - 1) ☐ Commercial recreation
 - 2) ☐ Outdoor recreation
 - 3) ☐ Community recreation
 - 4) ☐ Therapeutic recreation
 - 2a. Are you working for the same agency where you did your internship?
 - 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
3. What is your concentration area?
 - 1) ☐ Commercial recreation
 - 2) ☐ Outdoor recreation
 - 3) ☐ Community recreation
 - 4) ☐ Therapeutic recreation
4. Why did you accept an internship? (please indicate in order of priority, number 1 being best)
 - 1) ☐ to gain experience
 - 2) ☐ peer pressures
 - 3) ☐ professional contacts
 - 4) ☐ variety of experience
 - 5) ☐ required for curriculum
 - 6) ☐ to expand background (program)
 - 7) ☐ drawn by personnel in a given department
 - 8) ☐ to test the desirability of the field
 - 9) ☐ explore special interest area

5. What were your professional goals at the time you accepted the internship?
- 1) ☐ Advanced degree
 - 2) ☐ Director/administrator
 - 3) ☐ Teach in a college or university
 - 4) ☐ Supervisory position
 - 5) ☐ Position in a concentration area (e.g., therapeutic)
6. Did these goals change during the internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
- If yes, did this change involve (check each applicable response):
- 1) ☐ Change of priority
 - 2) ☐ Establishment of new goals
 - 3) ☐ Desire to get more involved in field
7. How do you feel the internship has affected progress toward the achievement of these goals? (check each appropriate response)
- 1) ☐ Speeded up progress
 - 2) ☐ Opened new avenues
 - 3) ☐ Provided contacts
 - 4) ☐ A delay in working toward certain goals
 - 5) ☐ Little or no effect
8. Please indicate the amount of time on the job which was devoted to the development and benefit of the sponsoring agency and its programs but not related to the internship.
- 1) ☐ 0-20%
 - 2) ☐ 21-40%
 - 3) ☐ 41-60%
 - 4) ☐ 61-80%
 - 5) ☐ 81% or more
9. What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student?
- 1) ☐ On-the-job experience
 - 2) ☐ Employment opportunities
 - 3) ☐ Professional contacts
10. Did you receive any compensation as an intern? (if salary, stipend, housing, meals)
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No

11. If yes, what did you receive?
- 1) ☐ Salary
 - 2) ☐ Stipend
 - 3) ☐ Housing
 - 4) ☐ Meals
 - 5) ☐ Tuition
- 11a. If yes, what did you receive?
- 1) ☐ \$50-\$125 per week
 - 2) ☐ \$126-\$150 per week
 - 3) ☐ \$151-\$175 per week
 - 4) ☐ \$176-\$200 per week
 - 5) ☐ \$201-\$250 per week
12. What importance did compensation play in the selection of the intern site?
- 1) ☐ Extremely important
 - 2) ☐ Important
 - 3) ☐ Of some importance
 - 4) ☐ Not so important
13. Please list the salary for each position subsequent to your internship:
1. First position
 - 1) ☐ \$ 8,000-\$13,000
 - 2) ☐ \$13,001-\$18,000
 - 3) ☐ \$18,001-\$23,000
 - 4) ☐ \$23,001-\$28,000
 - 5) ☐ \$28,001-\$33,000
 2. Present Position
 - 1) ☐ \$ 8,000-\$13,000
 - 2) ☐ \$13,001-\$18,000
 - 3) ☐ \$18,001-\$23,000
 - 4) ☐ \$23,001-\$28,000
 - 5) ☐ \$28,001-\$33,000
 - 6) ☐ \$33,001-\$40,000
14. Is your present position within the field of parks and recreation?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
15. What do you consider to be your foremost important duties or functions in your present position? (list in order of importance)
- 1) ☐ Public relations and communication
 - 2) ☐ Personnel supervision
 - 3) ☐ Programming, operations and evaluation
 - 4) ☐ Cost control and budgeting

16. N/A

EFFECTS OF INTERNSHIP ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT

17. What advantages have you observed in your professional career as a result of your participation in the intern program? (indicate order of priority)
- 1) ☐ Experience
 - 2) ☐ Knowledge
 - 3) ☐ Insight
 - 4) ☐ Personal contacts
 - 5) ☐ Job opportunities
 - 6) ☐ Placement service
 - 7) ☐ No advantage
18. Have you found any advantage in remaining in contact with the agency where you did your internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
- 18a. Please indicate the nature of the contact:
- 1) ☐ Phone
 - 2) ☐ Mail
 - 3) ☐ Personal
 - 4) ☐ Weekly
 - 5) ☐ Monthly
 - 6) ☐ Yearly
- 18b. For what reason (generally):
- 1) ☐ Information
 - 2) ☐ Personal
 - 3) ☐ Professional contact
19. Can you specifically identify any methods or procedures you are not utilizing that you acquired as an intern?
- 1) ☐ Programming
 - 2) ☐ Organization and paperwork (documentation)
 - 3) ☐ Communication and supervision skills
 - 4) ☐ Budget preparation
20. Was the agency where you did your internship instrumental in placing you at the completion of the internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
- 20a. In what way?
- 1) ☐ Recommendation
 - 2) ☐ Actively sought position in your behalf
 - 3) ☐ Hired you to department staff
 - 4) ☐ Introduced you to prospective employers
 - 5) ☐ Passed along employment vacancy notice

20b. To your knowledge, have you received any job offers since the internship based on the fact you were an intern?

1) ☐ Yes

2) ☐ No

EVALUATION OF THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

21. How did you learn of the internship program?

1) ☐ University faculty

2) ☐ Former intern

3) ☐ Center for Leisure Services

4) ☐ Other

22. In one sentence, what do you see as the purpose of an internship?

1) ☐ To gain on-the-job experience

2) ☐ Stronger competitors for employment

23. Do you know the objectives of the internship program as set forth by the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University? (not necessary to list them)

1) ☐ Yes

2) ☐ No

24. Did you know the objectives at the time of your internship?

1) ☐ Yes

2) ☐ No

25. What would you recommend regarding the length of the internship?

1) ☐ 30 weeks

2) ☐ Less than 30 weeks

3) ☐ More than 30 weeks

26. Did the variety of experiences during the internship meet your needs in preparing to enter the profession?

1) ☐ Yes

2) ☐ No

27. Was contact evident with the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University during your internship as follows:

27a. By the department intern supervisor?

1) ☐ Yes

2) ☐ No

a) ☐ By phone

b) ☐ By mail

c) ☐ Personal

28. How would you rate the supervisor provided by the CMU Recreation and Park Department?
- 1) ☐ Excellent
 - 2) ☐ Good
 - 3) ☐ Average
 - 4) ☐ Poor
 - 5) ☐ Not acceptable
29. N/A
30. How would you rate the supervisor of the agency where you did your internship?
- 1) ☐ Excellent
 - 2) ☐ Good
 - 3) ☐ Average
 - 4) ☐ Poor
 - 5) ☐ Not acceptable
31. N/A
32. What additional experience would have been beneficial to your intern experience?
- 1) ☐ More involved with scheduling and programs
 - 2) ☐ More involvement with staff meetings and guidance
 - 3) ☐ More management experience
 - 4) ☐ More involved with the budget and process
33. What experience could have been deleted?
- 1) ☐ Repetitive experiences
 - 2) ☐ Being impeded by personal bias of site supervisor
 - 3) ☐ Too much paperwork
34. Do you have any reason to think that accepting the internship was not a good idea in your situation?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
35. To what level do you feel the internship is geared (in order of priority)?
- 1) ☐ Administration
 - 2) ☐ Supervision
 - 3) ☐ Leadership
 - 4) ☐ Other
36. Are you aware of the present process for screening and selection of interns at CMU's Recreation and Park Department?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No

- 36a. Is the process:
1) ☐ Desirable?
2) ☐ Undesirable?
3) ☐ No comment
37. Would you recommend that every person entering the profession of Parks and Recreation do an internship?
1) ☐ Yes
2) ☐ No
38. Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at CMU prepared you for the internship?
1) ☐ Yes
2) ☐ No
39. Were you required to take the pre-internship class (RPA 215)?
1) ☐ Yes
2) ☐ No
40. If your answer is yes, do you feel the pre-internship class was beneficial?
1) ☐ Yes
2) ☐ No
41. If your answer is no, what would you suggest for improvement?
1) ☐ Should be more specific in concentration area
2) ☐ Spend more time on interviewing techniques
42. Would you recommend other students take the internship program?
1) ☐ Yes
2) ☐ No
a) ☐ Program allows students to explore the career field before committing to a full-time job
b) ☐ Cannot experience this in classes and makes you more marketable
43. What suggestions do you have for improving the internship program?
1) ☐ More communications with CMU supervisor
2) ☐ Better screening of internship agency
3) ☐ The internship program should be shorter than 30 weeks

APPENDIX B

**COVER LETTER, FOLLOW-UP LETTER, AND
INTERNSHIP AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE**



January 11, 1988

Dear Agency Supervisor:

The Visitation Team from the National Council on Accreditation, along with the administration of the Central Michigan University Recreation and Park Administration Department, have expressed the desire that an evaluation of the internship program is needed to determine if it is meeting the needs of the student for professional development. In addition, the results will be used as a part of my Ph.D. dissertation at Michigan State University.

The study has been undertaken in two directions. The first is to contact all former interns to gain their reactions as to their intern experience and to note their career progress and present status. The second is to contact the agencies where the interns completed their internship and have the supervisors (if that particular supervisor is no longer with the agency, someone familiar with the intern's performance) assess the abilities of the interns as to the professional preparation for the internship. It will take approximately ten minutes or so to fill out the questionnaire.

All the results will be treated with strict confidence and you will remain anonymous. Upon request and within these restrictions, results will be made available to you. The number on the form is merely an indicator in the event follow-up is needed. There is no penalty for declining to participate.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Donald F. Lutz, Associate Professor
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858
Telephone - (517) 774-7307



February 8, 1988

DID YOU FORGET? We need the recreation intern/agency questionnaire returned that was sent to you in January. This information is necessary to complete our recreation study at CMU.

If it's already in the mail, thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald F. Lutz

Donald Lutz
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
Finch 109

INTERNSHIP AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. With respect to Central Michigan University, where is your agency located?
 - 1) ☐ In state
 - 2) ☐ Out of state
 - 1a. What is your gender?
 - 1) ☐ Male
 - 2) ☐ Female
 - 1b. What was the gender of intern?
 - 1) ☐ Male
 - 2) ☐ Female
2. What is your agency's concentration area?
 - 1) ☐ Commercial recreation
 - 2) ☐ Outdoor recreation
 - 3) ☐ Community recreation
 - 4) ☐ Therapeutic recreation
 - 5) ☐ Other
3. What was the intern's concentration area, if known?
 - 1) ☐ Commercial recreation
 - 2) ☐ Outdoor recreation
 - 3) ☐ Community recreation
 - 4) ☐ Therapeutic recreation
 - 5) ☐ Other
4. Why did your agency accept an intern?
 - 1) ☐ Important to prepare future professionals for the field through "hands-on experience."
 - 2) ☐ To assist in the Recreation Program areas
5. What do you feel are the three major contributions of the internship program to the student?
 - 1) ☐ On-the-job experience
 - 2) ☐ Employment opportunities
 - 3) ☐ Professional contacts
6. What is your title with this agency?
 - 1) ☐ Director
 - 2) ☐ Supervisor or specialist
 - 6a. What is your level with this agency?
 - 1) ☐ Upper management
 - 2) ☐ Middle management

- 6b. What is your length of service with this agency?
- 1) ☐ 1-5 years
 - 2) ☐ 6-10 years
 - 3) ☐ Over 11 years
7. What is your educational background?
- 1) ☐ Ph.D. or terminal degree
 - 2) ☐ Specialist degree
 - 3) ☐ Master's degree
 - 4) ☐ Bachelor's degree
 - 5) ☐ High school
 - 6) ☐ Less than high school
8. What do you consider to be the four most important duties or functions of an intern with your agency?
- 1) ☐ Public relations and communications
 - 2) ☐ Personnel supervision
 - 3) ☐ Programming, operations and evaluations
 - 4) ☐ Cost control and budgeting
9. N/A
10. Can you specifically identify any methods or procedures that the intern was exposed to that could be utilized in the future for the intern? (e.g., filing, procedures, programming athletic league, setup, etc.)
- 1) ☐ Programming
 - 2) ☐ Organization and paperwork (documentation)
 - 3) ☐ Communication and supervisory skills
 - 4) ☐ Budget preparation
11. Do you feel your agency was instrumental in placing the intern at the completion of the internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
 - 3) ☐ Unknown
- 11a. In what way?
- 1) ☐ Recommendations
 - 2) ☐ Actively sought positions in behalf of intern
 - 3) ☐ Hired intern to department or agency staff
 - 4) ☐ Introduced intern to another prospective employer
 - 5) ☐ Passed along employment vacancy notice
- 11b. To your knowledge, has the former intern received any job offers since the internship based on the fact he/she was an intern?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No

12. How did you learn about the internship program in Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University?
- 1) ☐ Faculty or staff at CMU
 - 2) ☐ Michigan Recreation and Parks Association
 - 3) ☐ By intern
 - 4) ☐ Other professional organizations
13. In one sentence, what do you see as the purpose of an internship?
- 1) ☐ To gain on-the-job experience
 - 2) ☐ Stronger competitors for employment
14. Do you know the objectives of the internship program as set forth by the Recreation and Park Administration Department at Central Michigan University?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
15. What would you recommend regarding the length of the internship?
- 1) ☐ 30 weeks
 - 2) ☐ Less than 30 weeks
 - 3) ☐ More than 30 weeks
16. Did the variety of experience during the internship meet the needs in preparing the intern for the profession?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
17. Was contact evident with the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Central Michigan University during the internship as follows:
- 17a. By the department intern supervisor?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
 - a) ☐ By phone
 - b) ☐ By mail
 - c) ☐ Personal
18. How would you rate the supervisor provided by the CMU Recreation and Park Department?
- 1) ☐ Excellent
 - 2) ☐ Good
 - 3) ☐ Average
 - 4) ☐ Poor
 - 5) ☐ Not acceptable
19. N/A

20. How would you rate the intern from CMU?
- 1) ☐ Excellent
 - 2) ☐ Good
 - 3) ☐ Average
 - 4) ☐ Poor
 - 5) ☐ Not acceptable
21. N/A
22. What additional experience would have been beneficial to the intern experience?
- 1) ☐ Needs to know more information bout his/her concentration area
 - 2) ☐ Needs to know more about budgeting and process
23. N/A
24. Do you have any reason to think that accepting an intern was not a good idea in your situation?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
25. To what level do you feel the internship is geared? (in order of priority)
- 1) ☐ Administration
 - 2) ☐ Supervision
 - 3) ☐ Leadership
26. Would you recommend that every person entering the profession of Recreation and Parks do an internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
27. Do you feel the Recreation and Park courses at Central Michigan University prepared the intern for the internship?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
28. Are you aware of the present process for screening and selecting interns at CMU's Recreation and Park Department?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
- 28a. Is the process:
- 1) ☐ Desirable?
 - 2) ☐ Undesirable?
 - 3) ☐ No comment

29. Would you recommend other students take the internship program in the Recreation and Park Department at Central Michigan University?
- 1) ☐ Yes
 - 2) ☐ No
30. What suggestions do you have for improving the internship programs? Please explain.
- 1) ☐ More communications with CMU supervisor

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkinsom, J. A. "The Administrative Internship." Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1965.
- Ball, B. P. "The Undergraduate Internship Technique: An Essay on Program Development." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California, September 2-5, 1976.
- Balutis, A. P. "An Evaluation of the New York State Assembly Intern Program." Unpublished paper, New York State College, 1977.
- Bowler, R. M. "Fieldwork Supervisors Manual." Unpublished paper, University of Southern California, 1982.
- Bunch, R. A. "An Evaluation of Selected Internship Programs Sponsored by the National Recreation and Park Association." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1971.
- Center for Professional Development of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. "The Impact and Evaluation of Internships." Washington, D.C., 1985.
- Creager, J. A. "Goals and Achievements of the ACE Internship Program in Academic Administration." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Eden, J. E. "An Evaluation of the Internship in Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1965.
- Fagon, R. W. "Student Evaluation of an Urban Internship Program." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, San Antonio, Texas, August 27-31, 1984, 1985.
- Fevinger, F. R. "A Three Parameter Model for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating Human Services Field Experience." EDIC Monograph. Omaha, Nebraska: EDIC Associates, 1984.
- Geren, M. R. "An Evaluation of the Internship Program in Educational Administration at East Texas State University." Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1981.

- Gobel, C. "Evaluation of the WICHE Intern Program in the State of Oregon." Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Oregon State University, 1971-1972.
- Greenbaum, A. F. "A Description and Initial Evaluation of the Undergraduate Internship in Student Development at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975.
- Halteman, B. M. "The Use and Effects of Political Internships in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1980.
- Hanson, J. "Internships and the Individual: Suggestions for Implementing (or Improving) an Internship Program." Communication Education 33 (1984): 53-61.
- Haviland, M. G. "Good Grades for Liberal Arts Internships." Journal of College Placement 6 (1983): 57-60.
- Hayes, R. B. "A Study of Programs of Pre-Service and In-Service Education for Cooperating School Supervising Teachers Used by Selected Teacher Education Institutions." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1960.
- Heiges, H. E. "Progress and Development of a Student Internship Program in Geography." Unpublished paper, California State University, 1977.
- _____. "A Student Internship Program in Geography." Unpublished paper, California State University, 1972.
- Howe, C. Z. "Evaluation of Leisure Programs." Leisure Today, Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, vol. 10, p. 39.
- Hutkin, R. M. "The Community College Cooperative Internship Program: An Evaluation of the Internship Core Activities." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1971.
- Ivy, W. F. "A Diagnostic Design for Individualized Field and Campus Internship." Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Detroit, Michigan, April 4-8, 1983.
- Koll, P. J. "Evaluation of the Intern in Educational Administration in Wisconsin and Minnesota." Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, 1984.
- Konsky, C. "Practical Guide to Development and Administration of an Internship Program: Issues, Procedures, and Forms." Unpublished paper, University of Illinois, 1976.

- Kraus, R. G., and Curtiss, J. E. Creative Management in Recreation and Parks. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1982.
- Land, G. A. "A Proposed Model for Internships in Human Services Professions." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1980.
- Lanese, L. D. "How to Get an Intern Off and Running: A Model." Performance and Instruction 22 (1983): 30-32.
- Lapan, S. D., and Vogal, F. X. "Checklist for University Supervisors and Field Experience." Unpublished paper, Southeastern Illinois University, 1982.
- Lowery, J. H. "Guidelines for Field Placements in Social Gerontology Courses." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Detroit, Michigan, August 31-September 1, 1983.
- Lundegren, H. G., and Farrell, P. Evaluation for Leisure Service Managers. Philadelphia: Saunders College Publishing, 1985.
- Mares, K. R., and others. "A Focus on Attitudes and Practices of 1,621 Departments and Central Offices on U.S. Campuses Concerning Internships." Raleigh, North Carolina, 1984.
- Mason, G. "Coordinating the Internship Program: The Ins and Outs of Directing Interns." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, Indiana, April 4-6, 1985.
- _____. "A National Survey of Internships in Speech Communication." Michigan, 1985.
- Mauke, O. R. "An Evaluation of the Internship Program at Endicott Junior College." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1965.
- McCuskey, D. Teacher Education and the Public Schools. Fortieth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1961.
- McDonald, B. A. "Professional Internship: Student Manual." Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1983.
- Morris, S. B., and Haas, L. J. "Evaluating Undergraduate Field Placement: An Empirical Approach." Teaching of Psychology 11 (1984): 166-68.

- Norsted, R. M. "An Analysis of the University of Minnesota Internship Program in Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1974.
- O'Brian, J. L. "An Evaluation of the Professional Internship in Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.
- O'Donnell, S. B. "An Evaluation of the Residential Internship as Training for Student Personnel Generalists." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1967.
- Oldfield, K., and Ayers, M. "Maximizing the Benefits of an Administrative Internship: Some Practical Advice." Springfield, Illinois: Sangamon State University, 1984.
- Profughi, V. L. "Student Interns in the Public Sector." Unpublished essays, Rhode Island University, 1976.
- Rossey, P. W. "An Evaluation of the Internship in Educational Administration With Special Emphasis on the Effects on the Intern." Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965.
- Rubin, S. "Performance Appraisal: A Guide to Better Supervisor Evaluation Processes." Paper presented at the meeting of the National Society for Internships and Experiential Learning, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 1986.
- Sakiey, F. A. "The Effectiveness of the Doctoral Internship Program in Vocational-Technical Education Offered by Rutgers University as Viewed by the Cooperating Agencies." Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1973.
- Satariano, W. A. "Undergraduate Internships: Problems and Prospects." - Teaching Sociology 6 (1979): 355-72.
- Sheckels, T. F. "Internships in Writing." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference of College Composition and Communication, New Orleans, Louisiana, March 13-15, 1984.
- Sigman, R. L. "Service-Learning Internships: How to Realize the Possibilities and Make the Most of Them." Raleigh: North Carolina Internship Office, 1972.
- _____. "Supervisor Participants in North Carolina State Government Internship Program." Raleigh: North Carolina Internship Office, 1973.
- Simonds, J. L. "An Evaluation of the Professional Internship in Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1974.

- Stauffer, T. M. "Assessment of Outcomes From the Academic Administration Internship Program." Washington, D.C.: Academic Administration Internship Program, American Council on Education, 1975.
- Wegner, K. W. "Beginning Counseling Practicum: An Evaluation of the Internship Program in National Counselor Training." Columbus: Ohio State University Model Training Project, 1978.
- Wright, L. V. "A Research-Based Model District Administrative Internship Program." Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, 1984.