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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore and examine the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies in the United States. Further, the study sought to compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies which have achieved accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) versus those who have not achieved CAPRA accreditation. Organizational culture according to Schein (1985) included characteristics found within a working environment, a pattern of assumptions, both written and assumed, passed on to new members. Authors throughout the literature wrote that all organizations have culture. Accreditation is a level of achieving best practice within a professional organization. The goal of this study was to expand the literature regarding organizational culture and accreditation of municipal park and recreation agencies which currently is lacking.

A written questionnaire was distributed to 57 CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and a convenience sample of 94 non-accredited agencies. Data was collected from 96 municipal park and recreation agencies: CAPRA accredited agencies (n=37) and non-accredited agencies (n=59) during winter 2010 using a written questionnaire. The questionnaire utilized the Diagnosing Organizational Culture model developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), the Competing Values Framework of Culture model developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991), demographic questions regarding population, budget size, and number of full-time employees, and two open ended questions regarding why accreditation was or was not chosen.
Results indicated that the overall organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when using the method developed by Harrison and Stokes was that the “Achievement Orientation” was the prominent profile. The prominent organizational culture of CAPRA accredited agencies was also the “Achievement Orientation” while the “Support Orientation” was the leading culture of non-accredited agencies. When seeking differences among CAPRA accredited and non-accredited agencies there were two areas of statistical significance: “Role Orientation” and “Achievement Orientation.” While using the Competing Values Framework of Culture model the results illustrated that the outcome was varied with statistically significance in the “Group Culture,” “Developmental Culture,” and “Rational Culture.” There was no association between the population, budget size, and number full-time staff with respect to the organizational cultures of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited agencies.

The CAPRA accredited agencies stated that they became accredited for basically two reasons: to meet and validate a set of best practices and to meet a high level of professional standards. The non-accredited agencies touted that lack of financial resources and the time to complete the accreditation process as reasons for not taking part.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

To summarize the words of Orson Scot Card:

One man did his part, and another his, and neither even had to check
to make sure all the parts were getting done. Like a dance of atoms
Alvin imagined in his mind. He never realized it, but people could be
like atoms. Most of the time people were disorganized, nobody
knowing who anybody was, nobody holding still long enough
to be trusted, just like Alvin imagined atoms, might have been
before God taught them who they were and gave them work. It was a
miracle seeing how they knew each other's next move before the
move even began. Alvin laughed out loud in seeing such a thing, knowing
it was possible, dreaming of what it could mean with thousands of
people knowing each other that well, moving to fit each other just right,
working together.

(Card, 1989)

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a multifaceted concept that can be defined in many
different ways. Numerous authors have discussed the importance of organizational
culture in organizations and have written that all organizations have a culture which
can be construed as a shared pattern of values, beliefs, and assumptions (Deal &
Kennedy, 1982; Edginton & Chen, 2008; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Pettigrew, 1979;
Schein, 1992). These patterns can appear as a verbal or written guide in which an
organization's behavior is followed by its members.

The culture of an organization can be seen as its collective character or personality.
A simple analogy of organizational culture is that an organization's culture is to an
agency as personality is to an individual (Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Mehrmann, 2006). An agency's organizational culture is an important element in its existence. Similar to an individual's personality, organizational culture is the one element that separates and defines it from other organizations or agencies. In essence, an organization creates an environment that is like no other. Its culture is a mixture of different characteristics.

Within every organization there is a culture. In fact, within any organizational framework, there could be multiple subcultures that exist side-by-side with one another and contribute to the organization's overall culture. Deal and Kennedy (1982) have suggested that every organization has a culture, but that it may be fragmented and difficult to identify. These authors also state that whether an organization has a weak or strong culture, the culture nonetheless has a powerful influence throughout the organization and affect practically everything; including promotions, decision making, how employees dress, and in which sports they take part. Schein (1985) adds that an organization's culture can also be thought of as a pattern of assumptions that have been accepted by the organization over time, validated, and then passed on to new members of the group as the correct way to do business. Edginton, Gassman, and Edginton (2009) have written, when researchers look at an organization's culture, the researcher thinks of its basic assumptions. In other words, it's the way the organization looks at itself and how it interrelates to the environment around it. The concept of culture penetrates all of our existence. Edginton, Hudson, Lankford, and Larsen (2008) also note that a leisure service organization's culture can be planned or occur by chance evolving into a viable working environment over time. These authors state that when
an organizational culture can be identified, it can be organized, planned, managed, and taught, then spread throughout its employee base.

For purposes of clarification within this study, organizational culture is viewed as a complex concept that is relatively young within the arena of management research. Its definition is varied, but the characteristics of the concept lead the researcher to believe that its existence within an organization is related to the elements of which it is bound. These elements form the environment from which the organization exists. The way in which its leadership manages, the way in which the organization’s structure is portrayed, the different roles that staff represent, and the resources under which it operates all contribute to the environmental existence or culture of the organization.

The first indication of the concept framing culture within an organization was linked to the Hawthorne Studies of the 1930s. Although organizational culture was not identified as such at the time, the Hawthorne Studies were recognized for the identification of two factors that impacted on work and productivity. The first factor was job supervision and the second was individual and small group interaction. Commenting on the Hawthorne studies, Edginton et al. (2008) have implied that the work patterns can be viewed in behavioral terms and that the manager’s role actually creates the positive interpersonal relationships. Elton Mayo, leader of the Hawthorne Studies, alluded to the importance of performance and outcomes in the workplace and demonstrated in his research that the human element was essential (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1975). Additionally, Mayo’s research, consisting of the human variable or human relation approach to management reflected attention to the culture of an
organization, and this concept ultimately was referred to as an organization’s corporate culture.

In the early 1950s, further indications of the confirmation of some type of organizational culture and its link to organizational performance appeared in the works of Elliot Jaques (1951) in the document *Changing Culture of A Factory*. The main focus of this research was the identification of the social interactions of an organization’s employees. Discussing Jaques research, Ashkanasy, Winderom, and Peterson (2000), have written that his findings focus on the culture of the environment as a barrier to productivity in that the culture was not in agreement with the organizational structure or the environment.

It was not until the early 1970s that research focused on the concept of “organizational culture” when the term began to appear in the literature. Andrew M. Pettigrew (1979), a professor in the Johnson School of Management at Cornell University, devised and implemented a study that would focus on:

> ...discuss how purpose, commitment, and order are generated in an organization both through the feelings and actions of its founder and through the amalgam of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth we collapse into the label of organizational culture. (p. 571)

According to Ashkanasy et al. (2000), this landmark study has been identified as the seminal research investigation pertaining to the introduction of the concept of organizational culture.

Early researchers, Deal and Kennedy (1982), first proposed organizational culture as a business environment which encompassed values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network. In 1985, Edgar Schein brought the concept of organizational culture
to the forefront. Schein (1985) describes organizational culture as a mixture of the influence of three sources: its founders, the industry itself, and the socialization of the organization's environment. As a result of years of research, Schein (1992) further expanded his initial thoughts and wrote that organizational culture defines an agency's environment. It also formulates the management of people as it begins to relegate the adopted values and doctrine of an organization.

Little is known regarding the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies. Only one study has been conducted and reported in the literature that discusses the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies. Colyer, Soutar and Ryder (2000) studied the organizational cultural profiles of four local government authorities in Western Australia. Their research ultimately suggested that organizations may have several common characteristics, although the characteristics may be of different magnitudes. There are no known studies which identify and compare the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies in the United States. More specifically, there are no studies which identify and compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies which have achieved the Commission on Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) accreditation through the CAPRA program.

This research study will focus on organizational culture using three different types of methods. The research instrument will have three parts. First, the instrument designed by Harrison and Stokes (1992) will be utilized to diagnose four different elements that they theorize is found in an organization's culture. In *Diagnosing*
Organizational Culture, the authors identified the four elements as “Power Orientation,” “Role Orientation,” “Achievement Orientation,” and “Support Orientation.” There are many different research perspectives that focus on the identification of an organization’s culture; these four orientations create only one research perspective in the identification of the various types of environments that exist within an organization. The instrument consists of 15 partial statements that have four choices for completion of each statement. Each completion to the statement is weighted “4” to “1” and requires that a priority be given from the “most likely” to the “least likely” to fit the organizational culture of the response agency.

The second instrument was based on the Competing Values Framework of Culture developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991). The instrument measures what Quinn and Spreitzer call the four quadrants of organizational culture: “Group Culture,” “Developmental Culture,” “Hierarchical Culture,” and “Rational Culture.” This method consists of 16 questions and utilizes a Likert scale which allows for the identification of the various types of culture found within each of the four quadrants.

The third portion of the instrument consisted of demographic questions regarding the municipal park and recreation agencies’ population of the community, annual budget size, number of full time personnel, whether or not the agency is accredited, and lastly, an open ended question allowing respondents to explain why they are or are not accredited. A more detailed explanation of each method will be explained further in Chapter 3.
Municipal Park and Recreation

Municipal park and recreation services are a staple of community life. According to Jensen and Guthrie (2006), there are over 3,300 municipal park and recreation departments in the United States. The majority of these agencies are defined as local park and recreation departments. These agencies offer a wide array of services and provide areas and facilities to meet the leisure needs of individuals in the context of local community settings. Such services and resources provide opportunities to individuals of all ages and abilities. It is estimated through the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA; 2009a) that nearly 200 million people use leisure services annually to enhance their physical and social well-being, while seeking the highest recreation experience possible. The scope of municipal park and recreation services is extensive in providing opportunities for individuals to focus on enhancing quality of life throughout their lifespan.

The concept of municipal park and recreation agencies is the foundation for the current leisure industry in America, especially in regard to municipal park and recreation. From a historical perspective, the establishment of municipal park and recreation agencies provided career opportunities that led to the foundation of the profession as we know it today. Meyer and Brightbill (1948) discussed this concept stressing that park and recreation contributes to the well-being of the community and how its implementation is a responsibility of government. Rodney (1964), a professional in park and recreation and academic leader since the late 1950s wrote:
... the principle that municipalities are responsible for the provision of recreation opportunities within their borders is clearly defined. The responsibility includes the acquisition, development, and operation of park and recreation areas that range in size from circles, squares, and ovals to neighborhood parks, playgrounds, playfields, and beaches. (p. 176)

Several authors support the concept of local government as the common provider of a comprehensive park and recreation program (Edginton et al., 2008; Kraus, Barber, & Shapiro, 2001; Russell, 2005). Thus, the types of services and resources not only include recreation programs, but also the provision of many different types of areas and facilities. The pervasiveness of services and resources provided by municipal park and recreation agencies is widespread.

Municipal park and recreation agencies are organized by state or local statues which provide a legal mandate for the provision of services to a local community. Numerous authors (Edginton, DeGraaf, Dieser, & Edginton, 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Kraus, et al., 2001; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Leighty, 1980) have also commented on the role of municipal park and recreation agencies, especially in relation to jurisdictional mandates, while discussing the inclusion of park and recreation services as a part of municipal government. Edginton et al. (2006) wrote

A common form of organizing leisure services in the United States falls under the jurisdiction of a municipal government associated with a city or a town. In this arrangement, park and recreation services become part of the community service offerings of the entire city government. . . the provision of leisure services within this structure, while not mandatory, is often provided by a community as a part of its complete package of services. (p. 7)

In the United States, park and recreation services are commonplace and are an important function of municipal government. According to various authors, the typical
municipal park and recreation agency is organized and operated as a separate
department of municipal government (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008;
Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Kraus, et al., 2001; Rodney, 1964;
Russell, 2005). There are, however, a number of variations to the way in which park
and recreation services are organized within local governments. The most prevalent is
the combined park and recreation agency, although there can be separate park
departments and also recreation departments. Other services may also be combined
with park and recreation into a broader organizing construct that may include forestry,
theaters, conference centers, libraries, culture arts, and other human services.

The drive for professionalization among municipal park and recreation agencies has
led to the development and implementation of a program of national accreditation
known as the NRPA agency accreditation program. According to several authors
(Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2006; van der
Smissen, Moiseichik, & Hartenburg, 2005), the accreditation process was initiated in
1989. The program was advanced through the efforts of Professor Louis B. Twardzik,
formerly the Chair of the Parks and Recreation Resources Department in the School of
Agricultural and National Resources at Michigan State University (Edginton et al.,
2008). The same group of authors stated that with the support of the American
Academy of Park and Recreation Administration and the National Recreation
Foundation, the NRPA agency accreditation program was adopted in 1996. It was then
organized to be administered by a separate group known as the Commission on
Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA; Edginton et al., 2008;
Participation in the CAPRA program distinguishes one park and recreation agency from another in that a CAPRA accredited agency has been affirmed by external reviewers as meeting a unique set of professional standards. As of October 1, 2009, there were 57 municipal park and recreation departments that completed the accreditation process (National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b). What are the distinguishing characteristics of accredited municipal park and recreation departments when compared with agencies not participating in the CAPRA program? A major factor that may distinguish accredited agencies from non-accredited agencies is organizational culture. As Edginton et al., (2009) have suggested, "... recreation, parks and leisure service agencies are deliberately constructed social units designed to attain a set of goals and objectives... they are made up of individuals and have a unique set of characteristics" (p. 68). As Schein has noted (2004), the idea of culture can be applied to any social unit. Further, Edginton, et al. (2009) note that "... the culture of recreation, parks and leisure organizations may be the most powerful factor influencing its success or failure ... [and] ... some recreation, parks and leisure service organizations have very strong and easily identified cultures" (p. 68).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore and examine the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies. Further, the study seeks to compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies which have achieved
accreditation through the CAPRA program with those that have not sought participation in the program. According to National Recreation and Park Association (2009a) there are over 2,300 park and recreation agency members of the NRPA. This includes municipal park and recreation agencies, special districts, and counties which have sought membership in the organization. As of October 1, 2009, there are 77 agencies which have sought and received formal accreditation from CAPRA (National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b). Of these, only 57 qualify as a municipal park and recreation agencies.

The culture of an organization is one of the major topics found in the current study of management practice and organizational theory. Alvesson (2005) stated that an organization's culture is central to its operation and an important factor to understand, address, and manage in an environment of turbulent change and increasing competitiveness for resources. Edginton (1987) stressed the importance of organizational culture when he stated that an organization's culture directly shapes the organization and impacts the individuals, groups and other constituencies it serves. Thus, it seems evident that an organization's culture is central to its dynamics and understanding its impact is essential to an organization's success. Therefore, it is valuable to study the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies. Further, an understanding of the differences in the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with those which do not seek such accreditation, may yield useful information in framing the benefits of the program to
prospective organizations. The outcomes of this study may assist CAPRA in its review of the accreditation program requirements and standards.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to examine the organizational culture of select municipal park and recreation agencies. Utilizing Harrison and Stokes (1992) instrument *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* for assessing an agency's organizational culture, the study will examine four elements of organizational culture in the sample populations including Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation. In addition, the study compared CAPRA accredited municipal parks and recreation agencies with agencies which have not sought accreditation.

A second portion of the study utilized the *Competing Values Framework of Culture* developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991). In this section, four different cultures are presented including group culture, developmental culture, hierarchical culture, and rational culture. A comparison of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited agencies will also be completed.

The study also examined a select number of variables to determine if there is a significant relationship among the various elements of agency demographics. These variables include: (1) population of the community service area, (2) size of the agency's operating budget, and (3) the number of full-time professional staff. These three characteristics, although very different within each municipal park and recreation agency, may also be a contributing factor with respect to CAPRA accreditation. These three variables have been chosen due to their specific characteristics and the desire to
ascertain whether or not they may directly affect the decision to proceed through the accreditation process. This study was designed to ascertain whether or not there is a significant relationship between any one of these three characteristics and the decision whether or not to become accredited.

Finally, the instrument included two open-ended questions asking whether the municipal park and recreation agency is accredited or not and allows space for the respondent to list the reasons, pro or con, for taking part or not in the CAPRA accreditation process.

Research Questions

1. What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing such elements as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

2. What is the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing such elements as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

3. What is the organizational culture of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing such elements as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

4. What are the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing such elements as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?
5. What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed using the Competing Values Framework of Culture?

6. What are the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the four Competing Values Framework of Culture?

7. What association does the population of the communities' service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff has on the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with those agencies that are not accredited?

8. What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency to become accredited?

9. What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency choosing not to become accredited?

**Hypotheses**

Due to the lack of formal research on this topic, an inductive or exploratory research study was performed. Inductive or exploratory research is typically utilized when new subject matter of social interaction is attempted to be established (Eisenhart, 1989; Stebbins, 2001). The following hypotheses have been formulated to enable statistical testing and analysis of new research.

1. There is no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited
agencies when viewing organizational culture orientations such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, or Support Orientation.

2. There is no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the Competing Values Framework of Culture.

3. There is no statistical significance between the populations of the communities' service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff and the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with those agencies that are not accredited.

Limitations

The following limitations were identified in this study of organizational cultures among select municipal parks and recreation agencies.

1. The study is limited to municipal park and recreation agencies in the United States.

2. A subset of the study includes NRPA member municipal park and recreation agencies that have received CAPRA accreditation. The other subset group consists of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies that may or may not be NRPA members. There are a relatively small number of CAPRA/NRPA municipal member agencies in which to survey. As of October 1, 2009, there were 77 total accredited agencies of which only 57 are
municipal park and recreation.

3. In the non-accredited sample, the study was limited to municipal park and recreation agencies that are located in the United States. A convenience sample of 94 municipal park and recreation agencies was chosen which were regionally representative.

4. The *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* and the *Competing Values Framework of Culture* surveys that were utilized for this research are typically used in the corporate setting of management and are not designed specifically for municipal park and recreation agencies. Minor word changes were made for ease of understanding and appropriateness for interpretation by a park and recreation agency.

5. Due to the length of time that CAPRA program has been in effect and with the five year re-accreditation process, the leadership of the accredited agency may have changed since the agency had been initially accredited. This change may have an affect on the current perspective of organizational culture of the agency and their answers to the survey.

6. The study was dependent upon the seriousness of the respondent in answering the written questionnaire. The researcher could not control the administration of the instrument: therefore, the researcher is not cognizant of the manner in which the questionnaire was completed, either seriously or casually.
Delimitations

The delimitations of this research are specific to those municipal park and recreation agencies in this study. The delimitations were identified as follows:

1. The accredited subjects of the research study were limited to municipal park and recreation agencies that were members of the NRPA.

2. The non-accredited subjects of the research study were limited to municipal park and recreation agencies that may or may not be NRPA members and are located in the United States.

3. The CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies surveyed were NRPA members effective August 2009.

4. There were two distinct subject groups which were surveyed within the NRPA member agencies.

   a. Those municipal park and recreation agencies that have received CAPRA accreditation.

   b. Those municipal park and recreation agencies who are not CAPRA accredited.

5. The researcher administered the *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* survey (Harrison & Stokes, 1992), and a *Competing Values Framework of Culture* model (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1991), to the entire municipal park and recreation CAPRA accredited agency population and to a conveniently selected sample group of non-accredited municipal park and recreation member agencies.

6. The distribution and collection of the survey was conducted in winter, 2010.
Significance of the Study

Organizational culture is one of the major issues in the current study of management practice and organizational theory because the culture of an organization is central to its operation and success in the competitive corporate world (Alvesson, 2005). Edginton (1987) stressed the importance of organizational culture in the leisure related services when he stated that an organization's culture directly shapes the organization and directly impacts the individuals, groups, and other constituencies it serves.

Therefore, it is important to study the NRPA municipal agencies to see if there are any relationships between the organizational cultures of those accredited versus those non-accredited. There are several questions that need to be answered. Are there simple reasons in an organization's environment that dictate whether or not a municipal park and recreation agency decides to strive for accreditation? Are there organizational traits that lend itself toward the accreditation process? Therefore, it is important to study the NRPA municipal agencies to see if there are any relationships between the organizational cultures of those accredited versus those non-accredited. The results of this study can be used by CAPRA to evaluate and refine future accreditation programs.

The study of organizational cultural theory is often discussed in comparison to professionalism or the level of quality of the organization. On a subjective level, an organization which is deemed viable, successful, innovative, and dynamic suggests that the organizational culture has contributed to a positive work environment. Peters and

In comparing and exploring the relationship of organizational cultures of a select group of member agencies of the NRPA (specifically those municipal member agencies that have received CAPRA accreditation versus those who have not received CAPRA accreditation), this study provides new and unique insights into the management practice of municipal park and recreation agencies. Limited research has been conducted in this area to identify the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies, let alone to compare those which are CAPRA accredited with non-accredited ones. Thus, the study will significantly add to the basic knowledge of the profession as it relates to organizational culture and municipal park and recreation agencies.

Further, there has been limited research with respect to the CAPRA accreditation program. Existing research is limited to three studies which indicate the viability of the goals of the CAPRA accreditation program. These studies focused on the importance of leadership, accountability, and performance with respect to the CAPRA accreditation program. This research study is the first to identify, compare, and discuss organizational culture as an important link to the CAPRA accreditation process.

No known studies have been conducted regarding the types of organizational cultures that exist in municipal park and recreation agencies with respect to accreditation status. There is no research literature to support it, nor is there research literature to compare CAPRA accredited agencies with non-accredited agencies. The
goal of this study was to expand the literature on organizational culture as it relates and compares those municipal member agencies that have received CAPRA accreditation and those who have not. The outcome of this research will not only identify the strengths and weaknesses of CAPRA accredited municipal agencies, but also compare those characteristics to agencies that are not CAPRA accredited. This important information can then be utilized by CAPRA to assist in the marketing and promotion of future accreditation programs.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined to clarify concepts and maintain continuity which will create a common understanding:

1. Accreditation: An assessment and self-evaluation process that a professional organization, academic agency, or program goes through that illustrates their successful completion of meeting a highly regarded level of recognized professional standards.

2. Achievement Orientation: This concept aligns an agency working toward a common goal/mission. There is a shared purpose and common value toward the workplace. This aspect is also team oriented and intrinsically motivated.

3. American Academy of Park and Recreation Administration (AAPRA): Consists of approximately 100 individual members of the park and recreation profession and 20 members of academia, who have been recognized as leaders in the field of park and recreation. Individual members are nominated then elected by their peers to this organization.
4. Commission for Accreditation on Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA): The group of park and recreation professionals that have been given the direct responsibility by the AAPRA and the NRPA to administer the NRPA agency accreditation program. There are 13 members: four appointed by the NRPA Board of Trustees, four appointed by the AAPRA Board of Directors, and five organizational representatives appointed by supporting leisure organizations (van der Smissen, Moiseichik, & Hartenburg, 2005).

5. County Parks and Recreation Agencies: A public governmental agency that provides regional park and recreation services at a county level, typically to a larger constituency. It may provide specialized recreation, parks, and services that meet the needs of a large population based in an identifiable political jurisdiction and may also be referred to as a local park and recreation agency.

6. Culture: The characteristics, traditions, values, morals, and work ethics shared by a specific group.

7. Developmental Culture: The definition according to the Competing Values Framework of Culture method includes flexibility, decentralization, expansion, development, innovation, change, and creative problem solving methods.

8. Group Culture: The definition according to the Competing Values Framework of Culture method includes participation, open discussion, employee empowerment, assessment of employee concerns, and human relations.
9. Hierarchical Culture: The definition according to the Competing Values Framework of Culture method, includes control, centralization, routine, formal structure, stability, order, and predictable outcomes.

10. Local Park and Recreation Agency: This term may be used in several different forms of governmental leisure service. Three basic types of local governments provide park and recreation services: municipal, county, or special district” (Edginton et al., 2006, p.215). Proximity to the constituency is central to its existence.

11. Municipal Park and Recreation Agency: A public governmental agency that provides parks, recreation, leisure services, programs, special events, and leisure facilities to one specific community. The agency is identified within a city, town, or local park and recreation department i.e. a “City Name” Park and Recreation Department. “A common form of organizing leisure services in the United States falls under the jurisdiction of municipal government” (Edginton et al., 2006, p. 217).

12. National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA): A professional association that represents over 2,300 park and recreation agencies throughout the world in the common area of parks, recreation, the arts, therapeutic recreation, armed forces recreation services, and other park and leisure endeavors.
13. National Recreation and Park Association Agency Accreditation Program:
The program adopted by the NRPA in 1996 to evaluate a park and recreation agency and recognize a high standard of management and operation. There are 144 standards of which 36 standards are designated as fundamental to quality operations (National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b).

14. Organizational Culture: The collective values, beliefs, and personalities of a group of individuals that forms the working relationship of an office, organization, corporation, or agency.

15. Power Orientation: This concept aspires to strong leadership and control of the work environment. Those in power, the heroes of the organization, are accepted as the hierarchy of the organization. The leadership controls the workplace by its power over the resources.

16. Rational Culture: This definition according to the Competing Values Framework of Culture method, includes a task focus, goal achievement, direction, efficiency, productivity, and outcome excellence.

17. Role Orientation: An organization with a work environment of understanding and portrayal of regulation. The organization also promotes delegation of responsibility. The norms of the organization are followed by everyone and are formulated by the heroes of the organization.

18. Special Park and Recreation Districts is a legal entity under state statute i.e.
a "Specific Name" Park District. It "is an autonomous, separate function of
government having a particular purpose, in this case the provision of parks
and recreation services," (Edginton et al., 2006, p. 222).

19. Support Orientation: The organizational environment creates shared values
of good work ethics and assumptions of shared success. The workplace
supports the organization, its beliefs, and is focused on socialization/support.
CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational cultures of selected municipal park and recreation agencies. The study seeks to compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies which have achieved accreditation through the Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) program with those that have not sought participation in the program. This chapter presents a pertinent review of the literature related to the topic of organizational culture, agency accreditation, municipal park and recreation agencies, the CAPRA program, and organizational culture as it relates to CAPRA and municipal park and recreation.

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section is dedicated to the topic of organizational culture, its definitions, its historical development, and the frameworks for assessing organizational culture. The second section focuses on the review of agency accreditation. The third section of this chapter is devoted to municipal park and recreation agencies and provides an analysis of the literature including definitions, characteristics, and the elements that differentiate one municipal agency from the next. The fourth and final section focuses on organizational culture, CAPRA, and municipal park and recreation agencies in general and how these areas apply to the park and recreation profession.
Table 1 presents a comprehensive list of the important literature incorporated in this review. There are five subsections that move from the general topic area to a more specific portion of the research. The first subsection focuses on defining organizational culture and its development, theories, and applications. The second subsection focuses on the overall subject area of professional accreditation. The third subsection includes information regarding the characteristics, formation, scope, and service delivery of municipal park and recreation agencies from several well utilized academic texts. Following these subsections is a list of citations regarding the CAPRA accreditation program including a review of its historical development and additional pertinent information describing the program. The last subsection discusses organizational culture in the park and recreation field and its applications in the literature.
### Table 1

*Research Literature Organized by Topic and in Chronological Order*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission of Accredited Park and Recreation Agencies</td>
<td>Edginton, Hudson, &amp; Lankford, 2001; Kraus, Barber, &amp; Shapiro, 2001; Sandberg, 2004; Moiseichik &amp; Bodey, 2005; Moiseichik &amp; Hughes, 2006; van der Smissen, 2005; van der Smissen, Moiseichik, &amp; Hartenburg, 2005; Edginton, DeGraaf, Dieser, &amp; Edginton, 2006; National Recreation &amp; Park Association, 2006; Rubens, 2007; Edginton, Hudson, Lankford, &amp; Larsen, 2008; National Recreation &amp; Park Association, 2009a; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture and Park and Recreation</td>
<td>Edginton, 1987; Coyler, Soutar, &amp; Ryder, 2000; Edginton, Hudson, &amp; Lankford, 2001; Ibrahim &amp; Cordes, 2003; Moiseichik &amp; Hughes, 2006; van der Smissen, Moiseichik, &amp; Hartenburg, 2005; Edginton &amp; Chen, 2008; Edginton, Hudson, Lankford, &amp; Larsen, 2008; Hurd, Barcelona, &amp; Meldrum, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Culture

The major construct studied in this research project is organizational culture. This section of the literature review is divided into five parts. The first part presents information found in the literature regarding the pervasiveness of the concept of culture in organizations. Next is a section which defines comprehensively what is meant by the term organizational culture. Third, the literature review discusses frameworks that have been used in describing the culture of an organization. This is followed by an exploration of the literature regarding characteristics or elements of an organization's culture and in the last part, methods or frameworks for studying organizational culture will be reviewed.

Pervasiveness of Culture in Organizations

The idea that every organization has a culture, and in some cases subcultures, was a reoccurring theme throughout the literature. Alkire (1995) and Kotter and Heskett (1992) supported the concept that all organizations have a culture and added that some cultures may be stronger than others. Ashkanasy et al. (2000) suggested that the pervasiveness of culture comes from various characteristics including but not limited to attitudes, behavior, values, and beliefs. Other authors argued that culture is spread throughout various defining elements, many different corporate characteristics, and multiple levels of the organization.

There are mixed approaches with respect to the levels of culture in an organization and needless to say there is no agreement about the scope of what defines culture. However, it is generally accepted that organizational culture does exist.
Defining Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a relatively recent area of research. Initial studies began to emerge in business and management related literature as recent as the late 1970's and early 1980's. It has become one of the primary areas of academic research in organizational theory and management and has gained wide acceptance (Alvesson, 2005; Symphony Orchestra Institute, n.d.). Based on the underpinnings of anthropology and sociology, organizational culture has been defined in many ways (National Defense University, n.d.). According to Ashkanasy et al. (2000), the most commonly accepted definition was presented by Edgar Schein (1992) when he wrote that organizational culture is a pattern of fundamental assumptions developed by a group of people within an agency to cope with the rigors of everyday work that is accepted by the organization and passed on to new members as the standard way to do business.

This definition takes on additional meaning with the statement by Deal and Kennedy (1982) that the culture of an organization may even be fragmented and difficult to describe since loyalties may exist in different areas and levels of the management structure. Several authors suggested that the term had many meanings and that each organization is unique (Kaarst-Brown, Nicholson, von Dran, & Stanton, 2004; Martin, 2002). As the research expands, the definition also increases.

Since the concept was introduced in 1979 there has been significant debate on its definition. Some authors strongly feel that due to the complexity of organizational culture that the definitions sometimes lead to confusion. When defining organizational
culture there are two eras of broadening thought, 1979-1988 and 1990-to the present. The next sections will present these thoughts.

Origins of the Idea of Organizational Culture Studies

Andrew Pettigrew first introduced the idea of organizational culture in a 1979 article in Administrative Science Quarterly, by stating, “how purpose, commitment, and order are generated in an organization, both through the feelings and actions of its founder and through the amalgam of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth we collapse into the label of organizational culture” (p. 573). Hofstede followed in 1980 in his writings in Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. He stated that an organization’s culture could be defined as the interactive combination of pervasive attributes that may manipulate a group’s response to its work environment. Deal and Kennedy (1982), similar to the thoughts of Pettigrew, offered that shared values and beliefs contribute to the organization’s success and performance. Trice and Beyer (1984) added and utilized the words myths, artifacts, and rituals in their definition of organizational culture. They also expressed that underlying assumptions were the “substance” of an organization and that “the network of meanings contained in its ideologies, norms, and values” (p. 654). Schein (1985) who is noted for his focus and more thorough study of the concept of organizational culture beginning in the early 1980s initially identified organizational culture as a combination of three sources: (1) influence of the organizational founders and its history, (2) influence of the overall industry, and (3) influence of social culture of the organization.
Schein contributed to the definition of organizational culture and motivated many other theorists to develop and advance the definition further (Riegle, 2003).

In other studies, authors Peters and Waterman (1982) and Wiener (1988) contributed to the definition stating that the norms of the organization act as a guide to the employees and are the core of American corporate culture. Louis (1985) and Sathe (1985) added that culture is a set of significant ideals that a community or group of people may have in common. Thus, the corporate environment evolves into a group with common understanding and values.

**Contemporary Works**

Since 1990, new studies have offered several new dimensions to the definition of organizational culture. The initial concepts of organizational culture continue to be the conceptual framework of the topic. However, more research has identified additional elements and characteristics within its design. Kotter and Heskett (1992) added that the term *culture* represents those elements or characteristics that are relegated from one group to the next.

Schein (1992) added to his previous definition by developing three levels of culture: (1) artifacts, (2) values, and (3) underlying assumptions. Artifacts may include staff dress code, communication, and language. Values include an organization’s vision, mission, and the presentation of its values. Assumptions are the rules and regulations of the organization that are often unwritten, yet seem as guidelines to staff. Figure 1 depicts this concept.
Some simple, more recent definitions of culture according to Neuhauser, Bender, and Stromberg (2000) include "(1) it’s the way we do things around here- the HP or the IBM way, (2) it’s the personality of the organization, (3) culture is what people do when no one is watching, and (4) walk the talk. Say what matters and then do it consistently" (p.4). Another, more recent definition utilizes the basic context of Schein and adds the ideas of Colyer et al. (2000). These authors introduce several new elements to an organization with respect to the dress code, behavior, accepted routines, rules and regulations, and the history of the organization. From a manufacturing perspective, Patterson, Warr, and West (2004) espouse that organizational climate
typically represents an employee's understanding of prominent values and processes. Alvesson (2005) discussed the variety of definitions of culture and introduced organizational culture as an umbrella concept taking on many definitions and characteristics. Alvesson (2005) added that organizational culture is also about symbolism, rituals, myths, stories, legends, events, ideas, values, and assumptions that are shared and shaped by groups. Rubenstein (2001) defined culture as "systems of belief: norms and values, attitudes, world-views, and so on- are adduced to explain conduct" (p. 1).

In a contemporary study of management principles about Toyota, Liker (2004) discussed the need to slowly build the culture of the workforce and that the "Toyota Way" was to focus on challenging and respecting the employees. This concept built cultural characteristics of the workforce, skills, and routines that lead to confidence and success at Toyota. Packard (1995), author of The HP Way, supports the old and the new ideals and adds that organizational culture is a conglomeration of rules, experiences, myths and legends, relationships, and rituals as complex as any family and just as difficult to describe to any outsider.

"How we do business" or the unspoken interactions, relationships, or the expectations within an organization's environment or family, is yet another perspective of an organizational culture (Magee, 2005; Ohm, 2006). Badrtalei and Bates (2007) stated that organizational culture was a powerful force that could dictate whether or not an agency would succeed or fail. Drucker (2006) added that organizational culture is a commitment by the employees of an agency to common objectives and common
values. Hurd, Barcelona, and Meldrum (2008) added yet another dimension of thought to the early concepts of Schein as they defined organizational culture as shared norms, values, and expectations that connect employees and differentiate one agency from another. Although contemporary researchers cannot agree on one specific definition, there seems to be a clear and general consensus of the various elements that define organizational culture.

**Elements of Organizational Culture**

Found within the approaches of organizational culture are elements or characteristics that further contributed to defining this multi-dimensional construct. Driskill and Brenton (2005) explained that “elements of culture” include various aspects or elements that reveal the organization’s culture. The elements of culture include but are not limited to artifacts and behaviors, social constructs including rites and rituals, values, basic assumptions, heroes, and symbols (Ashkanasy et al., 2000; Deal & Kennedy, 1999; Driskill & Brenton, 2005; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). In addition to contributing to the definition of organizational culture, these elements also provide a basis to assist in the analysis of the culture within an organization’s structure. Although the literature introduces many different elements, Ashkanasy et al. (2000) stated that these elements tend to influence each other over time.

Artifacts and behaviors according to Schein (1985) include an organization’s space, technology, cultural representations, and its more obvious behavior. Artifacts are more tangible in nature and represent the physical environment and what an organization
stands for. Schein (1992) further stated that artifacts and behaviors are difficult to interpret yet additionally represent the composition of an organization's structure and its method of doing business. Hatch (1997) added that artifacts are the more substantive and vocal characteristics of the organization.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggested that rites and rituals are focused on the daily routines of the organization. According to the authors, these “mundane manifestations” may actually provide a detailed guide of what type of behavior is expected. Driskill and Brenton (2005) explained rituals as events or traditions that involve social interaction that may contribute to the cultural personality of the organization.

According to Deal and Kennedy (1982) values are the basic beliefs and future of an organization and form the central core of the organization. Values also contribute to the establishment of standards which lead to the success of an organization. Deal and Kennedy (1999) added that values develop a focal point for an organization and also contribute to shaping its behaviors. Kotter and Heskett (1992) suggested that there are shared values that represent the majority of the employees which include issues, behavior, and goals. Schein (1992) used the term “espoused values” and stated that the organization’s values include strategies, goals, and philosophies. Further, Driskill and Brenton (2005) suggested that values are those beliefs that the employees have in common and that ultimately they are the central priority of the group.

Several authors suggest that basic assumptions are those unwritten beliefs and perceptions that are taken for granted in an organization, the core of its existence that exists as thought or feelings (Hatch, 1997; Schein, 1992). Neuhauser et al (2000)
suggested that underlying assumptions are paramount to the organization and represent
the core values in the deepest portion of the agency's culture. These basic assumptions
are communicated through policies and procedures of the agency.

According to Deal and Kennedy (1982) heroes within the organization are
considered as the leaders or role models for the company's culture. These individuals
represent the organization as its champions, are recognized by everyone in the
company, and have a passion and desire for the success of the company. The authors
identify these individuals as "special people." Driskill and Brenton (2005) added that
heroes consist of an individual or individuals that are respected in the organization due
to their positive representation of the organization's values.

According to Geertz (1973), culture may also be a system of shared symbols.
Driskill and Brenton (2005) stated that symbols are part of the process of developing
organizational culture and that they are typically traditional in nature. Symbols are also
objective and are those elements that represent or symbolize the organization.
Throughout the literature such elements as language, nonverbal symbols, and meaning
are included. Table 2 displays a portion of the various definitions and elements of
organizational culture with respect to various authors.
Table 2

Organizational Culture Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Language, Jargon, Myths, Stories, Heroes</th>
<th>Artifacts, Symbols</th>
<th>Patterns of Behavior, Rituals, Behavioral Norms</th>
<th>Espoused Values</th>
<th>Basic Underlying Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schien Evolved Definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schein</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin &amp; Siehl</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schein Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook &amp; Utley</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettigrew</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal &amp; Kennedy</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters &amp; Waterman</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallak &amp; Kurstedt</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Underlying Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouchi</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Reigle (2003)
Frameworks for Studying Organizational Culture

There have been several different frameworks suggested for the examination and exploration of an organization’s culture. According to Miller (2009) there are two approaches that can be taken when attempting to describe an organization’s culture, the prescriptive view, and the descriptive view. The prescriptive view, as Miller described it includes two ideals. The first ideal includes those individuals who will make positive contributions not only to the organization but also to performance and its members thus developing “a correct culture” (p. 83). The second ideal identifies organizational culture as an object, material item, or “thing,” that an organization “has.” Deal and Kennedy (1982) further supported this view by identifying five important elements of an organization’s culture: (1) the business environment, (2) values, (3) heroes, (4) rites and rituals, and (5) the cultural network. Sergiovanni and Corbally (1984) advanced this ideal when they included values, symbols, meanings, and ritualized practices as key characteristics in describing organizational culture.

The descriptive view of organizational culture (Miller, 2009) is more accepted by researchers today than the prescriptive view. This view visualizes a developing or emerging culture with fragmented characteristics including values, practices, narratives, and artifacts. This concept explored by Miller (2009) identifies organizational culture as “something an organization is” (p.84). This notion was supported by Meyerson (1991) who suggested the concept of shared solutions, Ashkanasy et al (2000) who promoted capturing meanings as the way in which meanings take shape, and by Schein (2004), who introduced a valid group of basic
assumptions. Kotter and Heskett (1992) added the concept of beliefs and practices, and Deal and Kennedy (1999) suggested that culture is made up of the norms, values, and beliefs of an organizational group. These authors and many others support the belief that organizational culture is not easily defined and that it is multi-dimensional. Martin (2002) introduced four dimensions that define the differences between prescriptive and descriptive approaches: (1) culture is complicated, (2) culture is emerging, (3) it is not a one dimensional construct, and (4) it is vague and may have several meanings.

There are additional approaches to defining or identifying the characteristics that assist in defining organizational culture. As previously identified, Schein (1992) suggested that there are three levels of organizational culture, artifacts, values, and basic assumptions. Kotter and Heskett (1992), on the other hand promoted that organizational culture has two levels: (1) values that are shared by a group, and (2) behavioral patterns of an organization. The first level is less visible and the values tend to sustain themselves over a long period to time, even when the group members change. The second level is more visible and may include work performance, friendliness, and dress. Edginton et al (2009) built upon Schein's approach and summarized the frameworks of many authors who have identified five additional characteristics: (1) relevant social constructs, (2) social knowledge, (3) practices, (4) vocabulary, and (5) metaphors. These elements were specifically utilized to define the organizational culture of Camp Adventure™ Child and Youth Services, a recent case study regarding the development and sustainability of its organizational culture.
Colyer et al (2000) studied the organizational culture of several municipalities located in Western Australia offering park and recreation services. Using the Competing Values of Culture method presented by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) the results identified in this particular research study included four different types of culture: (1) “Group Culture”- participatory and open discussion, empowerment, (2) “Developmental Culture”- flexibility, creative problem solving, growth, and change, (3) “Rational Culture”- goal achievement, efficiency, clarity, and (4) “Hierarchical Culture”- control, routine tasks, and formalized structure.

Additional approaches to defining organizational culture exist throughout the literature. The most recent literature stresses that organizational culture is always emerging and that it typically is not duplicated from organization to organization. The next section will identify various elements that exist within organizations. However, each element may have a different group of characteristics that identify with each element.

Methods for Studying Organizational Culture

The concept of organizational culture introduced in the late 1970s (Ashkanasy et al., 2000) is prominent in organizational and management publications. Its popularity in many areas of management research has shown that there are many different ways to measure organizational culture. Due to the variety of different contexts within organizational culture, researchers seem to be hesitant to study the topic as one all-encompassing concept. Researchers instead typically break down the subject matter into smaller yet definitive areas of study under the umbrella of organizational culture.
One useful type of measure according to Ashkanasy et al. (2000) is the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), a complex multi-dimensional profiling survey. OCP, developed in the early 1990s, identifies 10 elements of organizational culture: (1) leadership, (2) structure, (3) innovation, (4) job performance, (5) planning, (6) communication, (7) environment, (8) humanistic workspace, (9) development of the individual, and (10) socialization of entry.

Another measurement system is the Organizational Cultural Inventory (OCI) which was developed by Cooke and Lafferty in 1987. According to Human Synergistics International (2007) the OCI is identified as one of the most widely utilized surveys in the world with respect to organizational culture and provides an overall snapshot of an organization's operating culture. Further, it measures the behavior of an organization and categorizes the outcomes into three cultures; (1) constructive cultures, (2) passive/defensive cultures, and (3) aggressive/defensive cultures.

The measurement system used by Harrison and Stokes (1992) is a rather simple tool that makes 15 partial statements. In Diagnosing Organizational Culture each statement has four different ways in which to complete the statement which are in turn completed by the respondents in a ranking manner of "most likely" to "least likely" to describe their organization. The end result categorizes an agency with having a prominent culture into one of four different categories. The ultimate outcome identifies the most prominent to the least prominent type of organizational culture in an organization: (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation.
The Competing Values Framework of Culture is yet another method and was developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991). This method uses a Likert scale which the researcher has designated from “1” which is “strongly agrees” to “5” which denotes “strongly disagrees” in describing the characteristics of the specific culture. This method illustrates four cultures, each with specific characteristics that defines the specific culture: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, and (4) Rational Culture. Table 3 offers a comparison of the elements of culture. Further explanations of these methods will be detailed in Chapter 3.
### Table 3

**Critical Elements: A Comparison of Cultures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation and Cultures</th>
<th>Critical Elements</th>
<th>Relationship to Initial Definitions</th>
<th>Relationship to Contemporary Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Leadership/power Controls resources Leaders show direction External rewards to motivate</td>
<td>Heroes/champions Strong leadership Work = rewards</td>
<td>Leader as role model Heroes represent values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Set values Regulation defined Delegation defined External rewards</td>
<td>Adopted values Basic beliefs</td>
<td>Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Alignment of mission Intrinsic rewards Common values</td>
<td>Shared purpose Shared values Shared beliefs</td>
<td>Espoused values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Trust Common good Common values</td>
<td>Common characteristics that influence the work environment Values are a priority</td>
<td>Social interactions Espoused values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Culture</strong></td>
<td>Participatory Teamwork</td>
<td>Shared beliefs Shared solutions</td>
<td>Social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture</strong></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>External adaptation</td>
<td>Familiarity &amp; accepted routines World views Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth Innovation/change</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hierarchical Culture</strong></td>
<td>Control Formal structure Stability/predictable</td>
<td>Rites &amp; rituals</td>
<td>Skills &amp; routine = success Relegation of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rational Culture</strong></td>
<td>Goal achievement Setting objectives Efficiency/quality</td>
<td>Rites &amp; rituals</td>
<td>Focus on challenge &amp; respect Complex fabric of family &amp; equality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate*, Ashkanasy et al. (2000) presents a table which is a summary of 18 different methods used from 1975 to 1992.
Table 4 has been adapted to reveal 12 of these different methods. Two of the methods represent Schein's (1985) first level of organizational culture, that of behavior, while the remaining eight instruments represent the second level as introduced by Schein (1985) which are beliefs and values.
Table 4

*A Summary of Organizational Culture Instruments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Dyer</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Patterns of Behavior</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke &amp; Lafferty</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Patterns of Behavior</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enz</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>Behavior/Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris &amp; Moran</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison &amp; Stokes</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Patterns of Behavior</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede et al.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Reilly et al.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn &amp; Spreitzer</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Patterns of Behavior</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Values &amp; Beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Ashkanasy et al. (2000)
What Does the Literature Tell Us?

The study of organizational culture can be a complex undertaking. Historically researchers have focused the study of organizational culture within a management and organizational structure approach with respect to corporate culture. Organizational culture in the area of municipal park and recreation setting has had minimal mention in the literature. The next section will introduce some of the authors who have addressed this area.

Agency Accreditation

A major concept explored in this literature review is that of agency accreditation. Agency accreditation according to many professions when summarized refers to the assessment and self-evaluation process that organizations pursue in order to meet a set of recognized professional standards. First, this section of the literature review offers a reflection of the definitions of the term accreditation. Following is the second section which is a review of occupations that have adopted some form of accreditation. Next, the literature review includes a discussion of why agency accreditation is important and increasingly valued among professional organizations. The fourth portion discusses functions of agency accreditation and presents a review of the literature in terms of the ways in which it is applied. Last, relevant literature concerning the pros and cons of agency accreditation are presented.

Definition of Accreditation

Explaining accreditation, Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) stated that this type of evaluation determines whether or not certain pre-determined standards have been met.
A standard typically is a particular level of performance or accepted management practice. Fanning (1988) added that it is a common vocabulary that is used for a profession to compare themselves. "Accreditation" is a term that is used when establishing criteria for an assessment and self-evaluation process (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006). Professional organizations, academic agencies, or programs go through this process to illustrate its successful completion of meeting a level of professional standards. William Tschirhart, a park and recreation professional from the City of Kettering, Ohio, a CAPRA accredited municipal agency, stated a more simplistic definition of accreditation:

Accreditation means quite simply, you get it. You recognize the value of citizen input in the planning process. You recognize that parks and recreation agencies play a vital role in the quality of life for the residents of the community. You recognize the importance of having defined policies and procedures to help guide the decision-making in your agency. (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006, p. 1)

At the academic level colleges, universities, and local school districts go through a process of educational accreditation. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation is responsible for the accreditation process at the secondary educational level. At the professional level, professional associations offer certification programs for occupations such as doctors, dentists, lawyers, accountants, and nurses. Within municipalities, nonprofit agencies, police departments, fire departments, zoos and aquariums, park and recreation agencies, libraries, and public work departments have accreditation programs that evaluate the professionalism, best practices, management, and scope of these agencies (American Public Works Association, 2006; Association of Zoos and Aquariums, 2009; Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement
Occupations with Professional Agency Accreditation

In 1979, law enforcement initiated an accreditation process through the combined efforts of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriff's Association, and the Police Executive Research Forum. The group that administers the accreditation program is the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA; 2005). The purpose of the Commission is to establish a set of standards and to develop and administer an accreditation program for law enforcement agencies that meets professional criteria for excellence and service delivery. According to Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (2009), there are 398 municipal law enforcement agencies that have applied for and received national accreditation and another 87 agencies that are currently in the review process of agency accreditation. In 1988, the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC) combined to establish a voluntary accreditation program for the fire service (International City/County Management Association, n.d.). The Commission on Fire Accreditation International (CFAI) in its fire service accreditation information in 2009 stated the group oversees this accreditation program, and focuses not only on management but also long-range
strategic planning, staff tenure, and best use of resources. According to the Center for Public Safety Excellence (2009), to date there are 121 fire safety agencies accredited.

The Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) not only have an agency accreditation program, but also a certification program for professionals within the related field. Agency accreditation or certification is mandatory for any agency or individual that wishes to become an AZA member (Association of Zoos and Aquariums, 2009). According to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (2009), there are over 8,000 certified professionals and 216 agencies currently accredited. The mission of the AZA accreditation program is to establish, uphold, and raise the highest zoological and aquarium industry standards through self evaluation, on-site inspections, and peer review.

The list of accreditation programs also includes the American Public Works Association, American Camp Association, and the American Library Association. The one element these professional associations have in common is that they support the quality of life issues within their particular area of interest. More specifically, according to van der Smissen (2005), they provide a process by which an agency may reach the highest level of service management through self-evaluation, fulfillment of the professional benchmarks and standards set by the specific profession, and the successful peer assessment of the agency. This rigorous process may take from six months to one year or more to complete, and the agencies may become re-accredited on a periodic basis. Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) stated that the accreditation
process of an agency is a guideline for assisting organizations in the self-evaluation process by using the external standards as a starting point.

Importance of Agency Accreditation

According to van der Smissen (2005) accreditation means that an agency has met a level of desirable standards and that those standards, although not legally binding, have great legal impact within that profession. This author also states that in the area of law, the standards within a profession are often used as legal evidence as they relate to accepted, desirable levels of management and operation.

From an elected official’s perspective, accreditation of a specific department places an agency at a higher level of professional standard. According to Edginton et al. (2006) these standards are often driven by professional associations and influence the understanding and accepted management practices of that profession. Also, if an agency is accredited it may allow the elected official to be more at ease with any concerns that may arise regarding specific management practices.

As previously noted, the purpose of accreditation illustrates that an agency has met the minimum standards of accepted management practices. From the public perspective professional agency accreditation may not seem important. However, a municipal agency’s accreditation may reassure the citizenry that their particular park and recreation agency has completed the process and received accreditation. According to the National Recreation and Park Association, (2006), there are five benefits from the public’s perspective:
1. Assurance and validation of well-administered services in accord with approved professional practices;

2. Potential for external financial support and savings to the public;

3. External recognition of a quality governmental service;

4. Holds an agency accountable to the public and ensures responsiveness to meet their needs; and

5. Improves customer and quality services.

Within the last decade, it has become important for agencies to be able to appropriately justify not only their existence but also their budgets, staffing levels, and program benefits and outcomes. According to the National Recreation and Park Association (2006), the benefits to the agency include:

1. Public and political recognition;

2. Increased efficiency and evidence of accountability;

3. Answering the question, “How are you doing?” through extensive self-evaluation;

4. Identification of areas for improvement by comparing an agency against national standards of best practice;

5. Enhancement of staff teamwork and pride by engaging all staff in the process;

6. Creation of an environment for regular reviews of operations, policies, and procedures and promotes continual improvement; and

7. The mandate for the development of written documentation of policies and
procedures.

There are more advantages to the knowledge of reaching a high level of accepted management practice. The professional accreditation process, according to Kraus et al. (2001), aid in the advancement, awareness, and delivery of park and recreation services. According to Commission on Fire Accreditation International (1997-2000) in the field of public safety, more specifically fire protection, accreditation may allow for a reduction in business insurance rates. The Association of Zoos and Aquariums (2009) notes that accreditation not only shows an accepted level of management practices but also a higher level of care toward animals.

The Process of Agency Accreditation

There are several steps for most professional agencies to become accredited. The basic process includes the following steps:

1. The accreditation process begins with a self-evaluation tool for agencies interested in meeting professional standards through the process of accreditation. The self-evaluation is based on set standards of acceptable management practices for that specific field.

2. Upon completion the self-evaluation is sent to an “oversight group of peers that reviews and evaluates the criteria submitted. Any discrepancies or short comings are then identified by the peer evaluators and returned to the agency.

3. Upon final completion, the peer evaluation group will visit the agency to complete a “hands-on” review, touring the agency, and interviewing staff and officials to establish concurrence with the final report.
4. After the evaluation visit the review committee develops a final report and makes a general recommendation for either approval, approval with recommendations, or denial of accreditation. Once an agency has been approved it will remain certified for a set number of years, which varies depending on the profession. At this point, an agency may become recertified by completing a recertification process.

Sources: (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, 2005; Commission on Fire Accreditation International, 1997-2000; National Recreation and Park Association, 2006)

Municipal Park and Recreation

The primary setting for this research is municipal park and recreation agencies. In this initial portion of the literature review, six major sections are presented. First, definitions of local park and recreation are provided. Second, organizing constructs of local park and recreation are explored. The third section discusses the legal authority used by local park and recreation agencies in support of their operations, including their ability to tax, collect fees and charges, provide services, acquire and maintain areas and facilities and, in general, administer to the welfare of the local community. The size and scope of local park and recreation services is discussed in the fourth section, and the fifth section addresses the functions of such agencies. In the sixth section, the current status of local park and recreation services is reviewed.
Definition of Local Park and Recreation Agencies

There are approximately 4,500 local park and recreation agencies in the United States, of which 3,300 have been identified as municipal parks and recreation agencies (Jensen & Guthrie, 2006). Several authors stated that local government is responsible for park and recreation services since the local community is where the service delivery originates (Edginton et al., 2008; Hurd et al., 2008; Meyer & Brightbill, 1948). The responsibility and focus of municipal government has changed and developed over the years, but the focus on general well-being has remained paramount to the services of park and recreation agencies. Municipal park and recreation agencies have more recently been defined as those services which are found at the local level of government. The focus of a municipal park and recreation agency according to several authors (Leighty, 1980; Moiseichik, & Bodey, 2005; Rodney, 1964) is within its jurisdictional borders and those responsibilities are well defined. Certain authors (Hurd et al., 2008; Russell, 2005) add support to that information and further identify the municipal park and recreation agency as a local agency which is usually identified with a city, township, county, or borough. In addition these authors (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Russell, 2005) write that the municipal park and recreation agency is a common format of organization for the dissemination of leisure services, falling under the legal jurisdiction of municipal government typically identified with a city or town.

Although the jurisdictional explanation of local park and recreation mirrors other community services that are provided, the responsibilities and constructs of a local park
and recreation agency can be somewhat different. The next section explains the way in which park and recreation services are provided.

Organizing Constructs of Local Park and Recreation

Local park and recreation agencies provide a variety of programs and services that affect quality of life issues for the individual as well as the community. The structural constructs however are a bit different. When seeking organizational structure of park and recreation agencies the researcher finds that there are several different structures of local park and recreation agencies. The three major types of agencies include: (1) Municipal park and recreation agencies, (2) Special park districts, and (3) County agencies.

Municipal park and recreation agencies are the most common type of park and recreation governmental unit. The park and recreation agency is typically one department where a specific type of service delivery takes place. The park and recreation agency can also be an all-encompassing comprehensive unit of municipal government. Additional departments within the confines of municipal government may include police, fire, public works, human resources, finance, and administration (Edginton at al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Kraus et al., 2001; Rodney, 1964; Russell, 2005). The service delivery of municipal park and recreation can also be organized in many ways. The most common form found today is the combined park and recreation department.

Special park districts are another approach to the organization of local park and recreation. Numerous authors state that a park district may include several different
governmental jurisdictions (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Kraus et al., 2001). A special park district is an autonomous group, having its own boundaries and typically operating for only one purpose, the services of park and recreation.

County government is the third type of local park and recreation agency. Two groups of authors state that a county park and recreation agency typically has a larger service area, tends to centralize its facilities and services, and offers these services in many different ways (Edginton et al., 2006; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Kraus et al., 2001). These same authors added that a county agency may deliver many different services that could include regional park and recreation areas, unique or specialized areas and facilities, recreation programs that are difficult to offer by scale or location in an urban setting, specialized recreation that might be needed by a larger population base, and recreation program needs that meet the needs of those living in the rural setting. To this end, there are several legal arrangements that have been adopted. The most important legal arrangements are presented in the next section.

Legal Authority

The public sectors of government are typically tax-supported and municipal government is authorized through specific state and local legislation to organize, develop, and implement various functions of park and recreation services. Authority has been provided by state statutes to allow municipal government to provide these services (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Leighty, 1980; Moiseichik & Bodey, 2005). Given the legislative
power, various authors have identified five different types of legislation that promote the establishment of local park and recreation services. They include:

1. Special park and recreation laws. These laws enable specific governmental jurisdictions to provide park and recreation services. These laws include an organizing structure, power to tax, and the provisions to employ professional staff.

2. Regulatory laws. This legislation that provides authority and control of parks and recreation services. These laws provide the standard of operation for the management of park and recreation facilities.

3. Enabling laws. These laws provide the impetus for a municipality to own, operate, and manage park and recreation related services. Enabling laws do not mandate specific legislation, but do provide the local jurisdiction the opportunity to determine the size and scope of its services.

4. Special district laws. This legislative power allows the local government to establish an individual special single-use unit of government. These legislative powers are not strictly for park and recreation related services and may include other local units as well. These laws allow the unit to set up its own governing structure, as well as taxing guidelines, and for the acquisition and development of facilities and programs.

5. Home rule legislation. This type of legislation allows local government the opportunity to formulate its own type of government.

(Edginton et al., 2008; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Kraus et al., 2001).
The legal authority according to several authors (Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Leighty, 1980; Moiseichik & Bodey, 2005) is established within the legal framework of each state in which the park and recreation entity operates.

**Size and Scope of Municipal Park and Recreation Agencies**

The size and scope of the municipal park and recreation agency will differ, typically based on the size of an agency’s budget and number of staff, the population of the service area, park acreage, the different types of park and facilities, and the various types of programs and services provided (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Kraus et al., 2001). It is difficult to compare municipal park and recreation agencies not only due to the varied demographic differences in communities but also the type and scope of services that an agency offers. For example, an agency could have a large budget due to an abundance of recreation facilities and programs, whereas another agency with a similar size budget might focus more on beaches, parks, open space, and programs and services. According to Edginton et al. (2006) there is no typical organizational structure for a park and recreation agency since the format and scope are dependent upon the needs and focus of the community.

Table 5 shows a comparison of six municipal park and recreation agencies of different scope and size that are located in the Midwest. The first two are considered large agencies in their state, the next two are considered medium in size, and the last two are small but size is relative (Illinois Association of Park Districts, 2009; Indiana Park and Recreation Association, 2009; Iowa Park and Recreation Association, 2009; Michigan Recreation and Park Association, 2009). The Des Moines Park and
Recreation Department is considered the largest municipal park and recreation agency in Iowa due to the population it serves, its budget size, and the number of professional staff it employs. However, it is much smaller than the Chicago Park District, the largest leisure agency in Illinois (Illinois Association of Park Districts, 2009; Iowa Park and Recreation Association, 2009). Table 5 shows there are some similarities as well as vast differences between the Iowa and Illinois agencies. The number and type of recreation programs, special events, community activities, or exhaustive list of recreational facilities have not been included in this comparison as the scope of this endeavor would be too sizable to present accurately.
Table 5

_Municipal Park and Recreation Agencies: A Comparison of Scope and Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>$19,009,503</td>
<td>148 FT</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>3,221 acres</td>
<td>3 community centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325 PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 golf courses</td>
<td>1 botanical center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 zoo</td>
<td>2 aquatic centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Park District, Illinois</td>
<td>393,222,794</td>
<td>3,000 FT</td>
<td>2,896,016</td>
<td>7,300 acres</td>
<td>60 fitness centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500 PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>552 parks</td>
<td>22 “stunning” areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 beaches</td>
<td>9 museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 miles of Lakefront</td>
<td>2 botanical centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 miles of beachfront</td>
<td>1 aquarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 golf courses</td>
<td>1 planetarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 zoos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, Iowa</td>
<td>5,885,373</td>
<td>36 FT</td>
<td>98,300</td>
<td>2,200 acres</td>
<td>1 community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>259 PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 parks</td>
<td>1 botanical center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 golf courses</td>
<td>1 botanical park center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 community</td>
<td>2 aquatic centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 botanical</td>
<td>1 botanical center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>12,724,304</td>
<td>57 FT</td>
<td>115,518</td>
<td>2,500 acres</td>
<td>6 community centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650 PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 golf courses</td>
<td>1 nature center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 zoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Falls, 470 PT</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td>20 FT</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>1,500 acres</td>
<td>1 community Iowa center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 golf courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 aquatic center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, Indiana</td>
<td>440,033</td>
<td>6 FT</td>
<td>14,222</td>
<td>110 acres</td>
<td>1 cabin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 parks</td>
<td>1 arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 cemetery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Sources:_ (Illinois Association of Park Districts, 2009; Indiana Park and Recreation Association, 2009; Iowa Park and Recreation Association, 2008; Michigan Recreation and Park Association, 2009)
Functions of Municipal Park and Recreation Agencies

The responsibilities of a municipal park and recreation department include, but are not limited to recreational opportunities, programs, special events, park acquisition and development, recreation facility operation, maintenance and operation to include various community sizes and levels of participant use. Several authors have stated the fact that on a much broader scale, leisure service organizations, although representing different governmental jurisdictions, meet the leisure needs not only of the individual but also of society (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Russell, 2005). This idea is reinforced by Kraus et al. (2001) and illustrates that local park and recreation agencies often go beyond their boundaries to assist and serve other community organizations that provide similar or related services. When discussing municipal leisure delivery units these authors (Edginton et al., 2008; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006) point out that the most popular type of service delivery is through the combination of park and recreation authority under one department within local, municipal government.

Municipal park and recreation agencies can become an extremely comprehensive organization in which there is no definitive organizational structure. Edginton et al. (2006) support this ideal and further illustrate that each local park and recreation agency will develop its own unique organizational structure. Historically, the typical combination of a municipal park and recreation agency according to Rodney (1964) included the following divisions: (1) an administration division, (2) a recreation division, and (3) a parks division.
Although the definition of a municipal parks and recreation agency may seem clear-cut, this is rarely the case. Park and recreation agencies, as they have developed during the past two decades and into the 21st century have many unique characteristics. The profession has grown from the initial municipal park and green space focus of Frederick Law Olmstead’s design of New York’s Central Park of the mid-1800s, to the more refined, comprehensive, sophisticated park and recreation agency focus of today (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Frye, 1980; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003). Typical major functions of the park and recreation agency of the 21st century may include the development of leisure programs, activities, and special events; development and management of leisure facilities and services; acquisition, planning, development, and management of park and open space; facility, park maintenance and cemetery operations; urban forestry; public relations; business management and finance; fundraising and grant writing; libraries; conference centers; and theaters (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Edginton, & O'Neill, 2005; Kraus et al., 2001; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009a).

Status of Municipal Park and Recreation Services

The scope and size of municipal park and recreation departments vary by budget size, number of employees, population served, park acreage, facilities, recreation programs, activities, and special events. This also holds true when comparing the size and scope of other municipal departments that contribute to the comprehensive offering of city government. The relationship of a municipal park and recreation department to other city departments can be identified in many ways; the most consistent is by a
review of the expense portion of the park and recreation budget as compared to the total municipal budget. As previously noted from the comparison of scope and service, responsibilities as well as budgets vary dramatically. However, this does not seem to be the case when compared to the overall municipal budget.

Table 6 illustrates a comparison by percentage of three municipal park and recreation agencies: Lebanon Parks Department, Indiana; Chicago Park District, Illinois; and Davenport Park and Recreation Department, Iowa. The size of the park and recreation agency budget varies as does the overall municipal city budget. Even though there is a large separation in budget size, the municipal park and recreation agencies identified in Table 6 illustrate a range from 3.9% to 7.2% when comparing their budget to the total city budget. Once again this is a relative figure as it based upon various characteristics of the community including size, population, staff, and amount and level of public services. This range is typical of most municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to their overall municipal city governments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Agency</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lebanon, Indiana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>$ 440,033</td>
<td>The Parks Department budget is 3.9% of the total city budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lebanon</td>
<td>11,265,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chicago, Illinois</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park District</td>
<td>393,222,794</td>
<td>The Park District budget is 6.6% of the total city budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chicago</td>
<td>5,967,424,908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davenport, Iowa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Recreation</td>
<td>5,885,373</td>
<td>The Park and Recreation budget is 7.2% of the total city budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Davenport</td>
<td>81,214,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: (Chicago Park District, 2009; City of Chicago, 2009; City of Davenport, 2009; City of Lebanon, 2009; Davenport Park and Recreation Department, 2009)
Public Perception and Benefits of Municipal Park and Recreation

The public perception of overall government changed in the early 1970s and was re-enforced by the introduction and passage of Proposition 13 in 1978; a State of California Tax Initiative. This initiative cut California property taxes by nearly 50% and was the impetus of change to the way California governments traditionally conducted business. This enactment forced all levels of government to become more fiscally responsible and accountable for their actions. This new law caused a major shift throughout the United States in public sentiment, involvement, and government accountability during the last 39 years (Edginton et al., 2008; Holdnak, Mahoney, & Garges, 2005; Lutzin, 1980a).

How has this affected the public perception and benefits of park and recreation? It was clear in the mid-1980s that municipal park and recreation agencies according to Edginton and O’Neill (2005) would need to become more management oriented, and more businesslike in their operations. Park and recreation professionals had to be cognizant of new management skills and accept a more public way of doing business. Several authors (Edginton et al., 2008; Lutzin, 1980b; Russell, 2005) add that management decisions and justification of future planning would not only need to be scrutinized by the public, but that the public would also become an active part of the decision making process. Numerous authors (Edginton et al., 2006; Kraus et al., 2001) add that the benefits and outcomes of park and recreation programs and activities must be justified and documented in order to substantiate their success. This allowed not
only elected officials to heavily scrutinize and review budgets, programs and future planning, but also the general public.

In 1998, the NRPA introduced “Benefits-Based Programming” (BBP); this concept was developed by Lawrence Allen of Clemson University (Edginton et al., 2008; Edginton & O’Neill, 2005). The basic concept was to identify a target issue or program, develop performance objectives and procedures, monitor the issue or program, identify outcomes of the issue or program, and then through various means present the benefits and outcomes of the issue or program. This procedure helped the park and recreation professional develop and maintain programs and services while establishing the importance, benefit, and justification for it. This process established an agency that was more accountable to the public. Through this process the public has become more of a partner than an adversary.

The Status of a Municipal Park and Recreation Agency

During the past 20 years, the overall perspective of the municipal park and recreation agency has become more businesslike and professional. This is due to the willingness of park and recreation agencies to embrace public involvement and becoming more of a collaborative partner in the process. In addition the park and recreation professional has accepted a more businesslike and educated attitude toward the field. According to the National Recreation and Park Association (2009b), this has led to the rise in the study of park and recreation by students from accredited colleges in parks, recreation, or leisure studies, additional education and graduate work, and certification of park and recreation professionals.
Due to these elements the status of the park and recreation professional has reached a new level. The NRPA has seen a marked increase in the number of members seeking certification (National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b). By reaching this level of professionalism the field has begun to create a trusted system of accountability that is reflected by a benchmarking process against a set of higher standards. Therefore, the park and recreation field has moved in a more positive professional direction. This being said, the park, and recreation professional saw the need for an accreditation program that evaluated the stature of park and recreation. The profession then realized the need for a higher level of professionalism, a higher standard in the field, and established criteria to identify those agencies that met minimum standards of operational management. Thus, the profession created the agency accreditation program known today and administered by CAPRA (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b; van der Smissen, et al., 2005). The next section introduces the topic of accreditation and more specifically the accreditation program for park and recreation agencies.

**Commission on Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies**

The accreditation program concept for park and recreation agencies was initiated in 1989 by Professor Louis Twardzik, then chair of the Parks and Recreation Resources Department in the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources at Michigan State University (Edginton et al., 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2005). This portion of the literature review describes the development of the CAPRA program that ultimately grew from Twardzik’s leadership. The first section presents information defining the
basic program. This is followed by a discussion of the history of the program, its functions and its scope and size broken into individual sections. The last section presents information regarding the viability of the program.

Definition of CAPRA

The National Recreation and Park Association (2009a) stated that over 200 million individuals enjoy the many opportunities, programs, and services of their local park and recreation department on a yearly basis. In doing so, these individuals are not only seeking the benefits of physical, mental, and spiritual well-being, but also high quality programs, activities, and experiences. The CAPRA accreditation program was designed to set minimum standards to evaluate park and recreation agencies that deliver these services.

Like other accreditation programs, the NRPA program offers park and recreation agencies an opportunity to place itself in high esteem upon meeting the criteria and rigors of the accreditation process. The Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) administers the program of accreditation for NRPA members. CAPRA is an independent body, sanctioned by NRPA and American Academy of Park and Recreation Administration (AAPRA) for that purpose (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2006; van der Smissen et al., 2005).

History of CAPRA

Prior to the current CAPRA agency accreditation plan, the National Recreation Association (NRA) developed, and published the Standards and Evaluative Criteria in
1965 (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006) in order to create higher standards within the park and recreation field. This plan was the initial attempt by the profession to establish an agency accreditation program (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006).

Twenty-five years later, the AAPRA created a task force to formulate a master plan for an agency accreditation program (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006). Professor Twardzik served as the first chairperson of the group identified as the Commission on Accreditation for Public Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA). According to the National Recreation and Park Association (2006), the AAPRA along with the National Recreation Foundation (NRF) supported and funded the work of the task force which took several years to organize and develop a pilot program. In 1996, the agency accreditation program was finalized and is now administered by the CPRA (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006). The NRPA both co-sponsors and acts as the administrative support group for the commission (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b; van der Smissen et al., 2005).

CAPRA consists of 13 members. Membership includes four individuals appointed by the NRPA Board of Trustees, four members appointed by the Academy Board of Directors, and five organizational representatives appointed by supporting organizations including the American Association for Leisure and Recreation, International City/County Management Association, Council of Executive Directors, National Association of County Park and Recreation Officials, and the Armed Forces Recreation Society of the NRPA (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b; van der Smissen et al., 2005).
Association, 2006; van der Smissen et al., 2005). This group is committed to the highest standards of the profession and continually promotes the development and achievement of accreditation to NRPA members (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006).

Functions of CAPRA

During the development of the accreditation program the task force sought and received input from park and recreation agencies, state and regional organizations, and many other professionally accredited groups from throughout the United States (Edginton et al., 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2005). During this period various standards and procedures were developed and tested on public leisure agencies of all sizes and responsibilities to validate its purpose (Edginton et al., 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2005). There are three steps for a park and recreation agency to become certified in the CAPRA program (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006). The steps are similar to those used by other professional associations.

1. In order for a leisure agency to become accredited it must first complete preliminary application. This form is followed by a comprehensive self-assessment of its compliance with the accreditation standards. This is a lengthy process and includes thorough explanations and the agency’s status of 144 standards.

2. When completed with the self-assessment the agency submits the document to CAPRA for initial review. A team of trained visitors, field professionals from various agencies, then reviews the document and is then dispersed to the
agency for an on-site review, and evaluation. This process includes the
document validation as well as one-on-one meetings with various directors
from other departments, city administration, elected officials, and community
representatives at-large.

3. Upon completion of the visitation, a formal report is composed by the
visitation committee and submitted back to the organization. Compliance
issues or concerns are then defined or clarified by the visitation committee and
the agency is given the opportunity to respond and complete the document as
appropriate. The CAPRA board meets twice a year to review and grant agency
accreditation. At this point there are three choices: (1) approve accreditation,
(2) approve with contingencies, or (3) disapprove.

Accreditation is based upon 100% compliance with respect to the 36 fundamental
standards, and 85% compliance with respect to the remaining 108 standards (Edginton
et al., 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2005).

Several months after the closing of the NRPA National Congress & Exposition held
in Salt Lake City, Utah, in October of 2009, 77 NRPA member agencies had completed
the process and received their accreditation (National Recreation and Park Association,
2009b). This number equates to 5% of the total NRPA municipal agency membership
in the United States. Asking why only 5% of the NRPA membership is accredited led
to the foundation of this research topic.
Scope and Size of CAPRA

The CAPRA agency accreditation program is based upon an analysis of the application of the administrative competencies of parks, recreation, and leisure agencies. CAPRA is the independent body currently sanctioned by the NRPA and the AAPRA to facilitate the agency accreditation process. According to the National Recreation and Park Association (n.d.b), there are over 200 million individuals participating annually in leisure programs, special events, activities, leisure facilities and related amenities of parks and recreation agencies throughout the United States. Over 4,500 public parks and recreation agencies provide these services (Jensen, & Guthrie, 2006). It is the goal of the NRPA to promote a process by which all programs and services generated by member parks and recreation agencies are supported by the best administrative and professional standards available. The CAPRA agency accreditation program is committed to high standards and is working with public agencies to achieve those standards. Strong leadership and commitment not only to the public agency but also the community is paramount in this endeavor. According to Opportunities, Accreditation and Certification, National Recreation and Park Association (n.d.a), the CAPRA agency accreditation program is rigorous. Based on self-evaluation and peer assessment and review, it utilizes national standards and professional best practice to showcase a park and recreation agency’s commitment to quality assurance and improvement of services. To this end, the CAPRA agency accreditation program has developed a comprehensive process. During the first 20 years of the program, CAPRA had identified 156 standards comprised of 10 categories.
with which to evaluate public parks and recreation agencies (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2006; van der Smissen et al., 2005). Sandberg (2004) stated that “These professional standards serve as an aid for improving performance and maintaining quality. They provide parks and recreation agencies with an ability to evaluate their operations, while achieving and maintaining a level of efficiency and effectiveness” (p.67). The CAPRA agency accreditation program offers a benchmark of leadership, high quality, and achievement for member agencies. In 2009, the National Recreation and Park Association (2009a) updated the requirements and there are currently 144 standards within the same general 10 categories, although some re-titled, still remain.

### Accreditation Standards

CAPRA accreditation standards are thought to be benchmarks of best practice and high quality management systems. The National Recreation and Park Association (2006) states that they act as guidelines to the park and recreation agency as a management tool in its quest for excellence. These standards fall into 10 categories:

1. **Agency Authority, Role, and Responsibility**
2. **Planning**
3. **Organization and Administration**
4. **Human Resources**
5. **Financial Management**
6. **Programs and Services Management**
7. **Facility and Land Use Management**
8. Public Safety, Law Enforcement, and Security

9. Risk Management

10. Evaluation and Research

Thirty-six of the 144 standards are designated by CAPRA as “fundamental to quality operations” and are required of all agencies when seeking accreditation. For the remaining 108 standards an 85% compliance rate is required (National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b). All standards are constantly reviewed and are modified periodically by the commission.

NRPA/CAPRA Accreditation Research Studies and Viability

A review of dissertations within the field of park and recreation study suggests that academic research with respect to CAPRA agency accreditation is lacking. To date, there is only one research study that has been completed at an advanced academic level regarding the CAPRA agency accreditation program the focus of which is on the appropriateness of the accreditation standards, needs, and outcomes (Rubens, 2007); not organizational culture.

Ira Rubens (2007), Executive Director for the Arizona Park and Recreation Association, recently completed his dissertation entitled Recreation Accreditation: Making a Difference. The focus of Rubens’ academic research was to examine the relationships between the CAPRA agency accreditation program with accountability, professionalism, and performance. The outcome of the study supported the opinion that the CAPRA agency accreditation process added professionalism and improved the quality of park and recreation agencies and services. Although Rubens’ study has
contributed to the body of knowledge with respect to CAPRA agency accreditation in the parks and recreation field it does not identify or discuss the organizational culture or relationships of the NRPA member agencies involved.

Results of a survey of the CAPRA agency accreditation program were published in the August 2004 issue of the official NRPA magazine *Parks & Recreation*. The focus of the survey was to assess the overall perceptions of the existing professional standards used in the accreditation process by CAPRA. The surveys were sent to a randomized sample of park and recreation directors in the field. The summary of the survey included the following points: (1) accreditation would help agencies earn credibility, (2) promote excellence in the field, (3) aide in the improvement of efficiency, (4) obtain a measure of excellence, and (5) establish the field of park and recreation as a legitimate profession (Sandberg, 2004). According to Sandberg (2004) the survey assisted in establishing the validity of the CAPRA agency accreditation program among the park and recreation profession.

Two articles published in *Parks & Recreation*, the professional magazine of the NRPA, “Agency Accreditation: Addressing the Misconceptions,” and “Preparing to Shine” (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006), consist of factual overviews regarding the support and process of accreditation. These articles attempted to assist in marketing and promotion of the program CAPRA accreditation program (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006).

The research and published literature on CAPRA agency accreditation is scarce. There is a definite need for more academic research within this general topic area of
organizational culture, CAPRA, and municipal park and recreation. This study was designed to fill that void.

Accreditation and Organizational Culture

Studies That Have Explored Accreditation and Organizational Culture

Studies that have explored this topic are somewhat limited in scope. Throughout the literature many articles discuss how an entity’s organizational culture of an organization has changed due to the accreditation process, primarily in areas of academia. Others report the outcomes of agency accreditation with respect to performance and efficiency most of which are found within the health profession. In addition, there are many private consultant business agencies that have evaluated the organizational culture of various business interests, most of which do not share their results.

Lazzara (2005), when researching the organizational behavior of an academic business college found that the accreditation process identified several issues and challenges and that a final outcome of the process focused on a change in leadership structure of the organization. A second study by Lejeune and Vas (2009) which focused on the impacts of the accreditation process on an academic organization, found that there were minimal effects on the organization and that there were no effects on the organizational culture. A third study by Paccioni, Sicotte, and Champagne (2008) further suggests that accreditation does affect organizations internally but more as an external control document involving bureaucratic management. They add that
employees not involved in the accreditation process have very little interest in or enthusiasm for supporting its outcomes.

CALEA, the agency that oversees law enforcement accreditation, published an article on their website from the Largo Police Department. The department had completed its accreditation process and was commenting on the changes that resulted from this process. The Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (2009) stated that a summary of the changes that were made after completing the accreditation process suggested that both long term involvement with CALEA and the accreditation process was inherent to the change of the agency’s organizational culture.

Organizational Culture and Municipal Park and Recreation

A Study of Organizational Culture and Municipal Park and Recreation Agencies

Published studies regarding the relationship of organizational cultures with respect to the accreditation and non-accreditation of municipal park and recreation agencies are limited to only one. There are, however, several academic texts that establish not only that there is an organizational culture within each park and recreation agency, but also note that each culture or agency is somewhat different.

The one study that the researcher is aware authored by Colyer et al. (2000), focuses on organizational culture and municipal park and recreation delivery of four recreation agencies. The focal point of their study establishes profiles of the agencies in Western Australia with respect to the prominence of specific organizational cultures. The results illustrated the various cultural strengths, and the different emphasis of cultural values of each City.
With respect to academics, the application of organizational culture to park and recreation is, according to Edginton (1987), "reflected in the norms, customs, and values to which it is committed" (p. 1). The organizational culture of a park and recreation agency is established by many different elements including operational methods, personalities, character, professional practice, and staff behavior. These elements, along with many others are what establish the culture or the common environment. The organizational culture of any one park and recreation agency will separate it from the others. Trice and Beyer (1992) add that these organizations actually have two components of culture. The first component includes the standard elements of the definition which is specifically shared values, norms, myths, symbols, and taboos of the agency. The second component refers to the obvious ways in which agency member's act, both formally and informally. Ibrahim and Cordes (2003) also promote the concepts of values, ideology, rites, ceremonies, symbols, myths, and taboos in a leisure system.

Edginton et al. (2008), while discussing organization structure and administrative operations, agree that a park and recreation agency's organizational culture will distinguish it from any other agency. In addition, they state that it is through an agency's culture or personality that one can discern the differences. Edginton and Chen (2008) add when discussing organizational cultural change that it is the role of the park and recreation agency to clearly establish the preferred beliefs, values, and assumptions and to consciously present and teach them. This places the responsibility of culture on the leadership of the agency.
Accreditation, CAPRA, and Municipal Park and Recreation

No Studies Link Accreditation, CAPRA, and Municipal Park and Recreation

There have not been any formal academic studies that have focused on a combination of municipal park and recreation agencies CAPRA agency accreditation, and organizational culture. The professional literature distributed by the NRPA does promote the CAPRA agency accreditation program and municipal park and recreation agencies; however these writings do not discuss any relationship between these elements. There are several academic texts that minimally discuss accreditation on a broad perspective and there are two texts that focus specifically on CAPRA agency accreditation. The two texts are Management of Park and Recreation Agencies (2005), edited by van der Smissen, Moiseichik, and Hartenburg and the Compendium of Professional Field Materials: Companion to Management of Park and Recreation Agencies, Part 1 (2005), compiled by Moiseichik and Hughes. In addition, there are many textual instances within the academic literature where municipal park and recreation agencies are a focal point of study and discussion.

Summary

To summarize the existing literature, organizational culture is important to any organization. Edginton (1987) stated that an agency’s organizational culture may play the pivotal role in the frameworks of that agency and whether or not the agency is a success or failure. It is the framework by which an organization or a municipal park and recreation agency establishes its policies, develops its programs and activities, delivers its services, and provides opportunity to its community to improve quality of
life. Hurd et al. (2008) when discussing the organizational structure of park and recreation agencies summarizes by stating that organizations have extensive structures, designs, and cultures and it is important that these elements work together to define the organization and how it operates.

The literature has shown that agency accreditation is a process by which academic, professional, and government agencies become certified through a self-assessment evaluation program as they meet accepted professional standards. Several authors state that accreditation is achieved when an agency meets or exceeds the standard level of performance (Henderson & Bialeschki, 2002; van der Smissen, 2005).

These standards, according to Edginton et al. (2008), are often promoted by professional associations. Accreditation, as promoted by the National Recreation and Park Association (2006), benefits the agency in many ways. Government agencies that have an accreditation process include police and fire departments, public works departments, libraries, and park and recreation agencies.

The topic of CAPRA agency accreditation is limited in the literature. There are several academic texts that mention the CAPRA agency accreditation program (Edginton et al., 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2005) and assist in its definition and explanation. However there is no professional journal articles published to date. The NRPA has published several brochures on the academic and agency certification and the accreditation program and there have been several articles published in the *Parks & Recreation* magazine (Riley, Gaskill, & Weiss, 2002; Sandberg, 2004). One of the
goals of this research study was to initiate interest in the CAPRA agency accreditation program, leading to professional research.

The topic of organizational culture is abundantly addressed within the management profession in corporate literature, journals, and books. From 1979, when Andrew Pettigrew first introduced the concept of organizational culture in his seminal article found in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, through the more prevalent writings of Edgar Schein, recognized for bringing organizational culture to the forefront, the topic of organizational culture has been defined and redefined many times. More recently authors have continued to explore the topic of organizational culture, adding contemporary explanations to the earlier multidimensional definition. Additionally, organizational culture has been the focus of many corporations interested in changing the culture of the organization, increasing productivity, and generally building more successful corporations.

This comprehensive literature review has also revealed that there are no studies exploring the relationship between organizational culture, the CAPRA agency accreditation program, and municipal park and recreation agencies. The literature review demonstrated that in either area, organizational culture and professional accreditation of agencies in the municipal park and recreation field, there have virtually been no studies conducted. In addition, there have been few studies focused on the topics independently. It is evident that this area of research is underrepresented in the literature. No investigator has linked the two variables, organizational culture, and agency accreditation together in the study of municipal parks and recreation. Therefore,
this study, including the comprehensive literature review, fills an important void in the study of municipal park and recreation agencies.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to examine the relationship of the organizational cultures of select agency members of the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). More specifically, this study compared the organizational cultures of those municipal park and recreation agencies located in the United States that have achieved agency accreditation through the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) program with those agencies that have not participated in the program. This chapter presents an overview of the research methodology that was utilized in this study including research questions, population and sample explanations, the research design, and the research instrument and its elements.

Subjects

Population

This research study included NRPA municipal park and recreation member agencies that were accredited and NRPA members and non-members of those municipal park and recreation agencies that were not accredited. All agencies are located in the United States. Within the overall population there were actually two groups that were the focus of this study. According to Jensen and Guthrie (2006) there were over 4,500 park and recreation agencies located in the United States of which 3,300 agencies were
identified as municipal agencies. Taking this explanation one step further, according to the National Recreation and Park Association (2009a), there were approximately 2,300 member agencies. Of this figure there was one select population group; those that were both CAPRA accredited and NRPA members. The other population group consists of those who are not accredited and may or may not be NRPA agency members.

According to the National Recreation and Park Association (2009b) there are 77 NRPA member agencies accredited through August, 2009. Of these 77 accredited agencies, there were 57 agencies that meet the definition of a municipal park and recreation agency. Therefore, the population of one select group utilized for this study included 57 CAPRA accredited municipal agencies that were NRPA agency members. The other select group consisted of 94 NRPA or non-NRPA non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. The non-accredited agencies were conveniently chosen, selecting up to two agencies per state with regional representation from throughout the United States. The states of Idaho, Nevada, North Dakota, and Tennessee were limited to one agency each due to the number of agencies accredited in the state and/or a limited number of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies within the state.

Sample

In statistical research, a 100% response rate is a goal, however difficult to achieve. Therefore, a matrix has been developed by statisticians to determine an appropriate sample size and probability representation. According to Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) the sample sizes for the populations of these groups are:
(1) accredited agencies- 77 in the sample size, however only 57 of which were municipal park and recreation agencies, and (2) non-accredited agencies- 94 agencies in the sample size. The goal was to receive the largest possible response in both sample populations.

In addition, Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) qualify the response rates according to the level of interest and involvement into several categories. Specifically, when dealing with professional association membership they identify a response rate of 60% as the level of acceptance. Therefore, the responses required within the sample to meet the acceptable range were: (1) accredited agencies- 34 or more responses are suggested, and (2) non-accredited agencies- 56 or more responses are suggested. Because the suggested sample sizes were relatively small this study strived for higher numbers to increase reliable results. A convenience sample of the non-accredited municipal agencies was designed to achieve regional representation.

**The Research Instrument**

**Identifying the Organization's Culture**

The questionnaire had two components. The first section of the research instrument that was used in this study was an adaptation of *Diagnosing Organizational Culture*, initially introduced by Harrison and Stokes in 1992. The format of the survey was adapted slightly for clarity and to be more specific to the municipal park and recreation respondent. The format in this section is a partial statement that is completed by the respondent. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) this questionnaire was designed to identify the existing culture and the preferred cultural aspects of an organization.
The focus of this research study was to identify only the existing culture; therefore only the appropriate portion of the instrument was utilized. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992), the research “instrument contains 15 “beginnings” of sentences that describe some aspect of the organizational functioning and design. Following each of the beginnings are four possible “endings” (p. 1). The “beginning” of the sentence when combined with the respondents “ending” forms a complete sentence that in turn will describe “one of four different patterns of organizational behaviors, beliefs, values, etc” (p. 1). In addition, each choice of “ending” that is offered to complete the sentence represents one of the four orientations of organizational culture; power, role, achievement, and support. The completed sentence then has four “endings” which are prioritized and ranked with respect to the type of organization that best describes the organization. The research instrument, according to Harrison and Stokes (1992) has been utilized on several hundred occasions and has mainly been utilized in corporate management environments. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) this section of the instrument was designed to gather the following information:

1. work priorities
2. what makes a successful agency employee
3. how the agency treat the employee
4. how the staff is managed
5. what is the decision-making process
6. how tasks are assigned
7. the work characteristics of staff
8. the work characteristics of managers & supervisors

9. staff authority

10. what motivates employees

11. staff and departmental work relationships

12. how staff conflict is dealt with

13. what the external environment is like

14. what happens if rules/systems/procedures get in the way

15. what new staff members need to learn

The second section of the questionnaire focused on the *Competing Values Framework of Culture* established by Quinn and Spreitzer in 1991. This method was used to identify which of the four cultures established by Quinn and Spreitzer was the most prominent to the least prominent organizational culture within an organization.

The four cultures included: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, or the (4) Rational Culture. A Likert scale with five choices from "Strongly Agree" to "Agree" to "Neutral" to "Disagree" to "Strongly Disagree" was used to ascertain the respondent's perspective of their specific organization's culture. A scoring of "1" for "Strongly Agree" to "5" for "Strongly Disagree" was used for computing purposes.

The final section of the questionnaire consisted of two parts: three demographic questions and two open-ended questions. The demographic questions focused on the community's population of the service area, the size of the annual operating budget, the number of full time professional employees of the agency, and whether or not the
agency was or was not accredited. It is unknown whether or not there was any relationship between the population, budget size, and number of full time employees with the organizational culture of a municipal park and recreation agency. These three variables do have a major impact on the direction and scope of a municipal park and recreation agency; therefore they may also have a relationship with the prominent type of organizational culture of the agency. The results of this study may assist in answering this question. Also found in the final sections are two open-ended questions that pertain directly to the reason(s) why or why not the municipal park and recreation agency is CAPRA accredited. These two questions give the respondent the opportunity to give a definitive answer and fully explain their perspective on the issue. A copy of the complete questionnaire can be located in Appendix A.

**Distribution and Collection of the Instrument**

The instrument was pilot-tested by five municipal park and recreation professionals in Illinois and Iowa prior to the final printing and distribution. The format of the pilot-test was reviewed for clarity and ease of understanding; however, there were no changes needed to the questionnaire. The instrument was then forwarded to the University of Northern Iowa Internal Review Board (IRB) for approval. The questionnaire was reviewed and approved by the review board. The document was then immediately printed and readied for distribution.

In addition to the questionnaire, the instrument packet included an introductory cover letter which can be found in Appendix B explaining the purpose of the research
study and requesting cooperation. Additional enclosures included a self-addressed stamped envelope for the respondent to return the questionnaire by mail.

The instrument packet was sent by first class mail to 151 municipal park and recreation agencies, of which 57 were accredited and 94 non-accredited. The questionnaire was coded with a sequential number which was placed in front of the responding agency name in the research directory. The response from the agencies was over 60%, therefore a reminder and second mailing or contact was not needed.

For consistency purposes the research packet was distributed to the director of each park and recreation agency selected. As spokesperson and formal representative of the agency, this person would be most acquainted with final product of the accreditation process.

**The Analysis of Data**

The purpose of this study in addition to identifying the organizational culture of selected park and recreation agencies was to further understand the type of agency that may be a member of the NRPA and may hold CAPRA accreditation.

Three hypotheses have been formulated for this study. The following hypotheses are presented along with the appropriate statistical treatment:

1. There is no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing such organizational culture orientations such as Power Orientation,
Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, or Support Orientation. The Mann Whitney U and independent statistical t-test was used to calculate the results.

2. There is no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the *Competing Values Framework of Culture*. The independent t-test was calculated to determine if there is a statistical significance.

3. There is no statistical significance between the population of the communities' service area, size of the budget, and number of full time professional staff and the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to those that were not accredited. The Chi-square statistical test was calculated to determine if there was a statistical significance.

The Guttman Scaling Technique provides an ordinal type of measurement and ranking order to the applicable agencies. The Mann-Whitney U test is a non-parametric statistical method that determines ranking and whether or not the populations of two independent samples have a relationship. The independent t-test is a parametric statistical method that determines whether or not the populations of two independent samples have a significant relationship. The chi-square test is a nonparametric statistical test that determines whether or not there is an association between two variables. The scoring procedures will be further explained later in this chapter.
Diagnosing Organizational Culture

There are many different characteristics, elements, or traits of organizational culture that can be researched. This study looked at the relationships of select organizations and what Harrison and Stokes (1992) identify as “the core of what most people mean when they speak of their organizations culture” (p. 13). More specifically this instrument focused on the way in which people treat one another, their values, their motivation, and the use of power in an organization.

According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) there are four unique orientations or cultures of an organization that were ultimately identified in this instrument: (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation. Harrison and Stokes (1992) suggest that every organization has some combination of these elements but “the four cultures are only partially compatible with one another, and the benefits of one can only be achieved at the expense of some of the benefits of the others” (p. 13). Each statement included in Section I of the questionnaire has four different “endings,” which represents one of the four orientations.

A Power Oriented organization according to Harrison and Stokes (1992) focuses on the number of personnel and their ability to acquire or access available resources. The question is whether or not the leadership in power uses its status in the organization to control the access of resources thereby controlling behavior of subordinate staff. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) the Power Orientated organization at its best exudes firmness and fairness and a sense of obligation to its employees based on
loyalty and what they think is best for the organization. At its worst, the leaders may rule by fear which could lead to a politically-run organization.

The Role Orientation focuses on a strong leadership role. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) "the duties and the rewards of members' roles are carefully defined, usually in writing, and are subject of an explicit or implicit contract between the organization and the individual" (p. 15). The weakness of role culture orientation is that the organization is so structured and rule oriented that there is no autonomy, creativity is stifled, there may be external reward, and the organization is not timely in meeting needed change.

Achievement Orientation, unlike the previous two cultures, provides for internal rewards and intrinsic satisfaction. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992) this orientation focuses on organizational alignment because it establishes a shared vision and mission allowing the employees to contribute and participate more in the common goals of the organization. The shortcomings of the achievement culture orientation may include lack of organization, true commitment on the part of the employee, and a lack of trust that can lead to stress.

The Support Orientation according to Harrison and Stokes (1992) focuses on an organizational culture that concentrates on trust between the organization and the individual. This culture is humanistic in nature and provides a more caring work environment with respect to employees and their relationship to each other. A high level of prominence of the Support Orientation is typically not found in competitive
business settings and it works against making the difficult decisions. This orientation is more harmonious in nature than the others.

To summarize the four cultures that Harrison and Stokes and their research instrument propose it must realize that portions of all the cultures exist in every organization. It is the numerical ranking of the select cultures that identify and contribute to the categorical placement of the organization within the scalogram. This assists in defining the prominent culture of each organization that responded to the questionnaire. An explanation of the scalogram scoring is presented in Appendix C.

Competing Values Framework of Culture

To assist in the verification of potential organizational cultural relationships the use of the *Competing Values Framework of Culture*, developed by Quinn and Spreitzer in 1991, was also utilized. This method focused on four cultural designations. The characteristics of the Group Culture included participation, open discussion, empowerment of the employees, assessing employee concerns and ideas, and human relations, teamwork, and cohesion. The Developmental Cultural elements included flexibility, decentralization, expansion, growth and development, innovation and change, and creative problem solving processes. The focus of the Hierarchical Culture was on control, centralization, routinization, formalization, structure, stability, continuity, order, and predictable performance outcomes. The characteristics of Rational Culture included a task focus, accomplishment, goal achievement, direction, objective setting, goal clarity, efficiency, productivity, profitability, outcome excellence, and quality.
Similar to the cultural designations of Harrison and Stokes, the four cultures of Quinn and Spreitzer are found at some level in every organization. The outcome of the research as presented in Chapter 4 illustrates the outcomes.

Demographics

In addition to the 15 adapted questions originally designed by Harrison and Stokes, the Competing Values of Culture developed by Quinn and Spreitzer the questionnaire also included demographic information. For purposes of cross-evaluation several specific questions regarding the characteristics of the municipal park and recreation agency and its community were added. They included: (1) the population of the immediate service area, (2) size of the agency’s annual operating budget, and (3) the number of full time professional staff members. Each major division is more specifically defined by six categories which will more accurately define each agency. The demographics were cross-referenced, and categorized with the cultural information which will be further analyzed in Chapter 4. There were three additional questions in this section followed by two open-ended questions that relate to the open-ended questions. The next question in this section asked the respondent whether or not they have CAPRA accreditation; if they responded “Yes,” then the respondent was asked “Why did you choose to become accredited?” Conversely, if they responded “No,” then the respondent was asked “Why did you choose not to become accredited.” The results of this section are also presented in Chapter 4.
Guttman Scaling Technique

The Guttman Scaling technique, according to Nachmias and Nachmias (1987), was first introduced by Louis Guttman in the early 1940s. This technique “was designed to incorporate an empirical test of the unidimensionality of a set of items as an integral part of the scale-construction process” (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987, p. 475). Oppenheim (1966) adds that the level of data measurement is ordinal as it provides a ranking order of measurement. Kerlinger (1986), Nachmias and Nachmias (1987), and Oppenheim (1966) further add that the characteristics of the scaling are cumulative. Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) suggested that in this case ordinal data are more sophisticated. However, a characteristic of ordinal data is that the ranking order does not have any specific measurement between the categories or criteria.

The Guttman Scaling technique according to Nachmias and Nachmias (1987) has four steps to its process. The four steps include; (1) the selection of scale items, (2) the recording of responses forming a “scalogram,” (3) the calculation of the coefficient of reproducibility, and (4) the choice of the category separations or “cutting points.” An explanation of the process follows.

The first step is the development of the scale items. According to Gorden (1977), there are three conditions that must be met in the selection of items; (1) there must be an attitude in the minds of the respondents regarding the topic area, (2) the items in the topic area must include meaningful statements to the respondents which will in turn elicit a valid response, and (3) the items that form the questions must represent different degrees within the one-dimensional topic area. A series of questions is then
developed that formulates a questionnaire that is to be distributed to the sample population.

The second step focuses on the responses and the recording of those responses on a scalogram. According to Babbie (1986) a scalogram is a schematic diagram that represents all of the potential responses or categorical patterns. Each response is then placed on a scalogram placing the higher numbers, whichever is most consistent, for the positive or negative responses (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987).

The third portion of the process is calculating the coefficient of reproducibility. This step according to Nachmias and Nachmias (1987), allows the researcher to discern the extent to which the response patterns can be reproduced if only the total score is known. The level of deviation can be evaluated by calculating the coefficient of reproducibility.

The final step in the four-step process involves the evaluation and interpretation of placement. Harrison and Stokes (1992) have developed a scoring system based on percentages that allows for the comparison of one agency’s score versus its overall relationship to the scoring system. In other words, each agency in this research study had a total score for its Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation. The total of each individual agency’s score was then added and the overall summary of organizational culture will be given a numerical percentage for those accredited and those non-accredited agencies. The highest percentage described the dominant organizational culture and the lowest score will identify the
least dominant culture. Further explanation of this procedure is found in the next section.

**Scoring**

When utilizing the *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* method to define the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies, one must first develop a scalogram matrix. The scalogram matrix lists each respondent separately and displays four numeric answers for each statement. The completion portions or "ending" within each statement was categorized by the respondent from "1" to "4," with "4" as the most dominant view of the agencies culture and "1," the least dominant view of the agencies culture. When the statements were fully completed, each statement had four answers; 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d. The "a" statements represented the Power Orientation, the "b's" represented the Role Orientation, the "c’s" represented the Achievement Orientation, and the "d’s" represented the Support Orientation. The numeric answers were then all placed on the scalogram according to the appropriate respondent. Each respondent has 60 numeric answers, four from each of the 15 statements. Each "1a," "1b," "1c," and "1d" answers were added according to the specific category. The score was then compared to the percentile scores on the *Existing Culture Percentile Matrix*. Each agency was then identified with the most to the least prominent orientation according to each one of the four cultural orientations: Power, Role, Achievement, or Support. Each agency, accredited and non-accredited, has four numeric totals for the "a," "b," "c," and "d" designations. The totals from each category were then added and a mean ranking is calculated using the Mann-Whitney U statistical method. The results
illustrated the total ranking by question and overall ranking by accreditation status.

Table 7 illustrates this procedure.
Table 7

Scoring Procedure of Diagnosing Organizational Culture

Sample Agency

| Step 1 | All “A’s” 1-15 are added from the questionnaire, Section I  
|        | All “B’s” 1-15 are added  
|        | All “C’s” 1-15 are added  
|        | All “D’s” 1-15 are added |

| Step 2 | Orientation  
| Category | Culture Index |
| Power =  | “A” =  | 36  
| Role =  | “B” =  | 27  
| Achievement =  | “C” =  | 45  
| Support =  | “D” =  | 42  |

| Step 3 | Using the Scores of Existing Culture Matrix plot each score.  
| See Appendix C and D.  

| Scores | Power  
| 36  | 33%  
| 27  | 4%  
| 45  | 71%  
| 42  | 87%  |

| Step 4 | Rank each agency by their percentile score.  

Findings: Support at 87% is the dominant culture of the agency.  
Achievement at 71% is the next dominant culture.  
Power at 33% is a small portion of this agency’s culture.  
The least prominent culture in this agency is the Role at 4%.  

| Step 5 | The totals of all of the agencies “a’s,” “b’s,” “c’s,” and “d’s” are  
| then added and then the Mann-Whitney U method is computed.  
| A final ranking of those CAPRA accredited municipal park and  
| recreation agencies and non-accredited agencies are calculated  
| and can be analyzed by each statement and by the overall  
| organizational cultures that are the most likely and least likely to  
| be prominent.  

| Scores | Power  
| 36  | 33%  
| 27  | 4%  
| 45  | 71%  
| 42  | 87%  |
One of the more relevant portions of the study was be displayed on a scalogram which consisted of four columns, each representing one of the four cultural profiles: (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation. The percentage scores from 0 to 100 for each agency in each separate sample were then placed on the scalogram so that a comprehensive overview of the results could be analyzed and evaluated. It was important to understand that to properly identify the relationship between cultures of the selected park and recreation agencies the researcher must add the results of each responding agency with respect to the four cultures which includes the responses of 37 CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and 59 non-accredited agencies. When posting of the agency information was complete on the scalogram, the ranking mean was calculated identifying each orientation percentile and used for a comparison analysis.

The next portion of the study focused on the Competing Values Framework of Culture. This section of the questionnaire was divided into four cultural categories, and each cultural section had four categories of characteristics that were pertinent to that specific culture. A Likert scale was then utilized with numeric designations from “1” to “5” so that a Mann Whitney U and chi-square statistical tests could be calculated. The end result not only gave a ranking, but also designated whether or not there was statistical significance.

The third portion of this research study focused on the specific demographics of each municipal park and recreation agency. The demographics of each organization were recorded and an independent t-test was calculated. This allowed for the cross-
referencing analysis and the determination of relationships of each agency. The results identified the statistical significance between the three variables.

The final portion of this section focused on identifying the reasons that an agency became CAPRA accredited or not accredited. Two open-ended questions allowed the respondent to present their specific agency’s reasoning for going through the accreditation process or not. The responses that were the most common were listed.

While the outcome of this study was mixed between frequency counts, percentages, demographic cross-referencing, and the ordinal data of the scalogram, the results of the study were focused on *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), the *Competing Values Framework of Culture* developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991), and the demographic information gathered. The frequency counts and percentages of questionnaires sent, those responding, and “spoiled” questionnaires were represented in the results as well as a demographic comparison by community population, annual budget size, and number of full-time professional staff. For comparison purposes an overall ranking of cultures of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies will be calculated.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a computer software program according to Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) that is commonly used for statistical analysis in the social sciences, was used to facilitate all of these statistical procedures. First, the information on the questionnaire was coded by agency number, status (accreditation or non-accredited), and each statement or question on the questionnaire was given a numeric code and or letter. A numeric value was then placed
on an Excel spreadsheet for each statement or question. When all of the numeric values were entered into the spreadsheet the information was then transferred to the SPSS program. When the information was completely transferred the appropriate statistical method was then chosen in the SPSS program and the calculations were processed and calculated.

**Interpretation**

The focus of this study was to identify the organizational culture of selected NRPA municipal park and recreation agencies and to compare those profiles within the confines of those CAPRA accredited and those not accredited. The profiles of each agency were identified along with any relationships of those agencies with respect to the four cultural profiles as described by Harrison and Stokes (1992): (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation. Those profiles presented by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991): (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, and (4) Rational Culture were also identified along with any relationships. Demographic relationships of the municipal park and recreation agencies were analyzed. The three demographic characteristics included: (1) population of the community service area, (2) the agency's annual operating budget, and (3) number of full-time professional employees working in the agency. The last section will list the most common responses with respect to having CAPRA accreditation versus not having accreditation.
Summary

The final outcome of this research study will have three parts. The first section of this study used the *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* method developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), and concludes whether or not there was any relationship of the organizational cultures between the municipal park and recreation agencies. The second portion of the first section concludes whether or not there were any relationships between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. The second section of the study compared the organizational cultures of the agencies utilizing the *Competing Values Framework of Culture*, a method developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991). The final portion of the analysis identifies any relationships between those municipal agencies that are accredited with those who are not within any of the three demographic areas: (1) population of the community service area, (2) the agency’s annual operating budget, and (3) the number of professional full-time employees working in the agency. The results of both portions of this analysis are found in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies. Further, the study seeks to compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies that have achieved accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) program with those that have not sought participation in the program. In this chapter fundamental data related to the responses of the subjects will be presented. First, the response rates of those National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) members that have received CAPRA accreditation compared to those that have not received CAPRA accreditation will be presented. Following these results will be a presentation and discussion of the demographic variable findings related to the overall frequencies, and a comparison of each sample population. Next, scores regarding the accredited versus non-accredited respondents' ranking and their relationship to the four organizational orientations will be presented. Finally, the data will be presented regarding the relationships of accreditation and non-accreditation with respect to the competing values of culture.

Return of Data

In this research study, responses were sought from two very distinct populations of municipal park and recreation agencies located throughout the United States. The first
study sample consisted of 57 CAPRA accredited agencies that were members of the NRPA. The second sample included 94 non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies that were NRPA or non-NRPA members. Survey instruments, which included written statements and questions regarding *Diagnosing Organizational Cultures*, *Competing Values Framework of Culture*, demographic variables, and an open ended question pertaining to the reasons for CAPRA accreditation or not, were sent to 151 municipal park and recreation directors. This yielded the return of questionnaires from 96 respondents, producing an overall return rate of 66%. There were 37 responses from the CAPRA accredited sample, yielding a response rate of 67%, and 59 responses from the non-accredited sample totaling a 65% rate of response. There were a total of five "undeliverable" questionnaires, two from the accredited sample and three from the non-accredited sample. These responses were computed into the quoted response rates presented in Table 8. The response rates did reach the expected target participation rate which was initially established at a level of 60%. The reason for setting this minimum rate was due to the information gleaned from Henderson and Bialeschki (2002) which states that although researchers always seek a 100% response rate from surveys, a more realistic, and desirable figure with respect to professional groups is 60%. Fowler (1993) supports this idea and suggests that a response rate of between 60-75% is considered a high level of acceptable response.
Table 8

Response Rate by Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accredited</th>
<th>Non-Accredited</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Sent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Returned</td>
<td>37 (67%)</td>
<td>59 (65%)</td>
<td>96 (66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Population

This section reports on the analysis of the demographic characteristics, first reporting the frequency of the sample population in Table 9, and then illustrating the comparison between the two sample populations in Table 10 through Table 12. Responses within the two distinct samples include three major categories: (1) population of the community service area, (2) annual operating budget size, and (3) number of full-time professional staff. Each major category is further divided into six categories which identify the specific demographic size of that topic. As previously indicated frequencies and percentages were calculated.

Overall Demographics

As illustrated in Table 9, the majority of respondents in the demographic categories of population of the service area, operating budget size, and number of professional full
time employees fell into the categories that consisted of larger municipal park and recreation agencies. Forty agencies reported service area populations of 100,000 or more, while 44 agencies reported annual operating budgets of $7,000,000 or more. Thirty-four agencies reported having 65 or more full-time professional employees. The two smaller categories of service populations, 19,999 and under and 20,000 to 39,999 had the least number of respondent's with nine and 10 responses respectively. No municipal park and recreation agencies reported an operating budget size of less than $499,999. The smallest category with the least number of professional full-time employees was the 55-64 category, followed closely by the 41-54 category with five and eight responses respectively.
Table 9

*Frequency Table of Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,999 and under</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-39,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-59,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-79,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000-99,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$499,999 and below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-999,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000-2,999,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000-4,999,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000-6,999,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000,000 and above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or below</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or more</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-accredited</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population of Community

Agency service area population was divided into six categories ranging from 19,999 and under to 100,000 and above. The most frequently reported range for CAPRA accredited agencies in the service area population category was 100,000 and above (n=15). The ranges of 19,999 and under, 60,000 to 79,999, and 80,000 to 99,999 within the service area population category reported the fewest number of CAPRA accredited agencies (n=3) for each of these ranges. The most frequently reported range for non-accredited agencies in the service area population category was also the 100,000 and above (n=25). The ranges of 19,999 and under, 20,000 to 39,999, and 80,000 to 99,999 within the service area population reported the fewest number of non-accredited agencies (n=6), (n=3), (n=5) respectively. These results are found in Table 10.
Table 10

*Response Rate by Community Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Accredited (n=37)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Non-accredited (n=59)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19,999 and under</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 59,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 to 79,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Operating Budget Size*

The size of the operating budgets of the municipal park and recreation agencies were also divided into six categories ranging from $499,999 and below to $7,000,000 and above. In the CAPRA accredited sample there were no agencies with budgets of $499,999 and below, four agencies in the $500,000 to $999,999 category, four agencies of $1,000,000 to $2,999,999, one agency in the $3,000,000 to $4,999,999 category, five agencies of $5,000,000 to $6,999,999, and 23 agencies in the $7,000,000 and
above category. In the non-accredited sample, there were no agencies of $499,999 and below, six agencies in the $500,000 to $999,999 category, 10 agencies with budgets of $1,000,000 to $2,999,999, 10 agencies in the $3,000,000 to $4,999,999 category, 10 agencies with budgets of $5,000,000 to $6,999,999, and 23 agencies in the $7,000,000 and above category. Table 11 represents information regarding annual operating budget size.

Table 11

*Response Rate by Size of Annual Operating Budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Size</th>
<th>Accredited (n=37)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Non-accredited (n=59)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$499,999 and below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to 999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 to 2,999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000 to 4,999,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000 to 6,999,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000,000 and above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Full-Time Professional Staff

Table 12 refers to six different categories of full-time staff members ranging from 10 or below to 65 or more full-time employees. In the CAPRA accredited sample there were 16 agencies responding in the 65 or more full-time employees category. The second highest response rate was in the 26-40 category and the 11-25 full-time employees categories where there were seven and six agencies respectively that responded. The next highest response rate was in the 10 or below category with four responding agencies. The final two categories, with 41-54 and 55-64 full-time employees had two responses each. In the non-accredited area the highest number of full-time employees was 18 responses found to be in the 65 or more full-time employment category. The second largest response was the 11-25 full-time employee categories which had 16 responses. The remaining levels were found to have 10, seven, five, and three responses in the 26-40, 10 or below, 41-54, and 55-64 full-time professional employee categories respectively.
Table 12

Response Rate by Number of Full-Time Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Staff</th>
<th>Accredited (n=37)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Non-accredited (n=59)</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 or Below</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 Employees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40 Employees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54 Employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 Employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or More</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Research Questions

This section presents the results relating to the respondent’s relationship of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies to those agencies that are not accredited in regards to the areas of demographic variables, the diagnosing of organizational culture, and the four competing values of culture. There were nine research questions introduced in Chapter 1. Each question is presented here followed by the respondent’s answer with respect to the data.
Research Question Number 1

What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed by elements such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

One of the primary objectives of this study was to identify the organizational cultures of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. The *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* model developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992) was used to identify the organizational culture of all municipal park and recreation agencies participating in this study. Results are presented in Table 13. According to the ranking score, as tabulated using the Mann-Whitney U statistical method, the scores show that the Achievement Orientation with a ranking score of 46.73 and the Support Orientation with a ranking score of 40.32 are perceived to be the most likely and highly regarded elements of the organizational cultures of the accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. The Role Orientation with a ranking score of 37.85 and the Power Orientation with a ranking score of 26.19 do exist in the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies, but they are the least likely to be in a dominant capacity.
Table 13

Orientations of Organizational Culture Using Mann-Whitney U Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>40.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Number 2 and Number 3

Q2- What is the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four cultural orientations? Q3- What is the organizational culture of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four cultural orientations?

As this study begins to more specifically define organizational culture and focuses on CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies versus non-accredited agencies Table 14 identifies the strong elements of organizational culture found in the municipal park and recreation agencies. This measurement tool is the scalogram, the sum of all of the statements in Diagnosing Organizational Culture of “a’s”, “b’s”, “c’s”, and “d’s”. The scalogram developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992) was utilized to score each agency’s existing culture. The culture scores were then placed within the appropriate percentile, according to the Existing Culture Percentile Matrix developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), Appendix D.
As illustrated, the main orientations found in the CAPRA accredited agencies are the Achievement Orientation and Support Orientation, with a mean score of 50 and 42 respectively. The Achievement Orientation score of 50 placed it in the 90th percentile, comparing it to other mean scores, and establishes it as a dominant element. The Support Orientation score of 42 places it in the 87th percentile and establishes it as the second-most dominant element of culture. The Power and Role Orientations are the elements that have the smallest percentage of culture to be found in CAPRA accredited agencies. The orientation of highest regard found in the non-accredited agencies is that of Achievement Orientation with a mean score of 45. However, according to the existing culture matrix this places “Achievement Orientation” in only the 71st percentile. The Support Orientation with a mean score of 39 actually places it in the 85th percentile which makes it the dominant cultural element for non-accredited agencies. The Power Orientation is the only element that has the smallest percentage of existence to be found in non-accredited agencies.
Table 14

Comparisons of Organizational Culture Using the Scalogram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPRA Accredited</td>
<td>23(8%)</td>
<td>37(30%)</td>
<td>50(90%)</td>
<td>42(87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-accredited</td>
<td>28(15%)</td>
<td>39(39%)</td>
<td>45(71%)</td>
<td>39(85%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%= Existing Culture Percentile

Research Question Number 4

What are the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing organizational culture orientations such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

One aspect of this study was to identify and compare the organizational cultures of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. With both the Mann-Whitney U and the independent t-test statistical methods the results revealed statistically significant differences between participating CAPRA accredited and non-accredited agencies. The overall summary of CAPRA accredited and a non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation is depicted in Table 15. The statistics show that the mean rank and sum of ranks are different in the comparison of each orientation with respect to CAPRA accreditation and non-
accreditation status. In addition, there are two orientations that achieved statistical significance. The Achievement Orientation has the highest mean rank of the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with a score of 59.11. When compared to the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies the Achievement Orientation had the lowest mean rank with a score of 41.85. Therefore, the Achievement Orientation shows a statistical difference. Conversely, the Role Orientation of the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies had the lowest mean ranking of the four competing values with a mean score of 40.82. The non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies presented the highest mean ranking within the Role Orientation with a score of 53.31.

As illustrated in the t-test scores denoted by an asterisk (*), the Role Orientation and the Achievement Orientation present a statistically significant difference (p=.011) and (p=.001) respectively.
Table 15

Summary Comparison of Ranking and Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Accreditation (n=37)</th>
<th>Non-accreditation (n=59)</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Sum of Ranks</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>1590.0</td>
<td>51.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>1510.5</td>
<td>53.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>59.11</td>
<td>2187.0</td>
<td>41.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>56.57</td>
<td>2093.0</td>
<td>43.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 (2-tailed); Scale = 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

The summary of each of the 15 written statements of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and non-accredited agencies by mean rank is listed in Appendix D which is displayed for visual comparison and informational purposes and is intended to further support the answer to Research Question Number 4.

Research Question Number 5

What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed using the Competing Values Framework of Culture?

A second method used to identify organizational culture of all municipal park and recreation agencies was the Competing Values Framework of Culture model developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991). This section summarizes the organizational culture of
the CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies combined. The *Competing Values Framework of Culture* offers four different types of organizational culture: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, and (4) Rational Culture. As Table 16 illustrates, the four organizational cultures are represented in each of the municipal park and recreation agencies. In the Group Culture category, the element of empowerment by employees to act (47.9%) had the highest response and was followed closely by participation and open discussion (45.8%). In the Developmental Culture category, expansion, growth and development was highest (55.2%), with flexibility and decentralization the second highest (35.4%). In the Hierarchical Culture category, the element that denoted where the routine is set, formalization and structure had the highest response (57.3%), and control and centralization was the second highest in response (26.1%). Direction, goal setting, and clarity, elements found in the Rational Culture category, had the highest response (51%), while the elements of task focus, accomplishment, and goal achievement received the second highest response (38.5%).

Also noted in Table 16, is the importance of the values of the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies mean scores. The scores as illustrated indicate that 14 out of 16 elements have lower mean scores than the non-accredited scores. All four elements within the Group, Developmental, and Rational Culture categories are found to be within the "Strongly Agree" range. Two additional elements within the CAPRA accredited status are found in the Hierarchical Culture category and are in the "Agree" range (denoted by an asterisk*). There were only two scores, also found in
Hierarchical Culture, that were lower for the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. These scores are actually neutral and are denoted by a double-asterisk**.

Clearly the elements that had the lowest mean scores were: (1) participation, open discussion (1.38), (2) outcome excellence, and quality (1.54), (3) empowerment of employees to act (1.59), and (4) creative problem solving processes, and task focus, accomplishment, and goal achievement (1.68). These scores spread throughout three of the four categories of Competing Values Framework of Culture validate importance but not a dominant culture.
Table 16

**Organizational Culture Using the Competing Values Framework of Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Group Type</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean (Accredited)</th>
<th>Mean (Non-accredited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing employees concerns &amp; ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations, teamwork, cohesion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of employees to act</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation, open discussion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative &amp; change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, decentralization</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion, growth, &amp; development</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem solving processes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hierarchical Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control, centralization</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine is set, formalization &amp; structure</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability, continuity, order</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable performance outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rational Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction, goal setting, goal clarity</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, productivity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task focus, accomplishment, goal achievement</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome excellence, quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

* Located in the “Agree” range

** Located in the “Neutral” range
Research Question Number 6

What are the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the four Competing Values Framework of Culture?

The comparison of the organizational cultures of the CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies are important to the results of this study. The Competing Values Framework of Culture model developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) identified several significant differences, between six elements in three categories. Table 17 illustrates these differences. In this section, the independent t-test is used to identify and state the variables to be measured. Once again “p < .05” is used to measure the level of significance. In the Group Culture category there are two areas that show statistical significance between the CAPRA accredited and non-accredited samples: (1) “Participation and open discussion” shows a significant difference with a mean score at .004, and (2) “assessing employee concerns and ideas” identifies a significant difference (p = .017). Developmental Culture has two elements that illustrate a significant difference; (1) “Expansion, growth, and development” is identified (p = .007), and (2) “creative problem solving processes” (p = .046). The last category is Rational Culture which also presents two elements of significant difference. “Task focus, accomplishment, and goal achievement” has a significant difference (p = .036), and “efficiency and productivity” also show a significant difference (p = .035).
Table 17

*Independent Samples t-test for Equality of Means*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Culture</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation, open discussion</td>
<td>-2.987</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing employee concerns and ideas</td>
<td>-2.441</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion, growth, and development</td>
<td>-2.740</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative problem solving processes</td>
<td>-2.019</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rational Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task focus, accomplishment, goal achievement.</td>
<td>-2.126</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, productivity</td>
<td>-2.140</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 (2 tailed); Scale: 1=Strongly Agree; 2=Agree; 3=Neutral; 4= Disagree; 5=Strongly Disagree*

Research Question Number 7

What association does the population of the community service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and numbers of full-time professional staff have on the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to those agencies that are non-accredited?

Another objective of this research was to ascertain whether or not there was any association between the demographic variables with respect to the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation
agencies. The association between the three demographic variables: (1) population of service area, (2) size of annual budget, and (3) number of full-time professional staff, and the accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies is illustrated in Table 18. The numbers of responses were used to ascertain the relationship in the areas of accreditation and non-accreditation in Chapter Five.

Responses in each demographic classification vary whether or not the municipal park and recreation agency is CAPRA accredited or non-accredited and also in the major categories of size of population, size of annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff.

The most frequently reported range for CAPRA accredited agencies in the service area population category was 100,000 and above (n=16). The ranges of 19,999 and under, 600,000-799,999, and 800,000-999,999 within the service area population category were reported by the fewest number of CAPRA accredited agencies (n=3) for each of the ranges. The most frequently reported range for CAPRA accredited agencies in the annual operating budget category was $7,000,000 and above (n=22). The budget category with the fewest responses in the accredited group was $3,000,000-$4,999,999 (n=1). In the full-time staff category the CAPRA accredited agencies with the most responses was the 65 or more (n=16). The categories with the least number of responses were 41-54 and the 55-64 (n=2).

In the non-accredited sample the category with the most frequent number of responses in the population category was 100,000 and above (n=24). The category with the fewest responses was 20,000-39,999 (n=3). With respect to the operating budget
the non-accredited category with the most responses was $7,000,000 and above (n=22),
while the category with the least number of responses was 499,999 and below (n=0).
The most frequently reported range for non-accredited agencies in the number of full-
time employee category was 65 or more (n=18). The range of 55-64 within the annual
operating budget category was reported by the fewest number of a non-accredited
agency (n=3).

Using chi-square statistical analysis, the statistics within Table 18 demonstrate that
there is no significant association between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited
municipal park and recreation agencies. The population score (p= .327), the operating
budget score (p=.116), and the number of employees (p=.803) verify these findings.
Table 18

*Frequency Table of Demographics by Accreditation Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Accredited n=37</th>
<th>Non-accredited n=59</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,999 and under</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-39,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-59,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-79,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000-999,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 499,999 and below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-999,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000-2,999,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000-4,999,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000-6,999,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000,000 and above</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full time staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and below</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or more</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Number 8

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency to become accredited?

According to Henderson and Bialeschki (2002), an open-ended question is used when the researcher is unsure of the possible answers and the respondent may offer a variety of responses. There was one open-ended question included in the study that allowed respondents to describe why their municipal park and recreation agencies became accredited. There were 20 responses with some respondents offering more than one reason. One of the most popular reasons, with 8 responses, from accredited agencies was that accreditation offers an opportunity to meet, maintain, and validate a set of best practices. A second reason, also with 8 responses, focused on the setting of high quality standards and the benchmarking of progress. Table 19 presents all CAPRA accredited agency responses.
Table 19

*Summary of Accreditation and Why it was Chosen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Reason</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet, maintain and validate best practices</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set high quality standards and benchmark progress</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality of service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set policy, procedures, and systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure of excellence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement, professionalism, future sustainability, successful planning, increase funding, seal of approval, reorganization, accountability, and city administrator direction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of performance, to elevate services, to create a culture of excellence, efficiency, and teamwork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Number 9

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency choosing not to become accredited?

There was also one open-ended question included in the study that allowed the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies to describe why they did not become accredited. There were 32 responses. Lack of budget and time were the most frequently cited reasons with 12 each. Nine respondents felt there was no benefit or value in accreditation. Six agencies reported starting or planning to start the accreditation process in the near future. Table 20 gives a summary of all the responses with respect to the participating non-accredited agencies.
### Table 20

*Summary of Non-Accreditation and Why the Accreditation Process was not Chosen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Reason</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of budget, not funded</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have started the process, the future</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with CAPRA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff restraints</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed on the back-burner, not a priority yet, we do things right in spite of accreditation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator doesn’t care, no departmental documentation, not ready, more important projects, only 1 city in our state is accredited, need to focus on internal organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Findings

The purpose of Chapter 4 is to demonstrate the results of this research study. In particular, the chapter was divided into three sections: (1) demographic characteristics of the subjects of the study, (2) the results of the statistical analysis of the eight major research questions, and (3) a discussion of the limitations of the study. A summary of these three sections follows.
Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

Descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the demographic data submitted by the respondents. The data revealed several interesting findings. The majority of the municipal park and recreation agencies that were CAPRA accredited were found to be in the largest “population service area” category. Of the 35 CAPRA respondents, 42.9% had a service area population of 100,000 or more. With respect to the budget, 60% of the municipal park and recreation agencies had an “annual operating budget” of $7,000,000 and above. In the area of “number of full-time employees,” 42.9% had 65 or more full-time professional staff. The data illustrate that the largest percentage of municipal park and recreation agencies responding were those agencies that were the largest in population, budget, and full-time personnel. In addition, the cities with the largest population typically had a larger annual operating budget, and more full-time professional staff.

The non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies were also found to have the most responses of the agencies with the largest “service population” at 41.4% of the sample. The category with the largest response rate with respect to the annual budget size was the $7,000,000 and above category with a 37.9% response rate. The number of full-time professional staff variable with the largest response rate was the 65 or more full-time employees, with 18 responses, or 31.0%
Summary of Research Questions

The following conclusions have been reached with respect to the research questions.

Research Question Number 1

What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed by elements such as the Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

According to the outcomes of the data analysis, the prominent organizational culture of all park and recreation agencies when viewed by the four cultural orientations of Harrison and Stokes was the Achievement Orientation. With a mean ranking score of 46.73 the Achievement Orientation is the most likely to be the dominant culture in the organizational culture of a municipal park and recreation agency. The least likely element to be dominant in the organizational culture of a municipal park and recreation agency is the Power Orientation with a ranking score of 26.19.

Research Questions Number 2 and Number 3

Q2- What is the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies? Q3- What is the organizational culture of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies?

With respect to the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies, the Achievement Orientation was the most dominant organizational culture with a mean ranking of 50. This score places it in the 90th percentile of the Existing Culture Matrix. The orientation with the lowest mean ranking for CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies was the Power Orientation with a mean ranking score of 28,
which places in the 8th percentile. The orientation of non-accredited park and recreation agencies with the most dominant mean ranking was the Achievement Orientation with a mean ranking score of 45 which places it in the 71st percentile. However, with a mean ranking score of 39, the Support Orientation places in the 85th percentile, therefore it is the most likely culture of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency. The Power Orientation was the least likely dominant element in the non-accredited agency with a mean rank score of 29 or a placement in the 15th percentile. There are no studies with respect to municipal park and recreation agencies that reflect any relationship to the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited or non-accredited agencies.

**Research Question Number 4**

What are the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing organizational culture orientations such as Power, Role, Achievement, and Support?

The differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and non-accredited agencies when viewing the organizational cultures such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation were significant in two areas. The Achievement Orientation was the prominent culture within the CAPRA accredited agencies with a mean score of 59.11, while it was the cultural orientation least identified in the non-accredited agencies with a mean score of 41.85. The Role Orientation had the lowest score in the CAPRA accredited cultures with a mean score of 40.82 while the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies scored the highest in Role Orientation with a mean score of 53.31. In this
sample when the prominent culture of a CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agency is Achievement Orientation the culture with the least prominence will tend to be Rational Orientation. With respect to the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency, when the prominent culture is Role Orientation, the least prominent culture tends to be Achievement Orientation.

Research Question Number 5

What is the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed using the Competing Values Framework of Culture?

When viewing the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies while using the Competing Values Framework of Culture, the results are inconclusive with respect to a dominant culture. According to the outcomes of the statistical analysis, while using the Likert scale, the results illustrates that none of the four Competing Values Framework of Culture is dominant. However, certain characteristics of three types of culture do stand out. All of the elements stand out as important (Strongly Agree) for CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies in three of the four cultural categories: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, and (3) Rational Culture. Two elements within the Hierarchical category have lower scores for non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies; they are however, “Neutral” on the scale.
Research Question Number 6

What is the relationship between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the four Competing Values Framework of Culture?

There is a relationship between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies in three categories: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, and (3) Rational Culture. In Group Culture there is a relationship in the areas of participation and open discussion, and the assessment of employees concerns and ideas. Within the area of Developmental Culture when comparing CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies the areas of expansion, growth and development and creative problem-solving processes had a statistically significant relationship. In the area of Rational Culture when comparing CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies the statistically significant relationship included task focus, accomplishment, goal achievement, and efficiency and productivity.

Research Question Number 7

What association does the population of the communities’ service area, the size of the operating budget, and numbers of full time professional staff have on the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to those agencies that are non-accredited?

In reviewing the overall statistical data with respect to service area population, operating budget size, and number of full-time professional staff, there is no
association between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies in any one of the three categories.

Research Question Number 8

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency to become accredited?

The reasons that a municipal park and recreation agency becomes accredited are synonymous with the basic outcome of the accreditation program. According to the respondents to this question, the main reasons for becoming accredited include the validation of the use of best practices in the profession along with the benchmarking of high quality standards in the field. Further, the respondents felt that the improvement of the quality of service, the development of a predetermined set of policies and procedures, and the attainment of a specific level of excellence in the agency was important.

Research Question Number 9

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency choosing not to become accredited?

The lack of budget and lack of staff time were the two reasons most frequently given by non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies for not seeking accreditation. Non-accredited respondents also stated that accreditation had no direct benefit or value to their agencies and some added that they were not familiar with the CAPRA accreditation program. A number of non-accredited agencies reported a
positive attitude toward CAPRA accreditation, either noting they were in the process or had plans to begin the process in the near future.

Hypotheses Testing

A summary testing the three hypotheses is presented in Table 21.
Table 21

The Hypotheses Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There was no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing organizational culture orientations such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, or Support Orientation.</td>
<td>REJECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There was no statistical significance between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with non-accredited agencies when viewing the Competing Values Framework of Culture.</td>
<td>REJECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is no statistical significance between the populations of the communities' service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff and the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared with those agencies that are not accredited.</td>
<td>SELECTED VARIABLES RETAINED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further discussion regarding each of these findings is presented in Chapter 5. The next chapter also reflects the researcher's recommendations and comments regarding future research of this area of study.
The purpose of this study was to explore and examine the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies. Further, the study was designed to compare the organizational cultures of municipal park and recreation agencies which have achieved accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation for Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) program with those who have not sought participation in the program. This final chapter contains a summary of this study and a presentation of recommendations for the possible future study of this topic.

Summary of Introduction

There are over 2,300 park and recreation agency members in the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA; 2009a). This number includes municipal park and recreation agencies, special park districts, counties, state organizations, and military bases who have sought membership in the organization. As of October 1, 2009 there were only 57 municipal park and recreation agencies that have achieved CAPRA accreditation. The questions arise: (1) Why are the numbers of CAPRA accredited agencies so insignificant? and (2) Are there specific reasons or variables that preclude municipal; park and recreation agencies from going through the CAPRA accreditation process? For example, does the organizational culture of an organization influence its decision to seek accreditation?
Organizational culture is to an organization what personality is to a person. Edgar Schein (1992) the lead proponent who brought organizational culture to the forefront, described it as a complex system of values, beliefs, and assumptions that prevail throughout an organization. An organization's culture is a conglomeration of many traits and agency characteristics that form and reflect the organization's character. Every organization has its own personality. The purpose of this study was to explore and examine organizational culture of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. Further, the study sought to explore certain variables within the culture of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and to ascertain whether or not there were specific reasons why they seek or do not seek accreditation. Also, this study was designed to identify those relationships and establish whether or not there is statistical significance. The results of this research study may provide information that could assist the NRPA and CAPRA in the future design, marketing, and promotion of the CAPRA accreditation program.

Summary of Literature Review

The literature review included seven sections: (1) organizational culture, (2) agency accreditation, (3) municipal park and recreation, (4) CAPRA, (5) accreditation and organizational culture, (6) organizational culture and park and recreation, and (7) accreditation, CAPRA, and municipal park and recreation.

Organizational Culture

Throughout the literature, authors have suggested that every organization has a culture. Andrew Pettigrew (1979) first described the concept as an amalgamation of
beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth. Edgar Schein (1992), the individual most identified with the study of organizational culture, added that organizational culture was a pattern of basic assumptions which were invented, discovered, or developed by a group. Ashkanasy et al. (2000) further added that organizational culture was widespread throughout the organization and includes values, behavior, attitudes, and beliefs. Other authors argued that organizational culture was spread through many different characteristics that define the organization and can also be found throughout many levels of the organization. More modern interpretations of organizational culture included the ideas of Colyer et al. (2000) who suggested that dress code, behavior, accepted routines, and history are several elements that bind the organization. Other modern authors offered "the way we do things," elements that lead to success, "walking the talk," and common experiences, all of which are complex in definition and difficult to describe to an outsider.

Organizational culture plays an important role in the leadership, management, success, interactions, relationships, and the overall environment of those working within an organization. This study investigated whether or not there is statistical significant differences and similarities between the accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies.

Agency Accreditation

Agency accreditation is a process that professional organizations pursue in order to meet a set of established management-related standards for their specific area of expertise. (American Public Works Association, 2006; Association of Zoos and
Aquariums, 2009; Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, 2005; Commission on Fire Accreditation International, 1997-2000; International City/County Management Association, n.d.; National Recreation and Park Association, 2006). The accreditation process typically begins with the completion of a self-assessment of the agency, followed by rigorous organizational review and evaluation by an assessment team, eventually culminating with a decision of: (1) approval, (2) approval with a contingency, or (3) denial. The desire for agency accreditation is prevalent in many professional organizations.

For example, within the educational arena, there is an academic accreditation process for secondary school systems, as well as colleges and universities. Some professions also have a more specific accreditation process for university departments which involves curriculum, staffing, and outcome standards. Municipal accreditation programs also exist. Police departments, fire departments, public works departments, libraries, zoos and aquariums, and park and recreation agencies all have professional accreditation programs. These programs were designed to assist these agencies in providing a level of excellence synonymous with meeting an acceptable level of management standards within their profession. Professional accreditation also assists each agency in the positive expectations in the area of public understanding and perception. Whether or not an agency is accredited may be an important element in its success.
Municipal Park and Recreation

The exploration and examination of organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies was the focus of this study. In the public arena of the leisure profession; however, there were a variety of service delivery entities that included not only municipal park and recreation agencies, but also special districts, county agencies, and state and federal agencies. The municipal park and recreation department is typically an agency established by state statute within a local or municipal city government (Edginton et al., 2006; Edginton et al., 2008; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2003; Jensen & Guthrie, 2006; Kraus et al., 2001; Leighty, 1980; Moiseichik & Bodey, 2005).

According to Jensen and Guthrie (2006), there were approximately 3,300 municipal park and recreation agencies in the United States as of 2006. The formal organizational structure of “park and recreation” departments was the most common format within the public sector of the leisure profession. That being said, the way in which park and recreation services were provided may be somewhat similar in structure but vary considerably in the way in which they were delivered. The size and scope of the agency may also be different depending on the population of the community service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and the number of full-time professional staff it employs. Municipal park and recreation agencies offer a variety of programs including but not limited to recreation activities and special events, forestry, leisure facility management, park maintenance, cemeteries, golf courses, senior centers, and libraries. As municipal park and recreation agencies represent the largest portion of leisure
organizations and were the common method of service delivery in the public sector of
the leisure profession, it makes sense to begin research in this area.

Commission on Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies

In 1965, the park and recreation profession sought to develop and establish a higher
standard for the field of parks and recreation. This was the initial attempt by the
National Recreation Association (NRA) to establish an accreditation program (National
Recreation and Park Association, 2006). This resulted from concern over public
mistrust of government, which came to the forefront of American society in the mid-
1960s. The process became more serious with the approval of California’s Proposition
13 in California in the late 1970s. This legislation played a key role in government
becoming more resourceful and accountable.

The concept of accreditation within the NRPA was initiated in 1989. A task force of
NRPA members, educators, and field professionals developed a plan for agency and
professional accreditation CAPRA, the administrator of the accreditation process, was
established and supported by the NRPA, AAPRA, and the National Recreation
Foundation (NRF). The NRPA, AAPRA, and NRF were committed to establishing the
highest standards within the leisure profession and promoting the ongoing development
of the accreditation program (National Recreation and Park Association, 2006).

The CAPRA accreditation program has set the benchmarks of best practice as a
minimal standard in the accreditation process. The current benchmarks represent 144
standards, organized into 10 categories. Thirty-six standards require a 100%
compliance rate, while the remaining 108 standards require an 85% compliance rate.
The program completed a full review and evaluation in 2009 by CAPRA members which resulted in clarification and consolidation of its requirements (Edginton et al., 2008; National Recreation and Park Association, 2009b, van der Smissen et al., 2005).

Accreditation and Organizational Culture

The study of accreditation and its relationship to organizational culture is limited in formal research. There were several studies focusing on the accreditation process and how that process changes an organization. However, there were no studies regarding the types of organizational culture and their relationship to whether or not the agency is accredited.

Organizational Culture and Municipal Park and Recreation

A study of four park and recreation agencies located in Australia is the only formal research study that is known to exist regarding the relationship of organizational culture and municipal park and recreation agencies. The Competing Values Framework of Culture method was utilized to ascertain the primary type of culture that existed in each one of the four agencies.

Academic references found in text and journal articles also approached the subject of organizational culture. Edginton (1987) wrote that organizational culture manifests itself by an agency's commitment to its values, daily practices, and patterns. These elements, along with others, establish the personality of the organization. Further, it was the responsibility of the municipal park and recreation agency to clearly establish and develop these traits, (Edginton & Chen, 2008). There were also many other
references within the academic literature where organizational culture and municipal park and recreation agencies were a focal point of study and discussion.

Accreditation, CAPRA, and Municipal Park and Recreation

There were no formal research studies that approached the topic or examined the relationship of accreditation, CAPRA, and municipal park and recreation agencies. However, there was literature published by the NRPA that recognized and promoted the process that an agency must establish to receive CAPRA accreditation.

Summary of Methodology

The methodology utilized assisted in presenting an overall illustration of the relationships between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. In addition to demographic variables, including population of the community service area, the size of the operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff, the researcher also used two methods to assist in the identification of the types of organizational culture that were most prominent in CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. The two research instruments employed were *Diagnosing Organizational Culture*, developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), and the *Competing Values Framework of Culture* developed by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991).

These methods were utilized to calculate and examine the basic features of data including frequencies, means, and percentages for demographic data, and a Mann-Whitney U, Independent t-test, and Chi-square to identify whether or not there were associations, differences, or relationships between the accredited and non-accredited
agencies and to determine statistical significance. Table 22 illustrates a summary of the research procedures.
Table 22

**Summary of Major Elements of Research Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Element</th>
<th>Description of Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling</strong></td>
<td>151 municipal park and recreation agencies: 57 CAPRA accredited and 94 non-accredited agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate</strong></td>
<td>overall 96 responses were received (66%) 37 CAPRA accredited responses were received (67%) 59 non-accredited responses were received (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td>Municipal Parks and Recreation Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td>1) Accredited, Non-accredited 2) Population of service area, Operating budget size, and Number of full-time staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection of Data</strong></td>
<td>A questionnaire was separately mailed to every potential participant in an envelope that includes a letter of participation and consent, the research instrument, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for ease of return. The research document was mailed specifically to park and recreation directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Data</strong></td>
<td>The research procedure used SPSS 16.0 for Windows to analyze the collected data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Instruments

The research instrument was in the form of a written questionnaire that was mailed to the subjects in the study. There were three sections in the written questionnaire. The first section was composed of Diagnosing Organizational Culture which presented 15 partial statements that were to be completed by the respondent. The statements when completed depicted the four orientations of culture: (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation. Each statement had four possible completions, each of which represented one of the four orientations. The next section consisted of the Competing Values Framework of Culture which presented four types of culture: (1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, and (4) Rational Culture. Each category of culture had four characteristics that represented that specific type of culture. A Likert Scale was used to measure the intensity of each group of characteristics. The final section asked the respondent to identify the size of the community population, the size of the annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff that corresponded with his or her agency. In addition, there was a question that asked whether or not the agency was accredited and an open-ended question asking why the agency was accredited or non-accredited.

Discussion

Chapter 4 presented findings of this research study. A discussion of the nine research questions examined in the study is presented in the following context. For
clarity and organization, the discussion is presented in numerical order of each research question.

**Research Question Number 1**

What was the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed by elements such as Power Orientation, Role Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Support Orientation?

According to the outcomes of the statistical data analysis, the orientation most prominent and likely to be found within all municipal park and recreation agencies in the sample was the Achievement Orientation with a ranking score of 46.73. This was the first major finding of the study. Speculation allows for the researcher to come to the conclusion that there may be a connection between accreditation and organizational culture with respect to municipal park and recreation agencies.

Achievement, according to Guralnik in Webster's New World Dictionary (1984), is "to do; succeed in doing; accomplish" (p.11). The words "achievement" and Achievement Orientation are synonymous with the desire to succeed or to work toward successful accomplishment of a task. This factor may suggest why a municipal park and recreation agency places CAPRA accreditation as an important achievement.

The Achievement Orientation, according to Harrison and Stokes (1992), is called "the aligned organization" since it focuses on the agency's mission, goals, and objectives. An Achievement Oriented workplace is also more inclined to work toward a common goal, be mission focused, display high morale, have a team orientation with employees that enjoy what they do, and also were in support of their co-workers as well as the
organization in which they work. Since the Achievement Orientation is goal driven, it may be the profile that drives municipal park and recreation agencies to seek accreditation.

The Support Orientation, with a ranking of 40.32, was the second most prominent element to be identified in the sample of all municipal park and recreation agencies. The type of agency tends to develop a working environment that was built on trust between the staff and the organization. The staff also values coming to work and cares for other staff members. Human interaction is paramount to the success of an agency with a Support Orientation. All of the four orientations were found within the CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies and the two with the lowest prominence were the Role and Power Orientation with scores of 37.85 and 26.19 respectively.

There have been no studies utilizing the *Diagnosing Organization Culture* model of Harrison and Stokes to identify organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies to compare with findings of this study. Harrison and Stokes (1992) have used their model to ascertain the organizational cultural norm of over 190 business management organizations. They developed their *Diagnosing Organizational Culture* model so that individuals can identify and understand their organization better. The Existing Culture Matrix developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), was used to measure the four orientations of organizational culture, and illustrates scores from 16 to 60 and percentiles from 0% to 99%. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992), the norm of the four cultural orientations was: (1) Power Orientation: 47th percentile,
(2) Role Orientation: 44\textsuperscript{th} percentile, (3) Achievement Orientation: 48\textsuperscript{th} percentile, and (4) Support Orientation: 56\textsuperscript{th} percentile. Table 23 can be used to compare the norms of organizations to the scores of municipal park and recreation agencies. The results of this comparison illustrate that the cultural conditions of the business environment were evenly spread throughout the four orientations. The cultural conditions of the municipal park and recreation agencies had a heavier concentration of the Achievement and Support Orientation and less of the Power Orientation.
Table 23

Comparison of Business Norms to Municipal Park and Recreation Agency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Business Norms Scores From Matrix</th>
<th>Municipal Park and Recreation Agencies Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Orientation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Orientation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Orientation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implications for professional practice of municipal park and recreation agencies, when viewed by the four orientations of culture of Harrison and Stokes (1992), point directly to the overall working environment. The result of this portion of the study indicates that in this sample the Achievement Orientation was the prominent culture found in municipal park and recreation agencies. The characteristics of such an organization lends itself to a positive working environment and specifically signifies focus of the mission and objectives, high morale, teamwork, a high energy workplace, two-way communication, and a willingness to work hard, sometimes long hours for the success of the organization. Therefore, it would be to an agency’s advantage to ascertain its organizational culture (Harrison & Stokes, 1992) and seek possible
transformation to the Achievement Orientation as appropriate. The researcher understands that each municipal park and recreation agency is different and each has its own organizational culture; however, the characteristics of the Achievement Orientation do lend itself to management success. According to Harrison and Stokes (1992), the characteristics of this type of agency are value-driven indicative and typical of “excellent companies” (p. 18). What leader and management team of a municipal park and recreation agency would not want to consider this orientation within its organizational culture?

The researcher has detected a sense of interest among several respondents of this study with respect to identifying their agencies organizational culture. Through written correspondence when returning the survey, three municipal park and recreation agencies expressed interest in ascertaining the organizational culture of their organization and evaluating their cultural status. This leads the researcher to ask whether there were additional municipal park and recreation agencies that might be interested in further research of their organization.

**Question Number 2 and Question Number 3**

Q2: What was the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four cultural orientations? Q3: What was the organizational culture of non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four cultural orientations?

The second major finding of this study concluded that the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies in the sample aligned closely with that of
research question number 1. Using the scalogram for measurement, the Achievement Orientation was the prominent culture of the agency with a percentile score of 90%, followed closely by the Support Orientation with a percentile score of 87%. The results suggested that a goal achieving municipal park and recreation agency that was Achievement Oriented may be compelled to strive toward accreditation. The views of the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agency may follow this train of thought as these agencies place accreditation high within the standards of success. Several responses from the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies touted that CAPRA accreditation was in their future. If CAPRA accreditation was not important, why would the non-accredited agencies pursue it?

CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies had a similar outcome to the overall ranking. When using the scalogram developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992), the point of view most likely to be found as the premier orientation was the Achievement Orientation with a score of 50. This score was located in the 90th percentile when placed on the Existing Culture Percentile Matrix, a companion piece in the evaluation process, also developed by Harrison and Stokes (1992). The Support Orientation was the second most likely element to be found in CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with a scalogram score of 42. This score ranked in the 87th percentile. Non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies were similar in the order of orientations with the CAPRA accredited agencies. Using the raw scores of the scalogram, scores for the Achievement Orientation were the highest at 45. The Support Orientation and Role Orientation each had scores of 39. The percentile
scores from the *Existing Culture Percentile Matrix*; however, illustrate a different outcome. The Support Orientation was the category most likely to be reported by the non-accredited agencies as it was located in the 85th percentile. The Achievement Orientation was the second most likely culture found in the non-accredited agency with a score in the 71st percentile. The Role Orientation had a raw score of 39 which was equal to the Achievement Orientation, but its matrix score fell in the 39th percentile. Therefore, the typical non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency in the sample was more inclined to have the characteristics of the Support Orientation, followed by the Role Orientation.

The Role Orientation and the Power Orientation were the least prominent cultures with scores in the 30th and 8th percentile, respectively. Similar to the overall cultural results, the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies tend to focus more on the accomplishment and support of the workplace and less on the hierarchical and power requirements.

There were no existing formal research studies focusing on the organizational cultures of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four Cultural Orientations of Harrison and Stokes (1992). A complementary, multi-case longitudinal study, with respect to the accreditation process of two health-care agencies in Quebec, was conducted by Paccioni et al. (2008). In this study, the authors focused on the effect of the accreditation process and the organizations quality control and quality management practices. The researchers found that accreditation had little or no effect on the perceptions of those employees not
directly involved in the accreditation process. Further, the findings of this particular study stated that accreditation was nothing more than an external, bureaucratic control instrument. One positive result of accreditation, according to the study, was that it may possibly create better management practices. The Paccioni et al. (2008) study does relate to the value of accreditation, but by no means represents the overall perception of accreditation versus non-accreditation.

Senior park and recreation administrators may benefit from considering the implications with respect to CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. When viewing the four cultural orientations, the findings were indicative of the implications found in research question number one. The Achievement Orientation is a desirable culture to have as a prominent segment of one's organization. With its team concept and strong work ethic, the Achievement Orientation appears to be a desirable organizational culture. Directors of agencies not already espousing the Achievement Orientation may consider transforming their agencies to take advantage of it benefits.

The Support Orientation in this sample was the prominent culture of the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when viewing the four cultural orientations of Harrison and Stokes (1992). The Support Orientation focuses on mutual trust, human relations, socialization, and pride in the workplace, and was not in any way considered detrimental to the management of a non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency. Does this mean that if the agency became accredited that the culture would automatically transform to the Achievement Orientation? That is probably not
the case. The findings imply that an accredited municipal park and recreation agency was most likely to embrace the characteristics of the Achievement Orientation over any others. Perhaps an internal self-evaluation of “existing” versus “preferred” cultural orientation would assist a municipal park and recreation agency in understanding its current status and prompt it to further define its preferred cultural status and orientation (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

Research Question Number 4

What were the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to non-accredited agencies when viewing organizational culture orientations such as (1) Power Orientation, (2) Role Orientation, (3) Achievement Orientation, and (4) Support Orientation?

When viewing the outcomes of the data using the Mann-Whitney U rankings, there were no similarities in ranking. Therefore, each orientation is unique from the next. There were two statistically significant results. With CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies, the Achievement Orientation was the highest with a mean rank of 59.11, while the Role Orientation had the lowest mean rank score of 40.82.

The importance of the Achievement Orientation in CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies was further supported in the findings of research question number four. Not only was the placement of the Achievement Orientation the most prominent among the cultural profiles but the results also stated that the “Role Orientation” within CAPRA accredited agencies placed in the least prominent profile. This result may point out that the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation
agency is more of a people oriented workplace; therefore, focusing on the success of
the team and work environment. This may lead to the conclusion that the Achievement
Orientation, while focusing on agency success, may also strive to maintain a successful
working relationship with the public and the elected officials. Thus, agency
accreditation may be the result of the need to build mutual trust and to justify to these
different public entities that a high level of professional standards have been met by the
municipal; park and recreation agency.

With respect to non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies, the opposite
results occurred. The mean rank of the Role Orientation had the highest score of 53.31,
while the Achievement Orientation had the lowest mean score of 41.85.

The results of this section of the study illustrated that as the prominence or strength
of the Achievement Orientation of the CAPRA accredited municipal park and
recreation agency increased, the more likely that the prominence of the Role
Orientation in an agency decreased. The opposite is true with the non-accredited
municipal park and recreation agencies. The results illustrated that as the prominence
or strength of the Role Orientation increased the prominence of the Achievement
Orientation in the agency decreased. This leads the researcher to ascertain that as a
CAPRA accredited park and recreation agency in the sample becomes more focused on
the shared values of the organization, the mission, and team orientation, the less
concerned they are about formalized structure, authority, and procedures. Therefore, a
municipal park and recreation agency of CAPRA accredited status according to
Harrison and Stokes (1992) may become less powerful in its structure, have higher morale, work longer hours, and have a value-driven approach in the workplace.

In the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency, the results depict that the Role Orientation was the prominent cultural orientation and its strength increased as the level of culture of the Achievement Orientation decreased. Therefore, the non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency, according to Harrison and Stokes (1992), took on more of a formalized structure, becoming procedure-driven and bureaucratic in its environment with well-defined levels of authority.

The result was more advantageous for the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agency, since the working environment was more conducive to teamwork, open communication, trust, informal leadership styles, and agency success.

There were no formal research studies found comparing accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies, while viewing the four cultural orientations of Harrison and Stokes (1992). There was a study by McCabe and Fajardo (2001) that compared accredited and non-accredited law enforcement agencies with respect to operational and management issues. The study identified five specific agency characteristics that were different between the different statuses of law enforcement agencies. The variables of the accredited law enforcement agencies were identified to have: (1) more field training hours, (2) higher minimum educational requirements for new officers, (3) a greater likelihood of drug testing for new officers, (4) a greater likelihood of having an operating special drug unit, and (5) a greater likelihood of having an operating child-abuse unit. Research of this nature demonstrates that the
study of professional accreditation versus non-accreditation can be an important tool when assessing the levels of benchmarking and setting professional agency standards.

The results, when viewing the differences of the four cultural orientations with respect to CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies, suggest that there were no similarities in ranking. Each sample agency may have similar or different characteristics within its working environment, but the implication to professional practice indicates that each agency had its own organizational culture. The opportunity arises for a CAPRA accredited or non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency to initiate a self-evaluation of its existing cultural orientations to identify and further understand its status and evaluate whether or not to pursue a transformation of culture in the future.

Research Question Number 5

What was the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies when viewed using the Competing Values Framework of Culture?

Based on the outcomes of the frequency of responses, the organizational culture of all municipal park and recreation agencies in the sample, when using the Competing Values Framework of Culture, had a mixed result. By order of frequency and percent, the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with the highest rate of response was the Developmental Culture element of expansion, growth, and development (55.2%). The element of direction, goal setting, and goal clarity found within the Rational Culture followed closely in response with a 51% response rate. Group Culture followed with two elements: empowerment of employees to act
(47.9%), and participation and open discussion (45.8%). These percentages along with the means of the 14 of the 16 elements show importance for the CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agency. Any municipal park and recreation administrator would be envious of these characteristics is not already found within their agency.

The results also illustrated that all municipal park and recreation agencies in the sample, whether CAPRA accredited or non-accredited, have established cultural characteristics from all four of the competing values of culture. This result is similar to the results found in research question number one where all four orientations exist in every agency.

Another major finding was complementary to the findings presented in research questions number one and number two. In *Competing Values Framework of Culture*, the results identified that participation and open discussion (1.38), outcome, excellence and quality (1.54), empowerment of employees to act (1.59), and creative problem solving processes and task focus, accomplishment, and goal achievement (1.68), received the lowest scores, therefore, these elements stood out within the four categories. The characteristics of these profiles may also point toward an agency striving to achieve success and possibly accreditation. A non-accredited municipal park and recreation agency seeking these elements may regard accreditation as the direction in which to proceed. The accredited agency certainly seeks growth, has its systems formalized as well as the status of its mission, goals, and objectives in place.

The results of other studies have shown that that the culture of an organization does not fall into only one quadrant (Colyer et al., 2000). The Australian study by Colyer et
al. (2000) that measured the recreation services of four cities had mixed results. City number one had a high level of Rational Culture, which was followed by Developmental and Hierarchical Culture. City number two had dominance in Hierarchical Culture followed by Developmental and Rational Cultures. City number three was dominant in Developmental Culture but had close relationships to Rational, and Group Cultures. City number four was dominant in Hierarchical Culture and was found to be equally dominant in Group, Developmental, and Rational Cultures.

These findings suggested that the utilization of the Competing Values Framework of Culture model can be beneficial in the study of local government agencies (Colyer et al., 2000). As this was an exploratory study, it offered a basis for further study in the area of organizational culture of park and recreation agencies.

A second study by Zafft, Adams, and Matkin (2009), demonstrated the application of the Competing Values Framework with respect to 81 engineering students. The focus was to use the Competing Values Framework of Culture to understand four different leadership profiles when evaluating student team leadership and to determine the type of leadership role that was highly effective in a team setting. The outcomes of the study were twofold: (1) an increased awareness in students led to increased effectiveness, and (2) leadership complexity was significant with respect to performance but that did not affect team attitudes. This study verified the importance and usefulness of the Competing Values Framework of Culture.

Municipal park and recreation directors may benefit from considering the implications of the Competing Values Framework of Culture. Each of the four values
(1) Group Culture, (2) Developmental Culture, (3) Hierarchical Culture, or (4) Rational Culture has specific characteristics that further define it. Through the self-assessment tools available, a municipal park and recreation agency could determine the prominent, most likely culture to the least prominent culture of the agency. After a thorough evaluation of the results, an agency could determine whether or not the order of prominence is appropriate for the organization, and ultimately whether a shift of organizational culture should be attempted. The result of this research allows a municipal park and recreation agency to compare its results and to determine its future direction.

Research Question Number 6

What were the differences between CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to non-accredited agencies when viewing the Competing Values Framework of Culture?

The differences between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies were evaluated using the independent t-test to ascertain statistical significance.

The findings of this portion of the study echoed to a degree the results of research question number four and five. There were three areas of statistical significance: Group Culture, Developmental Culture, and Rational Culture. The results illustrated that there is a diverse result within the Competing Values Framework of Culture model. Group Culture had two characteristics with statistically significant differences, (1) participation and open discussion, and (2) assessing employee concerns and ideas
Developmental Culture also had two elements with significance, (1) expansion, growth, and development, and (2) creative problem solving processes (p=.007 and .046 respectively). Finally, Rational Culture also had two characteristics with significance, (1) task focus, accomplishment and goal achievement, and (2) efficiency and productivity (p=.036 and .035 respectively). The result denoted that the organizational culture of a CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agency is not one-dimensional. This outcome was important as it also illustrates that 3 out of the 4 cultures were represented as statistically significant and have characteristics that were shared and that 6 out 16 characteristics were statistically significant and were meaningful among municipal park and recreation agencies.

There were no existing formal studies examining the differences of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies to the Competing Values Framework of Culture model. There was a study focusing on the organizational culture of 86 utility companies in the United States, authored by Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) that utilized the Competing Values Framework of Culture. The results of the study illustrated that the four cultures were evident in each of the 86 companies. However, the outcome also indicated that as the prominence of one culture was high within one company, other cultures placed low in comparison of prominence and strength. The overall results demonstrated that a balance of cultures was evident within any organization and was established to mold the organizations working environment.

The present research suggests that there are differences between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited agencies. The result of this research question echoed the position of
question number four with the caveat of the utilization of the *Competing Values Framework of Culture*. Each of the four cultures was defined by different characteristics and each municipal park and recreation agency consisted of various levels of prominence of the four different cultures. Specifically, CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies were observed to have a statistically significant difference within 6 out of 16 characteristics found in three out of the four cultures. This suggests that cultural differences between CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies do exist within this sample. The lack of research in the area of municipal park and recreation agencies does suggest that the opportunity exists to further analyze this topic area in the future.

**Research Question Number 7**

What association did the population of the communities' service area, the size of the annual operating budget, and the numbers of full-time professional staff have on the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies when compared to those agencies that are not accredited?

Findings of the statistical analysis determined that there was no significant association between the organizational culture and CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with respect to population of the community service area, size of the annual operating budget, and the number of full-time professional staff. When reviewing CAPRA accredited responses however, there was a tendency for municipal park and recreation agencies with larger populations, larger operating budgets, and a larger number of full-time professional staff to become
accredited. These results indicated that the larger municipal park and recreation agencies may be driven toward CAPRA accreditation. It stands to reason that agencies with the greatest resources may have more opportunities to facilitate such a process. This conclusion was strictly observational, based on responses by agencies participating in this study. Further study is recommended.

There were no existing formal studies that examined the relationship of the population of the community service area, size of the annual operating budget, and number of full-time professional staff to the organizational culture of CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies. However, there were complementary studies that individually evaluated population, budgets, and the number of full-time employees to related topics within organizational culture. One such study by Goddard (1997) sought to establish a relationship between culture and budget-related behavior. There were three governmental agencies in the study, each consisting of national, corporate, professional, and hierarchical characteristics of culture. The agencies were located in the United Kingdom, British Canada, and French Canada. The results were threefold: (1) corporate and hierarchical cultures were found to be a major influence in budget-related behavior, (2) professional culture was found to be a lesser influence, and (3) national culture was found to have little or no influence at all. This study demonstrates the importance and level of interest in specific demographic variables as it relates to the overall need for further research.

Implications for professional practice in this portion of the current study indicates that there was no statistically significant association between CAPRA accredited and
non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies with respect to community population, annual operating budget size, or number of professional full-time employees. The frequency of response in this study illustrates that large communities with substantial budgets and a large number of professional full-time employees tend to be CAPRA accredited. Conversely, the frequency of the municipal park and recreation agencies with a smaller population base, smaller annual budget, and fewer professional full-time employees tended not to be accredited. Although this sample was small ($N=96$), it was adequate to withstand the rigor of statistical analysis (Henderson & Bialeschki, 2002; Huck, 2004). Further study of an equally representative CAPRA accredited and non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies sample is suggested.

Research Question Number 8

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency to become accredited?

There were two main reasons given by CAPRA accredited agencies for going through the process of accreditation: (1) to meet, maintain, and validate best practices, and (2) the opportunity to set high quality standards and to benchmark progress. Since the impetus behind accreditation is for an agency to reach a level of minimum standards and to maintain quality of service, these responses fully support the initial accreditation concept.

The findings of this study may indicate to NRPA and CAPRA that there are several very specific strengths that municipal park and recreation agencies recognize as
important to the CAPRA accreditation process. The validation of best practice and the
opportunity to set a high quality set of standards for a municipal park and recreation
agency may point directly to the characteristics of a successful organization and its
desire to accomplish accreditation. Further, if an agency seeks to continually
benchmark its progress and grow, accreditation may be the impetus for which to strive.

Future studies may yield stronger, more detailed results if researchers are able to
garner NRPA cooperation and obtain randomly-sampled membership information.

Research Question Number 9

What are the reasons for a municipal park and recreation agency choosing not to
become accredited?

The reasons given by the respondents for a municipal park and recreation agency
not to become accredited were twofold: (1) lack of financial resources, and (2) no
availability of time to move through the accreditation process. An unexpected reason
for not seeking accreditation was unfamiliarity with the CAPRA program. This
information may prompt NRPA and CAPRA to develop a new marketing strategy to
promote the CAPRA accreditation program while dealing with the specifics of
financial resources, time, and staffing requirements actually needed to become
accredited. Perhaps a series of case studies illustrating the process of successful
CAPRA accredited agencies might be advantageous to those considering or
questioning the benefits of the program.

Non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies not choosing to become
accredited indicated a need for clarification and possible simplification of the program.
If CAPRA can further develop an understanding of the importance of CAPRA accreditation and work with agencies that may need more time to complete the process, more agencies may become involved. Additional responses from non-accredited municipal park and recreation agencies indicated that there was a lack of education about the CAPRA accreditation program and that some misunderstandings with respect to the CAPRA accreditation program and process existed. Concise, clear, and continual communication with non-accredited NRPA members and non-members is indicated.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This was an exploratory study. The findings of this study offer future researchers a starting point of reference with respect to the organizational culture of municipal park and recreation agencies comparing those agencies that were CAPRA accredited with those that were not accredited. The following comments and recommendations for future studies to consider include:

1. This study had two sample groups. One sample group included CAPRA accredited municipal park and recreation agencies of the NRPA effective October 1, 2009. The number of CAPRA accredited agencies increases each year. The subjects of this portion of the study could double in five years and it would be advantageous at that time to expand the study.

2. The non-accredited sample group included a convenience sample of 91 agencies regionally located throughout the United States. With the cooperation of the NRPA, a random sample of agency members could be established and the sample could easily be expanded. This researcher was not able to obtain the
NRPA membership list for mailing purposes.

3. The research instrument was sent only to park and recreation directors, limiting the study to individuals in upper management. Perhaps a mixture of staff levels could be developed to further represent the entire municipal park and recreation agency.

4. This study represented only municipal park and recreation agencies. The study could be broadened to represent park districts, county, regional, and state park and recreation agencies.

5. The CAPRA accredited population were exclusively NRPA members while the non-accredited sample were both NRPA and non-NRPA members. Perhaps a study of only non-accredited NRPA members would strengthen the results.

6. Research was limited to municipal park and recreation agencies located in the United States. The study could be broadened to include park and recreation agencies located in other countries with similar delivery systems.

7. This study was completed by one researcher. Perhaps with the full cooperation of the NRPA and the CAPRA Board of Directors, a more robust study could be accomplished.

8. This research study was conducted using quantitative methodology. It is recommended that a future study be conducted using a mixed method and including a portion of qualitative research. More information is needed with respect to accredited agencies and the benefits of CAPRA accreditation and the
issues and concerns of non-accredited agencies. Additional open-ended questions and agency interviews would be suggested.

9. Create an instrument to measure organizational culture that is specifically related to government/parks and recreation.

10. Explore whether or not organizational culture or accreditation is the major driver of either of the two elements.

11. Explore how the respondents professional experience and education influences perceptions of organizational culture and/or accreditation.
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APPENDIX A

RESEARCH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
This questionnaire is germane to a research study comparing the relationships of organizational culture between select municipal park and recreation agencies. Organizational culture can be thought of as a group of characteristics or traits of the agency that separate your agency from any other organization; Harrison and Stokes (1992) have stated that organizational culture is to an organization what personality is to an individual. As you answer these questions think about those elements that are paramount to your organization's personality.

Your agency has been chosen to participate by a random selection of municipal park and recreation agencies. I thank you in advance for your cooperation.

SECTION I  DIAGNOSING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Instructions
The first section of this questionnaire introduces the “beginning” of a sentence followed by four alternative sentence “endings.” You are to read the “beginning” of the sentence and prioritize in order the most appropriate of the four “endings” that BEST describes your organization; “4” being the most like your agency and “1” being the least like your agency. Place one (4), one (3), one (2), and one (1) as an answer to each question. Please choose your answers according to the following:

4 = The MOST likely answer  2 = The NEXT LEAST likely answer
3 = The NEXT likely answer  1 = The LEAST likely answer

1. Staff within my park and recreation agency is expected to give first priority to:
   _____ a. meeting the needs/demands of their supervisors and other high-level individuals in the agency.
   _____ b. carrying out the duties of their own jobs; staying within the policies/procedures related to their jobs.
   _____ c. meeting the challenges of the job, finding a better way to do things.
   _____ d. cooperating with the staff with whom they work, to solve work and personal problems.
2. Staff members who do well in my park and recreation agency are typically those who:
   _____ a. know how to please their supervisors and are able/willing to use power and politics to get ahead.
   _____ b. work by the rules, work within the system, and strive to do things correctly.
   _____ c. are technically competent/effective, with a strong commitment to getting the job done.
   _____ d. build close working relationships with others by being cooperative/responsive/caring.

3. My park and recreation agency treats individuals:
   _____ a. as “hands” whose time/energy are at the disposal of individuals at higher levels in the hierarchy.
   _____ b. as “employees” whose time/energy are purchased through a contract, with rights and obligations for both parties.
   _____ c. as “associates” or peers who are mutually committed to the achievement of a common purpose.
   _____ d. as “family” or “friends” who like being together and who care/support one another.

4. Staff within my park and recreation agency are managed, directed, or influenced by:
   _____ a. individuals in positions of authority, who exercise their power through the use of rewards/punishments.
   _____ b. the systems/rules/procedures that prescribe what individuals should do and the right ways of doing it.
   _____ c. their own commitment to achieving the goals of the organization.
   _____ d. their own desire to be accepted by others and to be good members of their work group.

5. Decision-making processes in my agency are characterized by:
   _____ a. directives/orders/instructions that come down from higher levels of management.
   _____ b. the adherence to formal channels and reliance on policies/procedures for making decisions.
   _____ c. decisions being made close to the point of action, by the individuals on the spot.
   _____ d. the use of consensus decision-making methods to gain acceptance/support for decisions.

6. Assignments of tasks/jobs to individual staff members in my agency are based on:
   _____ a. the personal judgments/values/wishes of those in positions of power.
   _____ b. the needs/plans of the organization and the rules of the system (seniority, etc.).
   _____ c. matching the requirements of the job with the interests/abilities of the staff.
   _____ d. the personal preferences of the staff and their needs for growth/development.
7. All staff within my park and recreation agency is expected to be:
   a. hard-working/compliant/obedient/loyal to the interests of those to whom they report.
   b. responsible/reliable, carrying out the duties/responsibilities of their jobs and avoiding actions that could surprise/embarrass their supervisors.
   c. self-motivated/competent, willing to take the initiative to get things done, willing to challenge those to whom they report if that is necessary to obtain good results.
   d. good team workers, supportive/cooperative, who get along well with others.

8. Managers and supervisors in my park and recreation agency are expected to be:
   a. strong/decisive; firm yet fair.
   b. impersonal/proper, avoiding the exercise of authority for their own advantage.
   c. democratic and willing to accept subordinates’ ideas about the task.
   d. supportive/responsive/concerned about the personal concerns and needs of those whose work they supervise.

9. It is considered legitimate for one staff member in my agency to tell another what to do when:
   a. they have more power/authority, or “clout” in the agency.
   b. it is part of the responsibilities included in their job description.
   c. they have greater knowledge/expertise and use it to guide or teach the other staff person to do the work.
   d. the other staff person asks for their help/guidance, or advice.

10. Employee motivation in my park and recreation agency is primarily the result of:
    a. hope for rewards, fear of punishment, or personal loyalty to the supervisor.
    b. acceptance of the norm providing a “fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay.”
    c. strong desire to achieve/to create/to innovate/ along with peer pressure to contribute to the success of the organization.
    d. staff wanting to help others and to develop/maintain satisfying working relationships.

11. Relationships between my agency staff or departments is generally:
    a. competitive, both looking out for their own interests and helping each other only when they can see some advantage for themselves by doing so.
    b. characterized by indifference toward each other, helping each other only when it is convenient or when they are directed by a higher level to do so.
    c. cooperative when they need to achieve common goals. Staff is normally willing to cut red tape and cross organizational boundaries in order to get the job done.
    d. friendly, with a high level of responsiveness to requests for assistance from other groups.
12. Staff conflict within my park and recreation agency is usually:
   _____ a. dealt with personally; by intervention of staff at higher levels of authority.
   _____ b. avoided by reference to rules/procedures/formal definitions of authority, and responsibility.
   _____ c. resolved through discussions aimed at getting the best outcomes possible for the work issues involved.
   _____ d. dealt with in a manner that maintains good working relationships and minimizes the chances of agency staff being hurt.

13. The macro-environment outside my organization is thought to be:
   _____ a. a jungle, where the agency is in competition for survival with others.
   _____ b. an orderly system in which relationships are determined by structures/procedures and where everyone is expected to abide by the rules.
   _____ c. a competition for excellence in which productivity/quality/innovation bring success.
   _____ d. a community of interdependent parts in which the common interests are the most important.

14. If rules/systems/procedures get in the way my park and recreation staff will:
   _____ a. break them if they have enough clout to get by with it or if they think they can get away with it without being caught.
   _____ b. generally abide by them to go through proper channels to get permission to deviate from them or have them changed.
   _____ c. tend to ignore or by-pass them to accomplish their tasks or perform their jobs better.
   _____ d. support one another in ignoring or bending them if they are felt to be unfair or to create hardships for others.

15. New park and recreation staff members in my agency need to learn:
   _____ a. who really runs things; who can help/hurt them; whom to avoid offending; the norms (unwritten rules) that have to be observed in order to stay out of trouble.
   _____ b. the formal rules/procedures and to abide by them; to stay within the formal boundaries of their jobs.
   _____ c. what resources are available to help them do their jobs; to take the initiative to apply their skills/knowledge to their jobs.
   _____ d. how to cooperate; how to be good team members; how to develop good working relationships with others.
**SECTION II**

**ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

**Instructions**

The second section of the questionnaire presents 16 statements regarding four different types of organizations. In each sub-section circle the number for each statement that you feel best fits your parks and recreation agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation, open discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Empowerment of employees to act</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessing employee concerns &amp; ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Human relations, teamwork, cohesion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Flexibility, decentralization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expansion, growth, &amp; development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Innovation &amp; change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Creative problem solving processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control, centralization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Routine is set, formalization &amp; structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stability, continuity, order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Predictable performance outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rational Culture

13. Task focus, accomplishment, goal achievement

14. Direction, goal setting, goal clarity

15. Efficiency, productivity

16. Outcome excellence, quality

### SECTION III  DEMOGRAPHICS

**Instructions**

The third section of the questionnaire introduces several questions regarding your community park and recreation agency. In questions 16-19 please check the box that best describes your agency. For questions 20 & 21, please answer the appropriate question based on your response to question 19.

16. The population of our service area is:

   - □ 19,999 and under
   - □ 20,000-39,999
   - □ 40,000-59,999
   - □ 60,000-79,999
   - □ 80,000-99,999
   - □ 100,000 and above

17. The annual operating budget for the current FY of our agency is:

   - □ $ 499,999 and below
   - □ $ 500,000 to $ 999,999
   - □ $ 1,000,000 to $ 2,999,999
   - □ $ 3,000,000 to $ 4,999,999
   - □ $ 5,000,000 to $ 6,999,999
   - □ $ 7,000,000 and above
18. The number of full time professional staff members in our agency is:

☐ 10 or below  ☐ 41-54 full time employees
☐ 11-25 full time employees  ☐ 55-64 full time employees
☐ 26-40 full time employees  ☐ 65 or more full time employees

19. My park and recreation agency: ☐ is ☐ is not currently accredited by CAPRA.

20. If accredited, why did you choose to become CAPRA accredited?

________________________________________________________________________

21. If not accredited, why did you choose not to become accredited?

________________________________________________________________________

Should you have any questions I may be contacted at 563-355-3122 or JE-Farland@wiu.edu.

THANK YOU.... for your assistance!
APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY COVER LETTER TO RESPONDENT
February 22, 2010

Dear Parks & Recreation Director,

As a park and recreation professional for over thirty years and as the past director of several municipal park and recreation member agencies of the National Recreation & Park Association (NRPA), I request your assistance. I am seeking your insight into several basic characteristics of your leisure agency.

Enclosed is a survey that will assist me in the completion of my dissertation responsibilities at the University of Northern Iowa. It should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete. For your convenience it is divided into three sections. The first section consists of fifteen questions and asks you to prioritize the characteristics of your agency; the second section consists of sixteen questions and asks you once again to choose the most appropriate answer with respect to the environment of your agency; and the third section consists of five questions focusing on the demographics of your community and agency. While your participation is voluntary, I highly value your assistance. Your response is extremely important in the completion of this research study. Please respond by Friday, March 12, 2010 if possible.

There are no foreseeable risks or benefits to you or your organization. If you choose to participate your response will be cataloged only by a sequential number. In addition, all information from the questionnaire will be analyzed by category; thus no individuals or agencies will or can be identified. All responses will be kept confidential. Upon completion please place questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope, seal, & mail.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience. For answers to questions about rights of research participants and the participant review process, you may contact the Office of Human Participants Coordinator, the University of Northern Iowa at 319-273-6148. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Jef Farland

Doctoral Candidate
University of Northern Iowa
563-355-3122 or JE-Farland@wiu.edu

Note: By completing this survey, you are indicating that you are fully aware of the nature and extent of your participation in this project as stated above and the possible risks arising from it. By completing this survey you are also agreeing to participate in this research and acknowledge that you are 18 years of age or older. Please keep this correspondence for your records or future reference.
APPENDIX C

SCALOGRAM
EXPLANATION OF THE SCALOGRAM

The scalogram is a term for the scoring sheet for Diagnosing Organizational Culture.

Step 1:

As each of the 15 statements is completed by the respondent, there is a numerical figure given to each portion: “a,” “b,” “c,” and “d” for each statement.

Sample: Statement 1: a = 2, b = 3, c = 4, d = 1

Step 2:

The scores are then recorded on a matrix with a row designated for each respondent and 60 columns in which to record a 1, 2, 3, or 4 for each statement.

Sample:

Respondent 1: 1a 2, 1b 3, 1c 4, 1d 1; 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d and so on..

Step 3:

Each respondents a’s, b’s, c’s, and d’s are totaled.

The “a” total represents the Power Orientation = P.
The “b” total represents the Role Orientation = R.
The “c” total represents the Achievement Orientation = A.
The “d” total represents the Support Orientation = S.

Step 4:

The totals are then calculated (using the raw score) by this formula to ascertain the existing overall culture score.

\[(A) + (S) - (P) - (R) = \text{The Existing Culture Score}\]

A = Achievement, S = Support, P = Power, and R = Role

The scores are then recorded using the Existing Culture Percentile Matrix.
APPENDIX D

EXISTING CULTURE PERCENTILE MATRIX
## EXISTING CULTURE PERCENTILE MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48*</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score of orientation
APPENDIX E

DIAGNOSING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE STATEMENT RESULTS
## Summary of Diagnosing Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Accredited Mean/Rank</th>
<th>Non-accredited Mean/Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff within my park and recreation agency is expected to give first priority to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. meeting the needs/demands of their supervisors and other high level individuals in the agency.</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>52.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. carrying out the duties of their own jobs; staying within policies/procedures related to their jobs.</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>52.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. meeting the challenges of the job; finding a better way to do things.</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>39.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. cooperating with the staff with whom they work, to solve work and personal problems.</td>
<td>49.55</td>
<td>47.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff members who do well in my park and recreation agency are typically those who:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. know how to please their supervisors and are able/willing to use power and politics to get ahead.</td>
<td>41.91</td>
<td>52.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. work by the rules, work within the system, and strive to do things correctly.</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>54.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. are technically competent/effective, with a strong commitment to getting the job done.</td>
<td>56.26</td>
<td>43.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. build close working relationships with others by being cooperative/responsive/caring.</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My park and recreation agency treats individuals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. as “hands” whose time/energy are at the disposal of individuals at higher levels in the hierarchy.</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. as “employees” whose time/energy are purchased through a contract, with rights and obligations for both parties.</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>53.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. as “associates” or peers who are mutually committed to the achievement of a common purpose.</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>46.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. as “family” or “friends” who like being together and who care/support one another.</td>
<td>58.15</td>
<td>42.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff within my park and recreation agency are managed, directed, or influenced by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. individuals in positions of authority, who exercise their power through the use of rewards/punishments.</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>53.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the systems/rules/procedures that prescribe what individuals should do and the right ways of their own commitment to achieving the goals of the organization.</td>
<td>46.47</td>
<td>49.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. their own commitment to achieving the goals of the organization.</td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>43.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. their own desire to be accepted by others and to be good members of their work group.</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>45.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Decision-making processes in my agency are characterized by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. directives/orders/instructions that come down from higher levels of management.</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>50.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the adherence to formal channels and reliance on policies/procedures for making decisions.</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>44.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. decisions being made close to the point of action, by the individuals on the spot.</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>48.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the use of consensus decision-making methods to gain acceptance/support for decisions.</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>49.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assignments of tasks/jobs to individual staff members in my agency are based on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the personal judgments/values/wishes of those positions of power.</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>54.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the needs/plans of the organization and the rules of the system (seniority, etc.).</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>49.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. matching the requirements of the job with the interests/abilities of the staff.</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>43.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the personal preferences of the staff and their needs for growth/development.</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>46.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All staff within my park and recreation agency is expected to be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. hard-working/compliant/obedient/loyal to the interests of those to whom they report.</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>51.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. responsible/reliable, carrying out the duties/responsibilities of their jobs and avoiding actions that could surprise/embarrass their supervisors.</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>51.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. self-motivated/competent, willing to take the initiative to get things done, willing to challenge those to whom they report if that is necessary to obtain good results.</td>
<td>53.51</td>
<td>45.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. good team workers, supportive/cooperative, who get along well with others.</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Managers and supervisors in my park and recreation agency are expected to be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. strong/decisive, firm yet fair.</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>48.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. impersonal/proper, avoiding the exercise of authority for their own advantage.</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>52.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. democratic and willing to accept subordinates' ideas about the task.</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>44.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. supportive/responsive/concerned about the personal concerns and needs of those whose work they supervise.</td>
<td>49.46</td>
<td>47.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. It is considered legitimate for one staff member in my agency to tell another what to do when:
a. they have more power/authority, or "clout" in the agency. 42.93 51.99
b. it is part of the responsibilities included in their job description. 44.55 50.97
c. they have greater knowledge/expertise and use it to guide or teach the other staff person to do 53.84 45.15
   the work.
d. the other staff person asks for their help/guidance, or advice. 52.47 46.01

10. Employee motivation in my park and recreation agency is primarily the result of:
a. hope for rewards, fear of punishment, or personal loyalty to the supervisor. 45.51 50.37
b. acceptance of the norm providing a "fair day's work for a fair day's pay." 45.19 50.58
c. strong desire to achieve/to create/to innovate/ along with peer pressure to contribute to the 53.32 45.47
   success of the organization.
d. staff wanting to help others and to develop/maintain satisfying working relationships. 51.04 46.91

11. Relationships between my agency staff or departments is generally:
a. competitive, both looking out for their own interests and helping each other only when they 46.04 50.04
   can see some advantage for themselves by doing so.
b. characterized by indifference toward each other, helping each other only when it is 45.47 50.40
   convenient or when they are directed by a higher level to do so.
c. cooperative when they need to achieve common goals. Staff is normally willing to cut red tape 46.73 49.61
   and cross organizational boundaries in order to get the job done.
d. friendly, with a high level of responsiveness to requests for assistance from other groups. 55.68 44.00

12. Staff conflict within my park and recreation agency is usually:
a. dealt with personally; by intervention of staff at higher levels of authority. 42.68 52.15
b. avoided by reference to rules/procedures/formal definitions of authority, and responsibility. 47.19 49.32
c. resolved through discussions aimed at getting the best outcomes possible for the work 53.08 45.63
   issues involved.
d. dealt with in a manner that maintains good working relationships and minimizes the chances 49.11 48.12
   of agency staff being hurt.

13. The macro-environment outside my organization is thought to be:
a. a jungle, where the agency is in competition for survival with others. 42.61 51.44
b. an orderly system in which relationships are determined by structures/procedures and where 42.11 51.76
   everyone is expected to abide by the rules.
c. a competition for excellence in which productivity/quality/innovation bring success. 58.66 41.20
d. a community of interdependent parts in which the common interests are the most important 50.39 46.47

14. If rules/systems/procedures get in the way my park and recreation staff will:
a. break them if they have enough clout with it or if they think they can get away with it without 49.50 47.04
   being caught.
b. generally abide by them to go through proper channels to get permission to deviate from them 46.55 48.92
   or have them changed.
c. tend to ignore or by-pass them to accomplish their tasks or perform their jobs better. 50.30 46.53
d. support one another in ignoring or bending them if they are felt to be unfair or to create 44.43 50.28
   hardships for others.

15. New park and recreation staff members in my agency need to learn:
a. who really runs things, who can help/hurt them; whom to avoid offending; the norms 47.77 48.96
   (unwritten rules) that have to be observed in order to stay out of trouble.
b. the formal rules/procedures and to abide by them; to stay within the formal boundaries 46.68 49.64
   of their jobs.
c. what resources are available to help them do their jobs; to take the initiative to apply their 53.19 45.56
   skills/knowledge to their jobs.
d. how to cooperate; how to be good team members; how to develop good working relationships 48.41 48.56
   with others.