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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There were three major purposes of this study. The first was to determine if a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities. The second was to determine if a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions relative to 12 distinct categories of recreation programs. The third purpose was to determine if a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the percentage of time spent performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities.

Information used in this dissertation deals with the administrative functions performed by community education directors and recreation directors in providing a range of recreation activities.

Through the development of this dissertation, the
following questions were addressed:

1. What difference, if any, exists between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of performing each of seven selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities?

The seven selected administrative functions were planning, staffing, scheduling areas and facilities, evaluating, financing, public relations, and records and reports. Both community education directors and recreation directors were asked to what extent they performed each of the seven selected administrative functions in providing recreation activities. By comparing the responses of the two groups, a determination was made whether or not a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors regarding the extent to which they performed each of the seven selected administrative functions.

2. What difference, if any, exists between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing 7 selected administrative functions relative to 12 distinct categories of recreation activities?

The 12 recreation categories were dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, music, playground programs, aquatics, special events, outdoor recreation, social recreation, athletics and sports, service projects, and handicapped programs. In each of the 12 categories, both community education directors and recreation directors were asked to what extent they performed all 7 selected administrative functions. By comparing the responses of the two groups, a determination was made whether or not a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors regarding the extent to which they performed all 7 selected administrative
functions in each of the 12 recreation categories.

3. What difference, if any, exists between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the percentage of time spent performing each of seven selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities?

For each of the 7 selected administrative functions, community education directors and recreation directors were asked what percentage of time they spent performing that function in providing the recreation activities they listed in all 12 recreation categories. By comparing the responses of the two groups, a determination was made whether or not a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in the percentage of time spent performing each of the 7 selected administrative functions for all recreation activities listed.

Rationale for the Study

Education for the worthy use of leisure has long been recognized as a function of our national educational institutions even before its formal acceptance as a "cardinal principle" in 1918 by the National Education Association. Because of technological advances, our society experiences more leisure than ever before. The twentieth century faces the challenge of how man can constructively utilize his leisure time as indicated by historians such as Toynbee (1964) and futurists such as Shane (1953).

Since 1935, when Charles Stewart Mott gave Frank Manley $6,000 to open the schools in Flint, Michigan, for recreation,
community educators have considered it a viable function within a community education program. This initial effort was in part responsible for the rapid spread of the community education philosophy and implementation of the concept throughout the United States. Through the efforts of community educators within the community education process, communities' recreational needs have been, and likely will continue to be, identified and met.

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) pointed out that people who are dedicated to the recreational field identify the scope of recreation as being far more extensive than that ascribed to it by community educators. Because the recreator perceives recreation in its broadest sense, he sees it as broad and encompassing, whereas the community educator, because of the diversity and scope of his other general areas of programming, tends to hold a narrower view. The narrowing of the concept of recreation by the community educator is to be expected inasmuch as the delivery of recreation services is only one of his many responsibilities. Minzey and LeTarte (1972) further stated:

As a director with a limited perspective of recreation begins working and discussing shared recreational programming with agencies that have a much broader concept of what recreation is, there will be a discrepancy in the perceptions of what programs and responsibilities should be shared. The recreationist will perceive a responsibility for activities in many areas which the community educator might designate as adult education or student enrichment. (p. 121)
The concept of community education is rapidly being accepted and implemented throughout the nation, spurred most recently not only by state but also federal legislation. Community education offerings often include preschool activities for children and their parents, continuing and remedial education for adults, cultural and enrichment activities for all citizens, offerings of technical services to community groups as well as the provision of recreation activities.

In the State of Michigan there are two distinct professions programming recreation activities, namely, community education and recreation. Such apparent duplication of effort raises the question of which agency is more capable of providing recreation activities and which should be responsible for the administration of such offerings. There appears to be divergent thinking on the part of various groups as to who should be responsible for what. Professional educators maintain that they possess the major share of understanding and training to operate recreation programs, while professional recreators contend they possess the proven experience in managing the recreational aspects of community school programs. There appears to be some disagreement as to the right of the community school program to provide, on its own, services of a recreational nature when another agency might be in a better position to assume that responsibility. In the context of the proposed study, the word "right" is defined as responsibility vested in a public
organization.

The 1973-74 edition of *A Description and Evaluation of Community School Programs*, published by the Michigan Department of Education, pointed out that a large amount of responsibility for provision of recreation activities was being assumed by the community school director. Administration appeared to be a significant aspect of the community school director's job, with 23 percent of the director's time spent on program planning and 42 percent on program operation and management. This study also found that recreation was at the top of the list in three out of four age-group categories of services provided or coordinated by at least 50 percent of the community school programs. Recreation was also found to be first in two out of four age-group categories and second in another category of services most often chosen or used by community groups.

A question can be raised concerning the two major program components as reported by local community school directors, namely, recreation and social enrichment, and adult and continuing education. The problem seems to lie in the possible duplication of services between community education programs and recreation programs.

In a letter of April 22, 1975, from the Executive Director of the Michigan Recreation and Park Association to the Director of Adult and Continuing Education Services, concern was expressed relative to the community schools' sponsorship
of recreation programs. The letter pointed out that under the proposed community school philosophical concept the "current form could lead to a tremendous duplication of public funds and responsibilities."

Recently, the Michigan Department of Education decided to assist in coordinating local school districts in their efforts toward community school recreation planning. A series of task force sessions has been established with the results expected to contribute to a statewide community school program with heavy emphasis on recreation as an important and viable feature.

There are five basic questions which have emerged and which give basis for this study. First, there appears to be a great deal of duplication occurring between community educators and recreators in the responsibility each has assumed in providing recreation activities. Second, considerable confusion exists between the two professions as to who is providing which recreation activities and who should be assuming what responsibilities for the administration of such offerings. Third, whatever encroachment may have occurred which has caused concerns and ill feelings between the two professions can only be dealt with through a clearer understanding of each other's goals and roles. Fourth, because of a lack of accountability on the part of any particular agency in providing recreation activities, money, services, and facilities have often been misused. Finally,
the question arises concerning the need for special training in recreation administration when such services are being offered under the direction of those with little or no special recreation training and where the emphasis is on a much broader range of services.

In order to provide direction to the development of an appropriate questionnaire that would secure information necessary to answer the questions relative to the three purposes of this study, a series of hypotheses was formulated. The hypotheses are cataloged under three major headings. Those headings and the hypotheses appropriate to each are as follows:

**Selected administrative functions**

**H1A:** There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the planning of a range of recreation activities.

**H1B:** There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the staffing of a range of recreation activities.

**H1C:** There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the scheduling of areas and facilities for a range of recreation activities.

**H1D:** There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the evaluation of a range of recreation activities.
H₁E: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of financial arrangements for a range of recreation activities.

H₁F: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of public relations for a range of recreation activities.

H₁G: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of records and reports kept for a range of recreation activities.

Recreation program areas

H₂A: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dance.

H₂B: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dramatics.

H₂C: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of arts and crafts.

H₂D: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of music.
H₂E: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of playground programs.

H₂F: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of aquatics.

H₂G: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of special events.

H₂H: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of outdoor recreation.

H₂I: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of social recreation.

H₂J: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of athletics and sports.

H₂K: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative
functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of service projects.

H2L: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of handicapped programs.

Percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions

H3A: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the planning of a range of recreation activities.

H3B: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the staffing of a range of recreation activities.

H3C: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the scheduling of areas and facilities for a range of recreation activities.

H3D: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on evaluation for a range of recreation activities.

H3E: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on financing for a range of recreation activities.

H3F: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on public relations for a range of recreation activities.
There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on records and reports for a range of recreation activities.

Definition of Terms

Community education director. -- The contact person as identified in the Michigan Department of Education, Adult and Continuing Education Services, 1975-76 Community School Program Directory. This directory represents all school districts which received state community education funding for 1975-76, and was secured from Gary Sullenger, State Director of Community Education.

Recreation director. -- The organizational member as identified in the 1975-76 Membership Directory of the Michigan Recreation and Park Association (MRPA). This list was secured from John Greenslit, Executive Director of the MRPA.

Selected administrative functions. -- The administrative functions as identified by Krause (1966), in Recreation Today: Program Planning and Leadership for a Recreation Supervisor, and by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Recreation Services Division, for the proposed position of Director of Parks and Recreation for Monroe, Michigan. The administrative functions chosen for this study are (1) planning, (2) staffing, (3) scheduling of areas and facilities, (4) evaluation, (5) financing, (6) public
and community relations, and (7) records and reports.

Recreation activities.—As stated in the Dictionary of Sociology (1965), "Recreation is any activity pursued during leisure, either individual or collective, that is free and pleasureful, having its own immediate necessity" (p. 251).

Performing each of seven selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities.—The perception of the respondent as to what extent he performed each of the seven selected administrative functions of planning, staffing, scheduling areas and facilities, evaluating, financing, public relations, and records and reports, in providing the recreation activities he listed on the questionnaire.

Performing 7 selected administrative functions pertinent to provision of recreation activities in 12 distinct categories of recreation.—The perception of the respondent as to what extent he performs the 7 selected administrative functions in providing the recreation activities he listed on the questionnaire for each of the 12 recreation categories of dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, music, playground programs, aquatics, special events, outdoor recreation, social recreation, athletics and sports, service projects, and handicapped programs.

Percentage of time spent performing each of seven selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities.—The perception of the
respondent regarding the percentage of time he spends performing each of the seven selected administrative functions as he provides the recreation activities reported on the questionnaire.

Overview

This dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter II presents a review of literature. Chapter III will describe the research design and methodology. Chapter IV will present an analysis of questionnaire and interview responses. Chapter V will consist of a discussion of the findings and their implications, and recommendations for further research.

The next chapter reviews the literature on (1) recreation and the program component areas of recreation activities, (2) administrative duties and responsibilities as they relate to the provision of recreation activities, (3) relationship of recreation to community education, and (4) use of school facilities for recreation activities.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter II contains four sections: (1) recreation and the program component areas of recreation activities, (2) administrative duties and responsibilities as they relate to the provision of recreation activities, (3) relationship of recreation to community education, and (4) use of school facilities for recreation activities.

Sections 1 and 2 include selections from the field of recreation which appear to be of direct use to community education in developing and providing recreation activities: section 1 on the field of recreation and the appropriate activity areas, and section 2 on administrative functions performed in the provision of recreation activities.

Sections 3 and 4 deal with the relationship of recreation and community education and the usage of school facilities for delivery of recreation services. Community education programming efforts have traditionally included opportunities for citizen participation in a variety of recreation offerings, but few studies and program materials are available to community educators in specifically developing recreation activity opportunities.
Recreation and the Program Component Areas of Recreation Activities

It has been a tradition in American society to show concern over a person's productive work life, but free time has been more a personal prerogative. Leisure and its use will always remain a matter of personal choice, but the greater increase in the availability of leisure for the large numbers of people places some obligations and responsibilities upon society for providing adequate opportunities for its use.

It will only be through the contribution of numerous public, private, voluntary, and commercial ventures that an adequate delivery system of recreation opportunities can be made available. Carlson, Deppe, and MacLean (1972) identified categories of recreation opportunities including family recreation; industrial recreation; commercial recreation; libraries, museums, and nature centers; zoos and wildlife displays; botanic gardens and garden centers; lodges, clubs, and fraternal organizations; and settlements and neighborhood centers.

Municipalities and school districts have gradually accepted provision of recreation services as a function as the demand for organized services has grown. James (1917) noted that governmental functions were justified only by the contribution they made to the welfare of society and the individual within it. Recreation has made contributions to
the safety, health, morals, and welfare of the individual and society.

Municipal recreation contributes to the delivery system for recreation services most significantly because of its broad-based service area. Butler (1959) listed the major contributions of local government as follows: (1) it has ability to acquire, develop, and maintain lands for the total community; (2) it is all-inclusive and views the total community effort rather than a limited segment of it; (3) municipal recreation provides a large population of the urban population their major opportunity for a variety of wholesome recreation; and (4) municipal recreation provides for equitable distribution of costs.

Municipalities are capable of budgeting for, legislating, administering, providing areas and facilities, and protecting the services necessary to satisfy the recreational needs of its residents.

Similarly, public schools are able to contribute significantly to the provision of recreation services and provide an additional element--that of education for leisure. Schools can have a great influence upon the determination of the culture, customs, habits, and mores of a community and can serve as a resource for life enrichment. Bobbitt (1918) forecasted that the newer schools of the approaching humanistic age would recognize education for leisure as one of the most significant educational tasks.
School authorities in California in 1960 spelled out the role of the school in the total community recreation program by identifying recreation as a basic human need which contributes significantly to the cultural advancement of the individual, requiring the mobilization of all community resources including those of the public school system.

Carlson et al. (1972) identified the school's contribution as education for the art of leisure including aiding the development of a wholesome philosophy of leisure; teaching skills and knowledge; developing desirable attitudes, interests, habits, and aspirations; developing desirable personality traits; and guidance in the proper use of leisure.

School systems have resources in terms of facilities, leadership, and knowledge to both educate the public as to proper use of leisure and to provide opportunities to pursue interests once they have been developed.

Because both recreation and education are working toward the enrichment of a person's life, there is a close relationship between the two. This relationship is apparent between the adult educator and recreator, who both must deal with human welfare and combining appreciation and satisfaction with learning. Often, the only thin line of difference between the two professions is the motivation of the individual for participating in a similar class offering. If an activity is utilized for vocational progress, it is considered adult education; if it relates to skills and
appreciations for use in leisure, it is considered recreation. Such classes as sewing, welding, and public speaking are often difficult to classify within the province of either the recreator or the educator.

Physical education and recreation are also closely allied. Both utilize physical activities to a great extent, with the emphasis for the physical educator being fitness and the development of attitudes, interests, and skills which maintain that fitness. The recreator places emphasis upon enjoyment, with fitness being a possible by-product. The recreator provides for a more rounded program of offerings, of which physical activities are a part.

Numerous definitions have been posited for the term recreation which give a more clearly defined picture of the scope of its intent. Miller and Robinson (1963) defined recreation as "activities engaged in purposely with free, happy, natural attitudes, full of fun and expression" (p. 8).

Romney (1945) defined recreation as "not a matter of motions but rather of emotions. It is a personal response, a psychological reaction, an attitude, an approach, a way of life" (p. 14).

Braucher (1950) defined recreation as "the rallying word of those who work for a creative, cooperative expression of personality through sports, athletics, play, art forms—through recreation" (p. 23).

Butler (1959) expands upon the previous definitions by
stating:

Recreation . . . may be considered any activity which is not consciously performed for the sake of any reward beyond itself, which is usually engaged in during leisure, which offers man an outlet for his physical, mental, or creative powers, and in which he engages because of inner desire and not because of outer compulsion.

(p. 10)

Brightbill and Meyer (1953) stated that "recreation may be thought of as an activity voluntarily engaged in during leisure and primarily motivated by the satisfaction or pleasure derived therefrom" (p. 50).

The Dictionary of Sociology (1944) provides the definition which is utilized for this study:

Recreation is any activity pursued during leisure, either individual or collective, that is free and pleasurable, having its own immediate appeal, not impelled by a delayed reward beyond itself or by any immediate necessity. (p. 251)

Leisure and recreation are not to be equated, for recreation takes place in leisure and does not necessarily absorb all the leisure hours. Other leisure activities might include worship, education, or service.

Certain characteristics emerge as one reviews the term recreation. Carlson et al. (1972) list these characteristics as follows: (1) activity as opposed to idleness; (2) occurs in leisure; (3) choice of activity is voluntary; (4) provides enjoyment; (5) satisfactions are immediate and inherent in the activity; (6) is recreative; (7) provides a change of pace; (8) is broad in concept; and (9) should be wholesome,
constructive, and socially acceptable.

The application of these characteristics is to be made in each individual's selection of his or her recreation pursuits. The fact that we may not always understand specific choices of an individual's recreational pursuits does not preclude the fact that one can still appreciate the rationale of his/her selection if the above characteristics are present.

A variety of program areas evolves under which most common recreation pursuits may be classified. Corbin (1970) separated indoor and outdoor recreation experiences. He further classified by placing within the indoor category such programs as those for the adult and aged, arts and crafts, hobbies, therapeutic and play therapy, and industrial recreation. Within the outdoor category are such programs as outdoor education, aquatics, nature, and travel.

Meyer and Brightbill (1956) separated program areas into programs for the aging, arts and crafts, dancing, dramatics, music, literary activities, nature and outings, social events, sports and games, agency or departmental services, and special events.

Carlson et al. (1972) identified recreation program areas as including arts and crafts; dance; drama; literary, mental, and linguistic activities; music; outdoor recreation; social recreation; sports and games; service to communities; hobbies; and special events.

Recreation programs and activities take place in a
variety of settings, the choice again being that of the individual participating. Families participate and plan activities; religious organizations provide activities to attract and stimulate participation; agricultural extensions and industries promote organized programs; museums, nature centers, libraries, zoos, lodges, clubs, fraternal organizations as well as settlement and neighborhood centers all program activities of a recreational nature for the clientele they serve.

Administrative Duties and Responsibilities as Related to Provision of Recreation Activities

Certain administrative skills have been identified which must be performed properly to insure a smooth-functioning recreation operation. Because of the increasing demands for more sophisticated management of recreation areas, the opportunities for training for such management has become highly formalized.

The 1976-77 Society of Professional Recreation Educators: Recreation and Park Education Curriculum Catalogue, published by the Society of Park and Recreation Education, a branch of the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), contains information pertaining to training of recreation administrators. The publication contains data from 125 colleges and universities from the United States and Canada, of which there are some 345 institutions
offering professional preparation in parks and recreation. Degree programs are listed for 2-year and baccalaureate degrees, master's and doctorate degrees, and intermediate degrees.

A review of this curriculum guide shows common offerings for preparation for administrative positions to include such courses as an introduction to recreation and park administration, community organizations, programming recreation activities, public relations, facility planning and management, budget and finance, survey techniques and evaluation, staff and personnel, and records and reports. Numerous other offerings are listed which pertain to training for specific jobs, tasks, or special emphasis areas such as resource management and therapeutic, youth agency, or school recreation.

In 1973, the National Conference on Professional Preparation was held in New Orleans. It was pointed out that there was demand for administrators, interpretive personnel, supervisors, program specialists, recreation consultants, planners, researchers, college teachers, biologists, foresters, and others who may wish to make park and recreation services a career.

The conference further pointed out that the increasing demand for trained personnel would double in 13 years, with an approximate growth of only one-seventh the number of 4-year trained personnel.

The conference keyed on the enhancement of professional
education through recommendations for accreditation. The recommendation was made for each recreation graduate to have had exposure to selected administrative functions to include legal aspects of recreation and park services; principles of planning and operation of recreation and park areas and facilities; financial and business procedures; public relations; principles of organization; and coordination of services, personnel practices, and evaluation.

A section of the report is devoted to the concept of the community school. The greatest impact on recreation leadership is to be found in the smaller community where the community school director would need to assume the recreation programming responsibility. Undergraduate training in recreation, as well as teacher certification, was recommended as part of the training process for employment in community education.

Meyer and Brightbill (1956) defined recreation administration as "the act of planning, organizing, managing and directing organized recreation" (p. 25). The intent is to provide a better refined system to improve the delivery of recreation services to the public. It is a means to the end of a better format of organizing recreation opportunities.

Recreation administration is a balance between technical skills and human relations. Meyer and Brightbill (1956) noted that an administrator of a recreation system "needs to possess a great deal of technical knowledge but that
knowledge will be severely limited if one lacks skills in human relations" (p. 26). Some of the technical skills identified include the ability to organize and plan, to interpret one's ideas, to enlist the cooperation of others, and to analyze facts and place them in order of importance. Other characteristics include wisdom, freshness of view, imagination, self-starting capabilities, ability to compromise, enthusiasm, and a sense of humor.

Meyer and Brightbill (1956) identified several major components of recreation administration: community organization, planning, personnel, areas and facilities, programs and services, and finance and business procedures.

Community organization is viewed as a system whereby the various resources of the community are systematically organized to provide residents with recreation opportunities. These agencies include governmental units and services, voluntary agencies, commercial resources as well as educational, religious, political, business, service, fraternal, patriotic, or cultural organizations. The efficiency of a community recreation delivery system is directly dependent upon the willingness and ability of these various agencies and services to coordinate and cooperate with the numerous resources available.

The most common system of public recreation depends upon a legal, public, managing authority as the focal point of organized recreation services. The determination of
which public body should assume such responsibility is dependent upon willingness to accept and assume provision of recreation services as a function, an acceptance of a wide-based philosophy, methods and support for continual provision of adequate funding, and a willingness to cooperate with as well as coordinate services with other agencies.

A second category, planning, to be effective must be based upon sound research which provides a basic body of knowledge. Also, a knowledge of current legislation and its impact upon recreation services directly affects the planning function. This legislation might include enabling laws, service laws, regulatory laws, and/or special legislation. Establishing and maintaining the favorable attitude of the public determines the participation and support available for public involvement in the planning process. Each phase of the recreation process must be planned, and each person in the recreation system must assume some planning responsibility. The planning function consists of both immediate and long-range planning.

Meyer and Brightbill's (1956) third category, personnel, determines the ultimate success of any recreation agency. A staff which consists of competent, qualified, and committed personnel, whether professional or voluntary, can enhance the services of the recreation agency. This can only be accomplished with a clear definition of the function and responsibility at each level of operation.
Supervision and evaluation of job performance coupled with sound recruiting, selection, and training of the recreation staff are integral parts of the personnel process. The organization of the staff to best achieve an efficient and orderly operation with an allocation of responsibilities, duties, and authority is included in personnel administration.

Recreation areas and facilities must be professionally managed and scheduled. Maintenance, construction, provision of areas, design, location, and layout as well as availability at a time when people can utilize facilities are all part of the recreation process. In the development and operation of facilities, attention must be given to costs of construction, maintenance, and operation; existing and potential participant and attendance load; modification and orientation of natural features; health and safety; aesthetic attraction; functional use; and supervisory and leadership considerations.

The programming function is the culmination of the entire administrative effort. The recreational needs and interests of the people must be determined and provided for. Such determination would include the age groups and interest groups to be served; special needs and interests of each sex; individual versus group activities; seasonal factors; cultural, social, or athletic, planned or spontaneous activities; or special event versus regular programmed activity. To achieve the proper balance, program standards must be
established which insure a safe environment which allows individuals to progress in skills as they choose and are able.

Finance and business procedures constitute the final category. Without continued financial support, no system can provide the consistent level of services necessary to satisfy the ever-growing demands of the public. The balance between demand and available funding is affected by numerous factors such as public laws, limits and limitations, general funds, special tax levies, fees and charges policies, and gifts and donations coupled with the willingness of the public to support their recreation interests.

A system is imperative whereby funds for both maintaining and operating the program as well as funding for capital improvements can be systematically received and disbursed. Projection of expenditures over a period of time must be accomplished to insure sufficient future funding and a budgetary system which is accountable.

Effective recreation administration is particularly difficult because the nature of recreation makes it varied and broad in scope, bringing many elements into consideration which are not identified in areas of living more narrowly defined and interpreted. All of these administrative components must be coordinated into a single effective administrative pattern to insure maximum effectiveness of recreation services.
Numerous authors have supported the basic component areas of recreation administration with the addition of the area of research and evaluation. Krause and Curtis (1973), in their text *Creative Administration in Recreation and Parks*, identified personnel management, recreation programs, areas and facilities, budgets and fiscal management, public and community relations, planning, evaluation and research, and manuals and guidelines as the key administrative categories.

Specific administrative functions are identified which are pertinent to the successful management of a recreational system. Practitioners perform them, and training institutions through their preparatory programs attempt to develop these skills in their graduates. Rodney (1964) stated that a director in a recreation system requires a diverse range of knowledge, skills, and abilities:

Thorough knowledge of the principles, theory and philosophy of the recreation and park profession: skill in organizing the services of the department, which would include advance planning for areas and facilities, level of adequacy at which services are to be provided, development of long-term financial plans, and formulation of plans for the development and replacement of personnel; understanding of the recreational needs of the community, and ability to meet those needs with a progressive program; ability to guide and direct the work of the department and its personnel and to delegate tasks with dispatch to particular parts or divisions of the department; administrative skill in supervising the work of specialized personnel in landscape architecture, planning, horticulture, and recreation and park operation; intensive knowledge of the techniques of public administration, and executive capacity to make
decisions judiciously; skill in communication; thorough knowledge of the development, maintenance and operation of recreation and park areas and facilities; ability to inspire and work harmoniously with peers and employees. (pp. 137-138)

Simpson (1972), doing a job analysis study of municipal recreation departments in Oregon, found certain administrative tasks to be common among such directors. These included tasks relating to areas and facilities, such as planning future facilities as well as inspection and scheduling of existing facilities; programming, where the director's responsibilities ranged up to 28 percent; budget and finance showing a monthly average of 8 percent of total administrative responsibilities; public relations and publicity, which ranked seventh in relation to all categories; and personnel, which dealt with recruiting, hiring, and training of staff.

Relationship of Recreation to Community Education

Recreation is a topic area which elicits a variety of emotional responses among professionals who must deal with how the relationship between community education and recreation should be defined. Is recreation community education? Is it a part of it? How great a part, or of what importance? Whose responsibility is it to provide either community education activities or recreation activities? Is recreation a municipal function or a function of the public school system?

The role of community education in the provision of
leisure services seems nowhere to be clearly defined. It appears, rather, that the provision of leisure services is primarily a matter of local determination. Initial attempts at the definition of this role appear to have been unsuccessful as evidenced by numerous examples of conflict and duplication.

In 1973, while president of the NRPA, Rettie made the following statement to a senate subcommittee studying legislation for funding community education programs:

It has been the real life experience of N.R.P.A. professionals, however, that effective implementation of these goals depends heavily on a spirit of positive cooperation between the several agencies and groups involved. A number of community school programs have begun by immediately establishing recreation programs not in cooperation with local park and recreation agencies, but in competition with them. Thus instead of multiplying the possible services to a community, the program has immediately duplicated activities, reproduced facilities already available and replicated programs already being provided by trained recreation professionals. (p. 14)

The NRPA, the official voice of the parks, recreation, and conservation field, originally took a cautious wait-and-see attitude, but both the organization and several of its membership have more recently taken a more aggressive approach to its involvement in determining the direction and/or form community education is to take in individual communities. Some feel that the recreation profession must attach itself to the community education movement or lose out on both funding and influence.

As director of the Phoenix (Arizona) Parks and
Recreation Department, Swan (1974) made the following statement relating to the threat that community education has posed to some municipal agencies:

Community recreation service is the 70 year old stepchild of local government. The community school program is the very recently acquired stepchild of education. Community recreation service professionals have watched as school bond elections have failed and as schools have lost contact with people. School administrators and board members have watched as community recreation and park bond elections succeeded and as the community recreation image has steadily improved. Community recreation service professionals have watched as school administrators grasped for life-saving devices to regain their good public image; as they reached out to the community-school concept; as the community-school program has provided a focal point for the community. The community-school program is in direct competition with community recreation for the public dollar available for community activities. (p. 15)

The lack of a clear difference between what is recreational and what is educational seems to be at the root of whatever conflict has arisen between the two professions. Leadership which is attempting to build a program at all costs or which has a narrow definition of recreation is more prone to create circumstances in which duplication and kingdom building are the rule. Sprague (1974), chief of recreation and parks in Jacksonville, Florida, pointed out that independence would be nice but that without adequate staff, facilities, or financing neither group can be independent of the other. Because education relates to recreation and recreation to education, attempts must be made to maximize existing resources.
A look at two definitions— one of education, one of recreation— points out the thinness of difference which exists and which contributes to the problem. In an article by Greiner (1974), former University of Virginia Community Education Center Director Frossard defined education as "anything in which knowledge produces positive change in a person." A definition of recreation offered at a recent conference is that "it is not activities, or facilities, or programs that are central, it is what happens to people. Recreation is not a specific event, a position in time, or a place in space, it is a dimension in life; it is a state of being" (p. 16).

The role which both the recreation and community education professionals select to assume appears to be a second key in determining the future of the relationship of these two professions. If a clear definition of roles can be set out and if the leadership is willing to communicate and cooperate, then the conflict can be minimized. Swan (1974) pointed out that the potential conflict between recreation and community education has all the ingredients of a great fight, but it must never materialize. Only if the professionals face the facts "objectively, squarely, forcefully and immediately can this conflict be avoided" (p. 62).

The term recreation consistently emerges in the literature where the potential offerings of a community school or community education program are listed. Decker (1975)
Community schools offer lifelong learning and enrichment opportunities in education, recreation, social and related cultural services with the programs and activities coordinated and developed for citizens of all ages, ethnic backgrounds and socio-economic groups. (p. 5)

DeLargy (1974) listed as one of the categories of goals summarized in a national study the provision, development, or use of available community resources to meet the people's recreational and leisure-time interests.

Long (1975), in reacting to the relationship of community education and recreation in Minnesota, pointed out that recreation activities are a major method to be used to attract community residents to school facilities. With increased usage comes a closer identification of the public with the school and a greater willingness to participate in other community education offerings. Long further pointed out that the identity of each contributing agency and the service they provide should not be lost with the creation of community education programs. Details of Long's gap are contained in Appendix D.

Community education development has in many ways benefited from the groundwork laid by the recreation professionals. A number of leadership positions in local communities have been assumed by personnel with a recreation background and/or training. In Minnesota, a 1975 survey conducted by the Center for Community Education at Mankato...
State University showed the largest number of respondents in any one category as being trained in "Recreation and Park Administration."

Palm (1973) discussed the creation of the Brooklyn Park, Minnesota, community education program. The initial step was taken by a member of the city park and recreation department, who approached the local school district with the proposal of a community education program under the auspices of the City of Brooklyn Park. Palm also mentioned the creation of community education programs through the efforts of a local YMCA, churches, or any other service or government agency.

Probably the most significant support that recreation truly is an integral aspect of community education is the creation of the National Joint Continuing Steering Committee. Representing the National Community Education Association, the NRPA, and the American Association for Leisure and Recreation, this committee was funded by the Mott Foundation to pursue interagency communication, coordination, and cooperation between Parks and Recreation and Community Education.

Begun in 1974 through the efforts of the National Center for Community Education, this group was charged with initiating steps which would impact increased efforts among these groups to eliminate misunderstanding and to increase effectiveness of their respective agencies.
Two definitions were accepted as part of the implementation program:

Community Education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all its community members. It utilizes the local school or some other agency to serve as a catalyst to bring community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop a positive sense of community, improve community living and develop community processes toward the end of self-actualization. (Minzey & LeTarte, 1972, p. 19)

Recreation is an emotional condition with an individual human being that flows from a feeling of well-being and self-satisfaction. It is characterized by a feeling of mastery, achievement, exhilaration, acceptance, success, personal worth, and pleasure. It reinforces a positive self-image. Recreation is a response to aesthetic experiences, achievement of personal goals, or positive feedback from others. It is independent of activity, leisure or social acceptance. (Gray, 1972, p. 19)

As a result of "Super Seminar '74," a joint continuing committee was appointed, composed of three representatives from each organization. The following goals were identified for the committee in the publication The Ultimate—To Serve (Artz, 1976):

1. To maintain ongoing communications between the three organizations.

2. To encourage acceptance of the platform statements at the local level through the various state and regional affiliates.

3. To encourage joint programs at national and state conferences.

4. To encourage the exchange of information through the publications of the three organizations.
5. To review the recommendations of "Super Seminar '74" and make recommendations to the respective organizations for implementation.

6. To assess programs as to the degree of cooperative effort involved. (p. 10)

The Joint Steering Committee recommended that a strong communication system be established between the public schools and recreation organizations to provide for joint developments and to prevent competition and duplication.

**Use of School Facilities for Recreation Activities**

Primarily because of their variety of facilities, their vast collection of a variety of human resources, and their built-in delivery system, school districts have been called upon to participate fully in the delivery system of recreational services. Schools, however, have given education for constructive use of leisure time a low priority because of other curricular demands placed upon them.

Various studies have been conducted pertaining to the availability and use of school facilities for community recreation as well as the administration and supervision of community recreation programs.

Thorstenson (1969), in his study of Utah school facilities and their availability for community use, reported: (1) elementary schools had the least number of facilities, while high schools had the greatest variety of facilities;
and (2) the one facility which most schools had was the library, but it was the one least available for community organizations to use. He provided a rank order of the times when school facilities were most available for community use: (1) weekday evenings, (2) Saturday mornings, (3) summer vacations, (4) Saturday afternoons, (5) weekdays after school, (6) Saturday evenings, (7) school holidays, (8) Sundays, and (9) weekdays during school.

Otto (1970), in his study of the availability of Wisconsin school facilities for community recreation, found that the facility most readily available for community use was the gymnasium and the least available facilities were the auxiliary activity rooms. Lucenko (1972), in a similar study in New Jersey, found the most available facility for community recreation to be the multi-purpose room, with the least available facility being the swimming pool. Olsen (1970), in his study of school- and co-sponsored recreation programs in the north central region of the United States, found support for recreation programs for all ages by the majority of education and recreation leaders polled. These leaders also agreed that schools should help children and adults to select activities which they can pursue and enjoy throughout life.

Thorstenson (1969) found that of those facilities available in Utah school districts there was an 80-percent utilization by community groups. These facilities were used
most frequently by PTA organizations, youth groups, religious groups, municipal recreation groups, and miscellaneous groups. Otto (1970) found all available school facilities being utilized by the community, with the most readily available facility (the gymnasium) also being the most used. The Wisconsin school facilities were used most frequently by scouting groups, special interest groups, 4-H clubs, and the public recreation departments. The most extensive use of school facilities during the summer months was made by community groups in large urban school districts, with 57.1 percent used facilities above 30 hours per week during the school year.

Lucenko (1972) reported a favorable attitude toward the use of school facilities for community recreation by non-school groups by all connected with the school from taxpayer to superintendent. The only exception to this positive reaction was the attitude of school custodians.

Certain problems are inherent in the use of school facilities by outside groups. Such matters as leadership and supervision, scheduling, vandalism, relationships with custodians, poor planning of programs, and complaints of teachers must constantly be dealt with. Fees and charges policies for use of school facilities also determine the extent of usage and availability of school facilities. Hafen (1968) found that the majority of school districts did not charge a fee for use of school facilities, but if
charged, such fees were for defraying costs of utilities and personnel. The greatest contribution of school districts has been in the area of making facilities available to public agencies on a low- or no-cost basis.

Leadership of recreation programs was provided for in a variety of ways. Otto (1970) reported that a public recreation department administered the recreation program in 20.5 percent of the Wisconsin school districts. In 15.4 percent of those school districts, administration of such programs was done by the board of education, and in 8.4 percent there was shared responsibility by a public recreation department and the board of education. Thorstenson (1969) found that 30 percent of the Utah school districts had municipal recreation programs administered by the municipal recreation department, with 22 percent being jointly administered by a municipality and school district.

Lucenko (1972) found that public agencies in New Jersey provided recreation program leadership in 65.4 percent of the school districts, with the board of education being responsible in 15.2 percent of the districts. Olsen (1970) found that 40 percent of the school superintendents in the north central region of the United States were involved with sole or co-sponsorship of recreation programs.

Support exists for community use of school facilities and provision of leadership by school districts. Trapanese (1961), in his investigation of the relationships between
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the board of education and the recreational agencies in Jersey City, concluded that the board of education should become more involved in providing recreation experiences for the community. He recommended that the board should:

1. Take the lead in coordinating the youth program of the community.
2. Formulate definite policies which will guide it in dealing with voluntary agencies.
3. Set up a consultative service to aid voluntary recreation agencies.
4. Strive for community recreation programs which will meet the needs of youth.
5. Advocate a flexible program to meet the changing needs of the community.
6. Plan and construct future schools for education-recreation purposes.
7. Encourage greater use of existing facilities by community groups.
8. Play a role in future community planning.
9. Encourage community groups to work together for the welfare of the community. (p. 13)

Cook (1955) found that half of the Missouri superintendents polled did not believe that recreation agencies were taking full advantage of the use of school facilities. He also reported that 75 percent of school administrators contacted believed that there should be joint membership on school and recreation boards to foster better understanding and cooperation. Unruh (1955) recommended there be joint community action for all new school facilities being planned and designed for school-community use; and McQuarrie (1962)
recommended that there be joint planning, acquisition, and
development of school and recreation sites between school
and recreation authorities.

Summary

Support is apparent for cooperative input by school
districts into the delivery system of a community recreation
program. A variety of cooperative ventures, sharing facil­
ities and leadership, are currently in operation, many of
which operate under the direction provided by community edu­
cation personnel. The education system has the potential to
provide education for leisure, facilities and leadership and
the appropriate structure to deliver services on a low-cost
basis. Philosophically, education and recreation are not
far apart.

The literature to this point does not cover directly
the role community schools and community education should
play in the delivery of recreation programs. Neither have
a clear delineation of the role and professional contribu­
tion of recreation personnel within a community education
system been identified or defined. The aim of this study
was to gather data and to draw conclusions which might assist
in more clearly identifying the contribution being made by
both professions in the delivery of recreation activities.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the design of the study and gives a description of the methodology used to conduct it. Specifically discussed are the review of the problem, development of an appropriate instrument, the population and sample, the procedures adopted for data collection, and analysis of the survey response.

Review of the Problem

It was the intention of the present study to investigate and report the similarities and differences between Michigan recreation and community education professionals in their programming of recreation activities. Both the extent of offerings and the performance of selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities were to be studied and analyzed. In addition, information relative to the percentage of time spent in performing the selected administrative functions was to be secured.

The main questions are listed below:

1. Is there a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the performing of each of the seven selected administrative functions of programming, staffing, scheduling of areas and facilities,
evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities?

2. Is there a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the categories of dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, music, playground programs, aquatics, special events, outdoor recreation, social recreation, athletics and sports, service projects, and handicapped programs?

3. Is there a difference in the percentage of time spent by community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing the selective administrative functions of programming, staffing, scheduling of areas and facilities, evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities?

Instrumentation

An instrument was developed to elicit responses to the questions listed above and from which relevant data could be obtained. Since no existing instrument covered the questions to be answered, it was necessary to develop one without the support of precedent. Nevertheless, content for a data-gathering instrument was available from the literature as well as from various professional educators and practitioners from the recreation field. The literature search provided content for 12 selected recreation activity areas as well as 7 selected functions of administration pertinent to the provision of recreation activities. Discussion with professional
educators and practitioners from the recreation field provided support for the activity areas and the administrative functions already identified in the literature.

Because of the sample size and its geographic distribution, a mailed questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire was forwarded to selected recreators and community educators from the State of Michigan. The same questionnaire was sent to the recreators and community educators except that the questionnaires were color-coded for easy identification. The questionnaires sent to the community educators were green, and those sent to the recreation directors were yellow. The questionnaire was designed so that the respondent had only to list specific recreation activities and check the appropriate administrative functions applicable to that activity. Emphasis was therefore given to attractiveness of format and ease of response. In this regard, Mowly (1970) offered the following comment: "The validity of questionnaire data . . . depends in a crucial way on the ability and willingness of the respondent to provide the information requested" (p. 243). A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.

Criticism has been leveled at mailed questionnaires because of the problems inherent in a low return rate. One of the main problems, as Kerlinger (1964) noted, is that the non-respondents may differ in important respects from the rest of the population. Nevertheless, Moser and Kalton
(1972) have observed that this problem can be overcome to a marked degree if an estimate can be made of the effect of the non-response. Table 1 shows a comparison of the respondents and non-respondents by geographic location of both the community education directors and recreation directors. The information in the table shows a fairly even percentage of return from each of the four sections of the State of Michigan.

The questionnaire was designed as an instrument of data collection in the following main areas of recreation activities: (1) dance, (2) dramatics, (3) arts and crafts, (4) music, (5) playground programs, (6) aquatics, (7) special events, (8) outdoor recreation, (9) social recreation, (10) athletics and sports, (11) service projects, and (12) handicapped programs.

The questionnaire also was designed to collect data on the performing of certain administrative functions relative to the above listed categories by the respondent. Questions concerning these administrative functions were as follows:

1. Do you plan this activity?
2. Do you assign staff to conduct this activity?
3. Do you make the necessary arrangements for provision of the appropriate area or facility for this activity?
4. Do you utilize evaluative techniques to determine the effectiveness of this activity?
5. Do you make the necessary financial arrangements for this activity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
<th>Community Education Questionnaires</th>
<th>Recreation Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mailed</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper peninsula</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern lower peninsula</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central lower peninsula</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern lower peninsula</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Actually, 79 questionnaires were returned by recreation directors; however, 3 from the central lower peninsula were unusable.
6. Do you investigate and respond to public requests, suggestions, and complaints regarding this activity?

7. Do you maintain data relevant to the continuous, smooth operation of this activity?

These administrative functions were placed alongside the categories of recreation activities, allowing the respondent to check the appropriate function if it pertained to the activities the respondent had listed.

A prime question to which an answer was sought concerned to what degree recreation activities were offered by both community education and recreation professionals. A search of the literature revealed 12 programmatic areas that occurred most frequently. Each respondent was asked to list up to 4 of the most popular recreation activities within each program category.

Attempts were made to ascertain the face validity of the instrument (see Appendix A) by asking each of the following people to review the instrument and comment regarding the appropriateness of wording, arrangement of items, and importance of content of the instrument: one community education center director, one researcher, one staff member of the state recreation association, one professional recreation educator, two community education directors, and two recreation directors.
Population and Sample

The population for this investigation was composed of community education directors from state-reimbursed community education districts in Michigan for 1975-76 and recreation professionals representing organizational membership in the Michigan recreation association in 1975-76. Michigan was chosen for the study because of the sophistication of programs and the years that both community education and recreation programs have been in existence.

The community education population consisted of 199 community education contact persons as identified by the Michigan Department of Education, Adult and Continuing Education Services community school program directory for 1975-76. The data were solicited from every individual in the population.

The recreation director population consisted of 146 organizational members as identified in the MRPA membership directory for 1975-76. Again, the data were solicited from every individual in the population. Because 25 of the MRPA organizational members also were state-funded community education districts, those persons were included as part of the community education group, thus reducing the number of MRPA organizational members to 121.
Data Collection

On January 21, 1977, the questionnaires were sent to the 320 community education and recreation directors. Each person was sent the following: a cover letter (Appendix B); the appropriate colored questionnaire; and a return, self-addressed envelope, stamped for the convenience of respondents. Letterhead stationery from the Community School Development Center, Department of Educational Leadership, in the College of Education at Western Michigan University, was used for the cover letter, which was signed by the investigator and endorsed by the committee chairperson. The letter outlined the area to be investigated and stressed that confidentiality would be strictly observed.

An identifying code number was written on each questionnaire for follow-up purposes. To ensure confidentiality, names and the corresponding identification numbers were destroyed as questionnaires were returned. A separate list was compiled of respondents who had requested a summary of the results of the study. Procedures used to protect the respondents' confidentiality were explained in the cover letter. Finally, measures adopted to protect the confidentiality of the respondents were cleared with the Department of Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University.

On February 16, 1977, follow-up materials were sent to non-respondents. These materials consisted of a cover letter
(Appendix C), again seeking cooperation; q questionnaire; and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. On March 14, 1977, the decision was reached to accept no further responses, as the return rate had diminished to only a few a week.

Data Analysis

All information contained on completed questionnaires was coded to facilitate data analysis. A decision was reached that response frequencies of each of the 12 recreation categories and their corresponding 7 administrative areas of responsibility would be recorded. In reaching this decision, it was acknowledged that examples contained within each of the 12 recreation categories were of equal importance. For example, under the category arts and crafts, examples such as drawing, painting, macrame, and ceramics were accepted as being of equal importance. Each respondent was asked to list up to 4 of the most popular recreation activity offerings of his department in each of 12 recreation categories. For each activity listed, the respondent was then directed to check each administrative function he performed relative to that activity. A value of 1 was assigned to each activity listed as well as to each administrative function checked. The score for each category, then, was derived by counting the number of responses in that category.
In answering the question of percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions, it was intended that the respondent would consider each of the seven categories independent of the others and not treat them as a whole which needed to total 100 percent. If the respondent attempted to treat the seven responses as a whole totaling 100 percent, it would mean that the responses to the individual categories would be affected. As well, if the percentage of time spent was not listed on a questionnaire where recreation activities had been listed, that non-response was not included in the analysis for the category dealing with percentage of time spent.

Thus, it was determined that questionnaires where the sum of the percentage of time spent on performing administrative functions pertinent to a range of recreation activities totaled 100 percent, and those questionnaires where recreation activities were listed but percentage of time was not, would be excluded from analysis pertaining to the seven hypotheses in the category of percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions. For those questionnaires selected, the percentage of time was assigned the value which the respondent listed on the questionnaire.
A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether a difference existed between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in any of the 7 administrative areas. For example, this technique was used to determine whether a difference existed (over all recreation categories) between the two groups regarding responsibility in planning activities. Similarly, the one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether a difference existed between the two groups regarding responsibility in the remaining 6 administrative areas taken over all of the 12 recreation categories.

A one-way analysis of variance was also used to determine whether a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in respect to total administrative responsibilities for each of the 12 recreation categories. For example, this technique was employed to determine whether the two groups differed in the extent of their administrative responsibilities (planning, staffing, scheduling facilities, evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports) in respect to the recreation category dance. Similarly, differences between the two groups involving administrative responsibilities in respect to each of the other 11 recreation categories were determined by performing a one-way analysis of variance.
A one-way analysis of variance was also used to determine whether a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in respect to the percentage of time spent on each of 7 selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities.

For example, this technique was employed to determine whether the two groups differed in the percentage of time spent on administrative responsibilities for planning in respect to all recreation activity categories. Similarly, the one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether differences existed between the two groups in the percentage of time spent in the remaining 6 administrative areas taken over each of the 12 recreation categories.

Survey Response

During the period from January 28 through February 18, 1977, 137 usable responses (i.e., 43 percent of the 320 questionnaires posted) were received. Follow-up letters and questionnaires posted on February 16, 1977, elicited a further 58 usable responses (i.e., a further 18 percent of the 320 questionnaires posted). Following the initial mailing, a high return rate was noted during the first 7 or 8 days; after 8 days, the rate dropped appreciably. A somewhat similar pattern was repeated in response to the follow-up package. Figure 1 displays graphically the response rate.
Figure 1.—Graph of response rate by weekly return. (a) Community education and recreation directors' responses have been combined; (b) Only usable responses have been included; (c) Follow-up letters and questionnaires were posted on February 16, 1977.

by weekly return of usable responses.

Table 2 gives a summary of returns for the community education and recreation director samples. It should be noted that only three questionnaires were unusable, those sent to county park districts which had no responsibility for programming recreation activities. The response rate was approximately the same for both groups, with a 60-percent return from the community education group and a 63-percent return from the recreation group.
## TABLE 2.—Characteristics of returned questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Characteristics</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Com Ed</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number sent</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned unopened</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned unusable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned usable</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent returned usable</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The presentation of the research findings is organized around 3 categories containing a total of 26 hypotheses. The first category, selected administrative functions, contains 7 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to the responsibilities over all recreation program areas relevant to each of the 7 selected administrative areas. The second category, recreation program areas, contains 12 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to performing selected administrative functions relevant to the provision of recreation activities within each of the 12 recreation program areas. The final category, percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions, contains 7 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to the percentage of time spent over all recreation program areas relevant to each of the 7 selected administrative functions.

A probability of .05 for making a Type I error was used in testing the hypotheses.
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Selected administrative functions

This section contains 7 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to the responsibilities over all recreation program areas relevant to each of the 7 selected administrative functions. The survey instrument (Appendix A) lists the following selected administrative functions: planning, staffing, scheduling areas and facilities, evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports. This relationship is shown through the testing of each of the following hypotheses:

$H_{1A}$: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the planning of a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the planning of a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and
recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to the planning function relative to the 12 recreation program areas.

TABLE 3.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in planning recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = .17; p = .55 \]

H1B: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the staffing of a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the staffing of a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent the staffing function relative to the 12 recreation program areas than do community education directors.
A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of scheduling of areas and facilities for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 5.

### Table 5. One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in scheduling areas and facilities for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community ed.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>9.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.55; p = .032

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater degree the scheduling of areas and facilities relative to the 12 recreation program areas than do community education directors.

H₁D: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the evaluation of a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of the evaluation of a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in evaluating recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.68; p = .099

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in
respect to the evaluation function relative to the 12 recreation program areas.

H_{1E}: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of financial arrangements for a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of financial arrangements for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7.--One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in financing of recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.95; p = .026

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent the financing function relative to the 12 recreation program areas than do community education directors.

H_{1F}: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of public relations for a range of recreation activities.
A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of public relations for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 8.

**TABLE 8.**--One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in public relations for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 7.37; \ p = .007 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent the public relations function relative to the 12 recreation program areas than do community education directors.

**H\(_1\)G**: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to the extent of records and reports kept for a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of
Michigan with respect to the extent of records and reports kept for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities for records and reports for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 3.71; p = .053

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to the function of records and reports relative to the 12 recreation program areas.

In summary, the two groups differed little in the area of planning, with mean scores of frequency for the community educators being 13.4, and 15.2 for recreators. As well, in the area of evaluation, little difference was found in the extent of performing the evaluation function, with a mean score of 12.9 for community education directors and 15.1 for recreation directors. Also, a mean score was recorded for community education directors of 14.1 and a mean score of 16.7 for recreation directors in the administrative
function of records and reports, showing little difference between the two groups.

Significant difference was found between the two groups in four of the seven selected administrative functions. Recreation directors performed more frequently the administrative functions of staffing, scheduling, financing, and public relations. In staffing, community education directors showed a mean score of 14.2, and for recreation directors a mean score of 17.8 was recorded. Scheduling of areas and facilities for community education directors showed a mean score of 15.4 and for recreation directors a mean score of 18.4. A mean score of 14.3 was shown for the community education directors in the administrative area of financing and a mean score of 17.4 for recreation directors. In the final administrative function where a significant difference was found, public relations, a mean score of 14.7 was recorded for community education directors and 18.5 for recreation directors. Table 10 shows a summary of differences between the community education directors' and the recreation directors' performance of the seven administrative functions.

The mean scores for both groups indicated involvement by both community education directors and recreation directors in performing administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities. Where a difference was found, recreation directors' extent of performing that administrative function was greater.
TABLE 10.--Summary of differences between community education directors' and recreation directors' performance of seven administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Com Ed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Planning</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Staffing</td>
<td>17.8*</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Scheduling</td>
<td>18.4*</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Evaluation</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Financing</td>
<td>17.4*</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Public relations</td>
<td>18.5*</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Records and reports</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Recreation program areas

This section contains 12 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to performing selected administrative functions relevant to the provision of recreation activities within each of the 12 recreation program areas. The survey instrument (Appendix A) lists the following recreation program areas: dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, music, playground programs, aquatics, special events, outdoor recreation, social recreation, athletics and sports, service projects, and handicapped programs. This relationship is shown through the testing of each of the following hypotheses:
H₂A: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dance.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dance. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11.---One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for dance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = .36; p = .557

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dance.
H₂B: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dramatics.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dramatics. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for dramatics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F = .10; \ p = .745
\]

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of dramatics.
H2C: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of arts and crafts.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of arts and crafts. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 13.

**TABLE 13.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for arts and crafts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 13.18; p = .000

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that community education directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of arts and crafts than do recreation directors.
H_{2D} \text{: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of music.}

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of music. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = .31; p = .584

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of music.
**H2B**: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of playground programs.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of playground programs. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 15.

**TABLE 15.**—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for playground programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 8.66; p = .004 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of playground programs than do community education directors.
**H₂P:** There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of aquatics.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of aquatics. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 16.

**TABLE 16.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for aquatics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 5.24; p = .022 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater degree selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of aquatics than do community education directors.
H$_{2g}$: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of special events.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of special events. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 17.

**TABLE 17.** One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for special events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F = 18.85; p = .000$

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of special events than do community education directors.
There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of outdoor recreation.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of outdoor recreation. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = .94; p = .335 \]

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of outdoor recreation.
H21: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of social recreation.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of social recreation. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(F = 5.37; p = .020\)

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of social recreation than do community education directors.
H27: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of athletics and sports.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of athletics and sports. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for athletics and sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 17.81; p = .000 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan perform to a greater extent selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of athletics and sports than do community education directors.
H₂₀: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of service projects.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of service projects. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 21.

**TABLE 21.**—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for service projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = .07; p = .777 \]

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of service projects.
H2L: There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of handicapped programs.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan with respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of handicapped programs. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' administrative functions for handicapped programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.36; p = .122

The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the two group means. In other words, no support was found that community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan differ in respect to performing selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of recreation activities in the category of handicapped programs.
In summary, in the hypotheses dealing with the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors with respect to their performing all 7 selected administrative functions for each of the 12 recreation program areas, a difference was found between the two groups in 6 program areas. Those areas included arts and crafts, playground programs, aquatics, special events, social recreation, and athletics and sports. No significant difference was found between the two groups in the recreation program areas of dance, dramatics, music, outdoor recreation, service projects, and handicapped programs.

In the category of dance, the mean scores were 12.3 for community education directors and 13.1 for recreation directors. In the category of dramatics, the mean score for community education directors was 3.8; for recreation directors, 4.1. In the category of music, community education directors had a mean score of 7.1, and recreation directors had a mean score of 6.5. The category of outdoor recreation yielded a mean of 7.2 for community education directors and 8.5 for recreation directors, while in the category of service projects the mean was found to be 4.8 for community education directors and 4.5 for recreation directors. The final category where no significant difference was found was handicapped programs, where the mean scores were 2.4 for community education directors and 3.5 for recreation directors.
It should be noted that both groups performed some of the administrative functions in each of the above categories, but in only one category, that of dance, was that involvement at all extensive (means of 12.3 and 13.1). In the other five recreation program categories of handicapped programs (means of 2.4 and 3.5), dramatics (means of 3.8 and 4.1), service projects (means of 4.8 and 4.5), music (means of 7.1 and 6.5), and outdoor recreation (means of 7.2 and 8.5), the involvement of either community education directors or recreation directors was limited.

The other five recreation program categories where a significant difference was found were playground programs, aquatics, special events, social recreation, and athletics and sports. A mean of 7.3 was shown for community education directors in the category of playground programs, while recreation directors recorded a mean of 11.2. In the category of aquatics, a mean of 9.9 was recorded for community education directors and 13.5 for recreation directors. For the category of special events, community education directors had a mean of 7.7, while recreation directors had a mean of 13.4. Community education directors in the category of social recreation had a mean of 5.6, while the mean for recreators was 8.4. In the final category of recreation programs where a significant difference was found, that of athletics and sports, a mean of 13.7 was recorded for community education directors and 20.4 was recorded for
recreation personnel. Table 23 details the above information.

**TABLE 23.**--Summary of differences between community education directors' and recreation directors' total responsibilities for twelve recreation categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Com Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatics</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground programs</td>
<td>11.2*</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>13.5*</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>13.4*</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recreation</td>
<td>8.4*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics and sports</td>
<td>20.4*</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service projects</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped programs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Only in the category of social recreation, even though there was a significant difference, was there a limited extent of performance of the seven selected administrative functions. The other categories--playground programs, aquatics, special events, and athletics and sports--showed substantial involvement by both community education directors and recreation directors in performing the seven selected administrative functions. Table 24 shows the range of differences of the recreation categories.
TABLE 24.—Priority listing of twelve recreation categories according to probability between community education directors' and recreation directors' total administrative involvement in each category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Service projects</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Dramatics</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Music</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dance</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Outdoor recreation</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Handicapped programs</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Aquatics</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Social recreation</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Playground programs</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Arts and crafts</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Special events</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Athletics and sports</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions

There was confusion among some of the respondents as to the appropriate way to respond to the question about the percentage of time spent on each of the 7 selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreational activities. As pointed out in Chapter III, the questionnaire design did not intend that the sum of the percentages listed total 100 percent. Yet, 43 of the 120 questionnaires returned by community education directors did, in fact, show this sum to total 100 percent. Also, 17 community
education directors and 5 recreation directors failed to list the percentage of time spent performing the administrative functions pertinent to the recreation activities they listed in part 1 of the questionnaire. Having excluded these 65 questionnaires, the remaining 131, 60 from community education directors and 71 from recreation directors, were considered valid for analysis.

This section contains 7 hypotheses showing the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in respect to the percentage of time spent over all recreation program areas relevant to each of the 7 selected administrative functions. This relationship is shown through the testing of each of the following hypotheses:

\[ H_{3A}: \text{There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the planning of a range of recreation activities.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the planning of a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 25.

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage of time on the planning of a range of recreation activities.
TABLE 25.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on planning recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>24.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 264.38; p = .000 \]

than do community education directors.

\[ H_{3B}: \text{There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the staffing of a range of recreation activities.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on the staffing of a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on staffing recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>26.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 283.92; p = .000 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between
the two group means. Support was found that recreation
directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage
of time on the staffing of a range of recreation activities
than do community education directors.

H₃C: There is a difference between community edu­
cation directors and recreation directors in
the State of Michigan in the percentage of
time spent on the scheduling of areas and
facilities for a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to deter­
mine whether there was a difference between community educa­
tion directors and recreation directors in the State of Mich­
igan in the percentage of time spent on the scheduling of
areas and facilities for a range of recreation activities.
The results of this analysis are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27.—One-way analysis of variance determining differ­
eence between community education directors' and recreation
directors' percentage of time spent on scheduling of areas
and facilities for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 260.93; p = .000

The results indicated a significant difference between
the two group means. Support was found that recreation
directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage
of time on the scheduling of areas and facilities for a range
of recreation activities than do community education
directors.

\[ H_{3d} : \text{There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on evaluation for a range of recreation activities.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on evaluation for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 28.

\[
\text{TABLE 28.--One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on evaluating recreation activities}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>28.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 235.23; p = .000 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage of time on evaluation for a range of recreation activities than do community education directors.

\[ H_{3e} : \text{There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on financing for a range of recreation activities.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to
determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on financing for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 29.

TABLE 29.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on financing recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>25.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 314.67; p = .000 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage of time on financing for a range of recreation activities than do community education directors.

\[ H_{3F}^p: \text{There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on public relations for a range of recreation activities.} \]

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on public relations for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 30.
TABLE 30.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on public relations for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>27.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 252.67; p = .000 \]

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage of time on public relations for a range of recreation activities than do community education directors.

\[ H_3g: \] There is a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on records and reports for a range of recreation activities.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether there was a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the percentage of time spent on records and reports for a range of recreation activities. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 31.

The results indicated a significant difference between the two group means. Support was found that recreation directors in the State of Michigan spend a greater percentage of time on records and reports for a range of recreation activities than do community education directors.
TABLE 31.—One-way analysis of variance determining difference between community education directors' and recreation directors' percentage of time spent on records and reports for recreation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>26.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 287.49; p = .000

In summary, examination of the mean scores of both groups showed the following means: (1) planning, 10.1 for community education directors and 63.7 for recreation directors; (2) staffing, 7.1 for community education directors and 66.7 for recreation directors; (3) scheduling of areas and facilities, 5.7 for community education directors and 61.6 for recreation directors; (4) evaluation, 4.4 for community education directors and 61.3 for recreation directors; (5) financing, 4.9 for community education directors and 65.4 for recreation directors; (6) public relations, 7.9 for community education directors and 67.3 for recreation directors; and (7) records and reports, 5.1 for community education directors and 64.5 for recreation directors.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Chapter V presents a general discussion of the study and its potential usefulness to those concerned with the provision of recreation activities by community education and recreation directors. The objectives of the study will be summarized, followed by the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further studies.

Summary

There were three primary objectives of this study. The first was to determine whether a difference existed between community education directors' and recreation directors' responsibilities in any one of 7 selected administrative areas over all of the 12 recreation categories. The second was to determine whether a difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors in respect to total administrative responsibilities for each of the 12 recreation categories. The third was to determine whether the two groups differed in the percentage of time spent on any one of 7 selected administrative areas over all of the 12 recreation categories.
A search of the literature provided background information on four areas relating to this study: (1) program component areas of recreation activities, (2) administrative duties and responsibilities as they relate to the provision of recreation activities, (3) the relationship of recreation to community education, and (4) current use of school facilities for recreation activities.

The program areas of recreation activities were identified as dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, music, playground programs, aquatics, special events, outdoor recreation, social recreation, athletics and sports, service projects, and handicapped programs.

Administrative duties and responsibilities as they relate to the provision of recreation activities were identified as planning, staffing, scheduling areas and facilities, evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports.

Because of the lack of a clear identification of activities as being either predominantly recreational or educational, the role of community education and recreation agencies in providing those activities is not well defined. It appears, rather, that the provision of leisure services is primarily a matter of local determination. Efforts are being made on a national level to lessen apparent conflict and to build closer relationships between the two professions.
Answers to specific questions about the provision and administration of recreation activities by community education and recreation directors were sought through a survey instrument in order that a response to the primary objectives of the investigation could be obtained accumulatively. A questionnaire was designed as an instrument of data collection in the following areas: (1) extent of recreation activities offered within 12 recreation program areas, (2) administrative responsibilities performed to provide a range of recreation activities, and (3) percentage of time spent on performing those administrative responsibilities.

The population for this study was composed of 320 community education and recreation directors employed within the State of Michigan. The community education directors were those contact persons of school districts which received state community education funding for 1975-76, and the recreation directors were the contact persons for the organizational membership of the state recreation association. During the period from January 28 through February 18, 1977, 137 usable responses (i.e., 43 percent of the 320 questionnaires posted) were received. Follow-up letters and questionnaires posted on February 16, 1977, elicited a further 58 usable responses (i.e., 18 percent of the 320 questionnaires posted).

Coded data from questionnaires were transferred to computer cards. The data analysis techniques, determined when
the questionnaire was developed (Appendix A) were utilized to respond to 26 hypotheses. To reach a decision whether a statistically significant difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors on any of the stated hypotheses, a one-way analysis of variance was used.

Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the findings will be organized according to the following main areas: (1) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the extent of their performing each of 7 selected administrative functions over a range of recreation activities, (2) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the extent of their performing all 7 selected administrative functions for each of 12 recreation program areas, and (3) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the percentage of time spent performing each of 7 selected administrative functions over a range of recreation activities. These areas encompass the stated hypotheses and reach conclusions accumulatively about the main objectives of the study.

Selected administrative functions

Community education directors and recreation directors differed little in their frequency of performing the
the questionnaire was developed (Appendix A) were utilized to respond to 26 hypotheses. To reach a decision whether a statistically significant difference existed between community education directors and recreation directors on any of the stated hypotheses, a one-way analysis of variance was used.

Discussion of the Findings

Discussion of the findings will be organized according to the following main areas: (1) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the extent of their performing each of 7 selected administrative functions over a range of recreation activities, (2) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the extent of their performing all 7 selected administrative functions for each of 12 recreation program areas, and (3) relationship between community education directors and recreation directors in the percentage of time spent performing each of 7 selected administrative functions over a range of recreation activities. These areas encompass the stated hypotheses and reach conclusions accumulatively about the main objectives of the study.

Selected administrative functions

Community education directors and recreation directors differed little in their frequency of performing the
administrative functions of planning, evaluating, and the keeping of records and reports would understandably be performed by the community education director who seasonally would assign to a staff person the responsibilities of hiring staff, scheduling areas and facilities, making financial arrangements, and performing public relations activities specific to the provision of recreation activities. Although the community education director would commonly be performing all administrative functions for his/her overall program, those specific to the recreation area would be the responsibility of the personnel directly in charge of recreation activities.

Another important feature to consider is that community education directors' emphasis on recreation programming occurs often in the summer months, whereas full-time recreation agencies provide a range of recreation services throughout the year. Therefore, the planning, evaluation, and the keeping of records and reports would again be more specific to carry-over of information necessary for successful operation of those seasonal recreation activities. Both directors of recreation and community education would therefore assume those functions. The difference again lies in the structure of community education agencies which provide recreation services as one part of their overall service or which assign that responsibility to another agency or person.

In summary, community education directors would either
administer the recreation activities themselves, cooperate or contract with another agency to provide those activities, or assign the specific responsibilities to a staff person. The community education director as part of his overall responsibilities of planning, evaluating, and keeping of records and reports would perform the same function for the recreation activities. Recreation directors would normally not assign the responsibility for staffing, scheduling, financing, and public relations to others as might the community education director, but rather perform all administrative functions themselves. Hence, one would expect to find a difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the extent of performing the administrative functions of staffing, scheduling, financing, and public relations.

Recreation program areas

In the hypotheses dealing with the relationship between community education directors and recreation directors with respect to their performing all 7 selected administrative functions for each of the 12 recreation program areas, a difference was found between the two groups in 6 program areas. Those areas included arts and crafts, playground programs, aquatics, special events, social recreation, and athletics and sports. No significant difference was found between the two groups in the recreation program areas of...
dance, dramatics, music, outdoor recreation, service projects, and handicapped programs.

The recreation program category of arts and crafts was the first category where a significant difference was found between the two groups, and the only one in which community education directors' mean score (17.2) surpassed that of the recreators (12.0). A possible explanation of this may lie in the fact that school districts have extensive resources in the arts and crafts area and that they have been rich in curricular offerings of the arts and crafts nature. Community education systems often rely upon revenue-producing activities which are either self-supporting or can be utilized as revenue producers for support of other activities. Offerings in the arts and crafts area are such activities because of the great interest of the public in that type of leisure skill. Because of its potential revenue-producing power, the community education director would tend to spend more time on administrative functions pertinent to it, reflecting the importance of those activities to the community education system. A municipal system would be more likely to subsidize to a greater extent the extensive art and craft offerings of summer playground programs which are popular among youth activity offerings.

The other five recreation program categories where a significant difference was found were playground programs, aquatics, special events, social recreation, and athletics.
and sports. A possible explanation for the significant difference found in these five categories is that municipal recreation departments have seemed to emphasize those activities over the years. Those departments have been highly sophisticated in their offerings of summer playground programs for youth subsidized by municipal dollars as their contribution to youth development. Because most outdoor pools have been provided for by municipalities, it has also been common for those units of government to program those facilities heavily for community use. Thus, aquatics has been another area of heavy involvement by recreation personnel. Special events, social recreation, and most certainly athletics and sports have been extensive program areas assumed by municipal recreation departments. It became apparent in reviewing survey responses that the most extensive area of programming for recreation directors was the category of athletics and sports, showing a mean score of 20.4. The next closest categories where a significant difference was shown were aquatics (mean of 13.5) and special events (mean of 13.4).

Percentage of time spent on selected administrative functions

In every case of statistical analysis of the difference between community education directors and recreation directors on the percentage of time spent on selected administra-
tive functions, a significant difference was shown. In each case, the recreation director reported spending significantly more time on the administrative functions.

It should be noted that there was a failure to satisfy one of the assumptions underlying the analysis of variance, namely, the assumption of homogeneity of variance. When the sample sizes are unequal and the sample variances are unequal, the probability of a Type I error is different than \( \alpha \) (Glass & Stanley, 1970). Such was the case in this instance. Specifically, a greater number of persons were sampled from the population with a larger variance. The effect of this is noted by Glass and Stanley: "When the sample sizes and variances are unequal and greater numbers of persons are sampled from the populations with larger variances, the probability of a Type I error is less than \( \alpha \). The effect of heterogeneous variances in this case is to shift the distribution of F ratios to the left" (p. 372).

This shift to the left which made the probability of a Type I error less than .05 did not affect the significance at the given .05 level (because the resulting F ratio was to the right of the F-ratio value at the given level of significance) and therefore did not impact the results of this study. Even with this consideration, the probability of the F ratios having occurred under the null remains as reported, .000.

The great disparity between the two groups in the
percentage of time spent on each of the seven selected administrative functions could possibly be explained in two ways. First, the recreation director has as his sole responsibility the administration of recreation activities with possibly some limited responsibilities in related areas. The administrative time spent is spent solely on recreation activities. The community education director would have more varied responsibilities, thus spending less time on each administrative function for the recreation activities.

Second, because administration of recreation activities is the major responsibility of the recreation directors, they would more likely perceive that responsibility as of much greater importance than would community education directors. Community education directors would not be as concerned with extensive time spent on the administration of recreation activities because of their concerns in a variety of other areas.

It is also the belief of this writer that the recreation directors, having a specialty area, and because of their training in that area, either on a formal basis or an informal basis would tend to spend the additional time on the development of a quality program because they are more aware of the significance of the activities they provide. They are charged with a singular task to which they respond with great emphasis of their time. There appear to
be two reasons why the recreation directors did not spend an even greater percentage of their time on the administrative functions: (1) the additional responsibilities in such areas as park development and maintenance; and (2) the design of the questionnaire, which limited the response in each category to the four most popular activities (especially in the category of athletics and sports, where the majority of recreation directors could have listed many more because of the strong emphasis in many recreation departments on sport-oriented activities).

Conclusions

This study was pursued to determine the difference between community education directors and recreation directors in the State of Michigan in the following areas pertaining to the provision of recreation activities: (1) the extent of performing each of 7 selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities, (2) the extent of performing all 7 selected administrative functions for each of 12 recreation program areas, and (3) the percentage of time spent on performing each of 7 selected administrative functions pertinent to the provision of a range of recreation activities.

The following conclusions were drawn from the statistical analysis of data received:
(1) The administrative functions of staffing, scheduling, financing, and public relations are performed for a range of recreation activities to a greater degree by recreation directors than by community education directors.

(2) In the categories of playground programs, aquatics, special events, social recreation, and athletics and sports, recreation directors performed to a greater degree the seven selected administrative functions than did community education directors. Only in the category of arts and crafts did community education directors perform the administrative functions more extensively.

(3) In all seven selected administrative categories of planning, staffing, scheduling, evaluation, financing, public relations, and records and reports, the percentage of time spent on performing those functions over a range of recreation activities was greater for recreation directors than for community education directors.

Recommendations for Further Studies

There appear to be two major areas where further study should be pursued. One area which seems of great importance is that of training. Both community education directors and recreation directors are involved with the delivery of recreation services. There are numerous institutions of higher education offering degree programs or emphasis areas
in both the community education and recreation fields. Because certain skills have been identified as being important for those who are administering recreation activities, a study of the existing curricula could be made to ascertain if these skills are being developed. A further study in the area of training could direct itself towards quality of the recreation activities offered by both community education directors and recreation directors and the impact the training for the delivery of those activities has on that quality. Other areas of training such as workshops, seminars, conferences, and individual consultation could be studied to determine the impact which each may have on developing necessary administrative skills.

A second area of study which could prove very beneficial is the identification of select programs which reflect various types of delivery systems of recreation services and which are having apparent success. The identification of various models, which are providing recreation services either through a community education system solely or through the cooperation in some fashion with another agency or governmental unit and an extensive study of those models, could provide important information in the following areas:

1. Various ways of successful cooperation among and between agencies.

2. Methods of administering recreation services.
3. Patterns of funding recreation services.

4. How competition and duplication can be lessened or eliminated.

5. Types of recreation services that can be provided.

This information would be helpful to those communities which are initiating a program to provide recreation activities or wish to improve and strengthen an existing program. It also would be beneficial in aiding to eliminate any conflict which may now exist between community education directors and recreation directors.
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APPENDIX A

Survey Instrument
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Below you will find a list of twelve recreation activity areas. Under each activity area is space for you to enter up to four of your most popular program offerings that apply to that category. If you sponsor more than four activities within a category, please list the four you feel were your most popular. If you do not sponsor activities in a category or did not sponsor four, please list just those you have sponsored. You will also notice there are seven questions that pertain to each activity that you list. You are asked to place a check (✓) mark on the appropriate line under each of the seven columns where you have undertaken that function within the last twelve months.

1 = Do you plan this activity?

2 = Do you assign staff to conduct this activity?

3 = Do you make the necessary arrangements for provision of the appropriate area or facility for this activity?

4 = Do you utilize evaluative techniques to determine the effectiveness of this activity?

5 = Do you make the necessary financial arrangements for this activity?

6 = Do you investigate and respond to public requests, suggestions, and complaints regarding this activity?

7 = Do you maintain data relevant to the continuous, smooth operation of this activity?

Recreation Categories 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DANCE:

____________________  — — — — — — — — —

____________________  — — — — — — — — —

____________________  — — — — — — — — —

____________________  — — — — — — — — —
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAMATICS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS AND CRAFTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAYGROUND PROGRAMS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUATICS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Categories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EVENTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR RECREATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL RECREATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETICS AND SPORTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE PROJECTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recreation Categories  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

HANDICAPPED PROGRAMS:

Please indicate the percentage of time spent performing duties in each of the seven categories below. This percentage should reflect only the time spent in the recreation areas identified above and should not account for the total time spent on your job performing duties outside the area of recreation.

___% -- 1 (program planning)
___% -- 2 (staffing)
___% -- 3 (areas and facilities)
___% -- 4 (evaluation)
___% -- 5 (financial arrangements)
___% -- 6 (public relations)
___% -- 7 (records and reports)
As you know, due to the growing demand by the public for constructive leisure-time opportunities, numerous agencies within our state are programming recreation activities. I am attempting to determine the variety and the frequency of such activities as well as the administrative functions performed in providing recreation programs.

As part of this mailing, you will find a questionnaire which seeks your response to the importance of recreation activities in relationship to your overall program offerings. The questionnaire is also designed to examine the various administrative functions you perform in providing these activities. I am asking that you take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

You will notice that your questionnaire is coded with a number appearing in the top left-hand corner of page two. This number will be removed as soon as your questionnaire is received so that no one, including myself, will be able to identify a particular questionnaire with a particular person.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study, please enclose a note to that effect.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Patrick T. Long
Mott Intern
Community School Development Center

Donald C. Weaver
Professor
Educational Leadership

Enclosures (2)
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APPENDIX C

Follow-Up Letter
February 16, 1977

Dear Community Education/Recreation Director:

A few weeks ago a survey was mailed to you requesting information relative to the type and extent of recreation activities offered by your department and the administrative functions performed in providing those activities.

If you did not receive that mailing or if you have been unable to find time to complete the survey, would you please take time now to do so. Because you are one of a limited population receiving the survey, it is important that I secure the information you can provide.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Patrick T. Long
Mott Intern
Community School Development Center

Enclosures (2)
APPENDIX D

Tip Sheet
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SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING RECREATION SERVICES IN YOUR COMMUNITY!

Consider the recreational needs of all residents of all ages within your community.

Organize recreation programs as thoroughly and competently as any other aspect of your community education program.

Maintain credibility by providing for quality of programs rather than quantity.

Monetary planning is the foundation of your program—budget responsibly and be accountable for your expenditures.

Unlock the doors of your community facilities—nights, evenings, weekends, vacations, daytime, always.

Nothing is as important as having satisfied participants who have achieved success in their leisure pursuits.

Inventory all recreation resources—people—programs—land—facilities.

Therapeutic Recreation means equal leisure opportunities for special populations—elderly, mentally ill, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, etc.

Youth Serving Agencies are providing positive recreational experiences for our young people. Utilize their expertise to insure a well-balanced Community Education program.
Educate your residents to the proper use of leisure time by providing alternatives for leisure.

Develop rapport with community organizations to encourage their support, cooperation, and involvement in recreation developments.

Unite the efforts of municipal, county, regional, state, and federal agencies which currently provide recreational experiences.

Competent and trained leadership should be provided for all recreation programs.

Additional liaison is needed between physical resource management and community education personnel to insure proper utilization of our natural environment.

Thorough supervision will contribute to safe practices being employed in any recreation setting.

Involving the people you intend to serve in the planning for their programs and facilities.

Outdoor recreation developments can be enhanced by grant programs such as provided by Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Now is the best time to begin using recreational experiences for the enrichment of your residents.

Developed by Patrick T. Long, Recreation and Park Administration, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota.