

1984

Campus recreation survey: Student satisfaction and needs at the University of Northern Iowa

Michael Edward Gannon
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1984 Michael Edward Gannon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gannon, Michael Edward, "Campus recreation survey: Student satisfaction and needs at the University of Northern Iowa" (1984). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2404.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2404>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Campus recreation survey: Student satisfaction and needs at the University of Northern Iowa

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine student satisfaction with the campus recreation program and to determine student recreational needs at UNI.

CAMPUS RECREATION SURVEY: STUDENT SATISFACTION AND NEEDS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

A Research Paper
Presented to
The Department of Educational Administration
and Counseling
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education

by
Michael Edward Gannon
December 1984

This Research Paper by: Michael Edward Gannon

Entitled: Campus Recreation Survey: Student Satisfaction and Needs
at the University of Northern Iowa

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

J. F. Kimball

10/30/84
Date Approved

~~Director of Research Paper~~

Robert Krajewski

11/12/84
Date Approved

~~Second Reader of Research Paper~~

J. F. Kimball

10/30/84
Date Received

~~Graduate Faculty Adviser~~

Robert Krajewski

11/12/84
Date Received

~~Head, Department of Educational
Administration and Counseling~~

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Importance of the Study	1
Assumptions	2
Limitations of the Study	2
Definition of Terms	3
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
Summary	8
3. DESIGN	10
Development of the Instrument	10
Contents of the Instrument	10
Selection of the Sample	12
Procedures	12
Analysis	13
4. RESULTS	15
General Information	15
Participation	18
Publicity	21

Table of Contents, Continued

	Page
Chapter	
Activities	22
Facilities	24
Expansion and Policies	25
5. DISCUSSION	27
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
Summary	32
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	34
References	35
Appendix A	
Student Survey	37
Appendix B	
Student Suggestions for New Activities	39
Appendix C	
General Comments of Students	40

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Survey Sample Classes, Instructors, and Class Sizes	13
2. Sex, Age, Class, Major, and Credit Hours of Students	15
3. Housing, Greek, and Handicap Status of Students	17
4. Ranking of Factors Which Would Increase Participation	18
5. Participation Status of Students	18
6. Participation Status According to Sex and Housing Status	19
7. Reasons for Non-Participation	20
8. Publicity Sources Used and Initial Source Used by Students	21
9. Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Men's and Women's Activities and Co-Rec Activities . .	22
10. Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Facility Time Available and Space Available	24
11. Student Preference of Times for Expansion	25
12. Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Intramural Policies	25
13. Student Responses to Intramural Policy Items	26

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation must be a part of program planning in college student services (Stufflebeam, 1971). The Division of Campus Recreation at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) conducted a survey in the spring of 1984 to evaluate program operation. This survey was designed to determine student satisfaction and needs concerning campus recreation.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine student satisfaction with the campus recreation program and to determine student recreational needs at UNI.

Importance of the Study

Program evaluation is necessary for the continued development and success of a program (Hanson, 1978). A vital element of a successful program is to provide opportunities which match the needs of the clientele (Cook, 1977). This study determines student perceptions of the campus recreation program and determines student needs pertaining to campus recreation. Using this information, campus recreation administrators may obtain a better knowledge of the status of the program and may better serve the students. Data from this study may be used to make any needed adjustments in future programming.

Providing adequate campus recreation opportunities is important because of the personal development which results from recreational activity. Slavson (1946) lists main developmental foundations of

recreation that benefit the person. These are: (1) physical growth, (2) physiological development, (3) emotional security, (4) love, acceptance, and recognition, (5) social transition and widening, (6) self-expression and self-assertion, (7) organic and psychological balance, (8) new experiences and stimulation, (9) creative activity, (10) abiding interests, (11) vocational success, and (12) social adaptation. Possible personal development through recreation even more directly related to aims of education include: (1) personality development, (2) character training, (3) social education, (4) discovery of avocational interests, (5) vocational guidance, (6) refining selective capacity, (7) development of the power of creative imagination, (8) leadership, (9) evolving guiding philosophy of life, (10) intellectual hospitality, and (11) a keener sense of reality (Slavson, 1946).

Assumptions

1. Students would understand the survey.
2. Students would respond sincerely and honestly to the survey.
3. Students enrolled in recreation classes would be likely to participate in campus recreation activities and would provide knowledgeable feedback.
4. The sample selected would provide data which was representative of the entire student body at UNI.

Limitations of the Study

1. The results may not be as representative of the student population as possible because random selection of sample was not used

in the study.

2. The students may not be sincere or honest in their responses to the survey, which would reduce the reliability of the results.

3. The survey instrument was constructed by the researcher and no reliability or validity data are available.

4. The use of a larger sample may have produced more reliable data.

Definition of Terms

Campus recreation. Student service program which offers open recreation, intramural, and sports club activities to students.

Open recreation. Student participation, using campus recreation facilities, in informal impromptu games and/or activities.

Intramurals. Student participation in formal, organized events and/or league activities.

Sports clubs. Student sports groups and teams formed by interested students.

Co-recreational activities. Student intramural activities in which men and women participate together.

Participant. A student taking part in any campus recreation activity.

Non-participant. A student who does not take part in any campus recreation activity.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Evaluation studies of campus recreation programs will be reviewed in this chapter. The need for program evaluation was supported by the literature, although studies pertaining to campus recreation program evaluation were few in number. Aspects of campus recreation evaluated in the literature were similar to aspects evaluated in this study.

Scott (1953) conducted a study which evaluated intramural sports programs for men in 12 liberal arts colleges. A checklist of criteria was used to determine status of administrative policies and procedures, factors which influence operational efficiency of programs, and agreement among college recreation programs. Factors found to have the most influence on the efficiency of campus recreation and intramural programs were: program content, organization of programs, student participation in administration, publicity, program evaluation, awards, and point systems.

Spangler (1954) studied the relationship of student participation to intramural program success. She concluded that the success of a program cannot necessarily be measured by the level of student participation. A high participation level can be an indicator of a successful program, but a low participation level does not necessarily mean the program is poor. Spangler found that class load, work obligations, extracurricular activities, and lack of interest can reduce participation. However, internal deficiencies can be a cause for lack of participation. Poor publicity of program and poor

management by intramural coordinators can contribute to the problem.

Maclean (1963) recognized the importance of program evaluation for program success. Maclean stated that program strengths and weaknesses, organizational structure, administration, operation, and facilities should be assessed, with recommendations made in each area.

A study at the University of Iowa (Cook, 1977) determined factors which affect the success of recreation and intramurals. Fitting program opportunities to needs of the clientele was found to be a vital factor in program success.

Tyler (1981) stated that the key to effective decision-making by college recreation directors is the collecting of information. The more information administrators have collected prior to making a decision, the higher the likelihood that they will have the capability to make an informed decision. Also noted is that decision-making is usually subjective in nature.

Skola (1978) conducted an assessment of intramural participation and information sources at the University of Iowa. Students indicated campus recreation participation status and sources of publicity usually used. Forty percent of the students were campus recreation participants, and friends were the most common source of campus recreation information.

Zuercher, Sedlacek, and Masters (1980) measured student participation and perception of various aspects of the intramural program at the University of Maryland. A sample of 286 undergraduate students cooperated in a telephone survey. Ninety-three percent of

those surveyed were aware of the intramural program, and 43% were participants in the intramural program (70% male, 30% female). Most common reasons for participating were fun and exercise, and most common reasons for not participating were time and work conflicts. Students usually gave positive ratings to aspects of the intramural program, but gave low ratings to publicity, referees, and equipment.

Evaluation of recreation services was done at Iowa State University (Lass & Dittmer, 1981). The purpose of the study was to determine the overall use and effectiveness of the program. A total of 602 students completed a written questionnaire. Aspects of recreation examined were: publicity sources used, new recreation facilities needed, campus recreation participation, reasons for non-participation, intramural activities, and recreation facilities. Students usually heard of recreation opportunities in a residence hall or fraternity/sorority setting. Fifty-one percent wanted a new recreation facility. A total of 90% participated in some form of campus recreation activity, and the main reason for non-participation was lack of time. Generally positive ratings were given to intramural activities and recreation facilities.

The Office for Student Development at the University of Missouri-Columbia (1981) constructed a recreation survey for students to evaluate the recreation and intramural program. Examined were campus recreation participation, reasons for participation and non-participation, use of and quality of facilities, and need for expansion. Ratings of intramural policies, staff, and activities were

also included in the survey. Results of the study were unavailable.

Maas (1977) used a two-page written questionnaire to survey 539 Iowa State University students on their perceptions of the campus intramural program. Findings indicated that most students (95%) had heard of the intramural program, and that over 60% of those surveyed had participated in some form of intramurals. More males participated than females, and a majority of respondents liked the competitive nature of the program. Many students thought that officiating and publicity could be improved.

Hammitt and Hammitt (1978) reported on a pilot study of University of Michigan recreation facility users, based on a sample of 414 self-administered questionnaires. The results showed that students saw physical exercise as an important reason to use recreation facilities, but few were interested in competition or social interaction. Most students were willing to pay a higher student activity fee in order to keep the facilities open for more hours each week.

Foster, Sedlacek, and Hardwick (1977) compared recreation preferences of commuter and resident students at the University of Maryland. A survey of 407 undergraduates was conducted. Resident students, as compared to commuters, were engaged in nearly twice as many recreational activities during the school year, and were more informed about campus recreational opportunities when they first enrolled. Resident students were also more likely to feel that campus recreation facilities met their recreational needs.

Stevenson, Reznik, and Zuercher (1979) developed an evaluative tool which indicated user and non-user perceptions about recreational sports programs. Telephone interviews with 643 students were done at the University of Michigan. Data analysis indicated that 65% of the students participated in programs offered by the Recreational Sports Department. Nearly twice as many males as females participated. The primary reason students did not participate was lack of time.

Summary

Studies regarding campus recreation program evaluation supported the need for regular evaluation for program success. Few campus recreation program evaluation studies were present in the literature. Studies similar to this study were presented in this chapter.

Influences of various factors upon college recreation programs were examined. Regular evaluation of important aspects of campus recreation such as organization, administration, publicity, student participation, facilities, and student needs were found to be needed to maintain overall program quality. It was also reported that decision-making regarding programs is enhanced by the collection of much information, and that decision-making is mostly subjective in nature.

Iowa, Iowa State, Missouri-Columbia, Maryland, and Michigan universities conducted studies similar to this study. Similar aspects of recreation programs examined in the literature were: student satisfaction with intramural activities and recreational facilities, student participation, reasons for non-participation, publicity, and

program expansion. Lack of published studies pertaining to college recreation program evaluation, specifically student satisfaction and needs, points to the need for more research of this kind.

Chapter 3

DESIGN

Development of the Instrument

A written survey was chosen as the most practical and efficient means to obtain the information and opinions needed from students. The survey was designed to provide data which indicated student satisfaction with the campus recreation program and indicated student recreational needs. Dr. Ken Green, Coordinator of Campus Recreation at UNI, aided with the establishment of the research problem and with construction of the survey. Director of Student Research, Dr. Paul Kelson, also assisted with construction of the survey. Information needed to answer the research problem was discussed with Dr. Green, Intramural Director Donald Erusha, and Assistant Intramural Director Tim Klatt. Objectives of the campus recreation administrators were to determine: (1) student satisfaction with campus recreation activities, facilities, publicity and policies, (2) how to best increase student campus recreation participation, and (3) what students needed that was not provided by the campus recreation program.

The survey consisted of 19 questions which covered main aspects of the Division of Campus Recreation. These aspects were:

- (1) participation, (2) publicity, (3) activities, (4) facilities, and
- (5) program expansion and policies.

Contents of the Instrument

Questions 1-8 were included in the general information section. In this section, students indicated sex, age, class, major, credit

hours, living arrangement, Greek status, and handicap status. Responses could then be categorized and the sample used could be examined.

The participation section (questions 9-11) instructed students to rate factors which would most increase campus recreation participation, indicate participation status, and indicate reasons for non-participation. Only participants continued with the survey from this point.

Questions 12-15 constituted the publicity section. Students were asked to check all sources of information which made them aware of campus recreation. Next, the students indicated whether they used the school newspaper as a regular source and whether they felt adequately informed of campus recreation activities.

The activity section (question 16) listed all intramural activities. Students marked their degree of satisfaction with each activity in which they have participated. Similar to this was the facilities section (question 17), where students marked their degree of satisfaction with time and space available regarding a list of all recreational facilities on campus.

Program expansion and policies was the last section of the survey. On question 18, students indicated times they would be willing to participate in intramural events if program extension was necessary. Students gave opinions pertaining to intramural policies and new intramural activities on the final question (19).

Finally, an opportunity was given for students to write comments,

express needs, and suggest ideas for program improvement. A forced-response format was used throughout the survey, except where student suggestions or comments were desired. The actual survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.

Selection of the Sample

The surveys were distributed to selected classes and gathered immediately upon completion. This was done to save time and insure a high response rate. A sample of students was selected which provided a balanced distribution of class levels. Students enrolled in recreation classes were selected for the sample on the assumption that many of the students would be campus recreation participants. Dr. Green and Dr. Kelso assisted with sample selection. A sample of 329 students, which constituted 3% of the total university enrollment, completed the survey. Classes designated to receive the survey are found in Table 1.

Procedures

Dr. Green administered a pilot run of the survey in a Campus Recreation class of 18 students. The pilot run was conducted to measure time needed for completion of the survey and to identify any possible ambiguous or inadequate items in the survey. Time needed to administer the survey was ten minutes or less, and no changes in regard to survey items were required.

Surveys were issued to students at the beginning of class and collected upon completion. The distributor of the survey announced to the class that they were being given a survey by the Division of Campus

Table 1

Survey Sample Classes, Instructors, and Class Sizes

Class	Instructor	N
Astronomy	Hoff	100
Golf (2 classes)	Marsh	36, 25
Golf (2 classes)	Green	25, 21
Campus Recreation	Green	44
Organization and Administration of Competitive Sports (2 classes)	Erusha	40, 15
Swimming (2 classes)	Klatt	16, 7
		329 Total

Recreation to determine student satisfaction and needs concerning campus recreation, and that the survey would take about ten minutes to complete. Completed surveys were taken to the Campus Recreation Office in the P. E. Center after class. From there the writer obtained the surveys for tabulation.

Analysis

Tabulation consisted of counting frequency of student responses to items. The results were interpreted in terms of percentages and frequencies of student responses to items. Conclusions were based on

these percentages and frequencies. Results of the survey are recorded in Chapter 4, and a discussion of the results is presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Non-evaluative analysis of results is indicated primarily through the use of tables. Student suggestions for new activities and general comments are found in Appendixes B and C, respectively. Discussion of the results is presented in Chapter 5. Data is sectioned in the following order: General Information, Participation, Publicity, Activities, Facilities, Expansion and Policies.

General Information

Table 2

Sex, Age, Class, Major, and Credit Hours of Students

Category	N	%
Sex		
Male	185	56
Female	144	44
Age		
17-20	144	44
21-24	146	44
25 or more	39	12
Class		
Freshman	47	14
Sophomore	95	29

Table 2, Continued

Sex, Age, Class, Major, and Credit Hours of Students

Category	N	%
Junior	102	31
Senior	82	25
Graduate	4	1
Major		
Education	103	31
Business	89	27
Natural Sciences	43	13
Social Sciences	38	12
Humanities and Fine Arts	41	13
Undeclared	9	3
Other	11	3
Credits		
Less than 4	2	.5
4-6	2	.5
7-11	19	6
12 or more	306	93

Table 3

Housing, Greek, and Handicap Status of Students

Status	N	%
<hr/>		
Housing		
On-campus	184	56
Off-campus	185	44
Greek		
Greek	12	4
Non-Greek	317	96
Handicap		
Handicap	4	1
Non-handicap	325	99

Participation

Table 4

Ranking of Factors Which Would Increase Participation

Factor	% of votes for each rank				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Construct rec center	25	17	11	25	21
Better facility utilization	21	26	30	17	6
Add staff	3	3	11	30	51
Increase publicity	32	22	23	15	8
Increase offerings	18	32	21	18	10

Table 5

Participation Status of Students

Status	N	%
Intramurals	220	67
Open recreation	248	75
Sports clubs	31	9
Participants	280	85
Non-participants	49	15

Table 6

Participation Status According to Sex and Housing Status

Category	Participant		Non-Participant	
	N	%	N	%
Sex				
Males	168	91	17	9
Females	111	77	33	23
Housing Status				
On-campus	173	94	11	6
Off-campus	109	75	36	25

Table 7

Reasons for Non-Participation

Reason	N	%
No interest	12	24
Uninformed	18	37
Other activities	28	57
Lack skills	8	16
Job/Schoolwork	36	73
Facility space	0	0
Handicap	0	0
Unable to gather group	2	4
Facility location	4	8
Uneasy with other sex	1	2
Other	7	14

Publicity

Table 8

Publicity Sources Used and Initial Source Used by Students

Source	Have used		Initial source	
	N	%	N	%
Flyers	208	74	28	10
P. E. Center signs	149	53	4	1
Campus Rec Office	63	23	0	0
Summer orientation	32	11	22	8
UNI Catalog	58	21	16	6
Faculty	63	23	10	4
Friends	254	91	106	38
Intramural manager	103	37	55	20
CRIS line	43	15	66	24
Hardee's section of the student newspaper	211	75	66	24
Other	14	5	0	0

Activities

Table 9

Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Men's and Women's
Activities and Co-Rec Activities

Activity	Men's & Women's				Co-Rec			
	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Flag football	91	86	15	14				
Softball	128	95	7	5	59	98	1	2
Volleyball	124	95	6	5	58	97	2	3
Basketball	125	95	7	5	29	85	5	15
3 on 3 Basketball	49	89	6	11				
Basketball tournament	49	87	7	13				
Bowling	20	77	6	23	11	92	1	8
Turkey Trot	21	75	7	25				
Tennis	21	78	6	22	9	100	0	0
Table Tennis	11	69	5	31	5	100	0	0
Racquetball	24	80	5	20	11	92	1	8
Badminton	18	78	5	22	6	100	0	0
1 on 1 Basketball	16	84	3	16				
Free Throws	30	94	2	6				

Table 9, Continued

Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Men's and Women's
Activities and Co-Rec Activities

Activity	Men's & Women's				Co-Rec			
	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Golf	35	92	3	8				
Pass & Kick	14	78	4	22				
Swimming	26	81	6	19				
Wrestling	31	94	2	6				
Indoor Track	40	93	3	7				
Outdoor Track	22	85	4	15				
Fitness Trail	34	94	2	6				
Fall Softball								
Tournament					29	94	2	6
Spring Softball								
Tournament					31	94	2	6
Volleyball								
Tournament					16	94	1	6
Total	925	89	111	11	265	95	15	5

Facilities

Table 10

Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Facility TimeAvailable and Space Available

Facility	Time				Space			
	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pools	99	61	62	39	102	72	40	28
Indoor racquetball	41	44	52	56	23	26	66	74
Outdoor racquetball	70	86	11	14	64	86	10	14
Open Rec--P.E. Center	136	76	43	24	111	74	39	26
Open Rec--West Gym	82	73	30	27	72	72	28	28
UNI-Dome jogging	105	71	42	29	121	92	11	8
Tennis courts	106	92	9	8	93	87	14	13
UNI Golf course	122	98	3	2	105	95	5	5
Skating pond	32	78	9	22	33	80	8	20
Fitness trail	58	97	2	3	51	93	4	7
Weightroom	98	67	49	33	84	68	40	32
Outdoor playfield	86	98	2	2	81	96	3	4
Sauna	77	88	11	12	67	83	14	17
Totals	1112	77	325	23	1007	78	282	22

Expansion and Policies

Table 11

Student Preference of Times for Expansion

Time	N	%
Mon.---Thu., 10 p. m.---12 p. m.	87	31
Fri., 1 p. m.---6 p. m.	125	45
Fri., after 6 p. m.	75	27
Weekend, 8 a. m.---noon	85	30
Weekend, 1 p. m.---6 p. m.	147	53
Weekend, after 6 p. m.	66	24

Table 12

Degree of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Intramural Policies

Item	Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	N	%	N	%
Number of contests	161	80	40	20
Number and variety of activities	196	89	24	11
Number of playoff qualifiers	150	78	43	22
Skill level competition	177	82	39	18
Totals	684	82	146	18

Table 13

Student Responses to Intramural Policy Items

Item	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
All-sports championship affects participation	85	34	163	66
T-shirts for champs affects participation	144	55	120	45
Add new activities	69	29	168	71

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Students provided information for program evaluation which may be used by the Division of Campus Recreation in program planning. Results from each section of the survey are discussed in this chapter.

Results from the general information portion of the survey indicated sample distribution (see Tables 2 and 3). A generally equal balance of males and females, class levels, and on-campus and off-campus students was acquired. It was assumed that the general attitudes expressed on the survey were representative of the entire student body, especially campus recreation participants.

Students ranked factors which would contribute most to an increase in student participation in campus recreation activities. Students felt that to increase publicity efforts within the program was the best way to increase student participation in campus recreation. Complete results of the rankings are in Table 4.

Non-participants gave reasons for not participating in campus recreation activities, then were instructed to stop at that point in the survey. Eighty-five percent of the students surveyed indicated that they participated in at least one campus recreation activity offered at UNI (see Table 5). This figure was probably higher than the actual percentage of UNI students surveyed in recreation activities. This is because students surveyed in recreation classes may be more inclined than others to be active in recreational sports.

A slightly higher percentage of students participated in open

recreation activities (75%) than in intramural activities (67%). More males were participants than females, and on-campus students participated more than off-campus students (see Table 6). The main reasons for non-participation were that commitment to job or schoolwork took up time (73%) and that involvement in other types of leisure activities conflicted with campus recreation activities (57%). See Table 7 for reasons for non-participation.

The most popular publicity sources were conversing with friends (91%), Hardee's Campus Recreation section of the student newspaper (75%), and flyers posted throughout the campus (74%). Over 72% of the student participants read the Hardee's section regularly.

Sources which were the first contact that students had pertaining to campus recreation opportunities were usually conversing with friends (38%), Hardee's section of the student newspaper (24%), and intramural manager (20%). Publicity sources used are found in Table 8.

Most students (65%) felt adequately informed of campus recreation opportunities. There was virtually no difference between opinions of on-campus and off-campus students. Sixty-six percent of the on-campus students felt adequately informed, compared to 64% of the off-campus students. Yet, over one-third of all students surveyed thought that they were not well informed.

The rate of student satisfaction for all intramural activities was 90%. The percentage of satisfied participants for all men's and women's activities was 89%. Football had the highest percentage of dissatisfaction (14%) among the most popular sports, which were

football, basketball, volleyball, and softball. Co-recreational activities had an average of 95% satisfied. Table 9 contains results of activity ratings.

Overall, 77% were satisfied with the time available for use of facilities, and 78% were satisfied with the space of facilities. Students were least satisfied with the indoor racquetball courts. Forty-four percent were satisfied with the time available for racquetball, and 26% with the amount of space available for racquetball. Other facilities which were relatively low in degree of satisfaction of time and space available were the indoor swimming pools and the weightroom in the P. E. Center. All other facilities had over a 70% satisfaction rate in time and space available. Refer to Table 10 for facility information.

Participants indicated time preferences if intramural program expansion is needed on question 18 (Table 11). Most participants preferred weekends between 1 p. m. and 6 p. m. (52%) and Fridays at the same time interval (45%). Thirty-one percent expressed willingness to participate between 10 p. m. and 12 p. m. on weeknights, if necessary. Administrators can take student preferences into consideration if the decision to expand is made.

A total of 82% of the students were satisfied with intramural policies. A majority of students were satisfied with: the number of contests in intramural league play (80%), the number and variety of events offered (89%), and the number of playoff qualifiers in league play (78%). Eighty-two percent felt that separate skill level

competition should continue in basketball and volleyball leagues.

The use of award systems as a motivator for participation in intramurals was examined. Sixty-six percent indicated that the possibility of winning the UNI All-Sports Championship was no factor in student participation. Thirty-four percent stated that this is a reason for their participation. A total of 54% believed that awarding t-shirts to intramural champions is a factor in their participation. Tables 12 and 13 provide complete results concerning policies.

Students were asked if new activities should be added to the current intramural program and were given the chance to write in new activities desired. This was to help staff in meeting student needs. A wide variety of suggestions were made, but there was no activity mentioned more than four times. Soccer, spring softball, rugby, baseball, and broomball were mentioned most frequently. Seventy-one percent of the students were satisfied with the variety of intramural activities available. Student suggestions for new activities are presented in Appendix B.

An opportunity for the students to make general comments about the Division of Campus Recreation was given at the end of the survey. Comments from students were many. Mentioned most often were the lack of indoor racquetball courts available. Other common complaints were: the influx of unauthorized persons who crowd basketball courts due to poor checking of student identification, the need for time extensions for participation in the swimming pools and weightroom, and the need

for more intramural opportunities for older and married students.

Appendix C contains all student comments.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine student satisfaction with the campus recreation program and to determine student recreational needs at UNI. Information may be used to make any needed adjustments in programming.

Related literature supported the need for regular program evaluation, although few program evaluation studies were present in the literature. Studies reviewed in the literature were similar to this study.

Information pertaining to student satisfaction with the campus recreation program and to student recreational needs was obtained by the use of a researcher-developed survey. A total of 329 students were surveyed in selected classes. Findings showed that a majority of students were satisfied with aspects of the campus recreation program. Ninety percent of the students were satisfied with intramural activities. Seventy-eight percent were satisfied with space and time access to facilities. Most students were satisfied with publicity (65%) and policies (82%).

Students felt that the best way to increase student participation was to increase publicity efforts. Publicity sources used most by students were friends, Hardee's section of the school newspaper, and flyers.

Times that students were willing to participate in case of

intramural program expansion were Fridays and weekends between 1 p. m. and 6 p. m. Seventy-one percent felt that no new campus recreation activities were needed. Soccer, spring softball, rugby, baseball, and broomball were suggested most frequently as possible additions to the intramural program.

Students most often expressed needs for more: indoor racquetball courts, control of unauthorized persons using recreation facilities, opportunities to use swimming pools and the weightroom and opportunities for older and married students to participate in intramurals.

As a result of this study, campus recreation administrators at UNI can take student information and opinions into consideration in program planning. The program administrators may also be more aware of the status of the campus recreation program and of how well student needs are met by the program.

Conclusions

Based on the purpose and results of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. A majority of students indicated satisfaction with aspects of the campus recreation program. Most students were satisfied with campus recreation activities (90%), facilities (78%), publicity (65%), and policies (82%).

2. Most frequently mentioned student recreational needs were: addition of indoor racquetball courts, control of unauthorized persons who crowd facilities, increase of opportunities to use swimming pools

and weightroom, and increase of opportunities for older and married students to participate in intramurals.

3. Most students (71%) indicated no need for new activities to be added to the intramural program.

4. Most frequent suggestions for new intramural activities were soccer, spring softball, rugby, baseball, and broomball.

5. Most frequently used campus recreation publicity sources were friends, school newspaper, and flyers.

6. Most students indicated that an increase of publicity would contribute most to the increase of student participation in campus recreation activities.

7. Regular program evaluation is necessary for the continued development and success of a program.

Recommendations

Based on results and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. To increase the number of indoor racquetball courts.
2. To prevent unauthorized persons from using campus recreation facilities.
3. To increase publicity of campus recreation activities.
4. To experiment with different intramural activities and extended times for open recreation.
5. To consider student information and opinions in program planning.
6. To conduct campus recreation program evaluation regularly.

References

- Cook, S. (1977). Factors affecting the success of women's intramural-recreation programs at selected universities. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Foster, M., Sedlacek, W., & Hardwick, M. (1977). Student Recreation: A comparison of commuter and residence students (Rep. No. 4-77). College Park: University of Maryland, Counseling Center.
- Hammitt, S. A., & Hammitt, W. E. (1978). Campus recreation users: Their preferences and administrative priorities. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Hanson, G. R. (Ed.). (1978). Evaluating Program Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lass, L., & Dittmer, J. (1981). University recreation services evaluation. Ames: Iowa State University, University Recreation Services.
- Maas, G. (1977). Survey of intramural programs in Iowa high schools. Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association. New York: NIRSA.
- Maclean, A. D. (1963). The women's intramural program at the University of British Columbia: An evaluation. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Office for Student Development. (1981). Recreation survey. Columbia: University of Missouri-Columbia, Office for Student Development.
- Scott, E. G. (1953). An evaluation of intramural sports for men in liberal arts colleges in terms of selected criteria. Unpublished

- doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Skola, S. (1978). An assessment of intramural participation and intramural information sources at the University of Iowa.
Unpublished master's thesis, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Slavson, S. R. (1946). Recreation and the Total Personality.
New York: Associated Press.
- Spangler, D. A. (1954). A survey of the problem of participation in the women's intramural program at the University of North Carolina.
Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Stevenson, M. J. Reznik, J. N., & Zuercher, S. M. (1979).
Development of a model for a recreational sports user indicator survey in recreational sports programming. Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. Corvallis, Oregon: Benton Printers.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision-making. Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock.
- Tyler, C. (1981). Intramural Directors Guide to Program Evaluation.
West Point, N. Y.: Leisure Press.
- Zuercher, S. M., Sedlacek, W. E., & Masters, M. D. (1980). University student participation and perception of intramural program activities. (Rep. No. 11-80). College Park: University of Maryland, Counseling Center.

Appendix A

CAMPUS RECREATION - STUDENT SURVEY

Spring 1984

The information you provide in this survey will be most helpful in evaluating current Campus Recreation services and in making any needed adjustments in future programming.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Sex
<input type="checkbox"/> male
<input type="checkbox"/> female | 2. Age
<input type="checkbox"/> 17-20
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-24
<input type="checkbox"/> 25 or more | 3. Class
<input type="checkbox"/> freshman
<input type="checkbox"/> sophomore
<input type="checkbox"/> junior
<input type="checkbox"/> senior
<input type="checkbox"/> graduate
<input type="checkbox"/> other | 4. Major
<input type="checkbox"/> Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Business
<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Sciences & Math
<input type="checkbox"/> Social Sciences
<input type="checkbox"/> Humanities & Fine Arts
<input type="checkbox"/> Undeclared
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| 5. Current credit hours
<input type="checkbox"/> less than 4
<input type="checkbox"/> 4-6
<input type="checkbox"/> 7-11
<input type="checkbox"/> 12 or more | 6. Current living arrangement
<input type="checkbox"/> university housing
<input type="checkbox"/> fraternity or sorority
<input type="checkbox"/> rent house or apartment
<input type="checkbox"/> with parents or relatives
<input type="checkbox"/> other: _____ | 7. Member of Greek system
<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | |

9. Rank in order of importance the factors that would increase student participation within the Division of Campus Recreation. Rank from most important (1), to least important (5).

- Construct a recreational sports/wellness center.
 Better utilization of present facilities.
 Add new staff.
 Increase promotional efforts in present program.
 Increase program offerings.

*NON-PARTICIPANTS

- | | |
|---|---|
| 10. Check all activities you have participated in at UNI.
<input type="checkbox"/> intramurals
<input type="checkbox"/> open recreation (weightroom, swimming, sauna, basketball, racquetball, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> sports clubs
<input type="checkbox"/> non-participant*
Non-participants answer question 11, then stop and return survey to individual who gave it to you or Room 183, P.E. Center.
**Participants skip 11 and continue with survey. | 11. Check all reasons for non-participation.
<input type="checkbox"/> Not interested.
<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know what is available.
<input type="checkbox"/> Conflicts with personal leisure activity.
<input type="checkbox"/> Lack skills to participate.
<input type="checkbox"/> Job and/or schoolwork takes up time.
<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of space in facilities.
<input type="checkbox"/> Handicap or disability.
<input type="checkbox"/> Can't gather a group to play.
<input type="checkbox"/> Facilities inconveniently located
<input type="checkbox"/> Uneasy participating with opposite sex.
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|---|---|

**PARTICIPANTS

12. Check all sources of information which have made you aware of recreation and intramural opportunities at UNI.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Flyers around campus
<input type="checkbox"/> Signs in P.E. Center
<input type="checkbox"/> Campus Recreation Office
<input type="checkbox"/> Summer orientation
<input type="checkbox"/> UNI catalog
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty or staff at UNI | <input type="checkbox"/> Conversing with friends
<input type="checkbox"/> Intramural manager
<input type="checkbox"/> Recorded phone message (CRIS Line)
<input type="checkbox"/> Hardees Campus Recreation section of the Northern Iowan.
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|--|--|

13. Using the list above, write in the source of information which first made you aware of recreation and intramural opportunities at UNI: _____

14. Do you read the Hardees Campus Recreation section of the Northern Iowan regularly?
 yes no

15. Do you feel adequately informed of recreation and intramural opportunities at UNI?
 yes no

16. Circle your degree of satisfaction with the following intramural activities.

MENS AND WOMENS ACTIVITIES

- Satisfied
 ↓ Dissatisfied
 ↓↓ Didn't participate
 S D N Flag Football
 S D N Softball
 S D N Volleyball
 S D N Basketball
 S D N 3 on 3 Basketball
 S D N Basketball Tournament
 S D N Bowling
 S D N Turkey Trot
 S D N Tennis Singles or Doubles
 S D N Table Tennis Singles or Doubles
 S D N Racquetball Singles or Doubles
 S D N Badminton Singles or Doubles
 S D N 1 on 1 Basketball
 S D N Free Throw Contest
 S D N Golf
 S D N Pass & Kick Contest
 S D N Swimming Meet
 S D N Wrestling Meet
 S D N Indoor Track Meet
 S D N Outdoor Track Meet
 S D N Fitness Trail Run

CO-REC ACTIVITIES

- S D N Softball
 S D N Volleyball
 S D N Basketball
 S D N Bowling
 S D N Fall Softball Tournament
 S D N Spring Softball Tournament
 S D N Volleyball Tournament
 S D N Tennis Doubles
 S D N Table Tennis Doubles
 S D N Racquetball Doubles
 S D N Badminton Doubles

17. Circle your degree of satisfaction with time available and space for the following recreational facilities.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| TIME | SPACE |
| Satisfied | Satisfied |
| ↓ Dissatisfied | ↓ Dissatisfied |
| ↓↓ Haven't used | ↓↓ Haven't Used |
| S D N Swimming pools | S D N |
| S D N Indoor racquetball courts | S D N |
| S D N Outdoor racquetball courts | S D N |
| S D N Open rec at PE Center | S D N |
| S D N Open rec at West Gym | S D N |
| S D N UNI-Dome jogging | S D N |
| S D N Tennis courts | S D N |
| S D N UNI Golf course | S D N |
| S D N Ice skating pond | S D N |
| S D N Fitness trail | S D N |
| S D N Weightroom | S D N |
| S D N Outdoor playfield area | S D N |
| S D N Sauna | S D N |

18. Check all times you are willing to participate in intramural events if program expansion were necessary.

- | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| MONDAY THRU THURSDAY | FRIDAY | WEEKEND |
| ___ 10 PM - 12 PM | ___ 1 PM - 6 PM | ___ 8 AM - NOON |
| | ___ after 6 PM | ___ 1 PM - 6 PM |
| | | ___ after 6 PM |

19. Circle appropriate response concerning UNI Intramurals.

- Too many
 ↓ Adequate
 ↓↓ Too few
 ↓ No opinion
 M A F N Number of contests in league play.
 M A F N Number and variety of events offered.
 M A F N Number of playoff qualifiers in league play.
 YES NO Separate skill competition in basketball & volleyball should continue.
 YES NO The UNI-All Sports championship is a factor in your participation.
 YES NO The awarding of T-shirts to intramural champions is a factor in your participation.
 YES NO New activities should be added to the current intramural program.
 If yes, specify _____

COMMENTS:

Appendix B

Student Suggestions for New Activities

New activities suggested by students are as follows, with the number of times mentioned in parentheses if suggested more than once:

Coed volleyball (men can spike)	Hiking
Spring volleyball	Chess
Freestyle frisbee	Aerobics
Frisbee golf	More swimming meets
Soccer (4)	More coed sports
Spring softball (4)	More women sports
Rugby (2)	More special events
Baseball (2)	Hockey sack tourney
Field Hockey	Fun game festival
Arm wrestling	Snow skiing
Javelin throw	Archery
Running	
Cross country	
Boxing	
Bicycling	
Mud volleyball	
Superstars contest	
Rowing	
Parachuting	
Hang gliding	
Water skiing	

Appendix C

General Comments of Students

Comments made by students in regard to the Division of Campus Recreation are as follows:

Need more times available in day to run inside when the weather is bad.

Weightroom needs more free weights and a bigger area for lifting. UNI has a Division I football team and a Division III or high school weightroom.

Open rec and weightroom are hardly open. When they are, we have classes. Open them every night.

I feel that UNI's intramural program is very adequate but some of the other open recreation facilities such as the West Gym and racquetball courts could use some improvements in space and time allotted.

For a college the size of UNI, some regulation size racquetball courts would be in order. I would bet 8 to 10 racquetball courts would be used fulltime.

I feel a university of this caliber could at least have legitimate indoor racquetball courts. Two indoor courts aren't really able to handle the amount of needed time.

I think we need more indoor racquetball courts and we need some that are regulation size.

Need more indoor racquetball courts, more open times for jogging in Dome.

UNI racquetball facilities are substantial compared with other colleges and there is enough interest to validate new facilities.

Better indoor racquetball courts.

Construct new racquetball courts.

I think the swimming pools should open at 6 p. m. rather than 7 p. m.

I was very disappointed to find the pools closed so often throughout the semester, and can't use the pools during the summer unless I'm registered even though I live here.

Need new regulation size 6-8 lane pool. Wrong size.

One of the problems with the swimming pools (especially West Gym) is the divers. People doing laps don't like to get jumped on!

Why don't they check I. D.'s so that the east side of Waterloo doesn't use court space? They don't pay tuition and should not be allowed to participate.

I think there should possibly be a better system for checking I. D.'s. A lot of non-students are taking advantage of the facilities.

I think our recreation program is outstanding. The only negative thing I can think of is too many non-students cause over-crowding in open recreation basketball.

The PEC and West Gym should be open longer on weekends. A lot of people like to play basketball on weekend nights.

Put hoops back up at Price Lab School.

I think the overall intramural championship should be stressed more. All members of the champion team (overall) should receive a

t-shirt and house of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd get a trophy.

Award t-shirts to all champions, regardless of which league they are in.

Award t-shirts for B league and UNI coats for A league -- mainly involving basketball.

Need something for off-campus older students.

Activities don't seem available to older off-campus and married students -- would be used if they were available.

If you are off-campus and don't read the Northern Iowan, no way to find out when events occur.

It is tough to know when things aren't open as usual because of other university conflicts.

Ice skating pond was scooped in December but no one scooped it in January or February. I saw many skating in December when it was scooped.

Scoop pond in winter.

Change in location of the sauna was a good move. Somehow should get all students more knowledgeable about how the total intramural program works -- points, champs, manager responsibilities, etc.

Post times when varsity will be using the tennis courts. Separate skill levels are a necessity.

The Dome has plenty of room for jogging, but the times aren't the best, but is understandable. I wouldn't object to any new activities.

(Track). Use standard events and distances. Too many people with no lane lines.

Keep sauna open on nights of games in Dome.

Need more early time (open rec) 6:00 - 8:00.

More organization.

No help from staff in information or promotion.

Basketball referees are terrible.

More time should be allowed for getting people in shape, and be given the different skills to participate.

As a graduate assistant, I didn't have time to participate.

Can't compete in intramurals -- scholarship track athlete.