indiana park and recreation association

# 2010
# INDIANA PARK AND RECREATION ASSOCIATION
# RECREATION RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM

## BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

**West Lafayette, IN**
**January 20 – 22, 2010**

**Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD**
**Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium**

# PREFACE

Greetings! I am excited to present to you the 2010 Indiana Park and Recreation Association Recreation Research Symposium Book of Abstracts. The 2010 Research Symposium was the 1st of its kind for the Indiana Park and Recreation Association. We had six excellent research sessions presented by researchers from Indiana and Illinois.

At the 2009 IPRA Conference in Bloomington, Indiana, IPRA set a goal to increase the presence of our university partners, professors, and students. It was thought that if we desire to engage more students in IPRA, we need to engage more faculty. To engage faculty, we need to create scholarly venues for publication and presentation of research and other scholarly projects. Thus, in January 2009, IPRA re-created the Research Committee. Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel from Indiana State University assumed leadership of the Research Committee on October 1st, 2009. At this time, the IPRA Research Committee is made up of practitioners and scholars representing Indiana State University, Ball State University, Indiana University, and Purdue University.

It is my hope that all current Research Committee initiatives, including our annual Recreation Research Symposium and the IPRA Profile Peer-Reviewed Web-Extra articles, lay the seeds for a tradition of research, scholarship, and student and faculty involvement in IPRA.

As editor of the IPRA Profile Peer-Reviewed Web-Extra articles, I am constantly accepting manuscripts to be reviewed for publication. Beginning with the Summer 2010 issue of IPRA Profile, one "Peer Reviewed" article has been and will continue to be published as a "Web Extra" article. Research articles will have the 1st page of the manuscript published in IPRA Profile, and then the full text of the article will be published online in the Research Section of the IPRA web site.

Research will cover a variety of topics, however, preference will be given to research studies that focus on Indiana-based recreation research (i.e., scholarship of discovery); as well as research projects that are considered the scholarship of application/engagement (i.e., Indiana-based community engagement and service-learning projects). Faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, and practitioners are encouraged to submit manuscripts.

I would like to thank Will Lacey for his excellent work with the Communications Committee and IPRA Profile magazine, as well as the Conference Committee for working with me on the Research Symposium. Their collegiality and flexibility have been appreciated!

I am looking forward to our 2011 Recreation Research Symposium in Indianapolis, Indiana on Thursday, January 20th, 2011! The 2011 Call for Abstracts is at the end of this book!

Sincerely,
Nathan A. Schaumleffel, Ph.D., CPRP, IYD
Research Committee and Symposium Chairperson
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu

# Indiana Park and Recreation Association
# 2009-2010 Research Committee/Symposium Abstract Reviewers

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, Indiana State University, Chairperson

Dr. Kimberly J. Bodey, Indiana State University

Dr. Rasul Mowatt, Indiana University

Dr. Amy L. Gregg, Ball State University

Dr. Phil Troped, Purdue University

Gretchen Snethen, Indiana University

Kara Kish, Vigo County Parks and Recreation

Kathy Pargmann, Fort Wayne Parks and Recreation

<u>Ex Officio Members</u>

Steve Waltz, IPRA Executive Director

John Drew, IPRA President

Will Lacey, IPRA Publication Chairperson

Carrie Crisan, IPRA Conference Program Committee Chairperson

## Table of Contents

# CALL FOR ABSTRACTS
# 2010 INDIANA PARK AND RECREATION ASSOCIATION RECREATION RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM

West Lafayette, IN
January 20 – 22, 2010

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD
Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu; 812-237-2189

Note: This Call for Abstracts was intentionally modified from the National Recreation and Park Association Leisure Research Symposium Call for Abstracts, so that Indiana-based researchers and students can learn how to prepare an abstract for the National Congress. This "overuse" of the Leisure Research Symposium Call for Abstracts should not be perceived as plagiarism.

The IPRA Recreation Research Symposium provides a state-level forum for scholarly exchange and discussion about recreation and leisure. The Symposium includes both theoretical and applied research that transcends disciplinary boundaries. Papers will primarily address Indiana-based applied research directed at the recreation professional; as well as research conducted via Indiana higher education community engagement and service-learning research projects. Papers may also address leisure behavior, and structural and cultural aspects of leisure and leisure studies.

Papers are presented either as posters or as formal paper presentations. All abstracts receive the same rigorous, double blind peer-review without consideration of presentation format. Abstracts for both types of presentations may be included in a published book of abstracts.

Abstracts reporting empirical studies should contain subheadings identifying an introduction, methods, results, and discussion; only completed studies should be submitted. Abstracts reporting conceptual and theoretical discussions should also have an effective set of subheadings. Abstracts cannot exceed three pages, single-spaced (see attached instructions). Because of this extreme limitation, it is imperative that abstracts are written carefully and provide a coherent overview of the paper that will be presented.

## CONDITIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF ABSTRACTS

1. Only completed studies or scholarly discussions may be submitted.

2. Only studies that have not been previously published or presented at another professional conference may be submitted (some exceptions may be made- contact Research Committee Chairperson before submitting an abstract to discuss your scenario). Papers that ask the same question(s), use the same analysis, or develop the same logical argument as previous publications or presentations are not eligible.

3. Two or more abstracts from the same study cannot be submitted to different sessions under different titles/authorship unless substantially different aspects of the study are represented in each paper.

4. Abstracts undergo blind peer review by two (or more) reviewers with expertise in the topical area to which the abstract was submitted. The IPRA Research Committee/Symposium Chairperson makes final decisions about acceptance, but typically adheres to the recommendations of the reviewers. Papers may be rejected due to time and space limitations, ineffective development of the 3-page abstract, violation of conditions 2 or 3 (above), or weaknesses in the study itself.

5. Authors who have their abstracts accepted are expected to deliver their presentations as assigned during the Symposium. Please do not submit an abstract unless you are committed to attending the Symposium.

6. Abstracts are to be submitted electronically. See instructions below to determine where to e-mail your submission. Abstracts should be emailed no later than November 1, 2009; abstracts emailed after this deadline may be returned without review.

THE EMAIL SUBMISSION SHOULD INCLUDE

1. Abstract: An electronic copy of an abstract as a Microsoft Word document (other formats will not be accepted) that meets the following specifications:

   A. Three pages maximum including all discussion, tables, and figures. Abstracts exceeding this page limit will not be reviewed. A reference list is recommended but not required and may extend onto a fourth page if necessary. The text of the abstract may not exceed onto a fourth page.

   B. Use 12-point font and one-inch margins on sides, top and bottom.

   C. Single space the text.

   D. Abstracts should have a clear title above the first line of text, with no information about the author(s).

   E. Use appropriate subheadings.

   F. Remove author identification in properties (In Word, go to File, then properties, summary and remove author name).

   G. Tracking changes must not be readable.

   H. Abstracts that do not meet all specifications will be rejected from further consideration.

2. Cover Sheet: Include a cover sheet with the abstract. This cover sheet should include:

   A. Title of the abstract.

B. Principal author's name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address. It is assumed that, unless otherwise specified, this person will make the presentation if the abstract is accepted.

C. Full name and institutional affiliation of all co-authors.

D. The principal author's contact information over the summer, if different from above.

E. Three or more keywords to describe the substantive content of the abstract.

F. The specific topical area (***one only*** from the 11 topical areas that are listed on next page) in which the abstract should be reviewed.

G. The author's preference for presentation format. Indicate one of the following: (a) poster only; (b) prefer poster but would do formal presentation; (c) prefer formal presentation but would do poster; (d) formal presentation only. Note: Reviewers are not aware of the stated presentation preference. This information in conjunction with time and space limitations is used by the IPRA Research Committee/Symposium Chair when establishing the final conference schedule.

3. Correspondence regarding abstract.

A. We will notify authors of abstract receipt via email.

B. Remember to e-mail the abstract no later than NOVEMBER 1, 2009. See instructions below to determine where to send the abstract.

INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ABSTRACTS ACCEPTED:

1. All individuals who submit an abstract will be notified of acceptance/rejection by early December. Authors whose presentations are accepted must submit a REVISED THREE PAGE ABSTRACT and details for continuing education units ***via e-mail only*** no later than December 15 (instructions will be included in the acceptance letter). Please watch for your e-mail letter in early December and be prepared to submit the abstract promptly if your paper is accepted. Please remember, all communication this year regarding submission and acceptance of abstracts will occur via email.

2. Conference registration information will be posted on the IPRA web site.

3. IPRA reserves the right to reproduce and distribute abstracts of all presentations in a book of abstracts that may be produced on CD ROM and/or posted as a .pdf file on the IPRA web site. This does not preclude subsequent publication of the presentation (same version or an extended version) by the author(s) in a journal or other publication.

4. You will be notified of the date and time of your presentation in December after the full Symposium schedule has been established. Because of the complexity of scheduling, we cannot accommodate personal requests regarding this schedule. Typically, formal presentations are allotted 15 minutes, followed by 5 minutes for discussion. The poster session will be scheduled

for two hours in the exhibit hall. If you are doing a poster, you will receive instructions and guidelines for preparing your materials.

5. Regardless of which topical area abstracts are submitted to for review, they will be re-grouped into theme sessions for presentation (except posters). The theme sessions bring together papers with a similar focus.

SUBMISSIONS:

All submissions should be sent only by e-mail to:

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD
Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu
812-237-2189

## SUBMITTING AN ABSTRACT

Select the most appropriate one of the 11 topical areas listed below for review. These areas reflect the reviewers’ areas of interest and expertise. Papers accepted for presentation will be re-grouped into thematic sessions for the Symposium.

### TOPICAL AREAS:

1. Management of Recreation, Park, Leisure, and Youth Programs and Services
2. Research Projects Generated from Indiana-based Higher Education Community Engagement and Service-Learning Projects
3. Curriculum and Professional Preparation; Scholarship of Engagement; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
4. Outdoor Recreation: Policy, Planning and Management
5. Travel and Tourism
6. Leisure and the Humanities
7. Methodology, Statistics, and Research Design
8. Leisure over the Lifespan: Childhood through Old Age
9. Psychological/Social Psychological Aspects of Leisure
10. Sociological and Cultural Studies
11. Special Populations: Clinical and Community Focus

**2010 Indiana Park and Recreation Association**
**Recreation Research Symposium**
**Schedule of Presentations**

West Lafayette, IN
January 21, 2010

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD
Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu; 812-237-2189

**8:30 AM – 9:45 AM: Recreation Research Symposium – Session #1 (Lafayette Room)**

Moderator: Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation and Sport Management; Indiana State University

Presentation #1: Motivation in Web-Based Distance Learning: The Effects of Instructional Methods

Author/Speaker:

Dr. Michael Mulvaney, CPRP, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation Administration; Eastern Illinois University

Presentation #2: Interscholastic Sport Teams as the Nexus for a Sense of Community in Rural Settings

Author/Speaker:

Dr. Michael D. Lukkarinen, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Administration; Western Illinois University

Presentation #3: Searching For Stories: A Discussion of Place Meaning for Park Planners

Authors/Speakers:

James Barkley, Doctoral Candidate; Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Garrett Traylor, Undergraduate Student; Creative Writing and Scandinavian Studies; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Daniel M. Larson, Doctoral Candidate; Department of Communication Studies; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**10:00 AM – 11:15 AM: Recreation Research Symposium – Session #2 (Lafayette Room)**

Moderator: Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation and Sport Management; Indiana State University

Presentation #1: Outdoor Recreation Trends: An Indiana Department of Natural Resources Study

Author/Speaker:

Dr. Amy L. Gregg, Assistant Professor; Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management; Ball State University

Presentation #2: Risk Management is Not Just for Park and Recreation Professionals Anymore: How to Partner with Faculty on Mutually Beneficial Community Engagement and Service-Learning Projects

Authors/Speakers:

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation and Sport Management; Indiana State University

Dr. Mark Malaby, Assistant Professor; Department of Educational Studies; Ball State University

Dr. Jacquelyn B. Frank, Assistant Professor; Gerontology Programs; School of Family and Consumer Sciences; Eastern Illinois University (formerly of the University of Indianapolis)

Presentation #3: Indiana Park and Recreation Association Research Committee and Its Agenda: Planning for the Future

Author/Speaker:

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, IYD, Assistant Professor; Department of Recreation and Sport Management; Indiana State University

**Motivation in Web-Based Distance Learning: The Effects of Instructional Methods**

Michael Mulvaney, Ph.D., CPRP
Assistant Professor
Eastern Illinois University
Department of Recreation Administration
600 Lincoln Avenue
Charleston, Illinois 61920
Phone: (217) 581-6589
Fax: (217) 581-7804
Email: mamulvaney@eiu.edu

**Key Words:** Motivation, Social Cognitive Theory, Web-Based Distance Learning

**Topical Area:** Curriculum and Professional Preparation; Scholarship of Engagement; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

## Introduction

Web-based distance learning (WBDL) programs are becoming increasingly prevalent in the field of recreation. More and more university WBDL courses are being developed with several programs offering a 100% WBDL baccalaureate and/or master degree. State and national associations are also increasing the development of WBDL environments for their professionals. For example, NRPA recently introduced Pyxis Learning Center, a WBDL learning system containing several training and education courses for park and recreation professionals. Furthermore, as agencies are increasingly faced with tightening budgets and reductions in funding for travel to conferences and other workshops, WBDL programs represent a viable option to ensure professionals receive the necessary training and development to keep them updated on ongoing trends in their job domains. Despite the increasing presence and demand for WBDL programs, little empirical research has been conducted on the instructional design strategies of these programs. Consistent with the argument made by Salas and Cannon-Bowers (2001), the design and implementation of WBDL in the field of public parks and recreation is happening without much reliance on the science of training. Furthermore, as the field of parks and recreation is deeply rooted in public service that often depends upon its staff's direct, face-to-face involvement with the public, research that examines instructional platforms that are premised on their ability to allow learners from great geographical distances to interact in a non face-to-face format, such as WBDL programs, is warranted (Mulvaney, McKinney, & Barnett, 2008). Drawing from the tenets of Social Cognitive Theory, the purpose of this study was to examine the effects of two instructional design strategies in a WBDL workshop on pay-for-performance systems in public parks and recreation. Specifically, the effects of using online discussion groups and multiple formats on motivational (i.e., self-efficacy) outcomes were assessed. Self-efficacy was selected as research has consistently indicated that (a) people who have high self-efficacy for a specific task typically outperform those who have low self-efficacy, (b) self-efficacy often predicts future performance better than does past performance, and (c) self-efficacy accounts for a significant portion of variance in performance after controlling for ability (Bandura, 1986; Gist et al., 1991). Furthermore, this research builds upon previous research in which the effects of instructional design strategies on cognitive outcomes (see Mulvaney, McKinney, & Barnett, 2008) were examined. The moderating role of experience with technology, technology self-efficacy, and several individual characteristic variables were also examined.

## Theoretical Framework

Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1991) Social Cognitive Theory centers on the cognitive concepts associated with a learner's behavior. The theory expanded upon social learning theories by focusing on how learners cognitively interpret their social experiences and how these cognitions influence behavior. In particular, Bandura's work (1986) suggested the learning environment, behavior, and the individual each influenced and is influenced by the other. Referred to as reciprocal determinism, Bandura (1986) argued that human functioning was comprised of a series of reciprocal interactions between behavioral, environmental, and personal variables. From an adult learning perspective, reciprocal determinism is particularly relevant in that it takes into account learning, the individual, and the environment in which the individual operates (Gibson, 2004). Guided by reciprocal determinism, researchers have examined the interactions between the learner, environment, and their behavior and studies have indicated that purposeful interaction in a specific and pre-determined way can lead to an increase in the learner's motivation and learning (Sabry & Baldwin, 2003). Learner to learner and learner to instructor interactions through Web tools such as discussion groups have the ability to promote group collaboration and interaction within a WBDL program. In addition to learning being a social and interpretive process, it is also individualized, according to Social Cognitive Theory. Each learner embraces his or her own view or perspective into the training and/or educational program. In particular, social cognitive theory holds that people do not merely react to external influences, as if they were unthinking organisms, but actually select, organize, and transform stimuli that impinge upon them (Bandura, 1986; Wexley & Latham, 2002). From an instructional design standpoint, the learner should be exposed to several perspectives of the content. In particular, multiple perspectives and formats of the concepts and content should be presented.

## Methods

Guided by Social Cognitive Theory, the following hypotheses were developed:

*Hypotheses 1: Learners who participate in discussion groups will experience greater changes in performance appraisal self-efficacy (PASE) compared to learners who do not participate in a discussion group.*

*Hypotheses 2: Learners presented with content in a multimedia format will experience greater changes in performance appraisal self-efficacy (PASE) compared to learners who are presented content in one media format.*

*Hypothesis 3: An interaction is expected between discussion groups and multiple-formatted presentations of the content in a WBDL program. In particular, learners' performance appraisal self-efficacy (PASE) is expected to be higher in a WBDL program using discussion groups and multiple formatted presentations of the content than in a WBDL program using only discussion groups, multiple formatted presentations or a WBDL program with neither mode of instruction.*

In addition to the research hypotheses, the moderating effects of technology self-efficacy, experience with technology, and several individual characteristics were also examined. The hypotheses were tested using a 2x2 experimental design. Four variations/presentations of the WBDL workshop were created to test the hypotheses: noMFnoD, MFnoD, MFD, and DnoMF. The noMFnoD served as the control group and participants were provided the content in one format - an online format with images. The MFnoD group was one of the treatment groups as three sections of this WBDL workshop were presented in multiple formats: an online format with images, PowerPoint format, and a Portable Document Format (PDF) with images. The content within each of the three formats was identical, enabling the participant to select the most preferred format. The MFD group contained multiple formats (identical to the MFnoD group) and also participated in discussion group activities at the conclusion of the three sections. Discussion group activities required the students to reflect and comment on the content and respond to at least one other learner's posting. The DnoMF group integrated discussion group activities (identical to the MFD group) without multiple formats into the workshop content. The content of the 2-3 hour WBDL instructional workshop was pay-for-performance systems in public parks and recreation. The WBDL workshop followed a linear format as learners were required to complete each section of the workshop before advancing to the next section. Undergraduate students in the four university courses were invited to participate in the study with a total of 213 students registering for the workshop. Random assignment was used to place each student into one of the four WBDL workshops. Students were given two weeks to complete the WBDL workshop. Subscribing to a modified Dillman (2000) approach, a series of email reminders were sent to participants yielding an 85% response rate (n=181). Data of interest to the study for all four groups were collected prior to starting the WBDL and at the conclusion of the WBDL workshop. Prior to starting the WBDL course, participants completed a questionnaire (online) that collected demographic information and assessed participants' technology self-efficacy, experience with technology, and PASE. At the conclusion of the workshop, the participants were required to complete a post-test (online) assessment of their PASE. Univariate analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) and hierarchical regression analyses was employed to test the hypotheses and assess the contributions and differential effects of the demographic and moderator variables in addition to the group formats.

## Results

Reliability measures ranging from .78 to .80 were obtained for the study's measuring instruments. A 2 (multiple formats) x 2 (discussion activities) ANCOVA was computed to determine if there were any differences in PASE among the workshop groups (with the pre-test PASE scores covaried out). A significant difference was found ($p<.03$), and Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) post hoc analyses revealed that participants in the DnoMF workshop group had significantly higher levels of PASE compared to those in the other three workshop groups ($p<.05$), who did not differ significantly from each other. ANCOVAs were also calculated to test the moderating effects of experience with technology and technology self-efficacy. The main effect for perceived experience with technology and technology self-efficacy were non-significant as were the interactions (all, ns). To conduct the regression analysis, the individual characteristics were entered into the first block, followed by the technology self-efficacy and experience with technology variables in the second block, and workshop group contrasts were inserted as the final block to determine their incremental contribution beyond the effects of the other factors.  The results of the regression analysis indicated that the blocks of individual factors and technology self-efficacy and experience did not account for a significant amount of variance in participants' PASE score (ns).  When adding workshop groups, a significant change in explained variance was obtained specifically when contrasting workshop group DnoMF with the MFnoD ($F$ change = 10.04, $R^2$ change = .06, $p$<.05), MFD ($F$ change = 6.77, $R^2$ change = .04, $p$<.05) groups.

## Discussion

Overall, three major findings emerged from this research study.  First, there was a strong effect of having discussion group activities in the 2-3 hour WBLD workshop.  Furthermore, these positive effects were not impacted by participants' technology self-efficacy, experience with technology, or other individual characteristics.  The second finding was the neutral effect of multiple formats on learning.  Contrary to the hypotheses, using multiple formats in a WBDL workshop did not significantly affect PASE compared to a WBDL workshop without multiple formats.  A possible explanation for the neutral effect of multiple formats on learning centers on the length of the WBDL workshop.  Existing research has investigated the effects of multiple formats in 12-16 week WBDL courses and not 2-3 hour WBDL workshops (Johnson & Aragon, 2003).  Thus, it is possible that the length of the workshop impacts the effects of multiple formats.  Future research is needed to examine this issue.  The third finding was the negative effect of multiple formats on PASE.  This finding highlights the positive effect of discussion group activities, but these effects are negated when combined with multiple formats.  A possible explanation for this finding might be multimedia overload within the WBDL workshop.  As participants in the multiple formats and discussions group were exposed to both modes of instruction, the amount of information presented within the 2-3 hour workshop might have been overwhelming.  Researchers have suggested that feelings of being overwhelmed with information can oftentimes lead to negative affective responses of confusion, frustration and induce other affective outcomes such as lower self-efficacy (Dillon & Gabbard, 1998).

## References


Bandura, A. (1977).  *Social learning theory.*  Englewood Cliffs, NJ:  Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986).  *Social foundations of thoughts and action:  A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ:  Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1991).  Social cognitive theory of self-regulation.  *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 50, 248-287.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method.* (2nd ed.), New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dillon, A., & Gabbard, R. (1998). Hypermedia as an educational technology: A review of the quantitative research literature on learner comprehension, control, and style. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(3), 322-349.

Gist, M. E., Stevens, C. K., & Bavetta, A. G. (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post-training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 837-861.

Johnson, S. D., & Aragon, S. A. (2003). An instructional strategy framework for online learning environments. In S. A. Aragon (Ed.), Facilitating learning in online environments. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* (No. 10, pp. 31-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Mulvaney, M. A., McKinney, W.R., & Barnett, L. (2008). Online learning: Examining instructional design strategies in leisure curriculum, *2008 National Recreation and Park Association Leisure Research Symposium Abstracts.*

Sabry, K. & Baldwin, L. (2003). Web-based learning interaction and learning styles. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *34*(4), 443-454.

Salas, E. & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: a decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471-499.

Wexley, K. N. & Latham, G. P. (2002). *Developing and Training Human Resources in Organizations, Third Edition.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

**Interscholastic Sport Teams As The Nexus For A Sense Of Community In Rural Settings**

Michael D. Lukkarinen, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Recreation, Park & Tourism Administration
Western Illinois University
400 Currens Hall
1 University Circle
Macomb, Illinois 61455
Phone: (309) 298-1967
Phone: (309) 298-1517
Fax: (309) 298-2967
Email: MD-Lukkarinen@wiu.edu

**Key Words:** Sense of Community, Interscholastic Sport, Rural Towns

**Topical Area:** Sociological and Cultural Studies

## Introduction

A sense of community (SOC) may be generated around many objects in a community. Such objects could range from a sport program to an annual festival to a prominent business headquartered in the town. High school sport has been anecdotally demonstrated to be such an object in Bissinger's (1991) *Friday Night Lights: A Town, a Team, a Dream* as well as in the classic studies *Elmtown's Youth* (Hollingshead, 1949) and *Middletown* (Lynd & Lynd, 1929) where it was suggested that interscholastic sports teams are often the basis of community loyalty and pride, particularly in small-town America. To date, SOC research has typically examined either a geographic community or an interest community, but not both concurrently with a few notable exceptions (Obst, Zinkiewitz, & Smith, 2002a; Brodsky & Marks, 2001). These researchers found that a SOC is stronger within a community of interest compared to a geographic community. However, Obst et al. (2002a) examined science fiction aficionados from diverse geographic communities as opposed to one community. As such, the main goal of this study was to determine if there would be a difference between the overall geographic sense of community and the overall interest community of girls' interscholastic basketball similar to the findings of Obst et al. (2002a) or more in line with Brodsky and Marks' (2001) study that suggested a symbiotic relationship between what they termed the macrocommunity (geographic community) and sub-community (relational community) that was a mutually dependent relationship.

## Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine the overall SOC experienced by citizens of Rose City, IL, in relation to their community as a whole (OGSOC) and in relation to the interscholastic girls basketball program (OCIGB). Rose City is a small, rural town in central Illinois of approximately 5,600 people. The community was located at the intersection of east-west and north-south railroads, and had supplies of fuel and water for the steam engines of the railroad. It was once the place where four major rail lines (Illinois Central, New York Central, Baltimore & Ohio, Chicago & eastern Illinois) connected, but now only one line runs through town and the train never stops (M. Cross, Jr., personal communication, June 29, 2007). The other lines are gone; at least one having been reclaimed as a bike trail while sections of the others lie dormant, rusting and hidden by the countryside reclaiming what is rightfully its own.

It is also difficult to imagine that at one time the town held the designation “The City of Roses” for having more flowers under glass in greenhouses than anyplace in the world due to its proximity to coal, its weather and the fact that geographically hail storms are a rarity to the area. Today, the flower industry has moved on, a victim of more inexpensive ways and means to raise flowers. With no coalmines or greenhouses left to employ its citizens, many were forced to relocate or commute to neighboring communities; many area residents commute between 15 and 60 miles one-way daily to work (M. Cross Jr., personal communication, June 29, 2007). Over the last thirty years, the town’s population has gradually declined from approximately 6,000 in 1980; 5,800 in 1990 to 5,600 in 2000 (“U.S. Census Bureau,” 2007).

The focus of this study was to better understand SOC in Rose City, the girl’s basketball program and the relationship between them. This was accomplished distributing and collecting questionnaires in the places most frequented by the people of Rose City. These included the main shopping centers in town, the main park in town, the hospital, three golf leagues at two separate courses, city hall and the main streets where individuals shop and/or walk. The questionnaire consisted of three sections beginning with an open ended question that asked respondents to list 3-5 items that came to mind when thinking of Rose City. This information was coded and tabulated to look for common themes emerging from the responses (Schwandt, 2001). This section concluded by asking respondents for demographic information. Sections two (OGSOC) and three (OCIGB) made use of an adapted version of Chavis, Hogge, McMillan and Wandersman’s (1986) 12-item (short form) Sense of Community Index (SCI). Time was also invested in conversing with a variety of citizens (e.g., the Superintendent of Schools, the Rose City High School Athletic Director, two barbers, a pastor, several bankers, managers of local stores, a salesman, an auto body repairman, the newspaper editor) to gauge their perspectives.

## Results

The most relevant themes to emerge from the research for the purposes of this paper can be grouped into three areas. First, the open-ended question revealed strong ties specific to aspects of the community. Second, the nearly identical scores on the SCI for both the OGSOC and OCIGB will be examined. Third, the relationship between several variables found to have a significant relationship with both the OGSOC and OCIGB emerged. Together, this information paints a picture of a tight knit community whose fabric is quite interwoven between at least the two groups studied.

The first question on the survey asked participants to list 3-5 things that describe Rose City. These were tabulated and placed into groups with similar meanings (Schwandt, 2001). From this process the following categories clearly emerged: Small Town (N = 135, 48.7%), Good Schools (N = 130, 46.9%), Good Sports Programs (N =118, 42.6%), Friendly (N = 94, 33.9%) and Close Knit (N = 74, 26.7%).

A key finding of this study was that the SOC in the geographic and interest communities were nearly identical. This finding suggests that in small, rural communities the town and the team are one in the same and that separating out the two communities may not be possible. As evidence of this, several variables emerged as having significant relationships with both the

OGSOC and OCIGB. These included those whom had attended Rose City Schools themselves and/or had children in the school system. Although no significant relationship emerged between attending Rose City Schools in the OCIGB, it was present in the OGSOC. However, the case can be made that the OCIGB is direct extension of the community. Several areas of support (e.g., home game attendance, personal sponsorship) for the Miner Girl's Basketball program emerged as having a significant relationship with the OGSOC as well as the OCIGB. Finally, similar to the support variables, several motivations (e.g., community pride, socialize with friends) to attend Miner games emerged as having a significant relationship with the OGSOC as well.

## Discussion

The areas to be discussed are all evidence of the interwoven fabric of Rose City. It is difficult to examine Rose City without discussing the school system and the Miner sport programs and vice versa. The Miner Girls' Basketball program may not be thought of as a separate community in Rose City, but as a visible representation of Rose City. They are not two separate communities, but one in the same. Evidence of this shall be discussed next.

The open-ended question seeking top of the mind awareness of the community from respondents pointed to the strong bond between Rose City and its school system. Nearly 47% of the respondents listed "good schools" and 42.6% filled in a blank with the term "good sports" programs as well. These were the number 2 and 3 responses behind "small town," which was mentioned by nearly half the sample (48.7%). The importance of the school system and its sports program are clearly demonstrated through these freely chosen descriptors of Rose City by its residents. They also point toward the close relationship between the community and the school system. Peshkin (1978) posited that no matter the walk of life of the individual in the community, sports served as a foundation upon which a school system was based after taking care of the three "R's and that concern for one's school system might be the most powerful integrative factor in small communities. Similarly, Hale (1999) stated "that schools are often the centers of their communities and that one of the elements of the school that brings members of a community together is the athletic programs of the school" (p. 24).

As evidence of this close link, there was no clear distinction between the OCIGB and the OGSOC as was demonstrated in the Obst et al. (2002b) study. Instead, the obtained results were more in line with what Brodsky and Marks (2001) termed a symbiotic relationship between the two communities that was a mutually dependent relationship, which is one of the tenants upon which McMillan and Chavis (1986) built their conception of SOC as well. In a vibrant community, McMillan and Chavis (1986) argued that influence operates bi-directionally – members are able to influence their community and the community, in turn, exerts control over the behavior of its members. It is logical to believe that this same bi-directional influence can take place between an interest and geographic community as well where the members of both are largely comprised of the same individuals, as is the case in the rural community of Rose City.

It is logical to assume from the discussion above that the OCIGB has a component of OGSOC imbedded in it. Particularly in a small town like Rose City, it may be difficult for individuals to separate their feelings for their local sport teams because they are a part of the foundation of the community. Research by Heere and James (2007a; 2007b), using Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi and Ethier's (1995) research on individuals and their groups as a framework, suggested that team identity can also be symbolic of other types of external group identities. This framework is based on three tenants. First, the town itself is situated in a specific geographic locale and the high school sport team can be considered an extension of this location. The teams themselves bear the name of the community for which they compete, in this case Rose City Miner Girl's Basketball. Second, the blue collar nature of Rose City is an example of social class identity, which the Girl's basketball program embodies. Contrary to Heere and James, the third tenant of Deaux et al. (1995), social roles, may play a part in this relationship as well. In interscholastic sport, many people have the opportunity to either be a player, coach or member of management. These social roles add another layer to both community types in Rose City. Similarly, in small communities, Hale (1999) argued "the local high school team represents more than a game on Friday night. It is a period of time when…participation either as fans, coaches or players, engages deeply held emotions related to personal and community identity" (p. 10).

Finally, the relationship of respondents to Rose City school attendance, support of the OCIGB and the motivations to attend the games may lend credence to nearly lockstep scores obtained on the SCI. Boyer (1995) concluded, "Community is without question the glue that holds an effective school together" (p. 15). This sentiment can also be extended to include the athletic programs of the school as evidenced by the strong support the community of Rose City gives its Miner Girl's Basketball program. The significant support variables all represented a personal investment by the individual toward the program and by extension the community. Similarly, most of the significant motivation to attend variables had a family or community related emphasis. These findings are all so interwoven in the community it would be difficult to examine one without pulling in others. Further qualitative research would provide a more in-depth look allowing a deeper understanding of this relationship.

## References

Bissinger, H. (1990). *Friday night lights: A town, a team, a dream.* New York: HarperPerennial.

Brodsky, A., & Marx, C. (2001). Layers of identity: Multiple psychological senses of community within a community setting. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(2), 161–178.

Chavis, D., Hogge, J., McMillan, D., & Wandersman, A. (1986). Sense of community through Brunswick's lens: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 24–40.

Deaux, K., Reid, A., Mizrahi, K., & Ethier, K. A. (1995). Parameters of social identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 280-291.

Delaney, T. (2001). *Community, sport and leisure* (2nd ed.) Auburn, CA: Legend Books.

Hale, J. R. (1999). Significance of high school athletic program to school culture, community development and school-community connections in rural settings. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 9929117)

Heere, B. & James, J. J. (2007a). Stepping outside the lines: developing a multi-dimensional scale based on social identity theory. *Sport Management Review*, *10*, 65-91.

Heere, B. & James, J. J. (2007b). Sport teams and their communities: examining the influence of external group identities on team identity. *Journal of Sport Management*, *21*, 319-337.

Hollingshead, A. (1949*). Elmtown's Youth*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, S. & Kistler, J. (2002*). Once there were giants*. Bloomington, IL: Illinois High School Association.

Lynd, R. & Lynd, H. (1929). *Middletown: A study in modern American culture*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

McMillan, D., & Chavis, D. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *14,* 6–23.

Obst, P., Zinkiewicz, L., & Smith, S. (2002a). An exploration of sense of community, Part 3: Dimensions and predictors of psychological sense of community in geographical communities. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(1), 119–133.

Obst, P., Zinkiewicz, L., & Smith, S. (2002b). Sense of community in science fiction fandom, part 1: Understanding sense of community in an international community of interest. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(1), 87-103.

Peshkin, A. (1978). *Growing up American: Schooling and the survival of community*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Schwandt, T. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

**Searching For Stories: A Discussion of Place Meaning for Park Planners**

James Barkley
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Park Planning and Policy Laboratory
Department of Recreation, Sport, and Tourism
104 Huff Hall
1206 S. Fourth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
Phone: (217) 244-4532
Fax: (217) 244-1932
Email: jbarkley@uiuc.edu

Garrett Traylor
University of Illinois

Daniel M. Larson
University of Illinois

**Key Words:** Lived Experience, Memory, Place Meaning, Parks

**Topical Area**: Leisure and the Humanities

This paper is intended to generate discussion among park planners, professionals, and academics about place meanings and the type(s) of knowledge they represent. There is a body of scholarship that has grown in the direction of place studies (see Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1972, 1974, 1975, 1977) surrounding park and wild land management (see J.O. Farnum & L.E. Kruger Eds. 2008). This paper presents a discussion of place meaning, or sense of place in a way that people can all relate to: the telling of stories. First, this paper appreciates the complexity of place meanings. Second, this paper introduces a basic notion of lived experience and the subsequent role of memory and emotion in coming to know and represent place meanings. This theoretical structure is critical to understanding the type of knowledge that is being produced in place making processes and the relevance of this knowledge to planning dialogue surrounding park and recreation administration.

This unique interdisciplinary project examines the environmental autobiography of a creative writing major at the University of Illinois whose piece focuses on an important, influential, and definitive landscape of his childhood. In framing Traylor's (2009) writing, this project presents a unique opportunity to understand a process of place making through an autobiographical lens. Traylor's (2009) project began in the summer of 2009 when he took a course taught by Barkley. The major paper for this class was to write an 'Environmental Autobiography.' This paper took shape according to two in-class exercises. In the first assignment the students were asked to think of an important outdoor childhood place and simply write down the name of that place. Later in the semester students identified an important outdoor place, considering their earlier selection, and wrote descriptive accounts of the place and their experience(s) there. As a double major in creative writing and Scandanavian studies, Traylor enjoyed the emphasis this assignment placed on memorable description; the telling of how the place is remembered. This led to discussion of how to explore this paper/topic further. It was decided that an independent study in auto ethnographic writing focused on place meanings was appropriate, with the final paper being Traylor's (2009) *Searching for Stories*. Lacking overt politicization, Traylor's story is more autobiographical than auto ethnographical. In developing the piece, Traylor nonetheless deeply personalizes an important outdoor landscape from his childhood.

Place meaning, or sense of place is approached here according to a basic notion of lived experience and the subsequent role of memory and emotion in coming to know and represent place meanings. Lived experience refers to a series of temporal, spatial organizations that in its most basic form involves our immediate consciousness of life prior to reflection (Dilthey, 1985; Sartre, 1957/1985; Van Manen, 1990). Lived experience - so defined - exists only in its representation and does not exist outside of memory (Denzin, 1992). The act of remembering happens in the present yet is referencing an absent past (Huyssen, 2003). As such, the process of memory construction is imaginative (Denzin, 2001). Condensation, elaboration and invention are common characteristics of ordinary remembering (Bartlett, 1932, p. 205). Subsequently, stories of the lived experience are understood to include emotions and feelings (Denzin, 1985) that are essential to place meanings but are often difficult to formally represent in park planning scenarios (Nie, 2003; Yankelovich, 1991). As Tuan (1977) – a prominent scholar in contemporary place studies - points out:

> *"A large body of experiential data is consigned to oblivion because we cannot fit the data to concepts that are taken over uncritically from the physical sciences"* (Tuan, 1977, p. 201).

Traylor's piece presents an autobiographical context for understanding the possibility of green space as it has been constructed through a careful and focused place making process. Place making is a storytelling process. Traylor's work delves into place meanings and their formation through the representation of [remembered] lived experience:

> *"Kicked out of the house. Again. Both houses, actually - my friend Daniel's and mine. And we were supposed to do what now, 'Contemplate the wonders of nature?' So said my friend's father, his words verbatim. My own parents agreed that a little less time playing Fallout and a little more time outdoors might do us some good. Seems they were in cahoots. I whined, 'But I want to play video games.'"* (Traylor, 2009, p. 1)

As Traylor takes the reader along on a harrowing journey in an endless forest landscape, the experience tells of a childhood place whose space – consisting of the physical characteristics of the landscape - is beyond measure (see Relph 1976; Tuan 1975 for basic idea of human place and physical space).

> *"Even now with those trees right in front of me, I hadn't thought much of them in any sense other than background. 'Think we can find the end of it?' I pulled my gaze up from my feet with a resounding, 'Huh?' 'The ravine,' Daniel explained. I looked, shook*

> *my head. 'Nah, looks endless.' A path led down from my patio into the trees, and the trees did seem to go on forever. And so background became foreground."* (Traylor, 2009, p. 1)

The forest comes into focus as Traylor digs into the trees and it is at this point that we begin to see a complex environmental engagement and how the physical space of a backyard becomes a human place of heroism:

> *"'Daniel?' 'Yeah?' 'Endless might be too far.' 'Too late now, look around.' We were surrounded by beasts and monsters of every kind. Our only option was to fight our way back, and fight we did. Thousands of the invisible horde fell to the strike of our swords until the blades shattered against the trees themselves. Suddenly all fell quiet. We gasped for breath, standing back to back and holding mere splinters to our defense, but the monsters were gone. The mighty forest had spared us. 'I think we should get back.' 'I think you're right.' And we left our adventure in the trees."* (Traylor, 2009, p. 2)

Traylor's experience tells of a childhood place whose space is immeasurable. Sensing a threat to this childhood haunt in his young adult life, Traylor laments:

> *"I stepped outside to see what had changed, to perhaps attempt the same journey I had made so many times as a child. … Unlike in my childhood, I found an end to my ravine. At the end of the path, just beyond the first few trees, I stood facing a rock wall that my neighbors had built at the property line. In my memory, the place had been endless, stretching into infinity in a way that blended fantasy with reality, but the wall separated absolutely. Worse yet, on the other side of the wall, my neighbors had been clearing trees. … My back yard had become Hetch Hetchy Valley, but it was not the damming of water that I feared, but that of my memories."* (Traylor, 2009, p. 6)

The reader can understand the importance of this place when Traylor tells his story. There is an empathetic turn that is made possible through the sharing of experiential, emotional knowledge. In this autobiographical context the reader is invited to enter the sphere of experience and emotion that is rooted in Traylor's important childhood place.

This understanding of place making as told through stories of lived experience is critical to park and wild land managers who are exploring strategies for public involvement that incorporate lived experiences of visitors and stakeholders into their planning processes (Kruger, 2008; Kruger & Jakes, 2003). These strategies are generally connected with collaborative forums for dialogue that nuance meanings of place, encourage emotional expression, and ultimately build trust (Barkley & Stewart, 2008; Cheng & Daniels, 2003; Stedman, Beckley, Wallace, & Ambard, 2004; Stewart, Liebert, & Larkin, 2004; Stewart, Barkley, Kerins, Gladdys, & Glover, 2007; Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992). At the core of these efforts is an examination of participants lived experience.

Lived experience, as a philosophical orientation toward knowledge and knowing reality, holds central the idea that through the actual experience of something its essence may be felt and understood as reality (Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991). In championing the sharing of experiential knowledge in place-making processes Stokowski (2008, pp. 31-60) posits a charge to managers-as-stakeholders:

> *"A manager's imperative then, should be to understand the emergent qualities of place-making and place meanings in order to respond to patterns of discourse shaped by structured communicators linked across social networks. In this effort managers should err on the side of variety rather than constraint in allowing resource settings to be as open as possible to social and cultural behaviors through which place meanings may be expressed."* (Stokowski, 2008, p. 54)

After presenting a well-developed story written as a place making exercise and developing a basic theoretical sketch, the discussion is intended to further develop dialogue focused on place meanings and experiential knowledge among park professionals and researchers alike. This project is intended to generate discussion among park professionals and researchers aimed at identifying the proper platform(s) for sharing this sort of experiential knowledge in park and wild land planning with a keen focus on the major limitations of this sort of knowledge as operating outside of a traditional scientific approach to knowledge.

## References


Barkley, J., & Stewart, W. (2008). *When a landscape is bigger than itself: A stakeholder analysis at Grand Canyon National Park.* National Park Service Tech. Rep.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932/1967). A theory of remembering. In F.C. Barton, *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology* (pp. 197-214). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, A. S. & Daniels, S. E. (2003). Examining the interaction between geographic scale and ways of knowing in ecosystem management: a case study of place-based collaborative planning. *Forest Science, 49, 6,* 841-854.

Denzin, N. K. (1985). Emotion as lived experience. *Symbolic Interaction, 8, 2,* 223-240.

Denzin, N. K. (1992). The many faces of emotionality. In Ellis and Flaherty (eds) *Investigating Subjectivity*, pp. 17-30, Sage: Newbury Park California.

Denzin, N. (2001). *Interpretive Interactionism, Second Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dilthey, W. (1985). *Poetry and experience.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fals-Borda, O., & Rahman, M. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action research.* New York: Intermediate Technology/Apex.

Farnum, J. O., & Kruger, L. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Place-based planning: Innovations and applications from four western forests.* Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-741. Portland, OR: U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present pasts: Urban palimpsest and the politics of memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kruger, L. E. (2008). An introduction to place-based planning. In J.O. Farnum & L.E. Kruger (Eds.), *Place-based planning: Innovations and applications from four western forests* (pp. 1-6). Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-741. Portland, OR: U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Kruger, L. E., & Jakes, P. J. (2003). The importance of place: Advances in science and application. *Forest Science*, *49, 6*, 819-821.

Nie, M. (2003). Drivers of natural resource-based political conflict. *Policy Sciences, 36*(3/4), 307-341.

Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion Limited.

Sartre, J. P. (1985) *Existentialism and human emotions.* New York: Citadel Press. (Original work published 1957)

Schneekloth, L. H., & Shibley, R. G. (1995). *Placemaking: The art and practice of building communities*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stedman, R., Beckley, T., Wallace, S., & Ambard, M. (2004). A picture and 1000 words: Using resident-employed photography to understand attachment to high amenity places. *Journal of Leisure Research, 36, 4,* 580-606.

Stewart, W. P., Barkley, J., Kerins, A., Gladdys, K., & Glover, T. D. (2007). Park development on the urban-agricultural fringe. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, *25* (4).

Stewart, W., Liebert, D., & Larkin, K. (2004). Community identities as visions for landscape change. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 69,* 315-334.

Stokowski, P. A. (2008). Creating social senses of place: new directions for sense of place research in natural resource management. In *Understanding Concepts of Place in Recreation Research and Management.* Kruger, L.E., Hall, T.E., & Stiefel, M.C. (eds.). USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-GTR-744, pp. 31-60.

Traylor, G. (2009). *Searching for Stories*. Unpublished manuscript.

Tuan, Y. F. (1972). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Tuan, Y. (1974). *Topophilia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tuan, Y. (1975). Place: an experiential perspective. *Geographical Review, 65,* 151-165.

Tuan, Y. (1977). *Space and Place: the perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. London, Ontario: Althouse Press.

Williams, D., Patterson, M., Roggenbuck, J., & Watson, A. (1992). Beyond the commodity metaphor: Examining emotional and symbolic attachment to place. *Leisure Sciences, 14*, 29-46.

Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to public judgment: making democracy work in a complex world.* Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY.

## FEATURED STUDY-IN-PROGRESS

# Outdoor Recreation Trends: An Indiana Department of Natural Resources Study of Local Providers of Parks and Recreation in Indiana

Amy L. Gregg, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management
West Quad, Room 110
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306
Phone: 765-285-5781
Fax: 765-285-2606
Email: algregg2@bsu.edu

**Key Words:** Outdoor Recreation, Local Recreation

**Topical Area:** Management of Recreation, Park, Leisure, and Youth Programs and Services

As part of the statewide planning for Indiana, the Division of Outdoor Recreation prepares the SCORP (Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan) every five years to qualify for federal grants, such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to make Indiana eligible for federal grant programs. The SCORP serves in effect as a Master Plan for the State and is updated every five years. Part of writing the SCORP is incorporating research on various issues in Indiana, such as the context for the Study of Local Providers of Parks and Recreation in Indiana. The first study was conducted in 2004 by researchers at Ball State University, and those researchers are doing a follow-up study in 2010. The Local Providers Study is targeted toward local park and recreation agencies, generally defined as local government agencies at county, township, municipal or other local units of government (N=102). Among the respondents, 76% have a park and recreation department, while 86% have a park board that operates in their community; and 26% have friends-of-parks groups. The research questions for the study are to identify the issues faced by local providers and measure their best practices in the areas of funding, staffing, facilities development, programming and other related issues. Preliminary analysis of the data suggests that municipal governments are more likely to respond to studies of local providers compared to county and township agencies, which can be explained in part because there are more municipal governments operating parks in Indiana that there are counties and townships with this responsibility. It is evident from the data that local agencies vary greatly in their provision of recreational opportunities. For example, the number of acres managed for recreation ranged from one acre to thousands of acres available for public use. Similarly, annual budgets for park agencies range from in the hundreds to millions of dollars. Local providers were compared by capital projects planned for the next 5 years; and the most popular projects were playgrounds and picnic areas, as well as building new parks in general. Some of the more unique projects planned were dog parks and spray parks, and some are developing wetlands and prairies for more naturalized features. Results of this study will contribute to the writing of the next SCORP for Indiana, and a first report of the data is scheduled to be provided to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources in May of 2010. Ongoing research and analysis will be used for ongoing publications in the future.

**Risk Management Is Not Just for Park and Recreation Professionals Anymore: How to Partner with Faculty on Mutually Beneficial Community Engagement and Service-Learning Projects**

Nathan A. Schaumleffel, Ph.D., CPRP, IYD
Assistant Professor
Coordinator, Recreation Management and Youth Leadership Concentration
Campus/Executive Director, American Humanics
Department of Recreation and Sport Management
Indiana State University
Arena B-56B
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
Phone: (812) 237-2189
Fax: (812) 237-2493
Email: nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu

Mark Malaby, Ph.D.
Ball State University

Jacquelyn B. Frank, Ph.D.
Eastern Illinois University (formerly the University of Indianapolis)

**Key Words**: Community Engagement, Promotion and Tenure, Scholarship of Engagement, Service-Learning

**Topical Area:** Curriculum and Professional Preparation; Scholarship of Engagement; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

**Note: This study is part of a larger study conducted by the 2008-2009 Faculty Fellows of Indiana Campus Compact titled: Serve at Your Own Risk?: An Indiana Study of the Meaning of Service-Learning in the Promotion and Tenure Process*

## Introduction

Service-learning, particularly within the field of parks and recreation, has long been recognized as a valuable teaching tool that forges connections between schools and communities, as well as students and possible career choices (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 2002; Steinke, Fitch, Johnson & Waldstein, 2002 ). In recent years, service-learning has become recognized as a viable vehicle through which the three faculty roles of teaching, scholarship, and service can be integrated succinctly.

In 1990, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published a study titled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate.* In this now famous work, Boyer moves beyond the traditional scholarship of discovery and proposes three additional types of scholarship that should be acknowledged in institutions of higher education: the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of discovery has traditionally received the most credit in the faculty reward system. The scholarship of discovery seeks to develop or create new knowledge and then disseminate this knowledge through peer-reviewed outlets, such as journal articles, books, and conference presentations. While Boyer's call has resulted in the adoption of his model in university mission statements and publicity materials (Harkavy, 2004; McDonald, 2002), the faculty reward systems within many institutions of higher education have been slow to institutionalize the scholarship of integration, application, and teaching. Institutions ranging from liberal arts colleges to doctoral-granting universities continue to utilize peer-reviewed publication as the traditional gold standard for faculty evaluation (Braxton & Bayer, 1986; Fairweather, 1996; O'Meara, 2002a; 2002b, 2005).

The scholarship of application addresses the question of "how can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?" (p. 21). This form of scholarship is closely linked with service. Here knowledge from one's own discipline can and should be used to address "important individual, institutional, and societal problems" (Braxton, 2006, p. 1). This form of scholarship is also known as *the scholarship of engagement and outreach.* Boyer notes that:

> To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to and flow directly out of this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring rigor—and the accountability—traditionally associated with research activities ( p. 22)

To date there has been little academic research on service-learning and promotion and tenure. Instead, individual colleges and universities have tended to develop and publish their own guidelines to specifically instruct faculty regarding how to integrate service-learning into their tenure and promotion dossiers. At this time, no single standard has been broadly adopted in higher education. Thus, this study focuses on five Indiana institutions of higher education and the tensions that exist between administrator perceptions of the value of service-learning and the demands of the institutional frameworks that exist around them.

## Methods

The purpose of this study was to gather data about administrators' views on service-learning as it relates to tenure and promotion in college and university settings across Indiana. Specifically, the two-pronged research question focuses on: 1) the level of intrinsic value that deans and chairs in Indiana place on service-learning as part of faculty professional development; and 2) their perceptions regarding if and how service-learning is rewarded as part of promotion and tenure at different universities in Indiana.

The survey instrument used in this study was developed by the researchers and consisted of both closed and open-ended banks of questions. In the first section of the survey, participants were asked a series of Likert-type scale questions, the first of which involved identifying where service-learning falls within the scope of faculty responsibilities at their university. The open-ended portion of the instrument asked participants to elaborate more fully on their perception of the value of service-learning and to describe the role of service-learning in the promotion and tenure process at their institutions.

The inclusion criteria for this study were that participants had to be either department chairs or deans (or equivalent promotion and tenure decision makers) at one of the five Indiana institutions represented by the researchers. All potential participants were asked to participate in the study via an institution specific e-mail invitation. By the end of the collection period seventy-five responses (n=75) were received (see Table 1).

Table 1: Responses by Institution

| Institution | Number Surveys Sent | Number Completed | Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ball State University | 57 | 22 | 39% |
| Indiana State University | 41 | 13 | 32% |
| Manchester College | 22 | 9 | 41% |
| Purdue University | 40 | 20 | 50% |
| University of Indianapolis | unknown* | 11 | unknown |

*The Provost's office at the University of Indianapolis sent the survey to Deans and asked them to forward to Department Heads. It is impossible to know how many of the Deans forwarded the email so a response rate for the University of Indianapolis cannot be calculated.

The researchers exported the quantitative data into SPSS and then cleaned the data. Descriptive statistics were compiled. The qualitative data collected from the open-ended questions on the instrument were transcribed and sorted into thematic categories using constant comparison (i.e., open coding) within the framework of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

## Results and Discussion

The majority of survey respondents (61%) were department chairs/heads. Other respondents consisted of deans (19%) and administrators in other positions (20%) who were involved in promotion and tenure decisions. Respondents had spent a variety of time in their current position with 15% in their current positions for less than 1 year and 3% in the same position for more than 20 years. Similarly, the number of years respondents had spent at their current institution ranged from less than 1 year to more than 20 years, with a mode of 13-15 years. Nearly eighty-three percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "service-learning is a valuable teaching methodology in higher education classrooms" while less than 3% disagreed with the statement. Additionally, a majority (56%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that designing and implementing a service-learning course is an appropriate use of time with only 16% of respondents disagreeing. While the respondents were consistently positive in their assessments of service-learning as a whole, less than half (39%) indicated that they have incorporated service-learning into their teaching.

Respondents were also asked to rank seven items in terms of their value for faculty seeking promotion and tenure. The overall trend in the data is that service-learning at our surveyed institutions is not highly valued in promotion and tenure decisions. Publications, especially peer-reviewed research articles, regardless of university mission and strategic plan, were named as the most important factor for faculty to consider in seeking promotion and tenure (51.6% of respondents), which illustrates the deference to the scholarship of discovery. A smaller number of respondents mentioned the possibility for service-learning to be broadly applicable in the promotion and tenure process, dependent upon the ability of the faculty member to document its efficacy. The two least important factors were number of service-learning courses taught (47.8%) and student evaluations of teaching (14.3%).

*Risk Management for Park and Recreation Faculty*

When asked what steps pre-tenure faculty could take in documenting service-learning projects to maximize impact for promotion and tenure, responses were quite negative, situating service-learning by itself as minimally important to the promotion and tenure process. One respondent noted that

> They [junior faculty] should make sure it doesn't interfere with their discipline-based, peer-reviewed scholarship. I have nothing against service-learning, but it is a part of teaching methodology and nothing more.

In fact, a majority of the administrators who responded advised pre-tenure faculty against engaging in service-learning altogether, noting that doing so could damage their chances for tenure. Even those who noted the value of service-learning in this section of the survey were quick to warn of its dangers for non-tenured faculty in the current system.

In order for the administrators we surveyed to feel comfortable advocating service-learning to pre-tenure faculty, existing promotion and tenure structures would need to be modified. However, while one respondent noted, “a separate category needs to be established in P&T format that accurately describes the service-learning project in terms of outcomes and community partners” the majority did not mention this possibility and merely advised faculty to stay away from service-learning until tenure was achieved.

Respondents were also unified regarding how service-learning is likely to be counted in promotion and tenure with and without accompanying products. Several respondents answered with the single word “None” or phrases like “not a primary criterion” when asked about the value of service-learning (on its own) in the promotion and tenure process. However, when respondents were asked if it is acceptable for “products” from service-learning (such as peer-reviewed journal articles and conference presentations) to count toward promotion and tenure in the area of scholarship over seventy percent of participants agreed. When considered separately from publications, service-learning was perceived as disproportionally time-consuming relative to its benefits in the promotion and tenure process.

Community service and engagement is growing in importance on campuses because its ideals connect closely with modern university mission statements. Yet, as noted above, in Indiana such engagement often is not meaningfully recognized in terms of tenure and promotion. What is happening in Indiana is reflected nationwide, as noted by O’Meara (1997), who conducted a study examining approximately 400 tenure and promotion documents and found that only 6.5 percent of the sample universities had changed their policies to better encourage and reward faculty service.

## Conclusion

Park and recreation professionals, when requesting assistance from faculty, must realize that community engagement and service-learning is risky business for pre-tenure parks and recreation faculty and that faculty must manage risk when making decisions to conduct pro bono consulting or to orchestrate complicated community-based class projects in partnership with a recreation agency. Typically, university to community assistance has been looked upon as a two-way partnership that ensures benefit to the agency in the form of free service and to the students as a quality “real world” learning experience. This research project gives credence to the assertion that community engagement and service-learning projects must be a three-way partnership between the agency, students, and the faculty member. If faculty are going to spend valuable and profuse amounts of time on a community project, the project must generate “products” that can be classified under the scholarship of discovery (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, juried presentations). Moreover, park and recreation professionals need to understand and work to establish quality partnerships with faculty that achieves the necessary three-way partnership. Community-based projects must generate: 1) a necessary service to a community-based agency; 2) a quality learning experience for the students; and 3) one or more "product(s)" that count(s) in the scholarship of discovery. If professionals are not willing to meet the need of faculty, then it is fair to say that faculty will likely manage their risk and not partner to assist unwilling agencies and professionals. To be successful in the academic setting, faculty must be selective about the community agencies and park and recreation professionals with whom they partner, so that the time they spend serving the community generates the necessary "product" to achieve promotion and tenure.

## References


Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39* (3), 251-263.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braxton, J. M. (2006) (Ed.) Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship. *New Directions for Institutional Research # 129*. Spring. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1986). Assessing faculty scholarly performance. In J.W. Creswell (Ed.), *Measuring Faculty Research Performance* (pp. 25-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Charmaz, C. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research.* 2nd ed. London, Sage.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (2002). Beyond surveys: Using the problem solving interview to assess the impact of service-learning on understanding and critical thinking. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Vol. 1. Service-learning: The essence of pedagogy* (pp. 147-160). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Harkavy, I. (2004). Service-learning and the development of democratic universities, democratic school, and democratic good societies in the 21st century. In Welch, Marshall, & Billig, Shelley H. (Eds.), *New Perspectives in Service-Learning: Research to Advance the Field* (pp. 3-21). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

McDonald, W. (2002). *In search of Ernest Boyer's Legacy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K. (1997). *Rewarding faculty professional service*, Working paper #19. Boston: New England Resource for Higher Education

O'Meara, K. A. (2002a). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure.* New York: Routledge-Falmer.

O'Meara, K. A. (2002b). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K. (2005). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types. In K. O'Meara & R. E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*, 255-289.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications.

Steinke, P., Fitch, P., Johnson, C. & Waldstein, F. (2002). An interdisciplinary study of service-learning predictors and outcomes among college students. In S. H. Billig & A. Furco (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Vol. 2. Service-learning research through a multidisciplinary lens* (pp. 73-102). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

# CALL FOR ABSTRACTS
# 2011 INDIANA PARK AND RECREATION ASSOCIATION RECREATION RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM

Indianapolis, IN
January 19 – 21, 2011
Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, CFRM, IYD
Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu; 812-237-2189

Note: This Call for Abstracts was intentionally modified from the National Recreation and Park Association Leisure Research Symposium Call for Abstracts, so that Indiana-based researchers and students can learn how to prepare an abstract for the National Congress. This "overuse" of the Leisure Research Symposium Call for Abstracts should not be perceived as plagiarism.

The IPRA Recreation Research Symposium provides a state-level forum for scholarly exchange and discussion about recreation and leisure. The Symposium includes both theoretical and applied research that transcends disciplinary boundaries. Papers will primarily address Indiana-based applied research directed at the recreation professional; as well as research conducted via Indiana higher education community engagement and service-learning research projects. Papers may also address leisure behavior, and structural and cultural aspects of leisure and leisure studies.

Papers are presented either as posters or as formal paper presentations. All abstracts receive the same rigorous, double blind peer-review without consideration of presentation format. Abstracts for both types of presentations may be included in a published book of abstracts.

Abstracts reporting empirical studies should contain subheadings identifying an introduction, methods, results, and discussion; only completed studies should be submitted. Abstracts reporting conceptual and theoretical discussions should also have an effective set of subheadings. Abstracts cannot exceed three pages, single-spaced (see attached instructions). Because of this extreme limitation, it is imperative that abstracts are written carefully and provide a coherent overview of the paper that will be presented.

## CONDITIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF ABSTRACTS

1. Only completed studies or scholarly discussions may be submitted.

2. Only studies that have not been previously published or presented at another professional conference may be submitted (some exceptions may be made- contact Research Committee Chairperson before submitting an abstract to discuss your scenario). Papers that ask the same question(s), use the same analysis, or develop the same logical argument as previous publications or presentations are not eligible.

3. Two or more abstracts from the same study cannot be submitted to different sessions under different titles/authorship unless substantially different aspects of the study are represented in each paper.

4. Abstracts undergo blind peer review by two (or more) reviewers with expertise in the topical area to which the abstract was submitted. The IPRA Research Committee/Symposium Chairperson makes final decisions about acceptance, but typically adheres to the recommendations of the reviewers. Papers may be rejected due to time and space limitations, ineffective development of the 3-page abstract, violation of conditions 2 or 3 (above), or weaknesses in the study itself.

5. Authors who have their abstracts accepted are expected to deliver their presentations as assigned during the Symposium. Please do not submit an abstract unless you are committed to attending the Symposium.

6. Abstracts are to be submitted electronically. See instructions below to determine where to e-mail your submission. Abstracts should be emailed no later than November 1, 2010; abstracts emailed after this deadline may be returned without review.

THE EMAIL SUBMISSION SHOULD INCLUDE

1. Abstract: An electronic copy of an abstract as a Microsoft Word document (other formats will not be accepted) that meets the following specifications:

    A. Three pages maximum including all discussion, tables, and figures. Abstracts exceeding this page limit will not be reviewed. A reference list is recommended but not required and may extend onto a fourth page if necessary. The text of the abstract may not exceed onto a fourth page.

    B. Use 12-point font and one-inch margins on sides, top and bottom.

    C. Single space the text.

    D. Abstracts should have a clear title above the first line of text, with no information about the author(s).

    E. Use appropriate subheadings.

    F. Remove author identification in properties (In Word, go to File, then properties, summary and remove author name).

    G. Tracking changes must not be readable.

    H. Abstracts that do not meet all specifications will be rejected from further consideration.

2. Cover Sheet: Include a cover sheet with the abstract. This cover sheet should include:

    A. Title of the abstract.

B. Principal author's name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address. It is assumed that, unless otherwise specified, this person will make the presentation if the abstract is accepted.

C. Full name and institutional affiliation of all co-authors.

D. The principal author's contact information over the summer, if different from above.

E. Three or more keywords to describe the substantive content of the abstract.

F. The specific topical area (***one only*** from the 11 topical areas that are listed on next page) in which the abstract should be reviewed.

G. The author's preference for presentation format. Indicate one of the following: (a) poster only; (b) prefer poster but would do formal presentation; (c) prefer formal presentation but would do poster; (d) formal presentation only. Note: Reviewers are not aware of the stated presentation preference. This information in conjunction with time and space limitations is used by the IPRA Research Committee/Symposium Chair when establishing the final conference schedule.

3. Correspondence regarding abstract.

A. We will notify authors of abstract receipt via email.

B. Remember to e-mail the abstract no later than NOVEMBER 1, 2010. See instructions below to determine where to send the abstract.

INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ABSTRACTS ACCEPTED:

1. All individuals who submit an abstract will be notified of acceptance/rejection by early December. Authors whose presentations are accepted must submit a REVISED THREE PAGE ABSTRACT and details for continuing education units ***via e-mail only*** no later than December 15 (instructions will be included in the acceptance letter). Please watch for your e-mail letter in early December and be prepared to submit the abstract promptly if your paper is accepted. Please remember, all communication this year regarding submission and acceptance of abstracts will occur via email.

2. Conference registration information will be posted on the IPRA web site: http://www.inpra.org/mc/page.do?sitePageId=100970&orgId=ipra

3. IPRA reserves the right to reproduce and distribute abstracts of all presentations in a book of abstracts that may be produced on CD ROM and/or posted as a .pdf file on the IPRA web site. This does not preclude subsequent publication of the presentation (same version or an extended version) by the author(s) in a journal or other publication.

4. You will be notified of the date and time of your presentation in December after the full Symposium schedule has been established. Because of the complexity of scheduling, we cannot

accommodate personal requests regarding this schedule. Typically, formal presentations are allotted 15 minutes, followed by 5 minutes for discussion. The poster session will be scheduled for two hours in the exhibit hall. If you are doing a poster, you will receive instructions and guidelines for preparing your materials.

5. Regardless of which topical area abstracts are submitted to for review, they will be re-grouped into theme sessions for presentation (except posters). The theme sessions bring together papers with a similar focus.

SUBMISSIONS:

All submissions should be sent only by e-mail to:

Dr. Nathan A. Schaumleffel, CPRP, CFRM, IYD
Chairperson, IPRA Research Committee/Symposium
nathan.schaumleffel@indstate.edu
812-237-2189

## SUBMITTING AN ABSTRACT

Select the most appropriate one of the 11 topical areas listed below for review. These areas reflect the reviewers' areas of interest and expertise. Papers accepted for presentation will be re-grouped into thematic sessions for the Symposium.

## TOPICAL AREAS:

1. Management of Recreation, Park, Leisure, and Youth Programs and Services
2. Research Projects Generated from Indiana-based Higher Education Community Engagement and Service-Learning Projects
3. Curriculum and Professional Preparation; Scholarship of Engagement; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
4. Outdoor Recreation: Policy, Planning and Management
5. Travel and Tourism
6. Leisure and the Humanities
7. Methodology, Statistics, and Research Design
8. Leisure over the Lifespan: Childhood through Old Age
9. Psychological/Social Psychological Aspects of Leisure
10. Sociological and Cultural Studies
11. Special Populations: Clinical and Community Focus