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This investigation dealt with the relationships between three main variables: (1) a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and in the field of recreation; (2) a camp director's attitudes toward handicapped persons and their integration into regular camp settings; and (3) a camp director's perception of barriers to integration.

The study was carried out via a mail-out questionnaire to 149 Texas camp directors. A return rate of 51% was achieved (66 returned surveys). Questionnaires were scored, and the data were punched on computer cards for analysis. The analysis indicated high reliability of the attitude and barrier scales. Results of the correlational analyses indicated a significant relationship ($p = .0001$) between a camp director's attitudes and his/her perception of barriers to integration.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the 70's there was a growing emphasis on normalization, i.e., the total integration of the handicapped into every facet of life (3, p. 43). Rather than initiating and maintaining specialized programs and facilities for the handicapped, the focus in the field of services for the handicapped shifted toward more integrative, innovative programming (6, p. 27).

Recreation services in particular have increasingly espoused goals and objectives which indicate the widespread acceptance of the ideal of normalization (6). Since recreation activities lend themselves well to adaptation and modification, integration is seen as a viable alternative in programming. Furthermore, professionals and practitioners alike have become more aware of the unique opportunity recreation integration provides for the enhancement of personal growth and development of all individuals (6, p. 46).

Among the settings often mentioned as viable for integration are summer resident camps (6, p. 36). Summer resident camps can play a salient role in the total rehabilitation process for handicapped individuals. Integration within the summer resident camp setting creates a group
living, working and playing situation with social and psychological opportunities often unavailable in educational or clinical settings (2, p. 39). The opportunity to attend a regular summer resident camp provides a very "normalizing" situation. What the handicapped want and need most is social acceptance, and an integrated camp can create a real life setting in which the handicapped individual learns to play and work with the non-handicapped in normal day-to-day living. Wherever the handicapped child is considered normal, s/he receives the best possible "therapy" for recovery or social adjustment (12, p. 4).

In addition to the above benefits, integration within the camp setting allows the social and personal freedom for self-discovery, a chance to win with dignity and fail with grace. It also provides a unique opportunity for the discovery of personal limitations, the development of physical and emotional potential, and the achievement of greater self-understanding and self-esteem (12, pp. 12-17).

According to Resnick (11, p. 91), one of the basic conditions necessary for successful integration is an "interested and understanding camp director." Interest and understanding underlie positive attitudes toward acceptance of handicapped individuals. Training, involvement with handicapped individuals, and a broad base of knowledge of handicapping conditions have also been shown to be highly correlated with an increased acceptance of integration (10,
These elements would presumably facilitate integration through greater emphasis on staff training and development, increased adaptability of camp programs to the handicapped individual's needs, and an active concern for enhancing the camping experience of all participants.

Total integration within the summer camp setting is a desirable and challenging aspiration. Before accepting this challenge, a solid base of information on the current status of integration in summer camp programs must be obtained. More importantly, common problems or barriers to integration must be identified, such as negative attitudes toward the handicapped, as well as architectural, administrative or economic barriers. This will promote the development of more effective techniques and guidelines to better serve the interests and needs of the handicapped camper through a deeper understanding and awareness of handicapping conditions and their personal and social implications.

Need for the Study

Numerous studies in the past have focused on factors which influence the success or failure of mainstreaming (or integrating) exceptional children into regular classroom settings (4, 5, 7, 8, 13). All have cited positive attitudes toward handicapped individuals as a critical element in successful integration. Positive attitudes are reflected in positive perceptions and expectations necessary for optimal growth and development of the individual (8, p. 3).
Given this, the importance of assessing the attitudes of those individuals or agencies currently providing human services becomes evident. If integration is to be successful, examination of attitudes toward the handicapped is crucial and should serve as a foundation for the implementation of any new programs. Furthermore, identification of other barriers is critical to more effective program design.

Just as attitudes of educators play a salient role in the successful integration of handicapped individuals into the academic setting, so too are the attitudes of recreation professionals a critical element in successful integration in recreational settings. Research in this area is sparse. Hence, this study is designed to provide baseline information regarding the attitudes of those currently providing camp programs to handicapped and/or non-handicapped campers. Such an assessment of attitudes should provide information and insight essential to the design and implementation of effective, integrative programs. In addition, the research is designed to identify specific barriers to integration within each camp, thereby providing some direction for future development of the total camp program.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are threefold:

(1) To examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her attitudes toward the handicapped and their integration;
(2) To identify barriers to implementing integrative summer resident camp programs, and examine how the perception of these barriers relates to the camp director's self-reported attitudes;

(3) To examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her perception of barriers to integration within the summer camp program.

Subproblems

This study will determine the extent of integration within summer resident camp programs in the state of Texas. In addition, recommendations and guidelines for the removal of identified barriers will be provided.

Hypotheses

The following null-hypotheses were generated from the statements of purpose.

(1) There is no significant relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her self-reported attitudes toward the handicapped and their integration.

(2) There is no significant relationship between a camp director's attitudes toward handicapped individuals and his/her perception of barriers to integration.

(3) There is no significant relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals
and his/her perception of barriers to integration.

4. There is no significant difference in the mean integration scores of camp directors with high attitude scores and those with low attitude scores.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to private, agency and church regular summer resident youth camp programs, registered with the Texas Department of Health. Information is based on data from the summer camp sessions of 1980.

Limitations

The following limitations were inherent to this study. The researcher could not guard against the possible tendency to choose a more socially desirable answer on the attitudes survey.

In measuring attitudes, the researcher assumed attitude behavior consistency, and could not be certain if responses reflect true attitudes.

The generalizability of the results is limited to the survey population.

Basic Assumptions

The author makes three assumptions.

1. Summer camp can be a valuable experience for any child.

2. Handicapped individuals have the same needs and
desires as normal individuals and should have the same developmental opportunities.

(3) Given the opportunity, many handicapped individuals would adjust well to and benefit greatly from participation in an integrated summer resident camp program.

Definition of Terms

Resident camp: an outdoor group-living experience where emphasis is placed on the enjoyment of simple living and where campers have the opportunity to take considerable responsibility for the basic problems of their day-to-day life. The camper remains at the camp, staying overnight for a week or more.

Handicapped individual: a person who, because of physical, emotional or neurological impairment, differs from the average individual in his/her physical, emotional, social and/or intellectual behavior (1; 9).

Integration: a process whereby handicapped individuals participate in and enjoy experiences of their choice, similar to their non-handicapped peers, with opportunities for upgrading skills and confidence. It involves continuous support and adding/changing services where necessary, as well as changing attitudes and policies which inhibit the integrative process (6, p. 32).

Barrier: structural, attitudinal or financial blocks to the integration of handicapped persons into every facet
of normal life.

**Attitude:** "an organized reaction of an individual toward something in his environment (object, person, process of idea) as a result of previous knowledge and/or experience"(7, p. 433).

**Prior experience:** refers to the actual level of education attained; courses taken which relate to the handicapped and integration; years of experience in directly working with handicapped individuals; assumed knowledge and information acquired from direct and indirect (e.g., informative workshops, conferences, lectures) contact with the handicapped.
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A review of related literature revealed that no research had been conducted with the specific purpose of examining the attitudes of camp directors toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular settings. Furthermore, none have attempted to relate a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals to his/her self-reported attitudes and their perceived barriers to integration. However, studies of camping programs for handicapped individuals have been conducted which are directly related to this study.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) camping and the handicapped; (2) recreation integration; (3) barriers to integration; and (4) removing barriers to integration. Each section discusses research and additional literature relevant to this study.

Camping and the Handicapped

Organized camping has the inherent potential to enhance the growth and development of all individuals (5, p. 9). Although most programs are for enjoyment, there are some that are therapeutic in nature. This literature focuses on the philosophy behind and benefits of organized summer camp
Organized camp programs can serve to promote greater self-understanding, individualism and independence, a sense of responsibility and self-discipline, and aesthetic appreciation (20, pp. 12-13; 21, p. 30; 26, pp. 12-17). Furthermore, such programs can provide the opportunity to acquire and develop new leisure/recreational skills and interests and promote better mental and physical health through involvement in physical activities (12, pp. 32-35; 21, p. 30; 26, pp. 12-17). Social skills may be sharpened as each camper realizes the interdependence of each individual in the camp setting. The participant must learn to get along with others, to share, and to be empathetic (12, p. 3). All of these skills may be carried over into everyday living (18, p. 321).

Persons with special needs should be given the same opportunities for growth through camping as are afforded the average child. All individuals have a right to services required for development as accepted and contributing members of society (9, p. 42). Hence, the need for camping programs for handicapped individuals becomes evident.

One of the earliest recorded camping programs for handicapped children in the United States began in 1888 when a group of crippled girls went on a two-week camp out sponsored by the Children's Aid Society of New York (29, p. 1). Later years saw the haphazard development of
other camps when funds were available, although little at-
tention was given to the educational and therapeutic value
of the camping activities themselves (29, p. 2). Currently,
there are 226 camps listed in the Easter Seal Directory of
Resident Camps for Persons with Special Health Needs, out
of the 10,000 organized camps registered by the American
Camping Association (29, pp. 1–2). Although overall par-
ticipation in camping has increased, only about 10% of the
population served is handicapped (29).

Generally, the overall purpose of special camps for
handicapped individuals is therapeutic: it provides an en-
vironment in which the individual can test the limits of
his/her abilities at "more personally rewarding and socially
acceptable levels" (27, p. 133). Such an environment encour-
gages risk-taking and provides necessary emotional support.
Hopefully, the camper will carry over learned skills into
everyday living.

Current research efforts in the area of camping for the
handicapped are aimed at developing training programs and
manuals to assist professionals and support personnel in pro-
viding services effectively.

For example, Project REACH, at the University of Ken-
tucky – Lexington, is a project to develop Resources for
the Expansion and Advancement of Camping for the Handicapped.
"The purpose of Project REACH is to produce and disseminate
training materials and programs that will help improve and
expand the quantity and quality of camping services for the physically handicapped" (22). Project EXPLORE (Expanding Programs and Learning in Outdoor Recreation and Education) has developed a resource model of a competency-based, skill-oriented curriculum designed to assist various personnel in providing more individualized instruction to handicapped youngsters (3). Project STRETCH, sponsored by the American Camping Association, is aimed at improving training for camp directors serving the handicapped in integrated programs.

In total, the literature on camping for handicapped individuals indicates a strong need for development of facilities and programs. Specific attention should be given to outreach programs, designed to locate and assist those individuals unaware of available services. Research efforts should be continued and expanded to support camping experiences for handicapped individuals.

Recreation Integration

It has been postulated that most learning is by imitation (19, p. 17). If this is so, then integration within a recreation setting could be a valuable tool in the rehabilitation process for handicapped individuals. Integration can provide "normal" role models and foster the development of appropriate social skills through interaction with "normal" individuals.
Integration enables the handicapped individual to maintain close contact with the real world, and to be better adjusted to it (8, p. 11). On the other hand, normal individuals learn acceptance and understanding, and develop more positive attitudes toward their handicapped peers (11, pp. 45-46; 28). This in turn can enhance the self-esteem of the handicapped person.

Integration of handicapped children into regular camp settings is a growing trend, and most integrative camping experiences have been considered successful (16, pp. 36-37; 25, p. 130). However, in one study by Dibner and Dibner (7, p. 133), it was found that handicapped children attending segregated camps "felt more generally competent than the children attending an integrated camp." Since both groups were as physically limited, this emphasized the strong effect of the environment on the children's self-concept. A closer examination revealed that the counselors in the integrated camp setting dealt with, rather than interacted with the handicapped children (7, p. 123).

An earlier study by the Dibners revealed that the question was perhaps not simply to integrate or segregate, but instead concerns for whom, and under what circumstances integration would be a feasible alternative (6).

Braaten concluded that the selection process is, indeed, a critical determinant of successful integrated camping experiences. She determined that (1) the failure to identify
and remedy specific weaknesses in the handicapped camper's skills (e.g., personal hygiene) long before the camping experience, and (2) failure to provide optimal camp conditions (i.e., placing children in camps with too rigid or loose structures) may impede successful integration (2, pp. 28-29).

Seagle (26, pp. 31 & 35) reported that the feasibility of integration in a resident camp setting is dependent upon factors of leadership, finance and program content, measured in terms of the potential contribution to the welfare of the campers. The success of integration, however, is dependent upon a proper setting, adequate staffing and program adaptation (8, p. 29; 26, p. 35). Another factor involved in the success of integration is the training and experience of the camp director, which may be related to whether or not handicapped individuals are encouraged to use the camp (5, p. 11).

In an article addressing the social issues involved in integrated camp situations, Antozzi (1) cites several successful integrated camping experiences. His article lends strong support to the idea that providing handicapped individuals with the opportunity for interaction with "normal" individuals will enhance the development of their social skills. Furthermore, Antozzi maintains that exposure to handicapped individuals may be the best method of changing society's distorted perceptions toward handicapped
individuals. This would enable the handicapped person's personality and other factors to become the determinants of other's responses, rather than the handicapping condition itself (1, pp. 36-37).

Integration of handicapped individuals into a summer resident camp setting can, indeed, be a highly valuable experience for all involved. Reports of past successful camping experiences makes the process of integration appear almost effortless, natural. Closer inspection, however, shows some of the difficulties encountered in the implementation of integrative programs.

Grossman (10, p. 108) found that many camp administrators do not want to "beg for trouble" by including abnormal youth in their regular summer resident camp program. He reported three findings of a five-year study conducted by the Girl Scouts of America in Chicago.

(1) Professional staff are generally too cautious about integration.

(2) Education and medical criteria are faulty in judging a handicapped individual's ability to cope in a camping situation.

(3) Camps do a limited job of grouping (10, p. 110).

In summary, integration of handicapped individuals into regular settings can be a rewarding experience for all persons involved. Integration of handicapped individuals into summer resident camp programs can be a feasible alternative
in camp programming. The success of integration, however, is dependent upon elements in the handicapped camper and factors within the camp facility and program itself.

Barriers to Integration

In order for integration to occur, i.e., for handicapped individuals to become part of the mainstream of society, barriers to integration must be identified, and strategies for their removal sought. The barriers to be discussed in this section are labelled under the headings attitudinal, functional, structural, administrative and economic. Each limits or restricts the integration of handicapped individuals into regular settings.

Attitudinal. --An attitude is "an organized reaction of an individual toward something in his environment (object, person, process or idea) as a result of previous knowledge and/or experience (17, p. 433). Thus, whenever a judgement is made based upon a perception, an attitude is born (17, p. 434). Furthermore, whether or not one's perceptions are accurate will determine the validity of one's attitudes.

An individual's physical characteristics and appearance strongly influence the judgement of those who perceive him (24, p. 242). Present cultural stereotypes of physical beauty are identified with goodness (24, p. 246); thus, we condemn those with physical defects as unproductive and socially useless (8, p. 9). It is clear, then, how negative
attitudes toward handicapped individuals arise. Attitudes or feelings of superiority, aversion, repulsion, fear, guilt, anger and pity (19, p. 18) serve only to reinforce resistance to integrating those who are different. Feelings of acceptance, reflected in a willingness to relate to handicapped individuals, to hire them, and to have them as neighbors and friends (30, p. 16) enable more effective action toward successful integration.

Labelling, segregation, rejection, and a focus on handicapped individual's differences all result from negative attitudes (16, p. 18). Negative attitudes perpetuate adverse opinions toward providing services for handicapped people, as well as a lack of public awareness, understanding and acceptance of the needs and benefits of integration (20, pp. 14-15). This is reflected in policies and behaviors which limit participation from handicapped individuals and stifle their potential to be independent, socially integrated individuals.

**Functional.** --Functional barriers refer to any real or imagined physical limitation imposed by the handicapping condition which restricts participation within an integrated group. Dibner and Dibner (7) found that counselors within the integrated camp setting tended to work primarily with "normal" (non-handicapped) campers, and saw the physical limitations of the handicapped campers as a constant challenge. In addition, the non-handicapped campers tired of
accomodating to the slowed pace of activities, required when the handicapped campers participated (7, p. 123).

**Structural.** -- Structural or architectural barriers refers to the accessability of a given facility, recreation site, or recreation program. Accessability includes "getting to and into a facility or area, moving around once there, and being able to do whatever everyone else does at that place" (23, p. 12). Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, passed in 1973, now requires that any building or facility, as well as any program receiving federal assistance must be accessible to all people (23, p. 132).

To facilitate integration, modification in architectural design or service delivery may be necessary to accomodate handicapped individuals. Lowered fountains, widened doors, handrails or skilled personnel to interpret for the deaf are some examples of such facility and program modifications (23, pp. 131-132).

**Administrative.** -- Administrative policies and procedures may result in a lack of coordination and sustained effort in providing integrated experiences (20, pp. 14-15; 23, p. 133). For example, policies which unreasonably restrict programs to ambulatory participants prohibit participation from a wheelchair-bound individual. Registration procedures which limit the time, place and method of sign-up may exclude a handicapped individual who is unable to acquire transportation
and other assistance at the appropriate time. Overlooking these factors when designing and implementing programs perpetuates segregated recreation facilities and activities.

**Economic.** --For many organizations and agencies, the expense of providing accessible programs and services is prohibitive. The cost of structural modification of facilities, acquisition of adapted equipment, and hiring of additional personnel may indeed be perceived as the major barrier to integration of handicapped individuals into regular settings (18, p. 320; 19, p. 9).

Removing Barriers to Integration

Through persistent, directed effort, the aforementioned barriers should be overcome. Perhaps one of the most difficult, yet most critical barriers to be overcome is negative attitudes toward the handicapped and their integration into regular settings. "There is no inherent problem in working with handicapped individuals that cannot be overcome if you can change attitudes" (4, p. 3).

Yuker contends that the extent of prejudice (a negative attitude) is related to the degree of ignorance (30, p. 16). With this in mind, the need for public education concerning handicapped individuals and the values of their integration becomes evident (20, p. 15). More contact and meaningful interaction with handicapped individuals will allow a broader base of information about handicapping conditions.
Increasing public awareness in this manner will allow more positive attitudes to be generated from within the individual (13, p. 394; 14, p. 496; 19, p. 20; 23, pp. 61-62).

Another more direct method of preparing non-handicapped persons for the integration of handicapped individuals is through affective training (18, p. 20). Getting people in touch with their attitudes through self-examination and role playing enables a deeper awareness and understanding of common misconceptions about the handicapped and resulting negative attitudes (4, p. 13).

Removing architectural barriers, while maintaining the highest level of challenge possible, is indeed a task. Knowledgeable individuals must be available for consultation concerning facility and program modification or relocation, equipment modification and alternative transportation methods (23, pp. 129-137). Careful thought must be put into the design of any facility or program that will eventually accommodate all people. Handicapped individuals may be an invaluable source of information and ideas about needed modifications (23, pp. 42-43).

Personnel preparation is another critical area to consider before implementing integrative recreation programs. Orientation and training for all staff and support personnel is essential to ensure successful operation (20, pp. 16-17; 23, pp. 115-116). Continuing education and exposure to new and innovative instructional resources and methods is also
a part of the successful integration process (16; 23, pp. 115-116).

Getting the public (including handicapped individuals) involved in developing and implementing changes necessary for integration can be an effective strategy in beginning the process of integration (16; 19, p. 22). Once the public is aware of the value of integration, they can provide strong support - financial and otherwise - for integration.

Summary

Chapter II presents a review of literature related to this study. It examines the philosophy, benefits and needs of organized camping, the value of integration of handicapped individuals into recreation settings, barriers to the integration of handicapped individuals, and methods of overcoming barriers to integration.

The review of related literature indicates that previous efforts at integration within the summer camp setting have generally been successful, and efforts toward full integration in the camp setting should be continued. Identifying and solving problems in implementing integrative programs is critical to the advancement of integration of handicapped individuals into summer camp programs.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter contains a detailed description of the methodology and procedures used to construct and conduct the study. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) sample; (2) instrument; (3) research design; and (4) statistical design.

Sample

A list of the names and addresses of Texas state resident youth camps registered with the Texas Department of Health in Austin, Texas, was obtained. The list contained a total of 224 camps. The list was narrowed down to a sample of 149 camps. Those that were eliminated included Girl Scout camps, Boy Scout camps, Campfire Girl camps, specialized camps (e.g., tennis camps), and camps that were known to serve strictly the handicapped. Camp directors of the remaining 149 camps were surveyed.

Instrument

The researcher developed a questionnaire which was used to assess (i) the attitudes of camp directors toward handicapped individuals; (ii) the camp director's attitudes toward integration of handicapped campers into the regular camp program; (iii) the camp director's perception of
barriers to integration; and (iv) the camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals. In addition, demographic data on the camp was obtained, as well as the camp director's suggestions for removal of identified barriers (see Appendix A).

A panel of five experts served as consultants to assess the validity of the questionnaire. The panel of experts included two camp directors in the state of Texas, and three faculty members at North Texas State University (see Appendix B).

The procedures for the construction of the instrument are explained under the headings of (1) instrument development and (2) field test.

**Instrument development.** --Surveys which have previously been used in assessing attitudes toward handicapped individuals and attitudes toward the integration of handicapped individuals into regular settings were reviewed for information and question structure or content which were pertinent to this study.

Parts I and II were developed by the researcher. Items were selected for their relevance to the study.

Items 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, and 15 on Part III of the questionnaire were selected from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons (ATDP) scale, and measure general attitudes toward handicapped individuals. Each item selected has been
shown to discriminate between high and low groups at the .01 level or beyond (1, p. 19). Item 14 also measures general attitudes toward the handicapped; however, it was selected from the Mainstreaming Planning Inventory, adapted from Baker's Mainstreaming Inventory and the ATDP scale.

Items 1, 4, 6, 11, and 13 on Part III of the questionnaire were selected from the Mainstreaming Planning Inventory. Items 1 and 13 were included on a subscale which measured attitudes toward the effects of integration of handicapped students on non-handicapped students. Items 4, 6, and 11 were included on a subscale which measured attitudes toward regular class placement of handicapped children. For the purposes of this study, wording of the statements was changed to be relevant to a camp setting.

The researcher developed survey items regarding the perception of barriers based upon common barriers to integrative programming most often cited in the literature.

Questions regarding the camp director's prior experience are contained in Part IV. This section was developed by the researcher.

The questionnaire was constructed by ordering the questions which covered all aspects of the study. The Likert scale format of response was used primarily, however, some questions required the use of open-ended responses or response categories.

A cover letter, self-addressed, stamped envelope and
the questionnaire were mailed to members of the panel of experts for their critique and recommendations (see Appendix C). A request was made that the comments and critiques be returned within one week. When responses were slow, the individuals who had not responded were telephoned. A second mailing of the questionnaire was made only if the materials had been misplaced.

The questionnaire was revised based upon the critique and comments from the panel of experts.

Field test. --A field test was carried out in resident youth camps in the state of Texas. Six such camp programs were selected for field testing: Camp Copass, Camp Longhorn, Camp El Har, Boy's Club of Dallas Camp, Camp Carter, and Camp Kiewa (see Appendix D). The close proximity of these camp headquarters to the residence of the researcher was a factor in their selection for the field test sample. In addition, the sample was representative of the camp types to be surveyed.

Prior to mailing out the questionnaire, the camp directors at the selected camps were contacted by phone to determine their willingness to participate in the field test. The questionnaire, cover letter with instructions, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope were sent (see Appendix E). Two weeks were allowed for the return of the survey.

Based upon the responses from members of the field test
sample, it was determined that no major revisions were required on the survey. Responses indicated that instructions and questions on the survey were clear and understandable. However, Part IIIB of the survey was shortened to include only ten items representative of identified barriers to integrative programming.

Research Design

The research was conducted through a mail-out/mail-in questionnaire. The researcher sent a cover letter, questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped return envelope to the camp directors of each of the camps in the sample. After two weeks, the researcher sent a follow-up post card encouraging those who had not replied to participate in the study (see Appendices F and G). Some camp directors were contacted by phone. Additional questionnaires were sent only to those who expressed a desire to respond, but had misplaced the survey. After four weeks, the responses from the pre-coded questionnaires were transferred to data sheets and computer cards for computer analysis.

Statistical Design

The statistics were designed to measure

(1) The relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her self-reported attitudes toward the handicapped and their integration into regular settings;
(2) The relationship between the camp director's attitudes and their perception of barriers to integration within their summer camp program;

(3) The relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and their perception of barriers to integration.

In addition, the statistics assessed the relationship between whether or not a camp has integration and the camp director's self-reported attitudes.

To determine these relationships, the frequency count, the mean and the standard deviation were calculated for each item, and for each of the three variables: (1) prior experience in the field of recreation and with handicapped individuals; (2) attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular camp settings; and (3) the perception of barriers to integrative programming. The statistical analysis proceeded as follows:

Part IV of the survey, measuring prior experience, contained items which gave two types of data. Items 3 and 6 provided nominal data, and items 1, 2, 4, and 5 gave interval data. When correlated with total scores from the scale measuring attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular settings (interval data), Pearson correlation coefficients were used with all six items.

In analyzing the relationship between prior experience and the perception of barriers (also interval data), the
same procedures as above were used.

To relate attitudes toward handicapped individuals to the perception of barriers to integration, correlations were again utilized.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The problems being investigated through this study involved the relationships between (1) a camp director's prior experience in the field of recreation and with handicapped individuals; (2) a camp director's attitudes toward handicapped persons and their integration into regular camp settings; and (3) a camp director's perception of barriers to integration. Demographic data concerning the surveyed camp settings was also collected.

Each question was scored, and the frequency count, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for each individual item on the questionnaire. In addition, the mean and standard deviation of the total scale scores were calculated for the attitude scale and the perception of barriers scale. The results from this analysis were utilized for comparisons and correlations.

Chapter Four presents the results of the computer analysis of data obtained from the returned questionnaires. The chapter is broken down into the following sections: (1) descriptive data; (2) reliability of the scales; (3) prior experience of camp directors; (4) correlations between the main study variables; and (5) summary of the chapter.
Descriptive Data

Information contained in this section will be discussed under the following headings: (1) return rate and (2) demographic data.

Return rate. — A total of 149 questionnaires were mailed to selected camp directors in the state of Texas. The original sample was limited to private, church and agency camps. (See Table I.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Type</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the initial mail-out, several surveys were returned, marked "undeliverable," or were found to be unusable for a variety of reasons. In some cases, the camp was closed. In others, the camp had no permanent director to fill out the questionnaire. A few surveys were returned incomplete. In total, nineteen questionnaires of the original sample
population were discarded, reducing the sample size to 130. (See Table II).

**TABLE II**

**REASONS FOR REDUCING THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Discarding Questionnaire</th>
<th>Number Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No permanent director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire returned, not deliverable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp closed/not a camp anymore</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same administration for several different listed camps</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire returned, incomplete</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp not appropriate to study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of fifty-four completed surveys were returned after the initial mailing. An additional twelve completed surveys were received after a reminder card was sent out and telephone calls made, for a total of sixty-six returned questionnaires out of 130. Thus, a return rate of 51 per cent was achieved, which is "adequate for analysis and reporting" (1, p. 335).

A breakdown of the respondents by camp type revealed a close match to the breakdown of the total original sample
population. Hence, the results from this study were considered generalizable to the original sample population. (See Table III.)

TABLE III
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY CAMP TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp Type</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camps listed under the "other" category included nonprofit organizational/church camps.

Demographic data. -- Table IV shows the number of camps which served male and female campers, by age group. Almost all camps served both male and female campers between the ages of six and sixteen, and more than half of the camps responding served campers between the ages of seventeen and thirty.
TABLE IV
NUMBER OF CAMPS SERVING MALES/FEMALES, BY AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 16 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 30 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and over</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether or not camp policy permitted handicapped individuals to attend camp, 66.7 per cent of the camps surveyed responded positively. (See Table V.)

TABLE V
NUMBER OF CAMPS WHOSE POLICIES PERMIT ATTENDANCE OF HANDICAPPED CAMPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under certain conditions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common explanations to a negative or "under certain conditions" response were

(1) Inappropriate facilities and equipment,
(2) Untrained/not enough staff,
(3) Inability to provide additional care and support,
(4) Inability to accommodate severe disabilities.

Table VI shows the responses when camp directors were asked if they would allow handicapped campers to attend their camp. Data indicated that 62.1 per cent of the camps would allow a handicapped individual to attend if s/he applied.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD PERMIT ATTENDANCE BY HANDICAPPED CAMPERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under certain conditions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations to negative or "under certain conditions" responses were similar to those listed after Table V.

When asked if their camp served handicapped campers during the summer of 1980, 65.2 per cent of the directors
surveyed responded positively. (See Table VII.)

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF CAMPS SERVING HANDICAPPED CAMPERS
(SUMMER, 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the forty-three camps that served handicapped campers during the summer of 1980, 79 per cent reported that they were served in an integrated, rather than a specialized program. (See Table VIII.)

TABLE VIII
TYPE OF PROGRAM OFFERED TO HANDICAPPED CAMPERS ATTENDING CAMP, SUMMER 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialized program within the regular camp program</td>
<td>15 of 43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated camp program</td>
<td>33 of 43</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: respondents had the option to "check all that apply" on this question; hence, total is greater than the total number of positive respondents in Table VII.
The most common types of disabilities served during the summer of 1980 in the camps that responded are listed in Table IX, along with the number of camps serving each type of disability. Mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, epileptic, and diabetic individuals were among the most frequent types of disability categories served.

**TABLE IX**

**NUMBER OF CAMPS SERVING EACH DISABILITY TYPE**  
(SUMMER 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number of Camps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentally retarded</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally disturbed</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epileptic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral palsy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenital birth defects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina bifida</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common responses listed under the "other" category included
(1) Muscular dystrophy,
(2) Asthma,
(3) Learning disabilities,
(4) Hyperactivity.

When asked to rate the feelings of the majority of non-handicapped campers and staff members toward handicapped campers who attended camp, most respondents indicated very positive feelings. Ratings showed a mean of 4.2 to 4.6 on a five point scale for each of five word pairs (accepting-rejecting, cooperative-uncooperative, empathetic-apathetic, comfortable-uncomfortable, and friendly-unfriendly), with the more positive word scored as a five.

Reliability of the Scales

Responses to Part IIIA and Part IIIB on the questionnaire revealed that both the attitude scale and the perception of barriers scale were highly reliable.

Attitude scale. --The fifteen items in Part IIIA were designed to measure attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular camp programs. All items except 5, 9, 13, and 15 were given a score of 5 for an "SA" response to a 1 for a response of "SD." Scores were reversed for the listed exceptions. Possible scores ranged from 15 to 75, with a high score indicating a more positive or favorable attitude toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular camp settings. Table IX
gives the mean, standard deviation, and the corrected item-total correlation for each item on the scale.

**TABLE X**

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ITEM CORRELATIONS FOR THE ATTITUDE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Statement</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A handicapped individual will be disruptive in a regular camp setting.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You have to be careful of what you say when you are around handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most handicapped individuals feel sorry for themselves.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that the specialized camp is the best placement for handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physically handicapped individuals are just as intelligent as non-handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Placement of handicapped individuals in a regular camp will likely result in his/her becoming socially withdrawn.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Handicapped individuals cannot have a normal social life.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Handicapped individuals should not be expected to meet the same standards as non-handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Statement</td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Item-Total Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Handicapped individuals are as happy as non-handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is almost impossible for a handicapped individual to lead a normal life.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe that placing a handicapped individual in a regular camp setting would damage the individual's self-concept.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You should not expect too much from handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I believe that average individuals will profit from their contact with handicapped camper's needs.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am uncomfortable when I am with individuals who have obvious physical deformities.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There shouldn't be special programs for handicapped individuals.</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total mean score on the attitude scale was 54.3 (with a range between 15 and 75). The scale item mean was 3.6, with a standard deviation of .71. The Kuder-Richardson formula gave a reliability coefficient of .76, indicating substantial reliability (internal consistency) for the scale.
Barriers scale. -- The nine items in Part IIIB were constructed to measure the perception of barriers to the integration of handicapped individuals into regular camp settings. Each item was scored (5 = SA to 1 = SD), and the total score could range from 9 to 45. A high score indicated a perception of a greater number of barriers. (Due to a lack of response, item 10 ("other") was deleted in the analysis of data.) Table XI gives the mean response, standard deviation, and the corrected item-total correlation for each item.

TABLE XI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND ITEM CORRELATIONS FOR THE BARRIERS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers Statement</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilities at my camp are not adapted to serve handicapped campers easily (e.g., entrance/exit ramps, support rails, etc.)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My staff already have enough responsibilities to handle with the non-handicapped campers - integration would overload them.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The camp's sponsoring agency does not care to become involved in integration.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers Statement</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I just don't know how to begin and continue the process of integration.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Handicapped campers do not have adequate skills to participate in the regular program.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Programs would have to be modified too much to make integration feasible.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-handicapped campers are not ready for integration.</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The overall cost of integration is prohibitive (e.g., cost of modification of facilities.)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My staff does not have the training necessary to effectively handle integration.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the total scale revealed a mean score of 24.7 (with a range between 9 and 45), with a standard deviation of 6.81. The Kuder-Richardson20 formula produced a reliability coefficient of .88, indicating high reliability of the scale.

In addition to responding to listed barriers, camp directors were asked to give suggestions for the removal of
barriers which they rated as "SA" or "A." Responses to this section were few. However, the most frequent answers to the open-ended section of Part IIIB were grouped according to the following needs:

(1) To build the budget, perhaps through increased fees, to enable the necessary modification of facilities,

(2) To train staff members through clinics, counseling, and information seminars, and to acquire additional staff members,

(3) To expose non-handicapped campers to handicapping conditions more frequently, and to develop handicapped camper's skills throughout the year,

(4) To engage the sponsoring agency in investigating the possibilities for integrative programming.

Prior Experience of Camp Directors

Table XII lists years of experience that camp directors reported at their current job and in related work. According to the responses from the returned questionnaires, the greatest percentage of camp directors had ten or more years of experience at their current job, with over 57 percent having more than seven years of experience. In addition, 65.2 percent reported experience in related work. Only 18.2 percent reported less than one to three years of experience at their current job.
TABLE XII
YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDING CAMP DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Current Job</th>
<th>Related Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XIII gives a breakdown of the respondent's highest level of education attained. More than 70 per cent of responding camp directors have earned either a Bachelor's degree or a Master's degree.

TABLE XIII
BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XIII--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctoral study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XIV shows that 36.4 per cent of the respondents had no experience in directly working with handicapped individuals.

TABLE XIV

YEARS OF DIRECT EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 50 per cent of the respondents reported over four years of working directly with handicapped
individuals. In addition, 56.2 per cent of the respondents with previous experience reported that the experience was personally rewarding. (See Table XV.)

TABLE XV
RATINGS OF PAST EXPERIENCE WITH HANDICAPPED PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally rewarding</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat rewarding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis for judgement or neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question six of Part IV on the questionnaire asked respondents about their participation in career development activities concerning handicapped populations. Positive responses to the listed areas were combined to give a total workshop participation score. This, then, was utilized in correlations. Table XVI gives a breakdown of the responses to question six. The most frequent responses in the "other" category involved

(1) American Camping Association director certification,
(2) Independent reading on new approaches and existing problems,
(3) Involvement in camp activities with the mentally
retarded and persons with muscular dystrophy,

(4) Involvement with handicapped staff members.

TABLE XVI

PARTICIPATION IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/clinics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service/in-service training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp director education/</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations Between Variables

A Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was utilized in analyzing the relationship between the variables, revealing some significant relationships and some strong tendencies. The results of this analysis are discussed under the following section headings: (1) attitudes and barriers; (2) prior experience and attitudes; (3) prior experience and perception of barriers; and (4) additional relationships.

Attitudes and barriers. -- An analysis of scores on the attitude scale and the perception of barriers scale produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of \(-0.44\), which is significant at the .0001 level. This relationship indicates that
those individuals with higher (positive) scores on the attitude scale tend to perceive fewer barriers to the integration of handicapped individuals into regular settings.

Prior experience and attitudes. -- No significant relationships were found between scores on the individual items measuring prior experience (Part IV) and attitudes toward handicapped persons. However, the analysis indicated a tendency for those with more experience and involvement with handicapped individuals to have more positive attitudes toward them ($r = .11; p = .18$).

Prior experience and perception of barriers. -- There was a tendency for individuals with a higher workshop participation score to perceive fewer barriers to integration ($r = -.15; p = .11$). No other significant correlations were discovered between the items measuring prior experience and scores on the perception of barriers scale.

Additional relationships. -- Individuals who responded positively on the question concerning whether or not camps served handicapped campers the summer of 1980 tended to perceive fewer barriers to integration ($r = .26; p = .02$). In addition, these individuals tended to have more experience and involvement with handicapped individuals, as indicated by responses to the question concerning years of involvement with handicapped persons ($r = .58; p = .0001$).
When asked about their feelings about past experience with handicapped individuals, directors whose camps had served handicapped campers tended to respond more positively than those who had not served them ($r = -0.44; p = .0001$).

There was a tendency for directors of private camps to report a greater amount of involvement in workshops/clinics and pre-service/in-service training programs.

No significant difference was found between the mean integration scores of private, church and agency camp. However, there was a tendency for camp directors with high attitude scores to respond positively to the question concerning whether or not their camp served handicapped campers during the 1980 session ($r = -0.18; p = .08$).

Summary

Chapter Four presented the results of the computer analysis of data collected in this study. The data were discussed under the headings of (1) descriptive data; (2) reliability of the scales; (3) prior experience of camp directors; and (4) correlations between the main study variables.

Chapter Five will give an overall summary of the study, in addition to interpretation and conclusions from the data analysis. Finally, recommendations for future development and improvement of integrative programming in the camping field will be discussed.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter are

(1) To provide an overall summary of the study, including a review of the hypotheses being investigated, methods used to conduct the survey, and results of the analysis of the data;

(2) To discuss and interpret the collected data;

(3) To discuss recommendations and guidelines for future development of integrated programming within a camp setting.

Chapter Five will be broken down into the following sections: (1) review of the study; (2) conclusions; (3) recommendations; and (4) summary.

Review of the Study

The purposes of this study were

(1) To determine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her self-reported attitudes toward handicapped persons and their integration into regular camp settings;

(2) To determine the relationship between a camp director's attitudes toward handicapped individuals and his/her perceptions of barriers to integration;
(3) To determine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her perception of barriers to integration; and

(4) To determine whether there is a significant difference in the mean integration scores of respondents with high attitudes scores and those with low attitude scores.

To investigate these problems, data was collected via a mail-out questionnaire to an original sample of 149 Texas camp directors. Only directors of private, church and agency camps were surveyed. Out of a reduced sample size of 130, 51 per cent (66) of the surveys were returned.

Responses on individual items of the returned questionnaires were coded, scored and punched on computer cards for analysis. The frequency count, mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item. In addition, total scores, means and standard deviations were calculated for the attitudes scale and the perception of barriers scale. Pearson correlation coefficients were used primarily in analyzing the hypothesized relationships between the variables.

A breakdown of the respondents by camp type revealed that those surveys returned were representative of the original sample. Most of the camps responding were willing to serve handicapped campers, and 65.2 per cent of the sample served handicapped campers during the 1980 summer season. The directors of these camps reported a greater amount of direct involvement with handicapped individuals, and perceived
fewer barriers to their integration than directors of camps which had not served handicapped campers. Seventy-nine percent of the camps which served handicapped campers integrated them into the regular camp program. The directors reported that the feelings of non-handicapped campers and staff members toward handicapped campers were very positive.

Both the attitude scale and the perception of barriers scale were found to be reliable. Individuals who scored high (positive) on the attitude scale perceived fewer barriers \( (p = .0001) \) to the integration of handicapped campers into the regular camp programs.

Furthermore, there was a tendency for individuals with high attitudes scores to more frequently give a positive response when asked if their camp served handicapped campers during the 1980 summer season \( (r = -.18; p = .08) \).

Analysis of the data measuring prior experience revealed that 57.5 percent of the respondents had seven or more years of experience at their current job, and 77.2 percent had received a Bachelor's degree or better. Those who had experience in directly working with handicapped individuals reported positive feelings about their experience.

Participation in career development programs was minimal. However, it was found that there was a tendency for directors of private camps to report more involvement in workshops and in-service/pre-service training. In addition, respondents reporting greater participation in these
activities tended to perceive fewer barriers to integration.

No significant correlation was found between a camp director's prior experience and their attitudes toward handicapped individuals. However, there was a tendency for those with more experience to perceive fewer barriers to the integration of handicapped campers into the regular camp program.

Conclusions

Based upon the results of the computer analysis of data obtained through the survey, the following conclusions can be made.

(1) As stated in Chapters One and Two, integration of handicapped individuals within the regular camp setting is a feasible alternative in programming. Past attempts have been successful and beneficial to those involved.

(2) Education and prior experience in the field of recreation and with handicapped individuals have very little effect on self-reported attitudes toward handicapped persons and their integration into regular camp settings.

(3) Education and prior experience may have a positive effect on the perception of barriers to integration, i.e., fewer barriers were perceived.

(4) Positive attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular settings seems to decrease the perception of barriers to integration.

These conclusions indicate a need for more direct
involvement (by camp directors, other staff members, and campers) with handicapped individuals. Contrary to approaches that emphasize didactic methods of changing attitudes toward handicapped persons, methods that utilize contact and direct experience in achieving the goal of positive attitudes toward handicapped persons may be more effective.

Dealing with negative attitudes on such an academic level, i.e., simply providing information on handicapping conditions and increasing awareness of the possibilities for attitude change, may be less effective for increasing understanding and acceptance of handicapped persons. Direct work or volunteer experience with handicapped individuals, however, may provide the necessary contact with handicapped individuals to generate more positive attitudes toward these people and their special problems.

Common approaches to challenging all of the difficulties associated with the integrative process have generally dealt with discussing either attitude change or methods of overcoming barriers to integration (e.g., architectural or financial barriers).

This study has shown that a link between the two (attitudes and barriers) exists. The perception of barriers to integration is significantly related to attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular settings. One might presume that a positive change in attitudes may be reflected in a decrease in the number of barriers
perceived as insurmountable. Barriers may become less "real," and exist only in the mind of the beholder.

Developing more positive attitudes toward handicapped persons and their integration into regular settings may subsequently reinforce the idea that continuous, directed action will be effective in making the possibility of total integration a reality. Barriers may be less substantive than imagined, i.e., the problem is as big as one thinks it is. As attitudes change, barriers to integration may thus appear less awesome. Consequently, integration of handicapped individuals will become the rule, rather than the exception.

Recommendations

Results of this study indicate a need for continued training and development of all individuals involved in an integrated camp setting. Such training should involve some academic learning, but more importantly, direct experience should be sought with handicapped individuals and their special problems.

Within the sample population, there is a need for funds for such training, as well as for the adaptation of camp facilities to meet the special needs of handicapped campers. Alternatives for generating these additional funds must be addressed and effective methods chosen.

Involving the sponsoring agency in the process of
integration is crucial to its continued success. An informed, interested sponsor will be more willing to continue integration efforts.

Future research should be aimed at more carefully delineating the barriers that exist to the integration of handicapped individuals into regular camp settings. More direct survey methods, such as camp visitation, may facilitate this task. Specific guidelines and suggestions for initiating integrative programs may then be set up and provided to interested camp directors and their sponsoring agency.

Additional research which more carefully examines the relationship between prior experience and the perception of barriers to integration may help to determine the specific areas of involvement which positively affect an individual's perception of barriers. This would be beneficial to the development of future learning/training situations.

A closer examination of the relationship between attitudes and the perception of barriers is needed. Correlating the attitudes score against individual barriers may produce specific barrier areas (e.g., financial or architectural) which are significantly related to attitudes. Assuming that the perception of these barriers is a function of attitudes, methods of modifying these attitudes may thus be developed such that perceptions will change.
Summary

This study dealt with the relationships between three variables: (1) a camp director's attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular camp settings; (2) a camp director's perception of barriers to integration; and (3) a camp director's prior experience in the field of recreation and with handicapped individuals.

Data on these variables, as well as demographic data on the survey population, was collected through a mail-out survey. The data were analyzed, and results indicated a need for further training and development of individuals involved (directly and indirectly) with the integrative process.

As these needs are met, and as additional research provides more information necessary to successful integration, handicapped individuals will grow to experience the understanding and unconditional acceptance that most non-handicapped individuals now take for granted.
APPENDIX A

FINAL FORM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE SURVEY POPULATION
ATTITUDES AND INTEGRATION: A SURVEY OF SELECTED TEXAS CAMP DIRECTORS

Introduction

In recent years, integration of handicapped individuals into recreation programs has become a controversial issue. This survey is designed to gain a better understanding of the problems and issues which must be dealt with before integration within a summer camp setting will be seen as a truly viable alternative in programming. It examines attitudes toward handicapped individuals and perceptions of barriers to integration, in addition to demographic data on the camp and the respondent.

Instructions

Completing this survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time. Questions are constructed for ease of response and almost all items can be answered with a check (✓) or a circle. All responses will be kept completely confidential. When completing the survey, please keep this definition of handicapped individuals in mind:

"A person who, because of physical, emotional or neurological impairment, differs from the average in his/her physical, emotional social and/or intellectual behavior."

PART I - THIS SECTION SHOULD BE FILLED OUT BY ALL RESPONDENTS. Please consider the camp session of last summer, May 1, 1980 to August 31, 1980, when answering these questions.

1. Please indicate the type of camp (check ✓ one):
   __ private __ church __ agency __ other

2. Is your camp primarily a residential camp?
   __ yes: if yes, __ year round? or __ seasonal?
   if seasonal: Spring Summer Fall Winter
                   (circle all that apply)
   __ no

3. Please check ✓ the appropriate boxes for each of the male and female age categories your camp served from May 1, 1980 to August 31, 1980.

   Age             Male    Female
   __ 5 years or less:  
   __ 6-11 years:        
   __ 12-16 years:       
   __ 17-30 years:       
   __ 31 and older:      

4. Does camp policy permit handicapped individuals to attend your camp? (check ✓ one)
   ✓ yes
   ◐ no (please briefly explain why not):
   ◐ under some conditions (please briefly explain what conditions):

5. Would you permit a handicapped camper to attend if s/he applied? (check ✓ one)
   ✓ yes
   ◐ no (please briefly explain why not):
   ◐ under certain conditions (please briefly explain what conditions):

6. Did your camp serve any handicapped campers last summer?
   ✓ yes (if yes, please go on to Part II)
   ◐ no (if no, please skip to Part III)

PART II - THIS SECTION SHOULD BE FILLED OUT BY THOSE RESPONDENTS WHOSE CAMP SERVED HANDICAPPED CAMPERS LAST SUMMER.

7. Last summer, did your camp program serve (check ✓ all that apply):
   ✔ handicapped campers in a specialized program within the overall camp program?
   ✔ handicapped campers integrated into the regular camp program?

8. Please check ✓ the appropriate boxes for each of the disability categories listed that your camp served last summer.
   mentally retarded
   emotionally disturbed
   deaf
   blind
   epileptic
   cerebral palsy
   deaf-blind
   congenital birth defects
   spina bifida
   rheumatoid arthritis
   diabetic
   other (please specify):

9. Please circle the appropriate number to indicate the feelings of the majority of non-handicapped campers and staff members toward handicapped individuals who attended your camp last summer.
   Accepting----1----2----3----4----5----Rejecting
   Cooperative----1----2----3----4----5----Uncooperative
   Empathetic----1----2----3----4----5----Apathetic
   Comfortable----1----2----3----4----5----Uncomfortable
   Friendly----1----2----3----4----5----Unfriendly
**Part IIIA - This section should be filled out by all respondents.**

The following statements refer to common attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration into regular camp programs. Please circle the response category which corresponds to the way you feel about each statement. There are no correct responses. Use the following scale in making your responses:

- **SA** = Strongly agree
- **A** = Agree
- **N** = Neither agree nor disagree
- **D** = Disagree
- **SD** = Strongly disagree

1. A handicapped individual will be disruptive in a regular camp setting.  
2. You have to be careful of what you say when you are around handicapped individuals.  
3. Most handicapped individuals feel sorry for themselves.  
4. I think that the specialized camp is the best placement for handicapped individuals.  
5. Physically handicapped individuals are just as intelligent as non-handicapped individuals.  
6. Placement of a handicapped individual in a regular camp will likely result in his/her becoming socially withdrawn.  
7. Handicapped individuals cannot have a normal social life.  
8. Handicapped individuals should not be expected to meet the same standards as non-handicapped individuals.  
9. Handicapped individuals are as happy as non-handicapped individuals.  
10. It is almost impossible for a handicapped individual to lead a normal life.  
11. I believe that placing a handicapped individual in a regular camp setting would damage the individual's self-concept.  
12. You should not expect too much from handicapped individuals.  
13. I believe that average individuals will profit from their contact with handicapped camper's needs.  
14. I am uncomfortable when I am with individuals who have obvious physical deformities.  
15. There shouldn't be special programs for handicapped individuals.
**PART IIIB - THIS SECTION SHOULD BE FILLED OUT BY ALL RESPONDENTS.** The following statements refer to possible barriers to the integration of handicapped campers into the regular camp program. Please circle the response which most closely reflects your perception of how major each listed barrier is to integrating handicapped campers into your camp program. There are no correct responses. **IF YOU RESPOND WITH SA OR A to any barrier, please suggest methods for overcoming these barriers in the space provided.** Use the following scale in making your responses:

- **SA** = Strongly agree
- **A** = Agree
- **SD** = Strongly disagree
- **D** = Disagree
- **N** = Neither agree nor disagree

**EXAMPLE:** My staff is not prepared to handle handicapped camper's problems.

**EXAMPLE:** Initiate training programs to enhance counseling abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My staff is not prepared to handle handicapped camper's problems.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities at my camp are not adapted to serve handicapped campers easily (e.g., entrance/exit ramps, support rails, etc.)</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My staff already have enough responsibilities to handle with the non-handicapped campers - integration would overload them.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The camp's sponsoring agency does not care to become involved in integration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just don't know how to begin and continue the process of integration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped campers do not have adequate skills to participate in the regular camp program.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs would have to be modified too much to make integration feasible.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-handicapped campers are not ready for integration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall cost of integration is prohibitive (e.g., cost of modification of camp facilities).</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My staff does not have the training necessary to effectively handle integration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If you require additional space for comments and suggestions on this section, feel free to enclose an additional sheet of paper with your survey.)
### PART IV - THIS SECTION SHOULD BE FILLED OUT BY ALL RESPONDENTS.

1. How many years of experience have you had at your current job? (check ✓ one)

- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10+ years

2. How many years of experience have you had in related work? (check ✓ one)

- none
- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10+ years

Please specify job area:

3. What is the highest level of education you have attained? (check ✓ one)

- some high school
- high school graduate
- some college
- Bachelor's degree (area of study):
- Master's degree (area of study):
- Doctoral degree (area of study):
- post-doctoral study

4. How many years of involvement have you had in directly working with handicapped individuals? (check ✓ one)

- none
- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10+ years

5. How would you rate the majority of your past experience with handicapped individuals? (check ✓ one)

- personally rewarding
- somewhat rewarding
- no basis for judgement or neutral
- somewhat unrewarding
- very unrewarding

6. Please check the appropriate blank to indicate participation in any of the areas listed below (check ✓ all that apply):

- Workshops/clinics (e.g., handicap awareness workshops, clinics on adapted recreational equipment, etc.).
- Pre-service or in-service training related to handicapped populations.
- Camp director education/certification with emphasis on handicapped populations.
- Other (please specify):
THANK YOU!

Please return the completed survey in the return envelope provided by April 17th to:

Carol M. Hanson, Research Assistant
Div. of Recreation and Leisure Studies
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203
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MEMBERS OF THE PANEL OF EXPERTS
Bill O'Pry  
Camp Wisdom  
Route IM, Box 240  
Dallas, Texas  75211

Carl Seifert, Director  
Camp Soroptimist  
6162 Mockingbird Lane  
Dallas, Texas  75214

Dr. Peter A. Witt  
Division of Recreation and Leisure Studies  
North Texas State University  
Denton, Texas  76203

Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock  
Special Education  
North Texas State University  
Denton, Texas  76203

Dr. Donald C. Bailey  
Division of Recreation and Leisure Studies  
North Texas State University  
Denton, Texas  76203
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER SENT TO PANEL OF EXPERTS
Dear [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to participate as a member of the panel of experts to critique the survey to be used in the completion of my thesis requirements. Your critique and comments will help to polish my study, and are greatly appreciated.

This study is designed to:
1. examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped and his/her attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration;
2. identify barriers to implementing integrative summer resident camp programs, and examine how the perception of these barriers relates to his/her self-reported attitudes;
3. examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her perception of barriers to integration within the summer camp program.

This information will provide a solid base of knowledge from which future programming needs and possibilities can be determined.

I ask that you would judge the questionnaire relative to the preceding statements of purpose, keeping these questions in mind:
1. Is the questionnaire difficult to understand?
2. Are there any areas not covered that should be?
3. Are there some questions that should not be included?

Any suggestions you have will be taken into consideration before the final revision and field test of the questionnaire. If you have any questions, I can be reached Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 788-2611, ext. 52, between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. I am hoping to mail out the survey by mid-March, and the field test still remains to be done. Your quick response is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Carol M. Hanson

Carol M. Hanson
APPENDIX D

NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF THE FIELD TEST SAMPLE
Camp Longhorn
P.O. Box 60
Burnet, Texas 78611

Camp El Har
Route 1, Box 236
Dallas, Texas 75211

Camp Copass
Route 2, Box 638
Denton, Texas 76201

Boy's Club of Dallas Camp
Box 364
Little Elm, Texas 75068

Camp Hope
Route 10, Box 649
Fort Worth, Texas 76135

Camp Kiewa
2200 South Davis
Arlington, Texas 76013
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER SENT TO FIELD TEST SAMPLE
March 13, 1981

Dear Director:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the field test of this survey. Your evaluation and comments are very valuable, and are greatly appreciated.

For your information, this study is designed to:
1. --examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her attitudes toward handicapped individuals and their integration;
2. --identify barriers to implementing integrative summer resident camp programs, and examine how the perception of these barriers relates to his/her self-reported attitudes;
3. --examine the relationship between a camp director's prior experience with handicapped individuals and his/her perception of barriers to integration within the summer camp program.

In addition to filling out the questionnaire, I ask that you would judge the survey relative to the preceding statements of purpose. While evaluating the questionnaire, please keep these questions in mind:
1. Is the questionnaire difficult to understand?
2. Are there any areas not covered that should be?
3. Are there some questions that should not be included?

Any suggestions you have will be taken into consideration before the final revision of the questionnaire. If you have any questions, I can be reached Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 817-788-2611, ext. 52, between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., or call collect at 817-383-4774 any evening.

Your quick response is greatly appreciated!

Thank you for your time and effort!!

Sincerely,

Carol M. Hanson

Carol M. Hanson, Research Assistant
APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER OF FINAL FORM OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Director:

We are conducting a study through the Division of Recreation and Leisure Studies at North Texas State University. The survey is designed to obtain objective data concerning handicapped individuals and their integration into regular summer camp programs in the state of Texas. It examines problems and issues which must be considered before integration within the summer camp program might be a feasible alternative in programming.

Your participation in the survey is critical to the successful completion of the study. Your responses are highly valuable in compiling a solid base of knowledge from which future programming, facility and administrative needs can be determined. Such information will help to further integrative programs in camping for handicapped individuals, and will benefit others involved as well.

For your efforts, and for your future reference, you will receive a one-page summary of the results of the study upon completion. Results will also be mailed to the Texas Department of Health for their information.

Should questions arise, they can be directed to Carol Hanson, at 817-788-2611, ext. 52, on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., or you may call collect any evening at 817-383-4774.

Remember - your feedback and input is vital. Please return this survey in the envelope provided by April 17th. Your quick response is deeply appreciated!

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Carol M. Hanson
Research Assistant

Dr. Peter A. Witt
Associate Professor, Division of Recreation and Leisure Studies
APPENDIX G

SAMPLE OF REMINDER CARD SENT TO SURVEY POPULATION
Dear Director:

Recently you received a survey examining attitudes of camp directors in the state of Texas. Collection of this data is crucial to the completion of the study.

I realize you are very busy at this time. Please take 20 minutes and complete the survey, and return it in the envelope provided. If there are problems, or you have misplaced the survey, feel free to call collect at 817-383-4774 any evening.

Thank you for your efforts!!!

Sincerely,

Carol M. Hansen
Research Assistant,
North Texas State University
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