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This study investigated the perceptions of administrators of the YMCA and municipal recreation departments in the state of Texas concerning their cooperative relationship in the use of areas and facilities, personnel management, and program planning.

A questionnaire was used to obtain their perceptions. Of the 140 questionnaires mailed, ninety-two were returned that were able to be utilized in the study. Their responses were analyzed using the Chi-Square test.

The findings revealed a general agreement concerning the lack of cooperation between them. This was evidenced in that they "never" or "seldom" communicated, consulted with the other, initiated joint sponsorship of programs, or cooperated in the three specified areas of recreational programming.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A notable development in recent years in American life has been the increase of cooperation in the industrial sector of the economy. Despite the tendency for competitiveness within business, private industry, and government, a trend toward voluntary cooperation has tended to suppress the struggles concerned with money-making ventures and distribution of wealth (9, pp. 110-113).

The fields "of recreation, informal education, and leisure-time activities" have been among the most recent to feel the impact of this need for more cooperation (3, p. 1). Some alert leaders in the field have begun to ask themselves the question of what should be their strategy regarding their relations with "existing and future government and governmental agencies and programs" and private sectors of recreation (3, p. 1). While the thinking of recreation and park professionals has led to the possibility of "stagnation" of community recreation programs, services, and facilities, many leaders in the field of recreation and leisure services anticipate the increase of cooperation between recreational agencies to restore the effectiveness of their programs (2, p. 67).
Two segments of recreation that are involved in the overall aspect of community-centered recreation are municipal recreation and the YMCA. Whereas municipal recreation theoretically serves the general citizenry, the YMCA, as a voluntary recreation and service organization, serves special groups within the citizenry. In reality, though, it has been revealed that municipal recreation bases its services around low or middle income groups who want a varied, all-around kind of recreation (5, pp. 79-80; 9, pp. 111-113). At the same time, the YMCA serves individuals and groups of people that are characterized by their homogeneity in regard to their interest in specialized kinds of recreation, such as swimming and gym-related activities (7, pp. 19-25; 8, p. 401).

According to Newling and others (7, p. 19; 13, p. 13; 14, p. 300; 17, pp. 18-20), however, the YMCA has been changing its image in recent years to one that is community-minded and community-spirited. YMCA leaders want to be able to add more to the community by providing for some of the public's leisure needs that other community agencies oftentimes cannot provide (6, p. 62). Along with municipal recreation, the YMCA hopes to be complementary in providing a well-rounded community recreation program. With this kind of thinking, essentially, both the YMCA and municipal recreation could be serving a larger and more inclusive citizenry than is currently being served.
Working with and alongside each other is practical and logical. Both agencies advocate an overall view of service and assistance to its patrons for richer and more satisfying lives. They stress the right of each person to develop inward and outward qualities through recreation, and they both appreciate an obligation to assist the individual by creating conditions or services that make this possible (8, pp. 247, 382). They have similar aspirations, and they have mutual areas of concern and interest (16, p. 72).

Cooperation carries immense implications for both the YMCA and municipal recreation. Especially is this true in minimizing the duplication of programs, allowing for more efficient use of personnel, and encouraging a better range of facilities (3, pp. 89-91). Coordinating their services and cooperating to achieve similar objectives are vital to both.

Quizzically, this same cooperative relationship between the YMCA and municipal recreation has received limited evaluation and study. For the most part, there has been very little focus on the perceptions of either agency's personnel concerning this cooperative relationship (11, pp. 16-17).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to evaluate the perceptions of YMCA and municipal recreation department directors
and administrators in the state of Texas concerning the status of their cooperative relationships in recreational programming. More specifically, their perceptions were evaluated in three areas of recreational programming concerning the (1) use of facilities and areas, (2) personnel management, and (3) program planning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was cooperation between the YMCA and municipal recreation departments throughout the state of Texas concerning the (1) use of facilities and areas, (2) personnel management, and (3) program planning.

Significance of the Study

Both the YMCA and municipal recreation have exhibited similar problems that need to be resolved. Providing opportunities for individuals' leisure pursuits while avoiding duplication with other agencies' utilization of resources have not only been desirable, but necessary for each one's particular success (5, p. 79). According to Fitzgerald (5, p. 80), the location and use of recreational facilities such as gymnasiums, swimming pools, and athletic plants were considerations that were especially important to an agency like the YMCA. Greiner (6) stated in similar terms that local park and recreation agencies were also confronted by "duplicated activities, reproduced facilities
already available and replicated programs already being provided by trained recreation professionals" and were to be considered "a waste of recreation programming" (6, p. 14).

Moreover, both the YMCAs and municipal recreation departments are struggling to solidify their finances. Both agencies are protecting their own areas of concern to insure adequate funding of programs (6, p. 16). Tax dollars for municipal recreation programming and public donations and contributions for the YMCA are difficult to substantiate when they both offer programs that are in competition with the other.

Another need in recreation services is obtaining personnel who are capable of formulating and running a well-rounded program (4, p. 7). The human factor is paramount, especially when personal attitudes can so easily pervade a recreation program, oftentimes bringing success or failure. The intangibles of neighborliness and cooperation so often reflect the spirit of the recreation department. And, based upon department personnel's attitudes toward their work in recreational services, many customer and clientele groups are unfavorably impressed with the services from many recreational agencies (4, p. 236). Agency personnel are necessary, then, in relaying cooperativeness to both their agency's patrons and to their professional counterparts in other recreational agencies.
The problem of providing adequate facilities, finances, personnel, and planning that are conducive to operating a well-rounded program is a problem that both municipal recreation departments and YMCAs need to have resolved. By consorting their concerns and resources toward an overall integration, they would likely enhance each one's effectiveness in meeting its own needs while supporting and promoting the same overall possibility for success by the other (9, p. 113).

To resolve these problems in recreational services in the community and to bring about quality output from each agency, there must be "effective cooperation among agencies offering similar services" (11, p. 5). Consequently, the primary problem in this study was to examine this same cooperative situation between the public and private sectors of recreational services. Specifically, the municipal recreation departments of the public sector and the YMCAs of the private sector were studied to determine the need for greater cooperation between them.

Delimitations

This study was delimited as follows:

1. Questionnaires were sent only to those leaders of municipal recreation departments and YMCA branch extensions in Texas communities in which both municipal recreation departments and YMCA branch extensions were located.
2. Municipal recreation administrators included in the study denoted the chief executive of the parks and recreation department, which was either the Director of Parks and Recreation, or the Superintendent of Recreation, or the Area Parks and Recreation Supervisor.

3. YMCA administrators included in the study denoted either the Physical Director of the branch extension or the Executive Director in case of no position of Physical Director.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Community--refers to "units of social and territorial organization which, . . . , may also be called hamlets, villages, towns, cities, or metropolitan areas" (12, p. 3).

Cooperation--a "voluntary association in which men combine for the double purpose of working together to produce wealth, and of sharing that wealth among them not by a competitive struggle, but on principles of reason and equity agreed beforehand" (18, p. 210).

Program--a schedule of activities whereby individuals or groups make use of facilities, equipment, and planned leadership; it involves (1) planning, organizing, and providing leadership for the program's activities, (2) providing facilities for individual or group use, and (3) providing
assistance to other agencies in the community in the form of consultation, cosponsoring activities, and contracting resources to other recreational agencies (8, p. 246).

**Recreation, municipal**—public, tax-supported agencies within villages, cities, and towns that provide opportunities to its citizenry for the worthy use of leisure (8, p. 4).

**Recreation, voluntary**—nongovernmental social agencies and organizations that serve special age groups or program interests (8, p. 5).

**YMCA**—Young Men's Christian Association, a "formal organization designed to assist community members in the constructive use of their spare time" (19, p. 3).
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Change is the pervasive fact of our day—changing values, changing communications, changing transportation, changing public service demands, changing patterns of living and working (18, p. 6).

Many forces are at work today in our society causing change. Some of these changes are noticeable in the area of community development, where such forces as specialization, complexity, mobility, large-scale operation, divided loyalties, and mounting fiscal problems are predominant (18, p. 6). From these forces one occurring change is the availability of resources in the community to cover community-wide needs and uses. More clearly stated, this is a problem that involves a lack of availability of community resources for community-wide use (13, pp. 110-113).

One community resource that deserves particular attention is the human factor, where people are continually relating to and dealing with other people. Where people are, there is a community situation (18, p. 6). If the community is experiencing change or conflict, its people are duly affected. Personal relationships, then, are as vital as ever.

Other vital resources to the community, other than its people, include its finances and physical surroundings. In
community recreation is this particularly true. The limited resources that are available warrants some sort of means of combining community individuals and groups into a coalition that is working towards providing recreational services for the community as a whole.

An arrangement of this kind of coalition would require the development of an increased amount of interagency and intergovernmental cooperation and coordination (11, p. 19). According to Fitzgerald (7, p. 79), consideration and respect for this tenet makes possible situations in which recreation efforts may be mutually benefitting to participating agencies. Two such agencies that could possibly benefit each other are the YMCA and municipal recreation.

Both of these agencies recognize the importance of cooperation. Authorities from both agencies seem to realize the necessity for mutual support and coordination of efforts, especially to prevent duplicated activities, reproduced facilities, and replicated programs (9, p. 14). Through this attitude of good will, they could reduce the problems of competitiveness and ambition at the expense of the other (10, p. 25).

A well-balanced and complete program by both agencies is unlikely without some degree of cooperation between them. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether a single recreational authority should or could administer all recreational
services for a community. A team relationship, then, is possible and should be sought where leadership, programs, areas and facilities, and other resources are included as elements for cooperation (11, p. 19).

Review of Related Literature

Relationships between agencies and groups within the community can easily dictate overall successes or failures for plans, projects, and programs. In recreation the relationship of the YMCA and municipal recreation is one such example regarding the importance of cooperation and coordination of efforts within the community.

Several authors have indicated that, although the YMCA and municipal recreation are two community agencies that have functions that are closely related, they do not cooperate to their maximum potential.

Miklich (16) noted in his study that one main reason why the YMCA and municipal recreation do not cooperate to their maximum potential is because of each one's tendency to protect its own program interests. He stated:

Competition between agencies does exist for resources such as money and program participants. There is also the built-in tendency on the part of agencies to perpetuate and protect their own self-interests which leads to autonomous units divorced from any type of cooperative efforts (16, p. 223).

The financial overtone behind each one's existence is reiterated by Greiner (9) as, perhaps, the most significant
reason for these groups not cooperating fully. He pointed out:

Public recreation agencies are fighting for the same tough dollar and are jealously guarding their own areas of concern, and private agencies, not endowed with public funds, are fighting for their lives. Out of this life and death struggle, somehow harmony and cooperation are supposed to reign supreme (9, p. 16).

Davis (6) indicated his concern for the funding problem within community agencies in a memorandum to members of the National Recreation and Park Association. He stated:

I urge you as a park recreation leader to take the initiative among the agencies in your area to develop an effective, cooperative written agreement so that the park and recreation agency is in the forefront of stretching tax dollars through interagency cooperation, eliminating competition and duplication and delivering more and better services to all citizens (6, p. 1).

In a noncooperative situation all concerned are hurt, particularly the public. Pierrel (19) recognized the importance of eliminating competition that was particularly at the expense of the public when he wrote:

Community relationships, it has been seen, are inevitable and desirable. No organization can live to itself in today's communities. No one organization can provide all the services needed. The needs of the people are interwoven. The organizations which serve them must work closely together (19, pp. 310-311).

Both money and patrons are major reasons for the struggle between the YMCA and municipal recreation (16, p. 201). However, other significant reasons are involved in the problem.
Miklich (16, p. 224) suggested that each agency needed to feel adequate and fit for cooperation to take place, especially to minimize the conflict that was created in the process. He went on to write:

Before any cooperation can effectively take place between agencies, there must be a feeling of self-adequacy by the members of the organization. . . . Each agency should feel adequate and not defensive in order for cooperation to occur. A feeling of inadequacy might cause agencies to hold back unless, of course, they receive encouragement or are aided in some process to overcome their inadequacies. In these instances, agency personnel who resist getting involved in cooperative efforts for fear of losing more than they will gain should participate initially in a very low risk cooperative situation (16, p. 224).

Miklich (16, p. 11) pointed out that both recreational agencies were not doing as much as they possibly could in offering community-wide recreational programs, possibly because the personnel of each agency were not aware of services available from the other. Without an established relationship with the other agency and its personnel, the chances are slim for being familiarized and acquainted with the other. Familiarity with and awareness of each agency's services would be a help in bridging the gap in the cooperative relationship of the YMCA and municipal recreation.

A similar train of thought concerns the factor of personality in an agency's personnel. Coordination efforts can be unsuccessful in many instances because of personality clashes between key members of the agencies. To maintain a
harmony in relationships, personal contact should be kept as often as possible. According to Hjelte and Shivers:

Harmonious official relations tend to be cultivated through personal contact and joint effort. A plan of coordination can be effective only if it cultivates good will between the representatives and disseminates information among them of what each is doing and can do toward the common objective (11, p. 95).

In reality, then, the behavior of agency personnel in leadership roles and administrative roles has much bearing on the effectiveness of that agency and the type of relationship it has with other agencies (16, p. 4).

Another possible constraint on agency cooperation efforts was expressed by Meyer and Brightbill (15) to be planning between agencies. Planning with little or no interplay from other agencies was often damaging and resulted in strained or broken relationships (15, p. 26). They continued:

That public and private agencies can coordinate their services and cooperate to achieve a single purpose [in planning] is not merely something to hope for, or to provide conversation for the philosophers. It [should have] already been translated into action (15, p. 55).

The President's Council on Youth Opportunity (20) indicated its concern for the importance of joint planning between public and private agencies such as the YMCA and municipal recreation. Joint planning could facilitate meeting the needs of the community by establishing year-round working relationships and developing a procedure for planning and programming for community recreational activities (20, p. 72).
Miklich (16) added convincing support to the need for more cooperative planning between the YMCA and municipal recreation. He wrote:

Agency personnel, especially those in administrative capacities, would have to be committed to a type of administrative pattern which provides the machinery for a friendly, cooperative relationship between each of the recreational agencies. They would have to recognize that, through cooperative planning, it would be possible for the agencies to complement each other's programs, lessen duplication and/or multiply resources and reduce the perceived conflict that was found to exist (16, pp. 222-223).

In the planning process decision-making plays a large part of the influence that planning produces in successes or failures. The decisions that either the YMCA or municipal recreation makes will have an imposing influence on each other. Lutzin and Storey (13) phrased it in this way:

The decisions of any segment of the recreation system influence and shape the decisions of other segments (13, p. 116).

Using the YMCA and municipal recreation to illustrate the idea, they continued:

For example, the desire of a YMCA to undertake a capital improvements drive has numerous consequences. It may be in conflict with the plans of the park and recreation department to submit a bond issue to public referendum. The Boy Scouts may be petitioning the Community Chest for additional funds for the expansion of their camping program, a feature also under consideration as a phase of the capital improvements request of the YMCA. If the efforts of these interdependent elements of the system are not coordinated all three may experience defeat, or the success of one may embitter relationships and negate future cooperation (13, p. 116).
Meyer and Brightbill (15) injected another importance of cooperative planning into the discussion of roles of the YMCA and municipal recreation. They suggested that cooperative planning was necessary to help alleviate funding burdens through sharing of recreation costs. Moreover, other repercussions were likely, such as competition for funds, areas of deficiency, an overlapping in service, with "resulting public criticisms and curtailment of support" (15, p. 436). In addition they wrote:

When planned cooperatively, agencies are in a better position to assist each other in the securing of their respective budgets (15, p. 436).

Another possible constraint on cooperative efforts by the YMCA and municipal recreation is the amount of communication between them. Because of differences of opinion, varying approaches for operation within each agency, and any potential areas of discord, communication would be an important key to fostering better relationships between agencies, leading to greater chances for cooperation (16, p. 217). Miklich (16) continued:

In the case of Parks and Recreation and the YMCA, where there was significance, the difference in perceptions might simply be the result of the agencies not communicating with each other. Communication is essentially the cornerstone to cooperation and coordination. The strength of agency relationships depends on effective two-way communication carried out by personnel in each agency, and it appeared that, based on the data, greater communication needed to take place (16, p. 211).
He further added that communication was largely the responsibility of the administrative directors and leaders of both agencies. He wrote:

It was felt that in each of the two agencies, especially the directors and administrative staff, should make a special effort to establish better communication with each other regarding what role they perceived their agency should play in rendering recreational services and to what extent, and in what way cooperation should take place between them. With the emphasis being placed on cooperative efforts, it was imperative that each agency work toward establishing a level of cooperation more congruent and, hopefully, of a higher level than what was perceived in this study (16, p. 211).

Kraus (12) enumerated some possibilities for a cooperative arrangement between the YMCA and municipal recreation. He mentioned communication between them as a major area for improvement. As he indicated, "there would be frequent interchange of ideas, and communication designed to minimize the duplication or overlap of services, and to identify gaps in services which should be filled" (12, p. 411).

Planning the use of facilities and areas is another part of the constraining influence that exists in the cooperation of the YMCA and municipal recreation. Especially where no facilities exist, both agencies should plan and develop needed facilities for their cooperative and mutual use (16, p. 227). Several writers are particularly outspoken about the use of facilities and areas in a cooperative relationship. In the YMCA and municipal recreation connection, Hardy (10), Fitzgerald (7), and Miklich (16) share their views.
Hardy (10) wrote in depth about the working relationship that should be developed between public recreation and the YMCA. Concerning the use of areas and facilities, he indicated that "the YMCA should place its best and most expensive facilities" in community areas in which it could best serve its patrons and show visible evidence of its faith in the future of these areas, especially in the deteriorating areas of cities (10, p. 20). Furthermore, he noted that, in regard to planning the use of these areas and facilities, material acquisitiveness was not as important as giving way to goodwill and cooperation so that a sense of common humanity could "override competitiveness and ambition" (10, p. 25).

Fitzgerald supported the sentiments that Hardy expressed but carried it into a discussion of both agencies. He wrote:

A factor of major concern today calling for cooperative endeavor by the public and private agency relates to location and use of large-type recreation facilities such as gymnasiums, swimming pools and other extensive developments for recreation opportunities for physical activities. This consideration is especially important to agencies like the YMCA and the YWCA which operate programs for young people as differentiated from other voluntary groups such as the PTA, veterans' organizations, and service clubs which are primarily interested in stimulation of recreation rather than operation of an activity program. Rather than plan the erection of such facilities as part of its plant the private agency should lend its support to plans and efforts of the public agency to supply the needed areas and facilities in every neighborhood of the community. The public agency in turn should recognize the right of the private agency in the community to a share in the use of public facilities (7, p. 87).
Thus, swimming pools, gymnasiums, and the like are special facilities around which the YMCA and municipal recreation could center their cooperative plans and ideas. Other possibilities for facilities and areas also exist for their cooperation. However, extensive indoor developments are more conducive, in view of the sentiments of Fitzgerald (7) and Hardy (10), for a mutually-supporting relationship between the YMCA and municipal recreation.

Miklich (16, p. 202) noted in his study that a large amount of conflict was expressed between municipal recreation and the YMCA concerning the accessibility of recreational facilities for community people. For those agencies which have recreational facilities located at various geographic areas in the community, allowing easier access to various recreational programs and activities is a source of discord that could be resolved in a cooperative arrangement between the agencies. Although an agency such as the municipal recreation department seems to have an advantage over an agency such as the YMCA in accessibility and number of facilities and areas in the community, combining physical resources for coordination and mutual support could mean the difference in failure and success for both agencies.

As it has been discussed and illustrated in this chapter, there are several factors that are constraining to a cooperative relationship between the YMCA and municipal recreation. Factors such as competition for money and program participants,
planning with little or no feedback, lack of communication, and protecting one's own program interests have been noted as significant constraints on cooperation. Yet, one factor that is paramount is the apathy in this situation. Agencies may talk as though they want cooperation, but no real results are realized until something is done to initiate that cooperation. Action is what is needed. According to Fitzgerald (7, p. 239), leadership and setting a proper example are what is needed, as they are factors that "give life to a recreation service." Moreover, he noted that "it makes meaningful all the other provisions of a good recreation service, i.e., administrative authority, finance, facilities, program, and community relationships" (7, p. 239).

Realizing a genuine desire to initiate leadership for cooperation should be the striving and earnest attempt for both the YMCA and municipal recreation. Hjelte and Shivers (11) recommended that the municipal recreation agency would be the outstanding choice for the leader who would put words into cooperative action. They stated:

The public recreational service should be actively related to all such [recreational] councils and may provide the impetus for coordination with and between the various social agencies of the community. In addition it consults with, advises and assists private organizations concerned with recreation. The purpose of these activities is to obtain the maximum possible benefit from existing facilities, manpower, and finances by the administration of a comprehensive, long range program (11, p. 94).
Accordingly, the National Joint Continuing Steering Committee recommended that municipal recreation authorities throughout the nation should listen to the possibilities for cooperation and act in a leading capacity to insure its successful implementation in community recreation programs (17, p. 7).

On the other hand, the YMCA voiced its approval to become involved with public recreation in changing old patterns and procedures of isolating themselves from each other. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the Urban Action Commission of the National Board of YMCA's recommended as "A Call to Action for All Local YMCA's" that local YMCA's follow and assist the lead of municipal recreation in bridging their cooperative relationship today. These recommendations were:

1. We recommend that the National Council and its member units look upon the Urban Crisis as its major concern for the year ahead and that this urgency be reflected by every Association's reconsideration of its program priorities, its internal policies, its financial allotments, and the composition of its decision-making bodies.

2. We recommend that YMCA's assume responsibility for bringing persons together for "up close" confrontations, involving representatives of diverse elements within their cities.

3. We recommend that Urban Training programs be launched for staff members to understand and assess the problems of our cities and the relationships of urban to suburban life, and that Special Training programs be developed for Outreach Workers.

4. We recommend that the YMCA's decision-making bodies be re-structured in composition to be more representative in age, race, sex, and community influence.
5. We recommend that the YMCA join with others in coalitions of effort to give more and better coordinated attention to the problems of the poor.

6. We recommend that the YMCA, in order to relate maximally to the human disruptions of our time, be prepared to share in the development of public opinion and policy by taking positions on the issues that have deep bearing on the lives of persons (22).

It has been suggested, then, by this commission for YMCAs to assume responsibility for, particularly, confronting municipal recreation and other authorities with the problems that they could jointly resolve and overcome. Yet, the YMCAs are reminded to not move too fast by trying to lead and direct this cooperative process.

Change, then, as suggested at the beginning of this chapter, can be perceived in community recreational services, particularly concerning the cooperative relationship between two community recreational agencies. Namely, these agencies are the YMCA and municipal recreation. Both advocate and show an interest in cooperation with each other. Both are reaching a point at which their successes will depend on their ability to coordinate their respective plans and ideas to better serve their constituents within the community. Their involvement could very possibly be beneficial for both of them.

Summary

A review of literature has been presented in this chapter dealing with the phenomenon of "cooperation,"
specifically in the relationship of the YMCA and municipal recreation. The literature reviewed indicated that cooperation could help both of them, regardless of the extent of their cooperation. As Greiner indicated:

The job of providing for the public's leisure needs is so vast that no one agency can expect to do it alone. . . . Cooperation and consultation--not competition--among agencies are the answer (9, p. 62).

Leadership needs to be assumed by one of the agencies to initiate a process of cooperation. The responsibility for continuing to support the other belongs to both.

Chase (3), in discussing how the field of recreation and leisure services would be affected without the element of cooperation, probably said it the best:

The time has come for the true recreation and park professional to take the initiative--to investigate and learn from the many triumphs of the commercial recreation enterprise. If changes in some archaic thinking are not soon made and community recreation programs, services, and facilities are not soon rejuvenated, present stagnation will lead ultimately to complete inability to meet increasing demands of the American people for high-quality leisure-time opportunities (3, p. 67).
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This was a study of the perceptions of municipal recreation administrators and YMCA directors throughout the state of Texas concerning the status of their cooperative relationships. Specifically, their perceptions were sought concerning the use of facilities and areas, personnel management, and program planning as aspects of recreational programming.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the instrument used in the study, the methods used in collecting data, and the procedures used in analyzing the data.

Description of the Instrument

A questionnaire survey was used to obtain the perceptions of YMCA and municipal recreation authorities. The questionnaire consisted of statements that were related to both agencies' policies toward their program planning and operation.

The questionnaire was comprised of statements that were formulated by the author. In devising the questionnaire, information was obtained from a questionnaire by Miklich (3) for designing, organizing, and phrasing statements that were
geared towards achieving perceptions towards recreational programming. His questionnaire was designed to gain, specifically, the perceptions of personnel from four recreational agencies in Flint, Michigan concerning their views of agency involvement in recreational programs and agency cooperation. Thus, the questionnaire developed by Miklich and and the questionnaire developed by this author were similar (Appendix A).

Three important aspects of programming were utilized in formulating the questionnaire. These were the (1) use of areas and facilities, (2) personnel management between agencies, and (3) coordinated program planning between agencies (2, pp. 95-96). Based upon the responses of the recreational authorities used in this study regarding these aspects of programming, it was possible to suggest whether or not the respondents thought that cooperation was possible in both agencies' programming efforts.

Whereas Miklich was assessing the extent of conflict between recreational agencies, this study was to investigate the responses of each agency's representative toward the status of cooperative efforts for both groups. In assessing the extent of cooperation that existed between the YMCA and municipal recreation, each respondent was asked to indicate for each of the twenty program statements (1) his or her perceptions to what extent their agency was involved in
offering each program and (2) his or her perceptions of how much the other agency was involved in the same programs (3, p. 93).

Procedure for Collecting Data

The population used in this study was taken from the (1) Mid-America Region of the National Council of YMCAs, which contained the list of YMCA branch extensions in the state of Texas along with each branch's administrators, and the (2) Texas Recreation and Park Society Membership List, which contained the names and addresses of municipal recreation department administrators in the state of Texas. Both lists are included in Appendix B, and both lists are 1975-76 records of both groups' respective members.

At the time of this study, fifty-four communities in the state of Texas had both YMCAs and a municipal recreation department. From this number a total possible response from each group would have been a return of seventy questionnaires, as some communities had several sources of response from both the YMCA and municipal recreation. To achieve results that were reliable and acceptable for this study, sampling was unnecessary. The universe group of seventy was the population for consideration. This represented an overall possible response of 140 recreational authorities throughout the state of Texas.
The questionnaire was mailed to full-time, professional administrators in either YMCA branch extensions or municipal recreation departments. Along with the questionnaire, the study was explained, and background information was included to introduce the study. Anonymity was assured to each respondent.

A postcard follow-up was mailed three weeks after the mailing of the questionnaire to those respondents in the study who had not returned their questionnaires. This mailing was a reminder to encourage the participant to complete the questionnaire and to return it as soon as possible (1, p. 113).

Procedure for Analysis of Data

Interpretation of the data involved determining whether or not a significant difference existed between the perceptions of the municipal recreation administrators and the YMCA directors. A primary investigation involved comparing the responses of both groups for each statement of the questionnaire. This was utilized to determine significant differences concerning particular statements.

To analyze the data, the Chi-Square test for independence of variables was utilized (5, p. 254). The .05 level of confidence was used throughout the interpretation and analysis of data.
Summary

This chapter presented the methods and procedures that were used to determine whether significant differences exist in the perceptions of YMCA directors and municipal recreation department administrators in the state of Texas toward policy-related statements that were included in the questionnaire. The population for both groups was taken from membership lists, which were (1) the Mid-America Region of the National Council of YMCAs and (2) the Texas Recreation and Park Society Membership List.

Each statement of the questionnaire was analyzed using the Chi-Square test for independence of variables. All raw data obtained from this study were processed at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Computing Center.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Overview of Data Collected

The results of this study are presented in this chapter. Information is reported on agency response, current positions of the respondents, sex, age, and their highest levels of educational achievement. Also, a comparison is made between the responses of the administrators of the YMCA and municipal recreation departments.

The perceptions of the respondents from both agencies were analyzed statistically. The analysis made it possible to make inferences as to whether or not both agencies were cooperating with each other in three areas of programming concerning the use of areas and facilities, personnel management, and program planning. Furthermore, determinations could be made regarding whether or not greater cooperation was suggested between them.

Of the 140 questionnaires that were mailed, 99 were completed and returned, showing a return rate of 70.7 per cent. Of these, seven had to be discarded because of not following directions. The adjusted rate of return was 65.7 per cent. An overview of this response is given in Table I.
TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE FROM
THE AGENCIES STUDIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER SENT</th>
<th>NUMBER RETURNED</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL RECREATION</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II shows the distribution of the agency response according to the types of administrators. The majority of respondents were Agency Directors.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSE OF AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY DIRECTOR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION DIRECTOR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM DIRECTOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table III, data obtained indicated that the majority of respondents were males. The data also revealed that the greater percentage of personnel taking part in the study in each agency were males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YMCA N</th>
<th>YMCA %</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION N</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION %</th>
<th>TOTALS N</th>
<th>TOTALS %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age distributions between agencies were recorded and presented in Table IV. The YMCA indicated having younger respondents in this study, with approximately 70 per cent of their respondents being in the "Less than 25" and "25-39" years of age brackets while the municipal recreation departments showed approximately 54 per cent of their respondents being in the same age brackets. For both agencies, however, the greatest percentage occurred in the "25-39" age bracket.
TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION BY AGE OF RESPONDENTS IN AGENCIES STUDIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>YMCA N</th>
<th>YMCA %</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION N</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION %</th>
<th>TOTALS N</th>
<th>TOTALS %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 AND OVER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the highest level of educational achievement between agencies, the YMCA showed a majority of its respondents to have college degrees, most of which were Bachelor's degrees. The respondents from the municipal recreation departments showed a majority to have college degrees, although it was a lesser majority than the YMCA. Very few respondents from either agency possessed graduate degrees, as 30 per cent and 13 per cent of the YMCA and municipal recreation departments, respectively, indicated this. All respondents had received a high school education. All YMCA respondents continued their education in college, whereas approximately 11 per cent of the municipal recreation department respondents did not. Altogether, the YMCA had an overall higher level of educational achievement indicated from its personnel.
as compared with the indications of the municipal recreation departments' personnel. This comparison is illustrated in that approximately 94 per cent of the YMCAs' respondents had obtained college degrees, and only 74 per cent of the municipal recreation department's respondents possessed college degrees. Table V contains a record of these figures.

### TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN AGENCIES STUDIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL RECREATION</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended High School</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>5 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended College</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>7 15.2</td>
<td>10 10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>28 60.8</td>
<td>28 60.8</td>
<td>56 60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>13 28.3</td>
<td>6 13.0</td>
<td>19 20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist's Degree</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate's Degree</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46 100.0</td>
<td>46 100.0</td>
<td>92 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology for Data Analysis

The data collected for analysis in this study were obtained from administrators' perceptions toward policy-related statements concerning recreational programming. The instrument used for this data collection was constructed for the purpose of obtaining their responses toward agency involvement in recreational programs and their perceptions toward the cooperation between the YMCA and municipal recreation departments in the state of Texas.

Data analysis was accomplished by using the Chi-Square test for independence of variables. This was concerned with comparing overall agency responses for each statement of the questionnaire to determine which statements carried significant differences in the perceptions of both agencies' administrators. By this comparison it was possible to infer whether or not both agencies were cooperating with each other in the areas of recreational programming concerning (1) the use of areas and facilities, (2) personnel management, and (3) program planning.

The statements concerning agency cooperation in the use of each other's areas and facilities are presented first. Seven statements were contained in this block, making seven comparisons to be analyzed using the Chi-Square test.

The first statement for analysis was statement five in the questionnaire. Findings from the analysis showed that there was significant difference in the perceptions of both
agencies' personnel regarding the extent to which they perceived their respective agency to initiate communication with the other regarding interagency sharing of facilities.

Of the YMCA personnel approximately 78 per cent responded "Occasionally" to "Always", while only 52 per cent of the municipal recreation personnel responded in this range. Accordingly, both groups responded differently in the "Never" to "Seldom" range, as approximately 48 per cent of the municipal personnel responded in this range as compared to only 22 per cent of the YMCA personnel. This suggests that the YMCA personnel were trying to initiate communication more than the municipal recreation authorities were. Table VI records these findings.

The second statement for analysis dealt with the respondents' perceptions toward the extent to which the other agency initiated communication with their agency regarding the sharing of each other's facilities. Analysis of the data indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of the two agencies. Both the YMCA personnel and the municipal recreation department personnel were in agreement that the other agency tended to initiate communication with them regarding the sharing of each other's facilities. These findings are in Table VII.
TABLE VI
EACH AGENCY INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH THE
OTHER REGARDING INTERAGENCY
SHARING OF FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER CENT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 12.94; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.0116 \]
TABLE VII
THE OTHER AGENCY INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH
THEIR AGENCY REGARDING INTERAGENCY
SHARING OF FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>8 17.4</td>
<td>11 23.9</td>
<td>10 21.7</td>
<td>13 28.3</td>
<td>4 8.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>14 30.4</td>
<td>14 30.4</td>
<td>10 21.7</td>
<td>6 13.0</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLUMN TOTAL | PERCENT | 22 23.9 | 25 27.2 | 20 21.7 | 19 20.7 | 6 6.5 | 92 100 |

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 5.24; \text{ df } = 4; p < 0.2634 \]
Table VIII presents a record of the analysis of data for the third statement, which is statement eight of the questionnaire. A significant difference was indicated regarding the extent to which the respondents' facilities were used by the other agency. A marked difference was revealed between both agencies' personnel, as YMCA personnel indicated that their facilities were not used by the municipal recreation departments, while municipal recreation personnel indicated a more significant amount of use of their facilities by the YMCAs.

The analysis of question nine of the questionnaire showed a significant difference in the perceptions of both agencies' personnel concerning their agency's use of the other's facilities. According to the data, approximately 96 per cent of the municipal recreation departments' personnel perceived less than occasional use of the YMCAs' facilities, and YMCA personnel perceived a smaller percentage of 76 per cent in using the municipal recreation departments' facilities on a less than occasional basis. Table IX gives the statistical account of this difference.

Both agencies were in general agreement concerning their cooperation with the other in the sharing of facilities. The majority of respondents from both the YMCA and the municipal recreation department indicated that they cooperated in the sharing of facilities "Never", "Seldom", or "Occasionally". Fifty-two per cent of the municipal administrators
and 58 per cent of the YMCA administrators responded in this way. Although the findings revealed no significant difference in their perceptions, the lack of significance did indicate that very little cooperation existed between the two agencies in the sharing of their facilities.

Respondents from both agencies were also in agreement concerning the extent to which the other agency cooperated with their agency in the sharing of facilities. Approximately 78 per cent of the municipal recreation personnel and 56 per cent of the YMCA personnel indicated that cooperation from the other agency occurred in the range from "Never" to "Occasionally". This showed a lack of cooperation between the agencies in the sharing of each other's facilities.

Table XII records the findings of the extent that both agencies consulted each other regarding the sharing of facilities. The chi-square value of 2.7133 (at four degrees of freedom) indicated no difference between the two groups and therefore was not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. This revealed that personnel from both the YMCA and the municipal recreation departments were in agreement. However, approximately 70 per cent of both agencies' responses were "Occasionally", "Seldom", or "Never". Little consultation existed between the agencies regarding their sharing of facilities.
### TABLE VIII

Each Agency's Facilities are Used by the Other Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT | 29 | 31.5 | 22 | 23.9 | 18 | 19.6 | 18 | 19.6 | 5 | 5.4 | 92 | 100 |

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 27.0864; \text{ df } = 4; p < 0.0000 \]
### Table IX

**Each Agency Uses the Facilities of the Other Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PERCENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[x^2 = 36.2208; df = 4; p < 0.0000\]
### TABLE X

**EACH AGENCY COOPERATES WITH THE OTHER REGARDING SHARING OF FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1 N</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 N</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 N</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 N</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 N</th>
<th>5 %</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 0.9000; \, df = 4; \, p < 0.9246 \]
TABLE XI
THE OTHER AGENCY COOPERATES WITH THEIR AGENCY REGARDING SHARING OF FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER CENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. SELDOM
3. OCCASIONALLY
4. USUALLY
5. ALWAYS

\[ x^2 = 7.9424; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.0937 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 2.7133; df = 4; P < 0.0609
The second block of statements was concerned with the extent to which both agencies perceived cooperation between them concerning the exchange of personnel and the extent to which they were involved in the sharing of personnel between their agencies. Four statements were contained in this block, accounting for four statistical comparisons of their perceptions.

The first statement in this category was concerned with the extent to which the respondents perceived their respective agency to initiate communication with the other agency regarding the sharing and exchanging of personnel. Whereas the municipal recreation department personnel responded conspicuously in the "Never" and "Seldom" categories, the YMCA personnel responded in a similar manner. Eighty-five per cent of the municipal recreation department personnel and 80 per cent of the YMCA personnel indicated either a "Never" or "Seldom" response. As it is indicated in Table XIII, there was no significant difference in the perceptions of either agency toward the extent to which their agency initiated communication with the other agency for the sharing of personnel. However, the overwhelming response from both agencies' respondents indicated that they felt that the communication between their agencies was lacking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNGA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: NEVER
2: SOMETIMES
3: OCCASIONALLY
4: USUALLY
5: ALWAYS

$X^2 = 6.6274; df = 4; p < 0.1569$
The next statement, which was statement fourteen of the questionnaire, was concerning the respondents' perceptions toward the extent to which the other agency initiated communication with their agency for the sharing and exchanging of personnel. No significant difference was reported in the perceptions of both agencies, as the chi-square value of 7.2160 indicated no statistical significance at the .05 level of confidence. Both agencies maintained a high record of response in the "Never" and "Seldom" categories. The YMCA personnel recorded an 88 per cent figure at those levels of response, while the municipal recreation department personnel recorded a 78 per cent figure. It was interesting to note that no municipal recreation respondent responded in the "Usually" or "Always" categories, and only 6 per cent of the YMCA respondents responded in those categories. The data indicated that, along with their general agreement in their responses, they perceived a lack of communication from the other agency concerning the sharing and exchange of personnel between their agencies. Table XIV contains a record of this comparison.

In the next statement respondents from both agencies indicated little perceived cooperation between them concerning the sharing of personnel. As recorded in Table XV, there was no significant difference in their responses. Both agencies were in agreement that they "never" or "seldom" cooperated in interagency sharing of personnel.
TABLE XIV
THE OTHER AGENCY INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH THEIR AGENCY REGARDING INTERAGENCY SHARING OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 7.2160; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.1249 \]


# TABLE XV

EACH AGENCY COOPERATES WITH THE OTHER REGARDING SHARING OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 0.9946; df = 4; p < 0.9106 \]
There was no significant difference indicated in the responses of both agencies' respondents concerning the extent to which the other agency cooperated in the sharing of personnel. Approximately 96 per cent and 94 per cent, respectively, of the municipal and YMCA personnel indicated that the other agency "never", "seldom", or "occasionally" cooperated in sharing and exchanging their personnel between the two agencies. Consequently, both agencies' personnel were in agreement toward the lack of cooperation between the agencies regarding interagency sharing of personnel. Table XVI contains a record of this comparison.

The third block of statements was concerned with the perceived extent of cooperation in recreational program planning. Nine statements were contained in this block.

The first statement in this category was concerned with the extent to which the respondents perceived joint program planning to be utilized between both of the agencies. Both groups responded noticeably in the "Never" and "Seldom" categories with 67 per cent of the municipal personnel and 78 per cent of the YMCA personnel responding. As revealed in Table XVII, there was no significant difference in both agencies' perceptions toward their joint planning efforts. This agreement indicated that both the YMCA and the municipal recreation departments made little or no effort to jointly plan their recreation programs.
TABLE XVI
THE OTHER AGENCY COOPERATES IN INTERAGENCY
SHARING OF PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 1.5690; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.8143 \]
### TABLE XVII

**Joint Planning Is Utilized Between Both Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Total Per Cent**

|        | 38 | 41.3 | 29 | 31.5 | 15 | 16.3 | 8 | 8.7 | 2 | 2.2 | 92 |

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 4.5612; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.3353 \]
Statement eighteen of the questionnaire dealt with the extent to which the respondents' agency initiated communication with the other agency regarding interagency program planning. A comparison of the responses of both agencies, as shown in Table XVIII, revealed that there was no significant difference. The majority of each agency's personnel chose to respond "Never" or "Seldom". This signified that neither agency perceived that any significant efforts were being made to initiate communication for interagency program planning.

The next statement, which was statement nineteen of the questionnaire, concerned the respondents' perceptions toward the other agency's efforts toward initiating communication with their agency for joint program planning. The chi-square comparison revealed that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of both agencies' respondents. Both agencies maintained a high record of response in the "Never" and "Seldom" categories. The YMCA personnel recorded an 82 per cent figure at those levels, while the municipal recreation personnel recorded a 67 per cent figure. It is interesting to note that neither agency responded in the "Always" category, and only 13 per cent and 2 per cent, respectively, of the municipal personnel and the YMCA personnel responded in the "Usually" category. The data indicated that, along with their agreement, they perceived a lack of communication from the other agency concerning efforts to jointly plan their recreation programs. Table XIX records this information.
### TABLE XVIII
EACH AGENCY INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH THE OTHER REGARDING INTERAGENCY PROGRAM PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER CENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER  
2. Seldom  
3. Occasionally  
4. Usually  
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 1.9106; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.7522 \]
### TABLE XIX

THE OTHER AGENCY INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH THEIR AGENCY REGARDING INTERAGENCY PROGRAM PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 4.6534; \ df = 3; \ p < 0.1990 \]
The next statement of the questionnaire to be analyzed statistically was question twenty, which was concerned with the extent to which each agency's personnel consulted with the other agency's personnel when planning to offer a recreation program. The chi-square analysis indicated that there was no significant difference in the response from both agencies' personnel. As recorded in Table XX, very few respondents from either agency responded in the "Occasionally" to "Always" range with approximately 26 per cent of the municipal recreation personnel and 28 per cent of the YMCA personnel responding within this range. The data indicated that the two agencies "never" or "seldom" consulted the other when planning to offer a recreation program.

Statement twenty-one of the questionnaire was concerned with the extent to which each agency's personnel were consulted by the other agency when planning to offer a recreation program. Analysis of the data indicated that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of both agencies' personnel. According to the data, approximately 78 per cent of the municipal recreation department personnel and 81 per cent of the YMCA personnel indicated that they were "never" or "seldom" consulted by the other agency for program planning. Table XXI contains a record of these findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasional
4. Usually
5. Always

\[X^2 = 3.9400; df = 4; p < 0.4142\]
### Table XXI.

**Each agency is consulted by the other when they plan to offer a recreation program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 4.0842; \text{ df } = 4; \text{ p } < 0.3947 \]
The next statement for analysis, which was question twenty-two of the questionnaire, was concerned with the extent to which the YMCA and the municipal recreation departments attempted to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with the other agency. It can be concluded from Table XXII in the chi-square value of 5.0282 that there was no significant difference in the responses from both agencies at the .05 level of confidence. Their agreement was to the extent that 83 per cent and 74 per cent, respectively, of the municipal recreation personnel and the YMCA personnel indicated responses in the "Never" or "Seldom" categories. Both agencies' respondents indicate that they "never" or "seldom" attempted to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with the other agency.

The chi-square comparison in the next statement for analysis, which was question twenty-three of the questionnaire, indicated no significant difference in the perceptions of both agencies' personnel. The agreement was in reference to the extent to which the other agency attempted to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with their agency. Approximately 83 per cent of the municipal recreation department personnel and 91 per cent of the YMCA personnel responded in the "Never" or "Seldom" categories. Accordingly, the data suggested a lack of cooperation from the other agency regarding the coordination of joint sponsorship of programs with their agency. This comparison is shown in Table XXIII.
TABLE XXII
EACH AGENCY ATTEMPTS TO COORDINATE JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF PROGRAMS WITH THE OTHER AGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1 N</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 N</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 N</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 N</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 N</th>
<th>5 %</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PER CENT

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 5.0282; \text{ df } = 4; p < 0.2844 \]
## TABLE XXIII

THE OTHER AGENCY ATTEMPTS TO COORDINATE
JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF PROGRAMS
WITH THEIR AGENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>21 45.7</td>
<td>17 37.0</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>28 60.9</td>
<td>14 30.4</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>49 53.3</td>
<td>31 33.7</td>
<td>8 8.7</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>2 2.2</td>
<td>92 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 3.7903; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.4351 \]
The next question, which was question twenty-four of the questionnaire, was concerned with the perceived cooperation between the YMCA and the municipal recreation departments regarding their interagency program planning. As recorded in Table XXIV, there was no significant difference indicated between the agencies. However, a majority of both agencies' personnel responded in the "Never" or "Seldom" categories. This is illustrated in that approximately 74 per cent of the municipal recreation department personnel and 78 per cent of the YMCA personnel responded in either of these categories. Again, both agencies were in accord that they "never" or "seldom" cooperated, in this case concerning joint program planning.

There was no significant difference revealed between the agencies' respondents in the chi-square comparison of question twenty-five of the questionnaire. The question was concerned with the extent to which the other agency attempted to cooperate with their agency in interagency program planning. Approximately 74 per cent and 80 per cent, respectively, of the municipal recreation department personnel and the YMCA personnel indicated a response toward this statement in the "Never" or "Seldom" categories. Consequently, both agencies' personnel were in agreement regarding the lack of cooperation from the other agency in interagency program planning. Table XXV contains a record of this comparison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NEVER
2. Seldom
3. Occasionally
4. Usually
5. Always

\[ x^2 = 3.2061; \text{df} = 4; p < 0.5240 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>1: NEVER</th>
<th>2: Seldom</th>
<th>3: Occasionally</th>
<th>4: Usually</th>
<th>5: Always</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL PER CENT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.0615; \text{df} = 4; \quad p < 0.7244 \]
Summary of Findings

The findings from this analysis of data on each of the twenty statements of the questionnaire suggest, overall, that the respondents from both agencies were in general accord regarding the lack of cooperation that existed between their agencies. Of the twenty statements, only three were a source of disagreement. These three were concerned with the use of each other's facilities and areas.

The first statement showing disagreement was in regard to their respective agency initiating communication with the other agency for sharing each other's facilities. The data suggested that the YMCA personnel were trying to initiate communication to a greater degree than were the municipal recreation authorities.

The second statement indicating disagreement was in regard to the extent to which each agency's facilities were used by the other. According to the data, the municipal recreation authorities used the YMCA's facilities rarely, while the YMCA authorities used the municipal recreation departments' facilities "occasionally."

The third statement revealing disagreement between the agencies was concerned with the extent to which each agency used the other's facilities. The results between this statement and the previously-mentioned statement were essentially the same. That difference concerned the finding that the YMCA used the public facilities more than theirs was used.
Of the twenty statements that were analyzed in this particular investigation, seventeen failed to reveal any significant difference in perception between the agencies. It was interesting, however, to note that their agreement was concerned with the extent to which cooperation was lacking between the agencies. Aspects of their cooperation that were revealed to be particularly lacking were concerned with a deficiency in communication and consultation between the agencies. Also, their efforts in joint sponsorship and planning appeared lacking.

A trend in their perceptions was indicated in the continuance of both agencies' responses in the "Never" and "Seldom" categories for most statements. In effect, each agencies' respondents were indicating that the YMCA and the municipal recreation department "never" or "seldom" cooperated in interagency use of areas and facilities, in sharing of their personnel between agencies, and in joint program planning.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This was a study that attempted to answer the question of whether or not administrators of the YMCAs and municipal recreation departments in the state of Texas perceived that cooperation existed between their agencies regarding three areas of recreational programming. These areas were the (1) use of facilities and areas, (2) personnel management, and (3) joint program planning. Moreover, this study attempted to determine whether or not there was a need for cooperation between the two agencies.

The basic concept for the study involved several parts. Initially, an assumption was tendered that there were too many problems for both agencies to overcome without adding a competitive element from the other agency. Therefore, cooperation and mutual support of each other's programs and services would help to succeed in delivering worthwhile and meaningful programs and services to their clientele.

Implicit in the assumption was the idea that both agencies needed to become aware of several significant ideas. First, while personal relationships between the agencies' personnel could cause friction and conflict, they could otherwise be
constructive and helpful in stimulating a mutually-benefiting situation. A second assumption was concerned with communication and consultation between agencies. When utilized on a frequent and regular basis, both agencies could become more aware of each other and what they each have to offer in services to the community. A third assumption involved the need for leadership from one of the agencies to initiate the process of cooperation. It was pointed out that both agencies could accept responsibility for this leadership.

Cooperation is not a new idea, but it has been an area of limited research. This has been particularly true in relation to the YMCA and municipal recreation in the state of Texas.

To conduct the study, agency administrators from both agencies were asked to complete and return a research questionnaire. This instrument was used to obtain their perceptions of the status of the cooperative relationship that existed between their agencies in recreational programming. The data acquired were analyzed for the purpose of assessing the extent to which both agencies cooperated.

One hundred and forty questionnaires were mailed, with a total of ninety-two usable returns.

The data analysis involved comparing responses concerning (1) the use of facilities and areas, (2) personnel management,
and (3) program planning. The data were analyzed using the Chi-Square test for independence of variables.

Findings

Data for the investigation can be found in Chapter IV. Tables VI through XXV presented the results of the data comparisons. The chi-square comparisons revealed that, out of twenty statements, seventeen contained no significant differences in the perceptions of the two agencies' respondents. The three statements that revealed significant differences were concerned with the extent to which they communicated for the sharing of each other's facilities and the extent to which they used each other's facilities.

A trend was noticeable from both agencies' responses. Both agencies' respondents indicated that they "never" or "seldom" communicated, consulted with each other, initiated joint sponsorship of programs, or cooperated concerning the three aforementioned areas of recreational programming. This consistently suggested that neither agency perceived any significant degree of cooperation in their relationship in these areas.

Conclusions

The findings of this study suggest that the cooperative relationship between the YMCA and municipal recreation departments is minimal, particularly in their use of each other's areas and facilities, in their personnel exchange and sharing, and in their joint efforts in program planning.
Based upon these findings, there is a possibility that other areas of cooperative relationships were less than adequate. However, it was not possible to make conclusions concerning areas other than those included in this study.

The following conclusions are offered:

1. There is a suggested need for greater cooperation between the YMCA and the municipal recreation departments in the state of Texas. With an increase in cooperation, many possibilities for enhancing the success of both of the agencies could exist. Sharing programming costs, increasing the number of each one's program participants, complementing each other's activities and programs so that a wider variety of different activities and programs could be offered, and making better overall use of each one's facilities and areas, personnel management and program planning are some possibilities. Increased cooperation would suggest that each agency could make definite progress in providing well-rounded community recreation programs that are community-based.

2. It may also be concluded that the possibility of increased competition, rather than increased cooperation, is a factor that would allow each agency to function more efficiently. In the United States competition has historically provided a stimulus for success. If competition would facilitate increased and more efficient leisure services delivery to the actual and potential publics serviced by the YMCA and the
municipal recreation departments, then this possibility is suggested along with the possibility of increased cooperation.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered:

1. Both agencies should reassess their cooperative relationships with the other.

2. Agency personnel should encourage positive inter-agency personal relationships.

3. Both agencies should attempt to communicate and consult with the other regarding their various programs.

4. Further study is needed concerning both agencies' perceived overlap of recreational programs.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

As a part of my Masters thesis, I am seeking information about your ideas concerning agency involvement in recreational programs of YMCAs and neighboring municipal recreation departments in the state of Texas. Hopefully, this research will help to determine what need there is for agency cooperation in planning and coordinating recreational programs to better serve the community. By taking a few minutes to complete the questionnaire in its entirety, you will greatly help me to attain accurate results and to complete this study. Upon completion, please place the questionnaire in the enclosed addressed envelope, and return it by Friday, June 3, 1977.

Your responses will be held in the strictest of confidence. No YMCA or municipal recreation department will be identified at any time. A summary of the findings will be furnished if you wish. Thank you for your help.

In appreciation, I remain

Cordially yours,

Lawrence D. (Dave) Nichols
Masters Degree Candidate
North Texas State University

________ I would like results of the study.

________ I do not wish the results of the study.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **AGENCY YOU ARE EMPLOYED BY:**
   - Parks and Recreation Department
   - YMCA

2. **POSITION WITHIN AGENCY:**
   - Agency Director
   - Division Director/Superintendent of Recreation
   - Area Supervisor
   - Program Director
   - Other (please specify ________________)

3. **SEX:**
   - Male
   - Female

4. **AGE:**
   - Less than 25 years
   - 25 to 39 years
   - 40 to 54 years
   - 55 and over

5. **HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT:**
   - Attended High School
   - High School Graduate
   - Attended College
   - College Graduate (circle level below)
     - Bachelor's
     - Master's
     - Specialist
     - Doctorate
     - Other (please specify ________________)
Listed below are statements relating to agency relationships. Indicate your perceptions toward each statement by placing the number of your response in the appropriate parentheses.

1 - Never (without exception)
2 - Seldom (at widely separated intervals)
3 - Occasionally (at some indeterminate time)
4 - Usually (whenever possible)
5 - Always (without exception)

### USE OF FACILITIES AND AREAS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Your agency initiates communication with the YMCA regarding interagency sharing of facilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The YMCA initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency sharing of facilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your agency's facilities are used by the YMCA.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Your agency uses the facilities of the YMCA.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your agency cooperates with the YMCA regarding sharing of facilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The YMCA cooperates with your agency regarding sharing of facilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Both agencies consult with each other regarding sharing of facilities.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONNEL CONCERNS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Your agency initiates communication with the YMCA regarding interagency sharing of personnel.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The YMCA initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency sharing of personnel.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Your agency cooperates with the YMCA regarding interagency sharing of personnel.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The YMCA cooperates with your agency regarding interagency sharing of personnel.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM PLANNING

17. Joint planning is utilized between your agency and the YMCA.

18. Your agency initiates communication with the YMCA regarding interagency program planning.

19. The YMCA initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency program planning.

20. Your agency consults with the YMCA when you plan to offer a recreation program.

21. Your agency is consulted by the YMCA when they plan to offer a recreation program.

22. Your agency attempts to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with the YMCA.

23. The YMCA attempts to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with your agency.

24. Your agency cooperates with the YMCA regarding interagency program planning.

25. The YMCA cooperates with your agency regarding interagency program planning.
Listed below are statements relating to agency relationships. Indicate your perceptions toward each statement by placing the number of your response in the appropriate parentheses.

1 - Never (without exception)
2 - Seldom (at widely separated intervals)
3 - Occasionally (at some indeterminate times)
4 - Usually (whenever possible)
5 - Always (without exception)

USE OF FACILITIES AND AREAS

6. Your agency initiates communication with the municipal recreation department regarding interagency sharing of facilities. ( )

7. The municipal recreation department initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency sharing of facilities. ( )

8. Your agency's facilities are used by the municipal recreation department. ( )

9. Your agency uses the facilities of the municipal recreation department. ( )

10. Your agency cooperates with the municipal recreation department regarding sharing of facilities. ( )

11. The municipal recreation department cooperates with your agency regarding sharing of facilities. ( )

12. Both agencies consult with each other regarding sharing of facilities. ( )

PERSONNEL CONCERNS

13. Your agency initiates communication with the municipal recreation department regarding interagency sharing of personnel. ( )

14. The municipal recreation department initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency sharing of personnel. ( )
15. Your agency cooperates with the municipal recreation department regarding interagency sharing of personnel.

16. The municipal recreation department cooperates with your agency regarding interagency sharing of personnel.

PROGRAM PLANNING

17. Joint planning is utilized between your agency and the municipal recreation department.

18. Your agency initiates communication with the municipal recreation department regarding interagency program planning.

19. The municipal recreation department initiates communication with your agency regarding interagency program planning.

20. Your agency consults with the municipal recreation department when you plan to offer a recreation program.

21. Your agency is consulted by the municipal recreation department when they plan to offer a recreation program.

22. Your agency attempts to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with municipal recreation.

23. The municipal recreation department attempts to coordinate joint sponsorship of programs with your agency.

24. Your agency cooperates with the municipal recreation department regarding interagency program planning.

25. The municipal recreation department cooperates with your agency regarding interagency program planning.
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH POPULATION

YMCA

1. Abilene, P. O. Box 3137, 79604, Senior Physical Director: Michael D. Osborn.


3. Austin, 1100 West First Street, 78703, Executive Director: Jim Cawley.


5. Big Spring, P. O. Box 1428, 79720, Physical Director: John Schiebel.

6. College Station, Texas A & M University, 77843, Executive: Colonel Logan E. Weston.

7. Corpus Christi, P. O. Box 2366, 78403, Physical Director: Gregory Pope.


9. Dallas, Denton Extension, P. O. Box 1362, 76201, Extension Director: Jowell W. Peden.

10. Dallas, Downtown Branch, 605 North Ervay Street, 75201, Director: James Hamby.

11. Dallas, East Dallas Branch, P. O. Box 9658, 75214, Branch Executive: Bruce Reaves

12. Dallas, Garland Branch, P. O. Box 730, 75040, Branch Executive: Mike Hamilton.

13. Dallas, Grand Prairie Branch, P. O. Box 633, 75050, Branch Executive: Terry Peal.

15. Dallas, Oak Cliff Branch, P. O. Box 24439, 75224, Branch Executive: Michael Bergus.

16. Dallas, Park South Branch, 2500 Romine, 75215, Branch Executive: Bill Lewis.

17. Dallas, Plano Branch, P. O. Box 332, 75074, Branch Executive: Charlie Lout.

18. Dallas, Richardson Branch, 821 Custer Road, 75080, Branch Executive: Jerry Haralson.

19. Dallas, Rockwall County Branch, P. O. Box 741, 75087, Branch Executive: Danny Meigs.

20. Dallas, Southeast Branch, 2818 Prichard Lane, 75227, Branch Executive: Bobby Aga.

21. Dallas, Town North Branch, 4332 Northaven Road, 75229, Physical Director: D. Pat Ryan.

22. Dallas, Johnston Outpost, 3325 Valley View, 75234, Director: (not listed).

23. Dallas, Lewisville Extension, 127 West Church Road, 75067, Director: Brooks Wetzel.

24. Dallas, Waxahachie Extension, P. O. Box 711, 75165, Extension Director: Lionel DeCuir.

25. Dumas, P. O. Box 1148, 79029, Executive Director: J. C. Johnson.

26. El Paso, Central Branch, 701 Montana Avenue, 79902, Physical Director: James Quiocho.

27. Fort Worth, Downtown Branch, 512 Lamar Street, 76102, Physical Director: Dwight Chancellor.

28. Fort Worth, Arlington Branch, 2200 South Davis, 77013, Branch Executive: (not listed), Program Director: Dave Lewis.

29. Fort Worth, Cleburne Branch, P. O. Box 1572, 76031, Branch Executive: John Schreiner.

30. Fort Worth, Eastside Branch, 1500 Sandy Lane, 76112, Branch Executive: Dave Judkins.

31. Fort Worth, Westside Branch, 8201 Calmont, 76116, Branch Executive: Craig R. Schaefer.
32. Galveston, 2222 Avenue L, 77550, Physical Director: Sherman McPhee.
34. Henderson County, P. O. Box 1183, Athens, Texas, 75751, Executive Director: Richard Nichol.
35. Houston, Downtown Branch, 1600 Louisiana, 77002, Physical Director: Joe Leach.
36. Houston, Baytown Branch, P. O. Box 414, Baytown, Texas, 77520, Branch Executive: William Hendley.
37. Houston, Channelview Extension, 15800 Bear Bayou, Channelview, Texas, 77350, Extension Director: Donald Kester.
38. Houston, Conroe Branch, 1203 Callahan Street, Conroe, Texas, 77301, Branch Executive: William Dawson.
39. Houston, Dads' Club Branch, 1006 Voss Road, 77055, Physical Director: William H. Lintner.
40. Houston, East End Branch, 7903 South Loop, East, 77012, Physical Director: Robert Boyd.
41. Houston, M. D. Anderson Branch, 706 Moody Street, 77009, Physical Director: Ronald Prochazka.
42. Houston, Northeast Branch, 7901 Tidwell Road, 77028, Branch Executive: (not listed).
43. Houston, North Shore Branch, 370 Uvalde, 77015, Branch Executive: Harvey Ray.
44. Houston, Northwest Branch, 1234 West 34th Street, 77018, Branch Executive: James Hale.
45. Houston, Post Oak Family Branch, 1331 Augusta, 77027, Physical Director: Michael Fitzsimmons.
46. Houston, South Central Branch, 3531 Wheeler Avenue, 77004, Physical Director: Fritz J. Greer.
47. Houston, Southwest Branch, 4210 Bellaire Blvd., 77025, Branch Executive: Robert Ferguson.
48. Houston, San Jacinto Branch, 1716 Jasmine, Pasadena, Texas, 77503, Branch Executive: David Sprague.

49. Longview, 1230 South High Street, 75601, Physical Director: Robert Cappel.

50. Longview, Rusk County Branch, P. O. Box 991, Henderson, Texas, 75652, Branch Executive: Jack Bender.


52. Midland, Central Branch, P. O. Box 954, 79701, Physical Director: Patrick Owens.

53. Odessa, 3001 East University, 79760, Physical Director: Gerald Hoban.

54. Orange, P. O. Box 1176, 77630, Executive Director: Carl Petry.


56. Perryton, P. O. Box 829, 79070, Executive Director: Raymond Ezzell.

57. Plainview, P. O. Box 37, 79072, Executive Director: Jack Geyer.

58. Port Arthur, Central Branch, P. O. Box 3525, 77640, Physical Director: D. C. Greer.

59. Port Arthur, Mid-County Branch, 300 South 12th Street, Box 289, 77627, Nederland, Texas, Branch Executive: Jack Nasworthy.

60. Port Arthur, West 7th Street Branch, P. O. Box 4067, 77640, Branch Executive: Warren Joseph, Jr.

61. San Angelo, 305 South Randolph, 76901, Executive Director: R. Chris Olin.

62. San Antonio, Central Branch, 903 North St. Mary's, 78215, Physical Director: Diego M. Vacca.

64. San Antonio, Town North Branch, 5331 Encanta, 78217, Branch Executive: Jerry L. James.

65. San Antonio, Westside Branch, 411 North General McMullen, 78237, Branch Executive: Jose V. Rendon.

66. Texarkana, 523 West 3rd Street, 75501, Executive Director: Willie L. Boyd.

67. Tyler, Central Branch, P. O. Box 514, 75701, Physical Director: John Shepherd.

68. Victoria, 1806 Nimitz Street, 77901, Physical Director: Dennis Riedesel.

69. Waco, Central Branch, 1115 Columbus Avenue, 76701, Physical Director: Steve Cooke.

70. Wichita Falls, Central Branch, 1010 Ninth Street, 76301, Physical Director: John L. Gibbs.

Municipal Recreation

1. Abilene, P. O. Box 60, 79064, Director: Perry Scott.

2. Amarillo, P. O. Box 1871, 79186, Director: Strick Watkins.

3. Arlington, 200 West Abram, Box 231, 76010, Director: Melvin Shanks.

4. Athens, c/o City Hall, 75751, Director: (not listed).

5. Austin, P. O. Box 1088, 78767, Director: Jack W. Robinson.

6. Baytown, P. O. Box 424, 77520, Director: Bobby Lee Rountree.


8. Bedford, P. O. Box 157, 76021, Director: Larry E. Brinkley.

9. Big Spring, 2110 Cecilia Street, 79720, Director of Recreation: John J. White.

10. Bryan, P. O. Box 1000, 77801, Director: Jay S. Williams.
11. Channelview, c/o City Hall, 77350, Director: (not listed).

12. Cleburne, c/o City Hall, 76031, Director: (not listed).

13. Conroe, c/o City Hall, 77301, Director: (not listed).

14. Corpus Christi, P. O. Box 9277, 78408, Director: Terry R. Dopson.

15. Corsicana, c/o City Hall, 75110, Director: (not listed).

16. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Director of Recreation: Johnny Carmichael.

17. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Area #1 Supervisor: Angus Greenwood.

18. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Area #2 Supervisor: Mickey Martin.

19. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Area #3 Supervisor: Joe Lawrence.

20. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Area #4 Supervisor: Jerry Garrett.

21. Dallas, 406 City Hall, 75201, Area #5 Supervisor: Billy Johnson.


23. Dumas, c/o City Hall, 79029, Director: (not listed).

24. El Paso, 5305 Anchorage, 79924, Director: Byron Dale Tate.

25. Farmers Branch, P. O. Box 34435, 75234, Director: John F. Burke.

26. Fort Worth, 1000 Throckmorton Street, 76102, Director: Charles Campbell, Jr.

27. Galena Park, P. O. Box 46, 77547, Director: Mrs. Louis Hinds.

28. Galveston, 2119 - 27th Street, 77550, Director: Bernard Davis.
29. Garland, P. O. Box 401889, 75040, Director: W. C. Winters.
30. Grand Prairie, P. O. Box 11, 75050, Director: Don L. Cramer.
31. Greenville, c/o City Hall, 75041, Director: (not listed).
32. Groves, c/o City Hall, 77619, Director: (not listed).
33. Henderson, c/o City Hall, 75652, Director: (not listed).
34. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Director: (not listed).
35. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "A" Supervisor: Mrs. Violet Forsythe.
36. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "B" Supervisor: Robert Duiett.
37. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "C" Supervisor: Mrs. Florence Blake.
38. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "D" Supervisor: James Walker.
39. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "E" Supervisor: Walter Pear.
40. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "F" Supervisor: Teddy Hunter.
41. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "G" Supervisor: Adam Atdoca.
42. Houston, c/o City Hall, Box 1562, 77002, Area "H" Supervisor: Mrs. Elois Moore.
43. Irving, 835 Irving Blvd., 75060, Director: J. Bill Enlow.
44. Lewisville, 151 West Church Street, 75067, Director: Cleolen Warnack.
45. Longview, 814 South Green, 75601, Superintendent of Recreation: Jess Ramsey.
46. Lubbock, Box 2000, c/o City Hall, 79457, Director: John H. Alford.
47. Midland, 300 Baldwin, 79701, Director: Robert Thomson.
48. Nederland, c/o City Hall, 77627, Director: (not listed).

49. Odessa, 801 North Vine, 78760, Ector County PARD, Director: Laurence M. Cobb.

50. Orange, P. O. Box 520, 77630, Director: Charles R. Thomson.

51. Palestine, c/o City Hall, 75801, Director: (not listed).

52. Pasadena, 311 San Augustine, 77503, Director of Recreation: Curtis R. Cooper.

53. Perryton, c/o City Hall, 79070, Director: (not listed), Superintendent of Parks: Arthur Emory.

54. Plainview, P. O. Box 1870, 79073, Director: Bill Rogers.

55. Plano, P. O. Box 358, 75074, Director: Robert Woodruff.

56. Port Arthur, P. O. Box 1089, 77640, Director: George Auld.

57. Richardson, P. O. Box 309, 75080, Director: D. L. Loughridge.

58. Rockwall, P. O. Box 204, 75087, Director of Recreation: Freddie Hailer Smith.

59. San Angelo, 211 South Chadbourne, 76901, Director of Recreation: Lewis McInnis, Jr.

60. San Antonio, 950 East Hildebrand, 78212, Director: Ron Darner.

61. San Antonio, 950 East Hildebrand, 78212, Area Supervisor: Ms. Mary L. Gardenas.

62. San Antonio, 950 East Hildebrand, 78212, Area Supervisor: Ms. Mary E. Morales.

63. San Antonio, 950 East Hildebrand, 78212, Area Supervisor: Ms. Phyllis L. Robinson.

64. Texarkana, P. O. Box 1967, City Hall, 75501, Director: Bill Harris.

65. Tyler, P. O. Box 2039, 75701, Director: (not listed), Recreation Supervisor: Wayne Sudduth.
66. Victoria, P. O. Box 1758, 77901, Director: Dan Clark.

67. Waco, Box 1370, Cameron Park, 76703, Director: Alva Stem.

68. Waxahachie, c/o City Hall, 75165, Director: (not listed).

69. White Settlement, 214 Meadow Park Drive, 76108, Director: Curtis Wheat.

70. Wichita Falls, P. O. Box 1431, 76307, Director: Bill Hursh.
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