

The availability of recreation policies and strategies for the provision of recreation service delivery in the North West Province, South Africa

V.S. MOGAJANE¹, C. MEYER¹, A.L. TORIOLA², L.O. AMUSA³ AND M.A. MONYEKI¹

¹*Physical Activity, Sport and Recreation Niche Area in the School of Biokinetics, Recreation and Sport Science, Faculty of Health Sciences, North- West University, Potchefstroom, Republic of South Africa. E-mail: andries.monyeki@nwu.ac.za*

²*Department of Sport, Rehabilitation and Dental Sciences, Tshwane University of Technology, P/Bag X680, Pretoria, South Africa*

³*Centre for Biokinetics, Recreation and Sport Science, University of Venda, P. Bag X5050, Thohoyandou 0950, South Africa*

(Received: 14 June 2013; Revision accepted: 17 January 2014)

Abstract

The promotion of recreation and leisure through coherent strategies and policy development is a significant move towards changing the quality lives of communities. The unavailability of recreation strategies and policies are associated with negative effect on the delivery of recreation services. The purpose of the study was therefore, to determine the availability of recreation strategies and policies in for the provision of recreation service delivery in North-West Province, South Africa. A mixed-method research design involving a questionnaire and a focus group were used to collect information from a targeted sample of 20 personnel who were responsible for managing recreation at local government levels. The results showed that the majority (75%) of the local governments are in the rural settings whilst 25% are located in urban areas with limited resources. 100% local governments do not have recreation strategic plans. Policy statements concerning finance (80%), provision of human resources (90%), provision of recreation facilities (65%), provision of recreation programme (80%), coordination, planning or implementation of recreation programmes (85%), the lease of recreation facilities (75%), the appointment of administrative or supportive service (95%) or the use of volunteers (80%) were not available. A practical significant effect ($\phi=0.540$) between area and the policy statements regarding recreation provision was observed in the provision of recreation facilities where the availability of policy in urban areas is larger than in rural areas. Focus group and sport personnel also indicated the unavailability of policies as a major issue affecting recreation service delivery. The study concluded that local governments are challenged with the lack of various policies for recreation provision. The study recommended that local governments should develop recreation strategies and policies that address recreation service delivery can be addressed. In addition, collaboration between local and provincial governments should be strengthened to ensure effective recreation service delivery.

Keywords: Recreation, strategy, policy, service delivery, management, South Africa.

How to cite this article:

Mogajane, V.S, Meyer, C., Toriola, A.L., Amusa, L.O. & Monyeki, M.A., (2013). The availability of recreation policies and strategies for the provision of recreation service delivery in the North West Province, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20(1), 24-39.

Introduction

Recreation provision as a social institution has become an important and widely recognised form of service designed to meet significant physical, social and emotional needs of all community residents and their families (Kraus & Curtis, 1990). However, from the literature it is evident that recreation provision may be affected by changes in government leadership structures such as local government (Edginton, Hudson, Dieser & Edginton, 2004). Various changes have taken place in the delivery of recreation services due to changes in technology, socio-economics, politics, new opportunities and changes in family structures (Edginton *et al.*, 2004). According to Meyer (2001), current changes in technology, urbanisation, cultural diversity and related aspects in South Africa, have brought about that the demand for specialised recreation service delivery is growing.

Recreation service delivery is an important part of community life, and the role of local government is critical as mandated by the White Paper on Local Government (1998) and the White Paper on Sport and Recreation (2002) in the delivery of recreation. Local government in South Africa is the third tier of government, which operates in geographical areas predetermined by legislation. The authority of these governments is vested in different council members who are elected by voters in that specific geographical area. The primary goal of local government is to deliver services in order to satisfy certain needs and demands of residents (Meyer, 2001). Many citizens and communities are concerned about the areas where they live, access to services and economic opportunities, mobility, safety, pollution and congestion, and lack of proximity to social and recreational facilities.

Local government can definitely have an impact on all of these facets of people's lives including recreation services (Naidoo, 2005). Local government will need to continue to be an important player if recreation is to be developed and services improved. The multiple benefits of recreation at the following levels: personal (relaxation, self-esteem and image); economic (small investment in recreation that can yield big economic returns); environmental (environmental health) and social (building strong communities, promoting ethnic and cultural harmony) are sufficient proof that it forms an important part of our everyday life (Collins & Kay, 2003).

Recreation policies and strategies in particular, are critical in the provision and delivery of service in local government (Scholtz & Saayman, 1996; Naidoo, 2005). Therefore, the White Paper on Local Government (1998) is the point of departure for local government to plan and implement recreation services. Problems pertaining to recreation service delivery such as lack of adequate strategies, policies, the provision of recreation facilities, programming, financing

and human resources still exist at local government level. According to Goslin (2003), decision-makers' understanding of the role and value of recreation is still lacking. Singh and Burnett (2003) indicated that there is confusion regarding roles and functions of local government in the implementation of policies. Naidoo (2005) indicates a lack of recreation policies as a major problem for local governments.

After 1994, the White Paper on Sport and Recreation (2002) identified the shortcomings in the South African recreation system such as the need for a national recreation body, provincial recreation structures and lack of insight into the problem of participation by the majority of the people in physical activity. It also identified a lack of resources needed for ensuring involvement in physical activity. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) states that everyone has the right to a safe and healthy environment. Local government must develop a policy framework for the governance of recreation at local level, that is, in concert with the national and provincial sport and recreation policy and must make recreation accessible to all people in the local area (White Paper on Sport and Recreation, 2002).

Therefore, development of recreation strategies and policy formulation by local governments is an obligation as mandated by the White Paper on Local Government (1998), White Paper on Sport and Recreation (2002) and Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996). The purpose of the study was to evaluate the availability of recreation policies and strategies in the provision of recreation service delivery in the North West Province of South Africa.

Methodology

Research design

The mixed-methods study design, which employed the qualitative and quantitative approaches, was used to collect data from 20 identified Local Governments within North West Province. Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) and Johnson *et al.* (2007) indicate that mixed methods research allows the researcher to combine elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches such as the use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration. De Vos (2005a) refers to the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods used in a single study as effective in providing valuable information.

Participants

The participants in this study were recruited from the four districts of Dr Kenneth Kaunda, Dr Ruth Mompati, Dr Modiri Molema, and Bojanala, consisting of 20 local governments according to the demarcation of the North West Province. The participants within these areas were personnel who were responsible for managing recreation at local government levels in the North West Province. Given the nature of this study (quantitative and qualitative designs), the participants comprised two main groups. Group one consisted of 20 personnel from local governments who were requested to complete the quantitative questionnaire. Group two was identified during collection of quantitative data to form focus group which consisted of five people. Approval for the study was obtained from the North-West University's Ethics Committee (*Ethics no: NWU-00023-11-S1*).

Instruments

Given the nature of the study two instruments were used:

Quantitative data collection: The *quantitative questionnaire* used in the study was adopted from a protocol by Scholtz and Meyer (1990). The questionnaire requested the participants to answer questions regarding information on human resources and the department responsible for recreation services. The data were based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (highly acceptable), 2 (acceptable), 3 (not sure), 4 (unacceptable) to, 5 (highly unacceptable). Prior to the completion of the questionnaire, briefing was done and subsequently the identified managers were given feedback to complete the questionnaires.

Qualitative data collection

Each group session took place at a central location, convenient for participants to be transported to and from the North-West University. Focus group consisted of five people. A qualitative questionnaire was developed using themes or theories identified during quantitative data collection. The format included open-ended questions with appropriate probes. Questions were designed to examine the perceived problems of recreation service delivery. Questions using individual experience were aimed at discovering what knowledge and skills personnel working in the recreation sectors in the local governments practise to encourage the usage of recreation facilities. All interviews took place on one day. In the present study, to ascertain the trustworthiness and qualitative procedures during an interview the participants were assured that their answers would be confidential and would be used for the purpose of research only. In addition, the participants were given pseudonyms based on alphabetical listing which were subsequently used for the results presentation and discussion (Neuman &

Kreuger, 2003; Rubin & Babbie, 2005; Babbie, 2009). Before the interview, participants were also made aware of the recorder, the purpose of the interview in the research and how long the interview would take (twenty to thirty minutes). The same moderators and observers were present during each of the focus group meetings to keep data accurate and consistent. Moderators participated in training prior to the study. Notes were taken and all sessions were recorded on tape. Participants in the focus group were informed about the aims and procedures of the study and were subsequently asked to complete and sign an informed consent form. Questions were pre-tested on a pilot group of five personnel in charge of recreation services in the local government who did not participate in the main study. In addition three recreation specialists who have proven practical experience in the industry were interviewed with regard to recreation service delivery.

Data analysis

Two forms of analyses based on the design of the study were followed: Firstly, the quantitative data were analysed to determine the frequencies, percentages and phi-coefficients. The phi coefficients ($\phi=0.1$ (Small) $\phi=0.3$ (Medium); $\phi=0.5$ (larger) were calculated to determine the practical significant differences in the measured variables. Secondly, for the qualitative data, the moderator and an observer were present during the sessions and conducted the analyses. Data were first analysed by thoroughly reading through the transcripts and listening to the tapes, while extracting any general themes and patterns that emerge. The data were systematically coded, sorted and organised into appropriate categories, patterns and themes. Comparisons were drawn between local governments. Finally, the results were discussed and a final analysis was prepared. Analyses were done with the assistance of a statistical consultant at the North-West University, South Africa.

Results and Discussion

The results indicated that all participants (100%; $\phi=0.19$) from the rural ($n=15$) and urban ($n=5$) settings in the study indicated that there were no strategic plans for recreation provision by local governments. When a follow-up study was conducted on a focus group, the responses showed that there is a need to have a strategic plan. The following supporting statements were made by the respondents:

B: "It must form part of the IDP" (integrated development programme)

C: "It is common sense that really we cannot work haphazardly. In my view there should be strategic plan because failure to have one it means I will use

year after year budget of recreation to do only and the same thing and it will not serve the purpose intended. In as much as B has said it can be part of the IDP with a view to be reviewed annually”

A strategic plan forms the basis of service delivery, and the absence of formal strategic plans indicates that service delivery will be compromised. Furthermore, linked to the strategic plan, the focus group also indicated that their local governments did not conduct recreation needs analysis for the overall planning. This is in agreement with what was reported by Goslin (2003) in which it was indicated that lack of recreation needs analysis may be attributed to lack of integration and absence of common intellectual interest. The following supporting statements were made by some of the respondents.

A: “I am not sure in my municipality was done, but I know there was a time one day, they went all out. They were doing parks, but they were doing parks they will just come and grade and put lawn and they will leave. So to me I do not know”

B: “Ok from B side I think the analysis has not really been done in terms of recreation but generally the needs of communities. We have the Imbizos, where communities speak to say this is what they need. And that is to be done almost every year, And that informs the IDP. The budget is according to IDP. So in short that has been done but is not actually focusing on recreation but general issues affecting the community”

C: NO

D: “Because it is not our core function. Is somebody who will have to do it”

E: “I think a lot of surveys have been done not specifically on recreation”

The results show that needs analysis forms the basis of developing a strategic plan. It is therefore important that local governments engage and interact with communities to obtain the necessary information. By this process a strategic plan can be put in place as a vehicle for service delivery. Although local authorities are different, every local authority is supposed to have a provision policy regarding sport and recreation (Scholtz, 1985; Singh & Burnett, 2003). These policies should concern the matters like financing, development and maintenance of facilities, human resources, community use of school facilities and multi-racial use of facilities (Scholtz, 1985; Singh & Burnett, 2003).

Table 1 presents the results on policy as an aspect of recreation provision. From the aspects concerning availability of recreation policy, it is clear that there were no policy guidelines concerning financing (in 80% of the cases), provision of human resources (90%), provision of recreation facilities (65%), and provision of recreation programme (80%). In addition there was no coordination, planning or implementation of recreation programmes in the local community (in 85% of

the cases), or the lease of recreation facilities (75%), or the appointment of administrative or supportive service (95%) or the use of volunteers (80%) either.

Table 1: Availability of recreation policy guidelines

Components of the guidelines	Total (N=20)			Rural (N=15)			Urban (N=5)			Phi Coefficient*
	Yes %	No %	No Response %	Yes %	No %	No Response %	Yes %	No %	No Response %	
1. Financing	15	80	5	13.3	86.7	0	20	60	20	0.130
2. Provision of human resources	5	90	5	0	100	0	20	60	20	0.456
3. Provision of recreation facilities	25	65	10	26.6	66.7	6.7	20	60	20	0.033
4. Provision of recreation programmes	5	80	15	6.7	86.6	6.7	0	60	40	0.116
5. Coordination, planning and implementation of recreation programmes in the local community	10	85	5	13.3	86.7	0	0	80	20	0.177
6. The lease of recreation facilities	25	75	0	20	80	0	40	60	0	0.200
7. The appointment of administrative/supportive services	0	95	5	0	100	0	0	80	20	0.001
8. The use of volunteers	15	80	5	20	80	0	0	80	20	0.224

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

Although there was no practical significant ($\phi=0.130$) effect on policy guidelines regarding recreation provision in financing, recreation facilities, programmes, planning and coordination and implementation of recreation programmes and appointment of supportive services, these factors remain critical to recreation service delivery. Practical significant effect ($\phi=0.5$) on the policy guidelines regarding recreation provision was observed in the provision of human resources, where the availability of policy in urban areas is larger than in rural areas. These findings may be related to the demography of the present study in which the majority of participants in the local governments were historically rural. It is clear that the historically rural areas are faced with many social challenges (Cronje *et al.*, 2007), which are structured by the national government according to priority needs so as to address the inequality in the provision of services such as the implementation of the recreation policy.

The lack of policy guidelines was confirmed and supported by the recreation specialists. The following are excerpts from the views of specialists.

A: I will be in agreement with this, it appears to be a general trend in local government across the country. I am glad that this research in a particular province has come up with empirical evidence. It supports the previous findings and the trends that are current. Now I would like to pick up on one at a time and then try to link them as well. If we address it as results showing the following factors as problems that hinder recreation service delivery, I think the first problem for me before I go to specific findings that you outlined for me.

I want to address the issue that is factors/problems hindering recreation service delivery. This is where the problem starts. When it comes to not only local government, if you come to National government, if you go to Provincial government as well as local government this is the start of the problem. Here are few things. Number one, what is service delivery is not clear, what is recreation service delivery is not clear.

As to what is recreation, what is recreation service and to whom is to be delivered and by whom? Those things are not clear in this country at this moment in time. So when we speak about the factors that you put down here I would agree with you that they do hinder what you call recreation service delivery but as academics and scientists we understand what it means in international context but specifically for South Africa that has not been addressed at this point in time. You will not find it in black and white in this country at this moment in time. So that is part of the problem.

B: I think if you look at the research that was done in the early eighties by the then HSRC, it revealed that policies are a problem at all levels, not only all at local government level. But I mean over a period of twenty years where I have been involved with local government research it is a problem so in terms of answering you question, yes I think it is a problem. I think maybe it's now worse than it was before due to a shift in service delivery. I mean if you go back earlier years eighties and nineties, recreation was I guess, let's put it this, that there was always a bit of money made available for it. But with all the gaps that we need to fill in terms servicing all communities. I think there is not enough money to service communities. I think that's where policy should come in. Because policies are the guidelines that should guide government and local authority in particular where they should put in money. And in the absence of policy it then implies that they will not put money on a particular budget item. So, that's obviously has a spill over effect which is reflected in your results, which means that they won't be money for facilities (bla, bla, bla) and the rest.

C: First of all I think it is not only just about lack of policies at local government level, but it is lack of policy or implemental policies from National level. That whilst South African government has tried to establish through sport and recreation department a policy which is defined in a white paper, it actually is geared towards promoting sport rather recreation service delivery. And that's

where the problem lies. Until this government develops a dedicated recreation specific policy in terms of service delivery, your service delivery is not going to happen at the lowest level. That's been your local government level. So whilst the local government is the delivery arm of government services, they are unable to deliver this service because of this lack of guidance from the policy which should be established at National level. So my interpretation is that I kind of agree with the study and what I am saying to you is anecdotal because of my exposure to local government, provincial and national government and that there is not a policy to direct their actions.

From the statements it is clear that local governments are still challenged with the lack of various policy guidelines for recreation provision. Policies for recreation form the basis of service delivery, and the absence of these policies indicate that service delivery is compromised. It can therefore be concluded that one of the main problems that local governments still face today, is inadequate policy guidelines, which has originated from the first and the second phase of recreation provision in South Africa (Scholtz, 1985). The need for formal policies cannot be overemphasised since recreation provision is an essential service in human development.

As shown in Table 2, 25% of local governments indicated full responsibility for the provision of recreation facilities. Thirteen percent (13.3%) in rural areas and 60% in urban areas indicated full responsibility. About 55% of the local governments indicated that they do not have policies. In rural areas the figure is 66.7% and in urban areas 20%.

A practical significant effect ($\phi=0.540$) regarding the provision of recreation facilities was observed where the availability of policy in urban areas is larger than in rural areas.

The lack of provision of recreation facilities has also been confirmed and supported by the professional recreation specialists. The following excerpts reflect the views of the recreation specialists.

Table 2: Provision of recreation facilities

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	25	13.3	60	0.540
Ample supplementary function	10	6.7	20	
Limited supplementary function	5	6.7	0	
Local community is solely responsible	0	0	0	
Has no policy	55	66.7	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

A: These low percentages would indicate what I have just mentioned. My explanation and my take on this is local authorities are best placed to address recreation at a grassroots level. The reason for this they own the property, they own infrastructure, they govern what is in the immediate vicinity where people stay. In settlements and for the best place of all tiers to utilise tax and rates they collect from citizens and translate that into satisfying the needs of the people and in this with regard to recreation facilities and infrastructure.

B: Ok again it reverts back to your issue of policies. The absence of a policy implies that government can only fund issues as per their policy. So again we need to have a framework where one can work from local government point of view. But I also think Victor that we need to maybe come with different model for facilities to say I think we need to draw in the private sector. I think we need to draw in schools, I think we need to have a re-look at how we use facilities. I mean we have been saying for a long time that lets take school facilities. They are only used during a certain time of the day, certain time of year. So maybe we should have a different model. If take Potch as an example where the local government and university has come into (MOU) in terms of facility development and that is working quite well.

C: You know I don't think there is a lack of recreation facilities. I think there is overabundance of facilities in this country. The problem is people within recreation and leisure services failed to understand that a facility could be an open space. But when you talk to people now in terms of facilities they want see a building, something that is built and that not necessarily constitute a facility where one can encourage people to participate in physical activity or in leisure time activity. Because if you look at leisure time activity and if we leave all sporting activities out, one really does not need much in terms of facilities. For mass participation and recreation services you need open space, you need a built environment that is designed to encourage people to engage in physical activity such as cycling, walking, running, jogging, bird watching, parks. Parks especially come into an important pleasure for recreation service delivery because that's where most of your leisure services take place. Recreation as opposed to sport is designed and delivered quite differently because your sport activities need to have a proper facility for effective service delivery.

Based on the excerpts it is quite clear that local governments do not prioritise provision of recreation facilities as an important and essential service. The provision of recreation facilities as a responsibility seems to be a historical trend as noted in the literature review (Botha, 1981; HRSC 1982; Fourie, 2006). According to Scholtz (1985), facilities must be made available for community use and it must be multipurpose to be used for sport and cultural events. Resources for the development of facilities are scarce and ways must be found to use school facilities to accommodate the general community (Scholtz, 1985; Singh & Burnett, 2003; Fourie, 2006). It is obvious that local governments require finance and human resource to be able to provide recreation facilities.

According to one of the specialists, there is an overabundance of recreation facilities. This statement needs to be qualified by the fact that this can be for certain urban geographical areas. The rest of the specialists agreed with the results that the recreation facilities are not adequately provided for community use.

In Table 3 it can be seen that 40% of local governments indicated maintenance of facilities as a function (26.7% in rural areas and 80% in urban areas). About 50% of local governments indicated no policy for the maintenance of recreation facilities (60% in rural and in urban areas 20%). A medium practical significant ($\phi=0.0461$) regarding the maintenance of recreation facilities was also observed with 80% in urban areas local governments taking full responsibility whilst no (60%) policy existed in rural areas.

Table 3: Maintenance of recreation facilities

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	40	26.7	80	0.0461
Ample supplementary function	0	0	0	
Limited supplementary function	5	6.7	0	
Local community is solely responsible	0	0	0	
Has no policy	50	60	20	
No response	5	0	0	

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

The maintenance of recreation facilities is critical for the sustainability of facilities. These results demonstrate a serious lack of management commitment to the maintenance of recreation facilities. The need for maintenance of facilities is crucial enough for the local governments to prioritise this function.

In Table 4 forty five percent (45%) of local governments indicated full responsibility for provision of public playgrounds with 40% in rural areas and 60% in urban areas. Furthermore 5% of local governments indicated lack of policies for the provision of public playgrounds (In rural areas it is 40% and in urban areas of 20%). Although no practical significant ($\phi=0.0461$) relationship was observed regarding the provision of public playgrounds, these factors remain critical to recreation service delivery.

Table 4: Provision of public playgrounds

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	45	40	60	0.298
Ample supplementary function	5	6.7	0	
Limited supplementary function	10	6.7	20	
Local community is solely responsible	0	0	0	
Has no policy	5	40	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

The provision of public grounds as a responsibility of local governments, seems to be a historical trend as noted by Meyer and Scholtz (1988). It can therefore be concluded that the need for provision of playgrounds is critical to the participation of the community in recreation. Local governments must ensure that they take full responsibility regarding development of policies for recreation as an essential service to communities.

Table 5 shows that 55% of local governments indicated full responsibility for the maintenance of public playgrounds. In rural areas it is 46.7%, while in urban areas it is 80%. About 25% of local governments have no policy with regard to maintenance of public playgrounds (In rural areas it is 26.7% whilst in urban areas it is 20%). According to the phi=0.303, there was visible practical medium effect regarding the maintenance of public playgrounds. In urban areas 80% of local governments have taken full responsibility whilst in rural areas only 47% have done so.

Table 5: Maintenance of public playgrounds

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	55	46.7	80	0.303
Ample supplementary function	5	6.7	0	
Limited supplementary function	5	6.7	0	
Local community is solely responsible	5	6.7	0	
Has no policy	25	26.7	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

These results indicate that it is crucial for the local governments to prioritise the maintenance and upkeep of facilities for human and economic growth (Fourie, 2006). Results in Table 6 show that 60% of local governments indicate full responsibility for the provision of community centres both in rural and urban

areas. About 30% of local governments indicate lack of policies in this regard. In rural areas it is 33.3% and in urban areas it is 20%.

A significant medium practical effect ($\phi=0.404$) between area and the policy statements regarding provision of community centres was also observed where the existence of a policy in urban areas seems to be greater in urban and lower in rural areas. These results concerning the lack of policies require local governments to prioritise development of policy guidelines.

In Table 7 it is seen that 60% of local governments indicated full responsibility towards maintenance of community centers with 53.3% in rural areas and 80% in urban areas. About 35% of local governments indicate lack of policies (40% is in rural areas and 20% in urban areas. Though no practically significant ($\phi=0.209$) relationship between the location and maintenance of community centers was found, these factors remain critical to recreation service delivery.

Table 6: Provision of community centers

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	60	60	60	0.404
Ample supplementary function	0	0	0	
Limited supplementary function	5	0	20	
Local community is solely responsible	0	0	0	
Has no policy	30	33.3	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

* ϕ coefficient=0.1 (small); ϕ coefficient=0.3 (medium); ϕ coefficient=0.5 (large)

Table 7: Maintenance of community centers

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	60	53.3	80	0.209
Ample supplementary function	0	0	0	
Limited supplementary function	0	0	0	
Local community is solely responsible	0	0	0	
Has no policy	35	40	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

* ϕ coefficient=0.1 (small); ϕ coefficient=0.3 (medium); ϕ coefficient=0.5 (large)

It can therefore be concluded that maintenance of community centres is also critical to enable the community to participate in recreation.

Table 8 shows that 20% of the local governments indicate full responsibility for recreation to be accessible to all communities with 13.3% in rural areas and 40% in urban areas. About 50% of the local governments have no policy with regard to accessibility to recreation services (in rural areas 60% and urban areas 20%). A practical significant effect ($\phi=0.551$) was found regarding location and accessibility of recreation facilities to all communities. The accessibility of recreation facilities in urban areas is better than in rural areas. This means that recreation services must be made accessible to communities to participate in recreation.

Table 8: Accessibility of recreation services

Functions	Total (N=20) %	Rural (N=15) %	Urban (N=5) %	Phi Coefficient*
Full responsibility	20	13.3	40	0.551
Ample supplementary function	5	0	20	
Limited supplementary function	15	13.3	20	
Local community is solely responsible	5	6.7	0	
Has no policy	50	60	20	
No response	5	6.7	0	

*phi coefficient=0.1 (small); phi coefficient=0.3 (medium); phi coefficient=0.5 (large)

These results also indicate lack of policies (60% in rural areas and 20% in urban areas). It is concluded that the need for recreation policies cannot be over emphasised. Local governments must have policies to provide strategic direction for the provision of recreation services (Scholtz, 1985).

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is apparent from the present study that lack of strategies and policies were factors affecting recreation service delivery. Additionally, non-compliance by local governments to delivery of recreation services was evident as mandated by the White Paper on Local Government (1998), the White Paper on Sport and Recreation (2002) and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. It is therefore, recommended that local governments should develop recreation strategies and policies so that recreation service delivery can be properly addressed. Local governments should prioritise research as a tool to facilitate development of informed recreation policies and strategies.

Participation in recreation by all community members in the local governments is required in order to remove the burden created by physical inactivity. The focus of such policies such as *Siyadlala* and keep the nation moving should capture the attention of all governments. “Just a few generations ago physical

activity was an integral part of daily life and in the name of progress we have now chipped away at it so thoroughly that physical inactivity actually seems normal. The economic costs are unacceptable; the human costs are unforgivable (ACSM & ICSSPE, 2012).

Acknowledgements

The financial support from National Research Foundation of South Africa (NRF) and Physical Activity, Sport and Recreation Niche Area North-West University are highly appreciated. **Disclaimer:** Any opinion, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and, therefore, the NRF does not accept any liability in regard thereto.

References

- American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) & International Council of Sports Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE) (2012). *Designed to Move: A Physical Activity Action Agenda*. Berlin, Germany: ICSSPE.
- Babbie, E. (2009). *The Practice of Social Research* (12th ed.) (p. 530). Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.
- Botha, B.P. (1981). Administrasie van munisipale parke en ontspanningfasiliteite. Kaapstad: Juta. p. 123.
- Collins, M.F. & Kay, T. (2003). *Sport and Social Exclusion* (p. 304). London: Routledge.
- Constitution of the Republic of South Africa no. 108 of 1996. Pretoria, South Africa: Government Printers.
- Cronjé, F., Dimant, T., Lebone, K., Macfarlane, M. & Tempest, J. (2007). *South Africa Survey 2006/2007* (p. 557). Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.
- De Vos, A.S. (2005). Combined quantitative and qualitative approach. In A.S. De Vos, H. Strydom, C.B. Fouché & C.S.L. Delport (Eds.), *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Services Professions* (3rd ed.) (pp. 357-366.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Edginton, C.R., Hudson, S.D., Dieser, R.B. & Edginton, S.R. (2004). *Leisure Programming: A Service Centred and Benefits Approach* (4th ed.) (p. 534). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fourie, J. (2006). *Tourism and Leisure Needs of High School Learners in Potchefstroom*. M.A. Dissertation. Potchefstroom: North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus.
- Goslin, A. (2003). Assessment of leisure and recreation research in Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health, Education Recreation and Dance*, 25(1), 35-46.
- Human Science Research Council (HSRC) (1982). Sports investigations: sport in Republic of South Africa. Pretoria: Blitskopie. (Main Committee report no 1.) 144 p.
- Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Turner, L.A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1,112-133.

Kraus, R.G. & Curtis, J.E. (1990). *Creative Management in Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services* (5th ed.) (p. 494). Boston, Mass.: WCB/McGraw-Hill.

Lourens, L. (1998). Parke- en rekreasie voorsiening in Roodepoort: 'n historiese perspektief. Pretoria: Universiteit van Pretoria (Verhandeling - MA.).

Meyer, C. du P. & Scholtz, G.J.L. (1988). Policy and local authority regarding recreation provision. *South Africa Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 11(2), 59-74.

Meyer, C. du P. (2001). Die problematiek asook die noodsaaklikheid om die rekreasiekundige beroep te professionaliseer. Potchefstroom: PU vir CHO. (Proefskrif - PhD).

Naidoo, M. (2005). The role of the Provincial Department of Sport and Recreation in collaboration with the local government to promote recreation as an essential service. (Paper presented at the Institute of the Environment and Recreation Management Conference held on 9-10 June. Mangaung, p.4) (Unpublished)

Neuman, W.L. & Kreuger, L.W. (2003). *Social Work Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Applications* (p. 624). Boston, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E.R. (2005). *Research Methods for Social Work* (5th ed.) (p. 789). Belmont, Calif.: Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Scholtz, G.J.L. (1985). Bestuur van sport, parke en ontspanning deur plaaslike owerhede van die RSA en SWA/Nambie: Potchefstroom Instituut van Vryetydstudies. Potchefstroom Universiteit van Christelike Hoer Onderwys.

Scholtz, G.J.L. & Meyer, C.D. (1990). *Provision of Leisure Resources and Services by Local Authority in the RSA And Namibia – 1984/85*. Potchefstroom: PU vir CHO.

Scholtz, G.J.L., Saayman, M. & Meyer, C.D. (1996). *Policy Document for the Provision of Recreation in the North West Province*. Potchefstroom: PU for CHE, Institute for Tourism & Leisure Studies.

Singh, C. & Burnett, C. (2003). The Tshwane metropolitan municipality and strategic partnership in sport and recreation. *African Journal for Physical, Health, Education, Recreation and Dance*, 9(3),78-88.

South Africa (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa.
<http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/index.htm> Date of access: 24 July 2007.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (p. 768). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

White Paper on Local Government (1998). Department of Constitutional Development, South Africa http://www.hst.org.za/pphc/Phila/summary/vol4_no1.htm Date of access: 24 July 2007.

White Paper on Sport and Recreation (2002). National Department of Sport and Recreation. South Africa. <http://www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1998/sports.htm> Date of access: 24 July 2007.

Copyright of African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation & Dance is the property of African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation & Dance and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.