



8-1-1974

## A Study of the Cooperative Practices Involving the Use of Selected Secondary Public School Facilities by the Recreation Commissions in Rural Minnesota

J. Ross Richardson

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Richardson, J. Ross, "A Study of the Cooperative Practices Involving the Use of Selected Secondary Public School Facilities by the Recreation Commissions in Rural Minnesota" (1974). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3434.

<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3434>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

T1974  
R394

A STUDY OF THE COOPERATIVE PRACTICES INVOLVING  
THE USE OF SELECTED SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL  
FACILITIES BY THE RECREATION COMMISSIONS  
IN RURAL MANITOBA

by  
J. Ross Richardson

Bachelor of Science, University of North Dakota, 1969

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
of the  
University of North Dakota  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Science

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August  
1974

448178

This Thesis submitted by J. Ross Richardson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

W. C. Koenig  
(Chairman)

W. C. Koenig

John D. Williams

William J. Johnson  
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

A STUDY OF THE COOPERATIVE PRACTICES INVOLVING THE USE OF  
SELECTED SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES FOR RECREATIONAL  
Title PURPOSES IN RURAL MANITOBA

Department Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Degree Master of Science

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. W. C. Koenig, Dr. L. Jorgensen, and Dr. J. Williams for their guidance and cooperation in the writing of this thesis.

A special acknowledgment is extended to Mr. W. W. Bolonchuk, Mr. A. Miller, the staff at the provincial recreation branch in Winnipeg, and to all the school superintendents who cooperated in this study for their invaluable assistance.

Special thanks is extended to Vailla, my wife, for her patience and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . iv

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . vii

ABSTRACT . . . . . viii

Chapter

    I. INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

        Statement of the Problem

        Purpose

        Hypothesis

        Delimitations

        Limitations

        Definition of Terms

        Review of Related Literature

        Comparative Studies

        Summary

    II. METHODOLOGY . . . . . 12

        Sampling Procedure

        Questionnaire

        Test Procedure

        Experimental Design

    III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . . 15

    IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 24

        Summary

        Conclusions

        Recommendations

APPENDIX A . . . . . 27

APPENDIX B . . . . . 31

APPENDIX C . . . . . 34

APPENDIX D . . . . . 36

APPENDIX E . . . . . 38

APPENDIX F . . . . .	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Frequency of Positive and Negative Responses and the Significance of These Responses . . . . .	16
2.	School Usage . . . . .	17
3.	Applications for School Usage . . . . .	18
4.	Expenses of School Usage . . . . .	19
5.	Liability of School Usage . . . . .	20
6.	Administration . . . . .	21
7.	Facilities Used By The Recreation Commission . . . . .	23
8.	Persons Through Whom Applications for School Usage Must Be Made . . . . .	23
9.	List of Communities and Schools Involved . . . . .	37
10.	Tabulation of Questions Requiring Positive and Negative Responses . . . . .	39
11.	Facilities Used By The Recreation Commission . . . . .	40
12.	Persons Through Whom Applications For School Usage Must Be Made . . . . .	40
13.	Example of Computation of Results . . . . .	42
14.	Example of Computation of Results . . . . .	43



## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to survey the use of selected public secondary schools by the recreation commissions in rural Manitoba, to determine the amount of, or lack of, cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in these communities, in regard to the commission's use of the school for community recreation.

A single group non-probability sample of all school superintendents from the rural communities in southern Manitoba, that had a recreation commission and a population of between 800 and 4000 people was employed in this study. The questionnaire method was used with a questionnaire constructed by the writer and validated in a pilot study. The scale of measurement was considered to be nominal, with the type of statistics being descriptive and non-parametric. The Chi Square Test was employed to test the significant difference between the observed and the expected responses. The level of confidence selected to test was the .05 level.

The data showed significantly that the majority of the schools were being used to a limited extent for community recreation but a lack of established practices and policies in such areas as: contract forms for school usage, liabilities of the user and administrative planning seemed to be limiting the recreation commissions' use of the school. The study hypothesis was therefore accepted; the more cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation

commission involving the commission's usage of the school for community recreation, the more available the school would be for recreation.

The writer recommended that these communities should require that a school official be on the recreation commission and that the school board and the recreation commission should meet periodically to plan and promote the recreational use of the school.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The scope of recreation in North America has grown considerably in the past few decades. Such things as increased leisure time, adult education, development of major national parks, concern for the plight of slum children, initiation of school, college and professional sports programs, and the development of recreation as a professional field of service are major causes of this rapid growth. Coupled with this expansion is the birth of the term community recreation (recreation for those of a common geographical area) and its adoption for control by local municipal governments. These local governing bodies have appointed a recreation commission or board to administer the programs, facilities, finances and personnel of the communities' recreational needs.

In terms of organized recreation function, it can be readily accepted that Manitoba, outside of Winnipeg, is still a province of small communities deserving the intimacy of recreation programs which are not devoid of strong personal relationships. In situations such as this, the role of an organized recreation program is synonymous with the educational function.

Since the inception of the organized community recreation movement, it has been recognized that schools are better distributed over an entire community than any other facility. In turn, the vital dependency of a community recreation program upon schools for funda-

mental uses has been proven. Nearly every major guide on recreation facility planning in the last several decades has explicitly recommended that the school site be included in neighborhood, community, city-wide or district recreation supply or plans.

The recreational role of the school districts is of special significance since local school districts, many in number, can combine with the local recreation commissions to offer local control without excessive politics and are endowed with the necessary legal powers to organize and finance recreation. Quite opportunely, the school districts are able to synchronize recreation among both youth and adults.

Therefore, it is logical that a small community and its recreation commission should look inward to the resources of the educational plant, to its leadership, facilities and philosophy for a more adequate recreation program.

#### Statement of the Problem

It was common knowledge that the public schools in most communities in rural Manitoba were not being used as extensively for community recreation as they could have been. The nature of the problem of this study, then, concerned reasons why these schools were not being used more for recreation. Were details such as expenses, poor planning, program duplication, interdepartmental friction, lack of policies or lack of cooperation some of the causes for non-usage?

As the recreation programs in most of these communities have been organized and supervised by the local recreation commission, the scope of the problem was to examine the cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission involving the use of

public secondary school facilities for recreational purposes. The information needed could only be obtained from the personnel directly involved in each separate community. Time having been of the essence and funds at a minimum, the questionnaire survey method was used in an attempt to obtain the needed information.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to survey the use of selected public secondary schools by the recreation commissions in rural Manitoba; to determine the amount of, or lack of, cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in these communities with regard to the commission's use of the school for community recreation.

#### Hypothesis

It was believed that, the more cooperative practices, between the school district and the recreation commission which involved the commission's usage of the school for community recreation, the more available the school would be for recreation to the benefit of the community's recreational program.

#### Delimitations

This study was limited to:

1. the population was only school superintendents of secondary public schools in rural communities, in the southern half of the province of Manitoba, with a recreation commission and a population of between 800 and 4000 people,
2. the sample was a non-probability sample of the entire population,

3. the study was concerned only with the recreation commissions' use of the schools for community recreation,
4. the survey method was used to obtain the data,
5. the setting was operational, and
6. the data were considered to be nominal.

#### Limitations

The limitations of the study were:

1. the knowledge the subjects chosen had of the problem under study, and
2. the responses received from the subjects chosen.

#### Definition of Terms

Recreation - is activity engaged in during leisure time and primarily motivated by the satisfaction derived from it (1).

Community Recreation - is socially acceptable recreation planned, established, and operated in an organized way and operated to serve the recreation interest of persons who have a common geographical, psychological, or institutional bond, and who share a common interest (1).

Rural - living in country areas: engaged in agricultural pursuits (2).

#### Review of Related Literature

The review of related literature was concerned mainly with trends of thought concerning the use of schools for community recreation. The review also covered comparisons of findings in other studies with those which formed the basis for the formulation of this problem.

The great growth of community recreation in the past decade has caused a greater need for more programs, facilities and monies. Due to the rise in the costs of living, land and construction, it has become increasingly more difficult for recreation departments to supply these needs from their funds and materials. American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER) officials claimed (3):

As population size and demands increase and the amount of available land and facilities decreases it does not seem likely that a community can afford several facilities, each operated by a different agency, serving a select few and each standing idle much of the time.

There has been a movement to look to other agencies and organizations for help. Of these, the school has the greatest supply of facilities, personnel and expertise to supply to the recreation function. As Yukic (4) stated:

Not only is the school site an indispensable recreation asset and a focal point in proper geographical facility distribution and need; but psychologically, the school is conveniently available to the public. Today's citizenry, including most children and youth will return to their schools for special leisure activities of many kinds.

A statement by the late and former president of the United States, Lyndon Johnson (5), indicated his concern for use of the schools:

Tomorrow's schools will be the center of community life, for grown-ups as well as children . . . It will provide formal education for all citizens and will not close it's doors anymore at three o'clock. It will employ it's buildings around the clock and it's teachers around the year. We just cannot afford to have an \$85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

Though the need for school participation in the community recreation function has long since been recognized, the response of authorities, past and present, toward the community use of the schools

leaves much to be desired. The following points were listed in a paper done for the Society of Directors of Municipal Recreation of the Ontario Training Institute in 1967 (6). It concerned attitudes toward the ways in which school authorities dealt with recreation in their schools:

- Recreation is something to be tolerated; it has never become a significant consideration in the education of the child . . .
- Schools have as their primary aim the education of the child, not for living, but for passing examinations . . .
- The school system has become a "machine" and has lost touch with both the community and the individual within the community . . .

More recently Wilson (7) has claimed:

A major problem related to the status of community use of schools is one of attitude--attitudes of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, clerical and plant operation personnel working within the more formalized educational structure. Also involved are attitudes of the more informal deliverers of educational services working in parks and recreation, adult/continuing education, and allied social service agencies.

Obviously many of these attitudes of the recreation and school administrators have changed in the past few years as great steps have been taken toward involving the school in community recreation. Many of the old drawbacks have either been eliminated or lessened to a degree. New philosophies have been arrived at by school and recreation authorities. This was made evident by "A Statement of Basic Beliefs About The School Programs in Health, Physical Education and Recreation" published in 1973 by the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (8):

#### Recreation

About Administration and Organization, we believe:

Schools have a basic responsibility to help the community develop awareness and understanding of the recreational needs of its children, youth and adults.

The spirit of cooperation should pervade community relationships . . .



Schools should stimulate and effectuate team work and cooperation among the agencies and organizations concerned with developing community wide recreation plans, in mobilizing existing school and community recreation facilities and in the joint planning and financing of such facilities and programs in order to make efficient use of all available resources.

About Programs, we believe:

The school curriculum should offer many opportunities for developing attitudes, understandings, knowledge and skills that will lead to the wise use of off-the-job hours.

Schools should provide planned experiences beyond the classroom, including outdoor education, in order to insure maximum articulation between learning and recreational activities.

Opportunities for children, youth and adults to participate in a variety of the physical, aesthetic, cultural, and social aspects of recreation should be provided under school auspices.

The scope of recreation has become very broad in terms of the kinds of population groups served and the varied program elements offered. Therefore, the role of the school, with respect to recreation, was rather obligated to change. This was quite evident in the above statement. Kraus and Curtis (5) summed up this change into three basic roles:

1. to sponsor community recreation directly . . . has declined in recent years,
2. to co-sponsor recreation programs with other agencies . . . usually with municipal recreation and parks departments . . . still offered in some cities,
3. to provide facilities that may be used by other municipal recreation agencies or community organizations . . . in use in the majority of cities in Canada and the United States.

The role of the schools in community recreation in most provinces in Canada (and in Manitoba primarily), has been that of role number three as listed above. It has been a role of coordinating and providing, not of cosponsoring. There were many advantages to this type of system, some of which were best brought out by Toffoli (9) in, "A Case in A Co-Ordinated Program":

- One of the basic principles of recreation is that we make maximum use of all available facilities . . . In this type of organization we find the recreation department has the full opportunity to use and schedule both schools and parks and to some degree, determining policy over the use of these facilities . . .

- Planning for parks, school parks, playgrounds, and programs is essentially the responsibility of one recreation agency. The agency can draw upon the resources of the schools and city for any assistance it may need.

- Duplication of facilities, personnel and programs can be avoided . . . saving tax money, allowing for a broader and more diversified program; a better range of facilities and the elimination of wasteful competitive practices.

- The education agencies can provide the framework and atmosphere for research while the municipality, through its finance, planning and similar departments provides a wealth of information that is required for pertinent studies.

Even though the school doors in Manitoba and other provinces in Canada have not yet been thrown wide open for the recreation commissions, recent laws have been passed to allow the school governing bodies more authority to conduct or facilitate recreational and adult education programs using school facilities. Examples of some such laws for the province of Alberta were published in an article called, "The School Jurisdiction" (10):

Excerpts from "The School Act, 1970"

65. (4) . . . a board . . . may
- (h) enter into an agreement with a municipality concerning the promotion and development of recreation and community services . . .
92. (1) . . . a board may pass a resolution authorizing the making of an agreement with another board, person or municipality:
- (a) for the joint construction, ownership, maintenance, operation or use of a public work or building, or
- (b) for the performance of any other matter or thing, considered by the board, person or municipality to be a benefit to the district, division or municipality and may enter into an agreement as to the joint control and management of anything that concerns the district, division or municipality.

- (2) Where an agreement is entered into pursuant to subsection (1) the board in the resolution may (a) appoint one or more of it's trustees to be members of a joint committee with persons appointed by another board, person or municipality, and (b) delegate to the joint committee power to construct, maintain and manage the undertaking, including the power to disburse the funds used for the purpose of the undertaking.
155. (1) A board may before or after normal school operating hours establish courses of study for any person on any subject and may employ teachers or other persons for that purpose.

The statements put forward in these laws and preceding studies have made it clear that the recreation commission and the school district must act in complete cooperation and coordination in order to share their philosophies, objectives and goals. As AAHPER officials (3) stated: "America's best recreation programs exist in communities where city and school jurisdictions complement and supplement leadership and facility resources in a warm and closely related team relationship."

#### Comparative Studies

No other study has been carried out attempting to survey the recreational use of public schools in rural Manitoba with respect to the cooperative practices between the school districts and the recreation commissions. There were, however, some studies which were closely related to the purpose of this study. In all of the studies cited below, some type of survey was used to obtain the data.

Olsen (11) carried out a study which compared school-sponsored with co-sponsored recreation programs in the north central region of the United States. Two separate questionnaires were used to gather the necessary data. The co-sponsored system was considered to be the superior of the two according to the results of the survey.

Hafen (12) did a survey of the established policies which determined the legal basis affecting the recreational use of school facilities during non-school hours in the state of Utah. The data were tabulated in an overall summary form and a guide for the recreational use of school facilities was created using the best of the already established policies.

Wipper (13) was also concerned with the extent to which school facilities were used for community recreation and the problems of cooperation in selected communities in the province of Ontario. Dr. Wipper concluded that the real problem lay in attitudes concerning such things as planning and how separate organizations had their own goals and objectives, programs and the poor attitudes some authorities had toward some programs, and school design and how the public looks upon the school and its grounds.

Nick (14), in the only previously published study done in Manitoba, performed a general survey of physical education in every school in the province. One section of this study dealt with the inter-utilization of community and school facilities but delimited itself to the gymnasiums, multi-purpose rooms and the outdoor facilities for community recreational use during the school year. Nick also discovered that the indoor facilities generally were not available during the summer, and, that rental charges for facility usage only applied to indoor facilities and only in certain school divisions.

#### Summary

In summation, the related literature and the comparative studies all pointed to the need for the use of schools as community recreation facilities. At the same time, it also brought to light

the problems involved. At the base of these problems were a lack of established policies and a lack of cooperative practices which seemed to cause many of the other problems. It was, therefore, the purpose of this study to attempt to determine the amount of, or lack of, cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission of communities in rural Manitoba in regard to the commission's use of the school for community recreation.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

A pilot study was carried out with the purpose of determining the validity of the questionnaire constructed for this study. The questionnaire was judged by a committee of ten administrators working in the fields of education and recreation in Manitoba. As a result of the data received and its statistical analysis the questionnaire was revised to its present form.

#### Sampling Procedure

The finite population selected for the study was the public school superintendents from the rural communities in the province of Manitoba, which were south of the 54th parallel, had a recreation commission and had a population of between 800 and 4000 people. A non-probability sample of the entire population was chosen as a broad sample was required. The entire population only numbered 26 subjects supervising schools in 37 communities involved in the population. These subjects were considered to have an expert first-hand knowledge of the problem under study. A list of their names and addresses was obtained from the Recreation Branch of the provincial government in Winnipeg.

An autobiography and an orientation letter (Appendix A, page 27) describing the purpose of the study, reasons why they were chosen

in the sample, and important dates in connection with the study were mailed to each subject. A reply was not requested.

#### Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix B, page 31) was constructed by the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of 20 questions. Eighteen questions were to be answered with a "yes" or "no" response as to the present practices in the school involving its use by the recreation commission for community recreational purposes. One question was to be checked as to which areas of the school were being used for community recreation. The last question was to be checked as to which person or group of people an application for the use of the school for recreational purposes had to be submitted. A statement was included that was to be checked if the subject wanted a copy of the final study results.

#### Test Procedure

The orientation letter was mailed to all the subjects on May 11, 1974, notifying them of the survey and the procedure. One week later on May 18 the questionnaire was mailed out with an instruction letter (Appendix C, page 34) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return purposes. The subjects were requested to complete and return the questionnaire by June 1, 1974.

An extra week was given in the hope that more questionnaires would be returned. As of June 8 approximately 65 per cent had been returned, so the mailing-out procedure was repeated. This time a hand-written note was included for each superintendent. This procedure brought the percentage of returns up to 81 per cent.

The responses for each question from those returned were summed, given a numerical value and recorded (Appendix E, page 38).

### Experimental Design

A single group, non-probability sample was employed in the study. The type of data collected was attribute data. The scale of measurement was considered to be nominal. This type of statistic is descriptive and non-parametric. The Chi Square Test was employed to test whether a significant difference existed between the observed number of responses for each question and the expected number based on the null hypothesis. The level of confidence selected to test was the .05 level. The following hypotheses were established to test on the basis of the estimated difference in responses:

$H_0$  - There is no significant difference between the frequency of the observed and the expected responses.

$H_1$  - There is a significant difference between the frequency of the observed and the expected responses.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The majority of the questionnaires were filled out completely except for two, which had negative responses for both the question involving school usage for recreation and the question involving future planning with the remainder of the questions left blank.

The results of the questions that required a positive or negative response were statistically analyzed for the significance of the responses using the Chi Square Test. Weber and Lamb (15) described the Chi Square Test:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(F_0 - F_E)^2}{F_E}$$

$\chi^2$  = chi square

$F_0$  = observed frequencies

$F_E$  = expected frequencies

Significance at the .05 level of confidence with 1 degree of freedom occurred when any  $\chi^2$  value was greater than 3.84 (15). The calculations here do not include a correction for discontinuity.

Only questions 9, 15, 17 and 18 were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was accepted for these questions; there was no significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES  
AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE RESPONSES

Question	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
1	28	2	22.53*
3	4	24	14.29*
4	28	. . .	28.00*
5	23	5	11.57*
6	8	20	5.14*
7	28	. . .	28.00*
9	15	13	0.14
10	6	22	9.14*
11	4	24	14.29*
12	23	5	11.57*
13	23	5	11.57*
14	25	3	17.29*
15	15	13	0.14
16	4	24	14.29*
17	11	17	1.29
18	11	17	1.29
19	6	22	9.14*
20	6	24	10.80*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

The remainder of the questions were significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

The total responses of the questions concerned with school usage by the recreation commission were summed and statistically analyzed. The totaled responses were significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

As was expected the majority of the schools were being used to some extent for community recreation by the recreation commissions.

Only two questionnaires stated that the recreation commission did not make use of the schools. Both of these were filled out by the same school superintendent and his responses seemed to be in contradiction to his responses in two questionnaires done for the provincial recreation branch in 1971 and 1972.

TABLE 2  
SCHOOL USAGE

Questions	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
1, 3, 4, 5, 13	106	36	34.51*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

The times of availability of the school for community recreation were extremely limited during school hours. This could have been due to a possible overcrowding of students in the rural public schools in Manitoba. Another possibility could have been the extra scheduling work necessary and the failure of either the school officials or the recreation commission to undertake this task.

The total responses of the questions concerned with the applications for the recreational use of the schools were summed and statistically analyzed. The totaled responses were significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

Only 28 per cent of the schools required a contract for the use of the facilities but these schools had more facilities being used by

the commission. These schools were also in the larger communities involved in the study. This indicated that the schools in the smaller communities probably did not require a written contract for some specific reason. This reason was that most of these schools were rented out on a very informal basis to groups from the community, usually for a nominal rental fee in order to save administrative time and expense.

TABLE 3  
APPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL USAGE

Questions	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
6, 7, 9	51	33	3.86*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

All the schools involved required that applications for school usage be made through one specific person. This was considered beneficial in helping to avoid the conflicts that could arise if more than one person were in control of the scheduling.

The split in the responses to the question concerning application deadlines weakened the overall positive significance of the above grouped questions. However, it did point out that some schools had enough confidence and flexibility in their scheduling system so as not to impose application deadlines.

The total responses of the questions concerned with the expenses involved with the use of the schools were summed and statistically analyzed. The totaled responses were significant at the .05 level.

Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

TABLE 4  
EXPENSES OF SCHOOL USAGE

Questions	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
16, 17	15	41	12.07*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

The recreation commissions were not being burdened with rental charges as was proven by the significant negative responses to that question. Also the writer, in reviewing information gathered by a previous questionnaire found that the rent was minimal in those schools that did charge the commission.

The majority of the positive responses were to the question of maintenance fees. The responses to this question alone were not significant. It was considered reasonable that some commissions should help pay for the extra custodial services while they are the user of the school.

The total responses of the questions concerned with the liability involved with the use of the schools were summed and statistically analyzed. The totaled responses were significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

TABLE 5

## LIABILITY OF SCHOOL USAGE

Questions	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
14, 18	36	20	4.57*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

While the responses to the question of established policies on the liabilities of the user of the school were not significant, the responses to the question concerning the reimbursement for damaged school equipment were significantly positive. In an overall review of this and other data, it became evident that the schools that required contracts also had established liability policies. It appeared that, although the remainder of the schools may have some policies concerning the liabilities of the user of the school, these were not clearly defined nor in contract form.

The total responses of the questions concerned with the administration of the recreational use of the schools were summed and statistically analyzed. The totaled responses were significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted; there was a significant difference in the frequency of the responses.

The responses to all the questions involving administrative practices were significantly negative. The responses to the questions involving scheduling conflicts and supervision by a school official were expected to be negative. The reasoning for this was that if the school officials and the recreation commission were working cooperatively

these things would not have arisen. The writer had some doubts as to the small number of scheduling conflicts that were reported. One explanation was that, when a conflict had arisen, the recreation schedule had been changed, with the school functions taking priority, and it had not been considered a conflict.

TABLE 6  
ADMINISTRATION

Questions	Positive Responses	Negative Responses	Tabled Value 3.84*
10, 11, 19, 20	22	92	42.98*

\*Significant at the .05 level.

The responses to the questions concerning a school board member being on the commission and establishment of plans to promote the use of the school were expected to be positive. Again the reasoning was that if the two groups were working together these matters would be fundamental to community recreation.

Larger and recreationally more progressive communities have found that a school official on the recreation commission is beneficial. The school superintendent of one such community, who was also on the recreation commission, personally told the writer that their commission already had achieved such benefits as easier access to the school facilities, avoidance of scheduling conflicts and more cooperation between the school board and the commission.

There were three possible contributing factors to the negative responses to the establishment of plans to promote the recreational use of the school. These were:

1. The possibility that the schools already were being used to their maximum. This has been shown to be untrue by statements of school officials and different survey studies.

2. The possibility that the community will not need the school more in the future for recreation. This has been shown to be untrue by the rapid steady increase in recreation in the past few years and by many recreation planning studies.

3. The possibility that there was a lack of cooperation between the school officials and the recreation commissions in these communities.

The question that required a check for the facilities being used by the recreation commission was summed and a percentage and rank were derived for each separate facility. The gymnasium, playing fields and the classrooms were the most widely used facilities in the largest percentage of the schools involved. The remainder of the facilities were either not open for recreational activities or the commission just was not using them. In relation to the other questions, the facilities being used in each school increased as the positive responses in other areas of concern increased. This was especially true for the schools located in the larger communities.

The responses, that required a check mark for the individual or group through whom school usage applications were made, was summed and a percentage and rank were derived for each separate individual or group. The principal and the school board (secretary-treasurer of the school board was often written in by the subjects) were the prime



controllers of the applications from the recreation commission. It then appeared evident that one of these individuals should have been the school official to be on the community's recreation commission.

TABLE 7

## FACILITIES USED BY THE RECREATION COMMISSION

School Facility	Response Totals	Percentage
Gymnasium	28	100.00
Playing Fields	23	82.14
Classrooms	22	78.57
Ind. Arts (Shops)	6	21.43
Music Room	6	21.43
Home Ec.	5	17.86
Library	4	14.29
Science Lab.	3	10.71

TABLE 8

## PERSONS THROUGH WHOM APPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL USAGE MUST BE MADE

Individual or Group	Response Totals	Percentage
Principal	21	75.00
School Board	14	50.00
Superintendent	2	7.14
Phy. Ed. Teacher	1	3.57
Town Council	. . .	. . .

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to survey the use of selected public secondary schools by the recreation commissions in rural Manitoba for recreational purposes; to determine the amount of, or lack of, cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in these communities in regard to the commission's use of the school for community recreation.

A non-probability sample of the entire population of school superintendents from the rural communities in the southern half of the province that had a recreation commission and a certain size population was utilized. The data was obtained by the questionnaire method and the Chi Square Test was used to test the significant difference of the responses.

The data showed that the schools were being used to a limited extent for community recreation. But, a lack of set practices and policies in such areas as contract forms, liability and administration seemed to be limiting the recreation commissions' use of the schools. The study hypothesis was therefore accepted: the more cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission which involved the commission's usage of the school for community recreation, the more available the school would be for recreation.

### Conclusions

Based on data gathered in the survey the following conclusions seemed warranted:

1. The schools involved in the study were not being used as extensively as they could have been for community recreation. The recreation commissions were not or could not make complete use of all the areas of the schools.

2. A lack of cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in many of these communities was limiting the commissions' use of the school for community recreation.

3. The requirements of having contract forms and a school official on the recreation commissions would aid in the availability of these schools for recreation.

### Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the writer made the following recommendations:

1. A study should be undertaken to discover the feasibility of allowing the recreation commission in these same rural communities to use certain school areas when they are not in use for instruction during the school day.

2. The schools should require the use of a prepared contract form for school usage, that states the charges (if any), responsibilities, rules and the liabilities of the user.

3. It should be required in each community that at least one school official be on the recreation commission to help coordinate the community's recreational use of the school.

4. The recreation commission and the school board for each community should have a combined meeting at least twice yearly to iron out any problems they may have and to promote the recreational use of the school.

5. A study should be undertaken to compare the amount of time the schools are used for recreation in communities who have recreation directors as opposed to those communities which do not.

6. A province wide conference of recreation and school officials should be arranged by the provincial government at their facilities in Gimli, to promote the recreational use of all of Manitoba's schools.

APPENDIX A  
ORIENTATION LETTER AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

May , 1974

Dear

As a native of Manitoba, and a teacher presently working on my Masters degree in recreation at the University of North Dakota, I am very interested in the use of public schools for community recreation in Manitoba. My Masters thesis is on the same subject and the purpose of my thesis is: "To survey the use of selected public secondary schools for community recreational purposes in rural Manitoba, to determine the amount of, or lack of cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in these communities with regards to their recreation program."

This study was designed with some aid from the provincial government's Department of Education and the Department of Tourism Recreation and Cultural Affairs, as a comparison to a grant study done in the fall of 1973, concerning the concept of community schools as it applies to Manitoba.

The survey is to be carried out by the questionnaire method. The constructed questionnaire consists of twenty questions that require a yes or no response. The questionnaire was validated in a pilot study by a committee of five school superintendents from large communities in rural Manitoba and five recreation consultants from the Department of Tourism and Recreation. The sample is to include all the communities in the southern half of Manitoba, with a recreation commission and a population of between 800 and 4000 people. This sample includes approximately 35 communities each of which has at least one secondary public school.

You, the school superintendent, were selected as the person to answer the questionnaire as you were considered to have the greatest amount of available information concerning the subject under study.

The questionnaire will be mailed out to you exactly one week after the mailing of this orientation letter. Included with the questionnaire will be an instructional letter plus a self-addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the questionnaire. All responses received will be kept in strict confidence.

You are requested to please complete the questionnaire and return it as quickly as possible as the information is needed to complete my thesis and to graduate. Please complete the questionnaire even if your school district has no working agreements with the recreation commission as it is this information that will be relevant to the study.

In anticipation of your cooperation, I thank you and remain

Yours truly,

Ross Richardson

P.S. There will be a box to check on the questionnaire if you would like a copy of the final results of this study to be mailed to you.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

ROSS RICHARDSON

Age 28

Married to M. VAILLA (HOGGAN) RICHARDSON  
- Girls P.E. teacher at D.M.C.I. Winnipeg  
- Coach of the Manitoba Water Ski Team

Born and educated in Winnipeg - St. Paul's High School  
- Vincent Massey High School

Graduated B.Sc. in Physical Education from U.N.D. 1969

Played for the Winnipeg Blue Bombers 1969-71

Taught school in the Fort Garry and St. James School Divisions 1969-71

Traveled in Europe 1972

Worked for The Manitoba Municipal Recreation Directors Association 1973

Worked for The Department of Tourism Recreation and Cultural Affairs  
in the Parks Branch 1973

Attended graduate school at the University of North Dakota 1973-74



APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

## QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is your school presently being used by the local recreation commission for community recreational purposes? YES NO
2. Check areas of the school being used by the recreation commission.
- \_\_\_ Gymnasium                      \_\_\_ Classrooms  
 \_\_\_ Playing fields                  \_\_\_ Home Ec.  
 \_\_\_ Ind. Arts (Shops)              \_\_\_ Library  
 \_\_\_ Science Lab                      \_\_\_ Music Room
3. Are certain areas of your school open to community recreation during school hours when not in use for classes? YES NO
4. Is your school open weekdays after school for community recreation? YES NO
5. Is your school open weekends for community recreation? YES NO
6. Is a written contract required for the use of the school facilities by the recreation commission? YES NO
7. Must applications for the use of the school facilities be made through one specific person or board? YES NO
8. Check the person or group of persons through whom applications for school usage for recreational purposes must be made.
- \_\_\_ School board  
 \_\_\_ Town council  
 \_\_\_ School Superintendent  
 \_\_\_ Principal  
 \_\_\_ Phy. Ed. Teacher
9. Must applications be made before a set time prior to the date of usage? YES NO

- |  |                                 |                                |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 10. After a scheduled time has been granted have schedule conflicts arisen between school and recreation programs conducted in the school? | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Is there a school board member on the community recreation commission?   | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Does the recreation commission supervise the community recreation activities conducted in the school?                                  | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Is the recreation commission allowed to use the school equipment when using the school facilities?                                     | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. Must reimbursement be made by the recreation commission for damage to school equipment or property when they are the user?             | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. Has the number of applications for school usage granted to the recreation commission increased in the past year?                       | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Is the recreation commission charged a rental fee for the use of the school facilities?  | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Is the recreation commission charged a maintenance fee for the use of the school facilities?   | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Are there any established policies concerning liability when the school is used by the recreation commission?                          | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Must a school official be present when the school is being used by the recreation commission?  | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Have any plans or policies been made to promote present or future use of the school by the recreation commission?                      | YES<br><input type="checkbox"/> | NO<br><input type="checkbox"/> |

Please check if you would like a copy of the final study results.

APPENDIX C  
INSTRUCTION LETTER

May , 1974

Dear

In anticipation of your acceptance to participate in this survey, I thank you. The following is the statement of the purpose of the study and brief instructions concerning the completion of the questionnaire.

Once again the purpose for this study is: "To survey the use of selected public secondary schools for community recreational purposes in rural Manitoba, to determine the amount of, or the lack of cooperative practices between the school district and the recreation commission in these communities with regards to their recreation program." The sample includes all the communities in the southern half of Manitoba, with a recreation commission and a population of between 800 and 4000 people. Each of these communities has at least one secondary public school and the superintendents of these schools are the subjects completing the questionnaires.

Please complete the questionnaire in the following manner:

- Read question number one and objectively answer it yes or no as to the present practices in your school.
- Continue question by question through the entire questionnaire.
- Review questionnaire to insure that all questions were answered.
- Place questionnaire in the return envelope and mail.

Please remember that if your school has no working practices or agreements with the recreation commission, still complete the questionnaire as this is relevant to this particular study.

Note: To those superintendents who supervise schools in two or more communities that are involved in the study, you have been supplied with a questionnaire for each individual community. Please fill out each questionnaire individually with reference to each separate community. This is necessary so that the results will be valid and reliable.

As my thesis and graduation rely upon your returning this questionnaire by June 1st, 1974, could you please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Relying upon your prompt action, I remain

Yours truly,

Ross Richardson

APPENDIX D

LIST OF COMMUNITIES AND SCHOOLS INVOLVED

TABLE 9  
LIST OF COMMUNITIES AND SCHOOLS INVOLVED

Community	Population	Schools Involved	Returned Questionnaire
Swan River	3,522	1	✓
Morden	3,266	1	✓
Neepawa	3,215	1	✓
Winkler	2,983	1	
Viriden	2,823	1	✓
Minnidosa	2,621	1	✓
Beausejour	2,236	1	✓
Altona	2,122	1	✓
Hartney	2,074	1	✓
Killarney	2,074	1	✓
Gimli	2,041	1	
Carman	2,030	1	✓
Roblin	1,753	1	
Souris	1,674	1	✓
Stonewall	1,583	1	✓
Russel	1,526	1	✓
Boissevain	1,506	1	✓
Morris	1,344	1	✓
Carberry	1,305	1	✓
Melita	1,132	1	✓
Pine Falls	1,122	1	✓
St. Anne	1,062	1	✓
Grandview	967	1	
Deloraine	961	1	✓
Niverville	938	1	✓
Lac du Bonnet	952	1	✓
Gladstone	933	1	
Birtle	882	1	✓
Arborg	879	2	
Manitou	871	1	✓
St. Pierre	846	1	✓
Emerson	845	1	✓
Gilbert Plains	854	1	
Shoal Lake	833	1	✓
Teulon	828	1	✓
Hamiota	822	1	✓
St. Rose	818	1	✓

APPENDIX E

TABULATION OF QUESTIONS REQUIRING POSITIVE  
AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES

FACILITIES USED BY THE RECREATION COMMISSION

PERSONS THROUGH WHOM APPLICATIONS  
FOR SCHOOL USAGE MUST BE MADE



TABLE 10  
 TABULATION OF QUESTIONS REQUIRING POSITIVE  
 AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES

Question	Positive Responses	Negative Responses
1	28	2
3	4	24
4	28	. . .
5	23	5
6	8	20
7	28	. . .
9	15	13
10	6	22
11	4	24
12	23	5
13	23	5
14	25	3
15	15	13
16	4	24
17	11	17
18	11	17
19	6	22
20	6	24

TABLE 11  
 FACILITIES USED BY THE RECREATION COMMISSION  
 Question Number 2

School Facility	Response Totals
Gymnasium	28
Playing Fields	23
Classrooms	22
Ind. Arts (Shops)	6
Music Room	6
Home Ec.	5
Library	4
Science Lab.	3

TABLE 12  
 PERSONS THROUGH WHOM APPLICATIONS  
 FOR SCHOOL USAGE MUST BE MADE  
 Question Number 8

Individual or Group	Responses Totals
Principal	21
School Board	14
Superintendent	2
Phy. Ed. Teacher	1
Town Council	. . .

APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF COMPUTATION OF RESULTS  
QUESTION NUMBER 1

EXAMPLE OF COMPUTATION OF RESULTS  
QUESTION NUMBER 2

TABLE 13  
 EXAMPLE OF COMPUTATION OF RESULTS  
 Question Number 1

Frequencies	Positive Responses	Negative Responses
$F_0$	28	2
$F_E$	15	15

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(F_0 - F_E)^2}{F_E}$$

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(28 - 15)^2}{15} + \frac{(2 - 15)^2}{15}$$

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(13)^2}{15} + \frac{(-13)^2}{15}$$

$$\chi^2 = \frac{169 + 169}{15}$$

$$\chi^2 = \frac{338}{15}$$

$$\chi^2 = 22.53^*$$

Significance at the .05 level of confidence with 1 degree of freedom occurred when the  $\chi^2$  value was greater than 3.84 (14).

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

TABLE 14

EXAMPLE OF COMPUTATION OF RESULTS  
Question Number 2  
Gymnasium Facility

---

School Facility	Check Total
Gymnasium	28 of 28

---

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{28 \times 100}{28}$$

$$= \frac{2800}{28}$$

$$= 100.00\%$$

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sessoms, H. Douglas. A Glossary of Recreation Terms. Cited by McFarland, Elsie Marie, The Development of Public Recreation in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Parks and Recreation Association, 1970.
2. Webster's Third New International Dictionary, 1961, s.v. "Rural."
3. A.A.H.P.E.R. Leisure and The Schools. Washington, D.C.: A.A.H.P.E.R., 1961.
4. Yukic, Thomas S. "Local Level School and Recreation: A Case for the Schools." In Recreation: Pertinent Readings. Guide Posts to the Future, 5th Copy. Edited by Jay B. Nash. Dubuque, Ia.: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1970, pp. 194-198.
5. Johnson, President Lyndon. Speech given at The Community School, Brigham Young Regional Center for Community School Development. Cited by Kraus, Richard J. and Curtis, J. E., Creative Administration in Recreation and Parks. St. Louis, Mo.: C. V. Mosby Co., 1973.
6. The Society of Directors of Municipal Recreation of Ontario, Training Institute. Recreation The Fourth R. Toronto: Ontario Recreation Association, Nov. 1967.
7. Wilson, George T. "Community Education: Some Growing Pains." J.O.H.P.E.R. 45 (April 1974):46-47.
8. The Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. "A Statement of Basic Beliefs About the School Programs in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation." J.O.H.P.E.R. 44 (June 1973):22-24.
9. Toffoli, John Jr. "A Case for a Co-Ordinated Program." In Recreation: Pertinent Readings. Guide Posts To The Future, 5th Copy. Edited by Jay B. Nash. Dubuque, Ia.: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1970, pp. 202-207.
10. The Alberta Departments of Education and Culture, Youth and Recreation. "The School Jurisdiction." Some Approaches to the Joint Use of Community Facilities. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1972, pp. 27-29.
11. Olsen, Burton K. "A Study of School-sponsored and Co-sponsored Recreation Programs in the North Central Region of the United States." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1970.

12. Hafen, William J. "Administrative Guidelines for the Cooperative Use of Public School Facilities for Recreational Purposes by Community Groups in the State of Utah." Ed.D. Dissertation, Utah University, Salt Lake City, 1968.
13. Wipper, Kirk. Report to: Ontario Recreation Association Committee on Cooperation and Planning of Recreation Facilities. Toronto: Ontario Recreation Association, 1964.
14. Nick, George. A Study of the Use of Physical Education Facilities in the Province of Manitoba. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1972.
15. Weber, Jerome C., and Lamb, David R. Statistics and Research in Physical Education. St. Louis, Mo.: C. V. Mosby Co., 1970.