In this survey of adults randomly chosen from the October 1967 voters' list for the City of Guelph, Ontario, information was gathered in individual and socioeconomic characteristics (including age, sex, marital and family status, income, education, occupation, and ethnic background), attitudes toward Guelph as a place to live and toward existing University of Guelph extension services; leisure activities (sports, entertainment, organizational membership, church attendance, reading, and others); and educational preferences, attitudes, and participation patterns. Adult education participation was greater in unsponsored than in sponsored activities: 417 had engaged in some form of adult education during the previous year. 337 expressed no particular sponsor or site preferences. 477 favored financial support of programs by participants only, vocational subjects (297) and academic subjects or general subjects (267) were favored. Preferred methods (mainly discussion groups, television, and short courses or lectures) varied widely among three hypothetical subject areas—religions of the world, current events, and new information in one's line of work. In regard to university extension, 447 were satisfied with existing service and 397 were uncertain. (The document includes 34 tables.)
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SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

This is the first report of the results of a survey of participation patterns of adults in the City of Guelph. Guelph was selected for this survey because of its proximity and because it is similar in many respects to other communities in the province.

Data included in this report are based on information obtained from a random sample of adults drawn from the October 1967 City of Guelph list of voters. Personal interviews were completed with 117 respondents which constituted a completion rate of eighty percent of the eligible adults in the sample. Interviewing was conducted during March, 1968, by twelve graduate students in the Department of Extension Education of the University of Guelph.

A great deal of information was collected. The data presented in this report relate only to the general areas covered in the survey. More specific information which may be of interest and concern to specific organizations and agencies will be processed and made available in the future.

Purpose of the Survey

The overall purpose of this survey was to acquire more information about the participation patterns and interests of the people of Guelph. The University of Guelph and other educational agencies are continuously concerned about identifying more effective ways of assisting citizens and communities in the province. Therefore, the data collected in this survey will assist in the development of programs based on the needs and interests. More specifically, an attempt was made through the survey to:

- Determine the extent and nature of utilization and participation in educational, recreational, organizational, religious, and other leisure time activities and agencies available to the population.
- Determine the educational interests and methods preferred by adults to study various kinds of subjects.
- Determine pertinent personal, economic and social characteristics of the adults in Guelph.

Organization of this Report

This report includes five sections as follows:

I - Introduction: Purpose and methodology of the study.

II - Characteristics of the People: This consists of such background characteristics as age, education, family income, occupational status and the like.

III - Attitudes toward Guelph and the University: This section summarizes the feelings and attitudes that people have toward Guelph as a place to live and the University's help to the community.

IV - Participation and Preference in Educative Activity: Reports on adult social participation related to educative activity.

V - Leisure Time Activities: Some of the ways Guelph adults spend their leisure time.
SECTION II
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PEOPLE

This section presents some of the background characteristics of the adults in Guelph. It contains information relating to such variables as age, marital status, sex, education, family income, number of children, religious preference, age upon arrival at Guelph, where reared, employment and occupational status and fathers' main occupation.

Age.-- Data in Table 1 indicate the age distribution of the respondents in the study. Approximately one-fifth of the sample were in each of the 21 - 29 and 30 - 39 year age categories. The largest number, about one-quarter, were in the 40 - 49 year category. Nearly one-third of the sample were aged fifty years or older.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>1968 Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>1961 DBS Census</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5859</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4668</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 or older</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23944</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAge of three respondents not ascertained
bReduced by ten percent to adjust for DBS census inclusion of 20 year olds.
Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1961 Census data are included in Table 1 for comparison purposes. The percentage distribution of the sample and census population are relatively similar although there are slight differences. Even if the age distribution of the population remained unchanged during the six years since the Census, the observed differences in age make-up of the survey respondents and the Census is within expected variation for a sample of this size. (It is interesting to note that the total population of Guelph has changed substantially, since the 1961 census figure of 39,838, to something in excess of 52,000 in 1968).

Marital Status.-- In Table 2 the present marital status of the respondents are shown. Eighty-three percent are married and nearly nine percent were either widowed, separated or divorced. Slightly more than eight percent of the respondents had never married. (Comparable 1961 Census figures were not available since the DBS data included all persons fifteen years of age and older in their published reports).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex.-- Interviews were completed with 47 males (40.2 percent) and 70 females (59.8 percent) as indicated in Table 3. Females were slightly over-represented in the sample compared to the 1961 Census distribution.
TABLE 3
SEX OF RESPONDENTS WHO ARE ALL TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>1968 Sample</th>
<th>1961 DBS Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Includes those twenty years of age and older

of 47 percent males and 53 percent females. It is not uncommon to find an unequal number of males and females, and different sex ratios are usually found in urban areas compared to rural areas (usually a larger proportion of males in rural areas with the reverse expected in urban communities) (i.e. in 1961 the sex ratio of adults twenty years and older in Guelph was 90 males for every 100 females).

Formal Education.-- Data in Table 4 indicate the educational attainment of the respondents in this sample. Approximately 68 percent of the

TABLE 4
FORMAL EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>1968 Sample</th>
<th>1961 DBS Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 or less</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9 - 11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training without high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school + vocational training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but not completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate study or degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)Number not reported separately by DBS in this category.
sample had not completed high school compared to 75 percent in the 1961 census. Eight percent of the sample had completed a university degree compared to four percent in 1961. The differences in the proportion in each category, between the survey sample and the 1961 census, probably reflect the general increase in formal educational attainment particularly among younger adults.

**Family Income.**—The total annual family income of the households included in this survey is shown in Table 5. Nearly one out of every

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>TOTAL FAMILY INCOME OF GUELPH RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Categories</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1000 - $1999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000 - $2999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3000 - $3999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4000 - $4999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5000 - $5999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6000 - $6999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7000 - $7999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8000 - $8999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9000 - $9999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 or over</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTotal does not include 7 respondents who did not indicate their family income and 4 who did not know the approximate amount.

five families had a total family income during the past year of less than $5,000. Approximately 57 percent had incomes between $5,000 and $9,999, while about 23 percent netted incomes of $10,000 or more annually.
Number of Children.-- The total number of children in married respondents' families are shown in Table 6. One quarter of the married respondents had three children, the largest proportion in any category, while one out of every five (20 percent) had two children.

**TABLE 6**

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN MARRIED RESPONDENT'S FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include ten respondents who had never married.

Religious Preference.-- The religious preferences of the respondents are shown in Table 7, together with somewhat comparable data from the 1961 Census for similar age groups. The two largest single categories of religious preference in the survey were United Church of Canada (with 30 percent) and Roman Catholic (with 26 percent). They were also the largest categories in the 1961 Census although the order was reversed. Presbyterians (with 20 percent) and Anglicans (with nine percent) were the next largest categories in the survey -- again similar to the Census distribution but in reversed order. Church membership and frequency of church attendance are outlined later in this report.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Infra, Tables 33 and 34, pp. 33-34.
TABLE 7
RESPONDENTS' RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>1968 Sample</th>
<th>1961 DBS Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Church of Canada</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-26--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Reformed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious preference; atheist; don't know, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a** Includes 63 Ukrainian Catholics.

**b** Census report did not identify constituents but classified them as "Others".

**Original Nationality**—Respondents were asked the original nationality of their family on their father's side. Data in Table 8 indicate the distribution of the adults in this survey. Two-thirds of the respondents were of British extraction. Italians and Germans, with seven percent each, were the next largest groups. Various other racial extractions made up the remainder of the sample. A comparison of the sample with the 1961 Census data in Table 8 indicate that the distribution of original nationalities are relatively similar.
### TABLE 8

**ORIGINAL NATIONALITY OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Nationality</th>
<th>1968 Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>1961 DBS Census</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26,878</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,971</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Belgian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of European</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know; not ascertained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>101%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,838</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Does not equal 100% due to rounding errors.

*b* Total Guelph population, rather than just adults.

---

**Age at Arrival in Guelph.** Slightly less than three out of every ten respondents (29 percent) were born in Guelph, as shown in Table 9, while an additional nine percent moved there when 17 years of age or younger. The largest single category of respondents, nearly 34 percent, moved to Guelph during their late teens or twenties. This also appears elsewhere to be the most mobile age group particularly for migration of rural people to urban areas. Nearly fifteen percent of the respondents came to Guelph while aged 30 - 39 years. It is apparent that a large majority of Guelph residents came to this city at a relatively young age with a large proportion of their productive years ahead of them.
TABLE 9

AGE WHEN RESPONDENTS FIRST CAME INTO THIS COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Arrival</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born here</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Where Reared.— Data in Table 10 indicate the size of community in which the respondents were mainly brought up or reared. Thirty percent of the respondents were reared on a farm with slightly more than one-quarter (26 percent) in a village or town. Presumably the bulk of those reared in a small city (30 percent) were born in Guelph or moved here at an early age. Data in Table 10 tend to support the speculation that a large proportion of the migrants to Guelph came from relatively "rural" areas.

---

TABLE 10

SIZE OF COMMUNITY IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE MAINLY REARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Community</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm or Open Country</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or Village (under 10,000)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small City (10,000 - 100,000)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium City (100,000 - 500,000)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large City (over 500,000)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Status.-- Fifty-two percent of the respondents were working full-time, as shown in Table 11, and another nine percent held part-time employment. Slightly more than one-quarter of the respondents were housewives with no additional employment. Nine percent of those in the survey were retired and nearly three percent were unemployed.

Main Occupation.-- Data in Table 12 indicate the main occupation of the heads of households included in the survey. Semi-skilled workers made up the largest single category with one-quarter of the total. The combined total of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers made up nearly half of the work force (47 percent). The second largest category was professional and technical workers which constituted 22 percent of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ascertained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

MAIN OCCUPATION OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, Officials and Proprietors(^b)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred Workers(^c)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, Foremen and Kindred Workers (skilled)(^d)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators and Kindred Workers (Semi-skilled)(^e)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (unskilled)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household &amp; Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, clergy, nurses, etc.

\(^b\) Includes owners or part-owners of businesses, salaried and self-employed managers and officials, public administration officials, etc.

\(^c\) Includes bookkeepers, receptionists, secretaries, cashiers, mail carriers, etc.

\(^d\) Includes electricians, carpenters, bakers, cabinet makers, machinists, etc.

\(^e\) Includes bus drivers, deliverymen, service station attendants, etc.

**Father's Main Occupation.** Nearly one-third of the respondents (32 percent) during their teens had fathers whose main occupation was farming as shown in Table 13. The second highest category of father's occupation was laborer (unskilled) with 15 percent in this group. Only nine percent of the respondents had fathers who were professional or technical workers.
TABLE 13
FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION WHEN RESPONDENT WAS IN HIS/HER TEENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, Officials and Proprietors&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred Workers&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, Foremen and Kindred Workers (Skilled)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators and Kindred Workers (Semi-skilled)&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers (Unskilled)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household &amp; Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate (father dead, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Includes doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, clergy, nurses, etc.
<sup>b</sup>Includes owners or part-owners of businesses, salaried and self-employed managers and officials, public administration officials, etc.
<sup>c</sup>Includes bookkeepers, receptionists, secretaries, cashiers, mail carriers, etc.
<sup>d</sup>Includes electricians, carpenters, bakers, cabinet makers, machinists, etc.
<sup>e</sup>Includes bus drivers, deliverymen, service station attendants, etc.

A comparison of data in Tables 12 and 13 suggest that on the average Guelph adult heads of households possess higher status occupations than the respondents' fathers during their teens.
SECTION III

ATTITUDES TOWARD GUELPH AND THE UNIVERSITY

This section is a brief summary of the feelings and attitudes people have toward Guelph as a place to live and the University of Guelph's help to the community.

Guelph as a Place to Live.-- Each respondent was asked whether, in general, he/she felt that Guelph is a good place to live, about average, or not so good. Data in Table 14 indicate the distribution of responses. A large majority of the respondents (89 percent) stated that they felt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's Feeling</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guelph was a good place to live. Only two of the 117 respondents felt that Guelph was not so good and another eleven (nine percent) suggested that it was about average.

Likes and Dislikes.-- The following two questions were asked of respondents. "What things do you like about living in Guelph?" and "What things do you not like about living in Guelph?" A general summary of the first responses by each respondent are presented in Table 15.
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The general categories in Table 15 summarize a number of specific responses. Of those things liked about their particular community, responses related to "size and location" of Guelph were given by 37 percent of the respondents. The second largest category (with 16 percent) was in the area of "people". One-tenth of the respondents mentioned something related to "services" and another ten percent indicated some "physical or social characteristic".

The following specific items were mentioned as being liked:

1. Size and location: Good size, just right size (mentioned by 16 respondents); "Medium" sized (mentioned by 14); location in province (10); other (3).
2. People: Friendly people (mentioned by 11 respondents); like the people (4); other (4).
3. Services: Schools (9); other (3).
4. Physical and social characteristics: Clean town (4); quiet place to live (3); other (5).
5. Other: It's home, good all-around place (7); scenic beauty (4); just like it here (3); other recreation (2); job opportunities (4); prosperous community (2); other economic reasons (3); don't know (2).

Things disliked about Guelph were mainly in the categories of "services" mentioned by 15 percent); "recreation" opportunities and facilities (13 percent), and "economic opportunities" (12 percent). Nearly two-fifths (39 percent) of the respondents suggested that they didn't know of anything, or nothing was disliked.

The following specific items were mentioned as being disliked:
1. Services: Shopping facilities poor (mentioned by 4 respondents); transportation poorly developed (4); poor parking (4); other services (6).
2. Recreation: Lack of entertainment (mentioned by seven respondents); activities for young people (4); some aspect of recreation (4).
3. Economic opportunities: Taxes too high (6); poor job opportunities (2); other economic aspect (6).
4. Physical and social characteristics: Appearance of town (3); other characteristics (8).
5. People: People aren't too friendly (4); other aspects of "people" (3).
6. Other reasons: Size and location (3); don't know (7); nothing disliked (38).

University Help to the Community.-- Respondents were asked the question: "Do you feel that the University of Guelph should do more to help you and the community with current problems and changes, or is the University doing all it can on this now?" Data in Table 16 indicate the distribution of responses to that question. Fifty-two of the 117 respondents (44 percent) indicated they felt the University was now doing all it can. Fifteen percent felt the University should do more. A relatively large number, 45 of the respondents (39 percent), indicated that they did not know. The latter figure might suggest that a relatively large
### TABLE 16

**ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH'S HELP TO THE COMMUNITY AND THEMSELVES WITH CURRENT PROBLEMS AND CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should do more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now doing all it can</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of adults in Guelph do not possess a clear understanding of the University's role in the community and for themselves -- and a need for improved "public relations" work by the University.
PARTICIPATION AND PREFERENCES IN EDUCATIVE ACTIVITY

This section reports on that aspect of local adults social participation related to educative behavior. Data in the tables will focus on participation in sponsored as well as self-directed educational activity, reasons limiting participation, respondents' views on financing adult education, preferences for various sponsors, current interest in studying various subject areas, and preferences for various educational methods through which to learn or study different subjects.

**Participation in Sponsored Educational Programs.** The extent of participation by Guelph adults during the 12 months prior to this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educational Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, lectures, or discussions sponsored by a university,</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or government agency</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses at a High School, Collegiate, Adult Education Centre,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or University of Guelph</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational activities by YM-YWCA, Guelph Public Library,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Commission, Church, or Service Club</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job or other training sponsored by employer or union</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in one or more of the above sponsored activities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during past twelve months</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in various types of sponsored adult educational activities is indicated in Table 17. Number of respondents who participated varied from about four percent in correspondence courses to a high of just over 16 percent in educational programs of the YM-YWCA, Public Library, Recreation Commission, a Church or Service Club. Forty-one percent participated to some extent in at least one or more of the sponsored activities. This is a relatively high proportion compared to participation levels measured by similar instruments in other communities on the continent (most of which ranged in participation from about ten to twenty percent).

**Participation in Un-sponsored Educational Activity.**-- Data in Table 18 indicate the proportion of respondents who participated in un-sponsored educational activity during the previous year. Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educative Activity</th>
<th>Yes No.</th>
<th>Yes Percent</th>
<th>No No.</th>
<th>No Percent</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying or practice by themselves</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying or practice with a few friends or other small group</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in one or both of the above unsponsored educative activity</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in one or more of the sponsored and/or unsponsored educational programs and activities</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were asked whether they had spent a total of six or more hours during the past twelve months, studying or practicing any subject or skill by themselves (self-directed). Slightly more than one-half (51 percent) indicated that they had undertaken a self-directed learning task of this type during that period.
A total of 15 percent stated they had studied or learned some subject or skill by meeting with a few friends or other small group (for six or more hours) without enrolling in a special course.

Slightly more than six out of every ten respondents (62 percent) had participated in educative activity that was either self-directed by themselves or in an unsponsored small group (or both). It is evident that the extent of participation in unsponsored educative activity is quite substantial.

Seven tenths (71 percent) of the respondents had participated in one or more of the sponsored and/or unsponsored educational programs and activities during the past twelve months.

Reasons for Not Participating More.-- Respondents were asked to indicate any reasons that may have prevented them from participating to a greater extent in educational activities. Data in Table 19 indicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of the 117 in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have no time; too busy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to be involved but have not given it real thought</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too old</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no particular problem making it necessary to be involved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too tired to use my spare time for such activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't afford it</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No educational programs which would interest me in this community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't like group activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous involvement was disappointing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational agencies don't have anything worthwhile to offer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the distribution of reasons for not participating more. About half the respondents (47 percent) felt they were too busy or had no time. Twenty-two percent suggested they would like to be involved but had not given it real thought. One out of every five respondents (21 percent) felt they were too old. No particular problem making it necessary to be involved was indicated by 15 percent of the sample and 14 percent stated they were too tired to use spare time for such activities. Nearly 13 percent indicated they could not afford to participate more. Various other reasons were indicated by a smaller proportion of the respondents.

Financing Adult Educational Activities.-- Respondents were asked the question, "Do you think that adult educational activities should be offered free of charge to the public, or that those who want to take them should have to pay, or do you have some other opinions on this?" Data in Table 20 indicate that nearly one-half of the respondents (47 percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Should Pay</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those who want it should pay</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who can afford it should pay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some fee charged (to make the person more appreciative, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community funds plus government support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free to participants</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free if on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should be paid to attend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ascertained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
felt those who want educational activities should pay (two-thirds of the sample suggested it was desirable for recipients to pay all or part of the costs). Twenty-two percent indicated that programs should be free to participants and an additional three percent also felt that way with certain qualifications.

Preference of Sponsor.-- Data in Table 21 outline the preferences expressed by respondents as to where they would prefer to participate in adult educational activities. One-third of the sample expressed "no preference" while one-quarter indicated a "University or College" was preferred. Other preferences were fairly evenly distributed between high school or collegiate (7 percent); Adult Education Centre (7 percent); YM-YWCA (6 percent); Guelph Public Library (5 percent); Church 5 percent); plus a lesser number with various other preferences.

TABLE 21
RESPONDENT'S FIRST CHOICE OF SPONSOR OR PLACE TO PARTICIPATE IN ADULT EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or college</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or collegiate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education centre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM-YWCA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph Public Library</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph Recreation Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public or private agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ascertained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects Now Interested in Studying.-- Table 22 contains data which indicate the categories of subjects that Guelph adults are currently
TABLE 22
SUBJECTS THAT RESPONDENTS ARE NOW INTERESTED IN STUDYING 
OR LEARNING MORE ABOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Category</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>No Interest Expressed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Subjects(^a)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or general education subjects(^b)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies and recreation subjects(^c)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development subjects(^d)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and family life subjects(^e)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current events, public affairs and citizenship subjects(^f)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion, morals, and ethics subjects(^g)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Subjects and skills used in the professional, technical, business, office, and sales spheres of white collar occupations, and in the skilled trades, semi-skilled and service spheres of blue collar occupations and topics dealing with farming and commercial gardening.

\(^b\) Academic subjects of the sort normally studied as part of a high school or college education, but excluding all business, trade, vocational, technical, professional, or other job-related courses.

\(^c\) Subjects and skills used in leisure time pursuits.

\(^d\) Miscellaneous subjects all aimed at helping people expand themselves in the areas of physical fitness, health, personality development, interpersonal and social skill, or basic reading, writing, and language skills.

\(^e\) Topics pertaining to the establishment, maintenance, and improvement of a home, or to the carrying out of household duties and family responsibilities.

\(^f\) Topics dealing with current social, political, and economic affairs, courses in citizenship, in civic responsibilities, and in general political education.

\(^g\) Traditional religious training, religion applied to everyday life, and all other subjects on religion, morals or ethics.
interested in studying or learning more about. Nearly three out of every ten respondents (29 percent) indicated an interest in studying some "vocational" subject. The second largest proportion, over one-quarter of the respondents (26 percent) expressed an interest in studying an "academic or general education" subject. Interest in studying a "hobby or recreation" subject was indicated by 19 percent, while 17 percent stated a "personal development" subject. "Home and family life" subjects and "current events, public affairs and citizenship" subjects each were outlined by nine percent of the respondents. Only three of the 117 respondents indicated an interest in studying or learning more about "religion, morals, and ethics" subjects.

Method Orientations. Each respondent was asked which method (listed on a card) he/she would prefer to use to study or learn more about subjects suggested in each of three hypothetical cases. The subject in the first case was "different religions of the world", in the second case "current events subjects such as Vietnam", and finally "new information in the line of work you are in". Data in Table 23 outline the distribution of first choice preferences for each subject. It is evident that method orientations (or preferences) vary depending on the subject.

A discussion group was preferred by the largest single proportion of respondents (28 percent) to study about "different religions of the world". Attending a short course or lecture series was the second largest (15 percent) for that subject. Books or pamphlets on one's own was preferred by 13 percent while television was suggested by one-tenth (10 percent) of the respondents.

Watching on television at home was preferred by 30 percent of the respondents for studying or learning more about "current events like Vietnam". Newspapers or magazines were preferred by over one-fifth (21 percent) for those subjects. Discussion group and consulting a specialist or expert were preferred by 12 and 11 percent respectively for subjects in that area.

1 General definitions of subject matter categories are included as footnotes to Table 22.
TABLE 23

METHOD ORIENTATION (PREFERENCE OF METHOD) FOR STUDY OR TO LEARN MORE ABOUT SUBJECTS SUGGESTED IN THREE HYPOTHETICAL CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical Subjects</th>
<th>Different Religions of the World</th>
<th>Current Events Like Vietnam</th>
<th>New Information in Your Line of Work*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Method</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend regular classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Short course or lecture series</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join a discussion group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop or Institute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence lessons by mail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult specialist or expert</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or pamphlets on my own</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper(s) or Magazine(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over television at home</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ascertained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This question not asked of persons who had never been employed or who are retired (included here as "not ascertained").

Short courses or lecture series were preferred by one-fifth of the respondents (20 percent) for studying "new information in your line of work". Other main method preferences for this subject were consulting...
specialist or expert (15 percent), workshop or institute (12 percent), and attending regular classes (10 percent).

Data in Table 24 indicate the method orientations (preferences) of respondents who expressed a preference for each of the three hypothetical subjects with methods classified as either group, individual, or mass media. The majority of respondents preferred a group method to learn or study "different religions of the world" (59 percent) and "new information in your line of work" (63 percent) whereas a majority (55 percent) preferred a mass media method for "current events subjects like Vietnam". These findings are similar to those in a study conducted by the author in Wisconsin in 1967.

**TABLE 24**

**METHOD CATEGORY PREFERENCE FOR STUDY OR TO LEARN MORE ABOUT SUBJECTS SUGGESTED IN THREE HYPOTHETICAL CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Category Preference</th>
<th>Different Religions of the World</th>
<th>Current Events Like Vietnam</th>
<th>New Information in Your Line of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes; Short Course or Lecture Series: Discussion Group; Workshop or Institute</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Lessons: Specialist or Expert; Book(s) or Pamphlet(s)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper(s) or Magazine: Television</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>107a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include respondents who indicated no preference.

b*Does not include respondents who were never employed or who are retired, or those who indicated no preference.
SECTION V

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

This section reports on the way Guelph adults spend their leisure time -- the things they do and the local resources and facilities they use -- in addition to educational participation that was reported in Section IV. Data in this section will focus on extent of involvement in various leisure time activities, participant and spectator sports, organizations, leadership in youth organizations, extent of leisure time activity as a family unit, attendance at Expo '67, and church membership and attendance.

Participation in Various Activities. -- Data in Table 25 indicate the extent of involvement of Guelph adults in a wide variety of activities. The activities utilized by the largest proportion of respondents were watching television (95 percent), reading newspapers (84 percent), visiting friends and relatives (83 and 75 percent), listening to radio (74 percent), and entertaining at home (74 percent).
TABLE 25
FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS LEISURE-TIME ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching T.V.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Radio</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Newspapers</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Magazines</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Books</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Relatives</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining at Home</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Cards</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a Movie</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Theatre</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to Nightclub</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorating Home</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitting</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in Sports.-- Respondents were asked the frequency of their participation in various sports during the past year -- the responses are summarized in Table 26. Dancing, driving for pleasure, and picnicking were each undertaken by 64 percent of the adults. Swimming was next highest with 38 percent participation followed by bowling with 26 percent. Slightly less than one quarter of the sample (23 percent) had undertaken physical fitness exercises. One-fifth (20 percent) had been fishing, while camping and boating were each undertaken by 19 percent.
TABLE 26
FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN VARIOUS SPORTS
DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Frequency of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for Pleasure</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Fit. Exercises</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating (winter)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golfing (in season)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobogganing (winter)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping Pong</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (snow)</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (water)</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback Riding</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending Spectator Sports.-- Table 27 contains a summary of the extent of Guelph adult attendance at spectator sports during the twelve months prior to interviewing. Hockey was highest in proportion attending
with 25 percent, followed by horse races with 16 percent. Thirteen percent attended baseball games while one out of every ten (10 percent attended football games.

### TABLE 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Frequency of Attendance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never or Less</td>
<td>Monthly or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Races</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Races</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Memberships.-- As indicated in Table 28, nearly three-tenths of the respondents (29 percent) reported no membership in any club or organization. One-half of those interviewed indicated membership in either one or two clubs or organizations. Only one-fifth (21 percent) belonged to three or more organizations.

### TABLE 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club and Organization Memberships</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Past Youth Leadership Experience.-- Respondents were given a card listing various youth organizations and asked to indicate any in which they now and/or had ever served as a volunteer leader or teacher. Data in Table 29 indicate the distribution of responses to that question. The largest proportion had been or were now leaders or teachers in Sunday School (20 percent) or other church-related groups (ten percent). Seven percent of the respondents had lead each of Boy Scouts and Girl Guides.

As summarized in Table 30, over one-third of the adults in this sample (36 percent) had been or were now volunteer leaders or teachers of one or more youth organizations. More than six-tenths (62 percent) of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Leadership Status</th>
<th>Never No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Now a Leader No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Previously a Leader No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday School</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIT, Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts, Cubs</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Guides, Brownies</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H, Junior Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadets</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM-YWCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Youth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents indicated they would be willing to serve as a youth leader or teacher in the future if the opportunity arose.

**TABLE 30**

**PAST LEADERSHIP IN SELECTED YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS AND WILLINGNESS TO SERVE AS A YOUTH LEADER IN THE FUTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth leader at present or in the past</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to serve in the future</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leisure Activities as a Family Unit.** Table 31 contains data which indicate frequency of leisure time activities by respondents as a family unit. More than one-half of the adults (55 percent) reported that type of activity at least weekly. Less than one-fifth of the sample (18 percent) indicated leisure time activities as a family either less frequent than monthly or never.

**TABLE 31**

**FREQUENCY OF LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES AS A FAMILY UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once monthly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attendance at Expo '67.-- Respondents were asked whether they happened to attend Expo '67. Almost seven out of every ten Guelph adults interviewed (69 percent) indicated they had not attended that event. The remainder attended one or more days as outlined in Table 32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DAYS OF ATTENDANCE AT &quot;EXPO 67&quot; DURING 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Church Membership and Attendance.-- Four-fifths of the sample indicated they belonged to a church as shown in Table 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH MEMBERSHIP STATUS OF RESPONDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate; No religious preference; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 34 indicate frequency of church attendance. Fifty of the 117 respondents (43 percent) suggested they attended church services at least once a week, while another fifth of the sample (19 percent) attended once or a few times per month.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Attendance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times a month</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times a year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never; inappropriate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>