

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Plan B Papers

Student Theses & Publications

1-1-1967

The Attitudes of a Random Sample of Students at Eastern Illinois University Toward Possible Physical Facilities in Cillage Unions Including those of the Eastern Illinois University Union

Rondald Ray Robinson

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b

Recommended Citation

Robinson, Rondald Ray, "The Attitudes of a Random Sample of Students at Eastern Illinois University Toward Possible Physical Facilities in Cillage Unions Including those of the Eastern Illinois University Union" (1967). *Plan B Papers*. 540.

https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/540

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Plan B Papers by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THE ATTITUDES OF A RANDOM SAMPLE OF STUDENTS AT
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY TOWARD POSSIBLE
PHYSICAL FACILITIES IN COLLEGE UNIONS INCLUDING
THOSE OF THE EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY UNION

(TITLE)

BY

Ronald Ray Robinson
B.S. in Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1964

PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION
AND PREPARED IN COURSE

Education 560

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1967

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS PLAN B PAPER BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE DEGREE, M.S. IN ED.

31 July 67
DATE

ADVISER

July 31, 1967
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Curtis Garner and Dr. Paul Overton for their interest and support. They were always available for assistance regardless of how minor the problem.

Mr. L. H. Horton, Jr., Director of the University Union at Western Illinois University, contributed timely suggestions and provided needed material. His interest and comments while the study progressed provided welcome encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	1
Methods of Procedure	2
Development of Questionnaire	2
Definition of Terms	3
Selection of Sample	3
Limitations	4
II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	5
Eastern Illinois University	8
III. RESULTS OF STUDY	10
Analysis of Returned Questionnaires	10
Analysis of Table 1	10
Analysis of Table 2	12
Analysis of Table 3	12
Analysis of Table 4	16
Analysis of Table 5	16
Analysis of Table 6	16
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
Conclusions	22
Recommendations	24
APPENDIX	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Comparison of Sample and Returned Questionnaires	11
2.	Response of Attitudes on Present Facilities (By Percent)	13
3.	Response of Attitudes on Facilities Not Located in the University Union (By Percent)	14
4.	Present Facilities Located in the University Union at Eastern Illinois University - Mean Value of Weighted Response	17
5.	Facilities Not Located in the University Union at Eastern Illinois University - Mean Value of Weighted Response	18
6.	Rank Order of Attitudes (By Mean Value of Weighted Response)	21

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To some, the college union is primarily a glorified fun palace and an expanded snack bar. To others, it is a necessary evil, a spawning ground for disorder on today's restless campus. But to the many people associated with its role and functions, it is a vital, moving force providing unity and warmth in the day to day life of the university community.

The writer has been fortunate in being associated with college unions in an administrative capacity for six years. Part of this association has been devoted to learning as much as possible about the nature and being of college unions. In part, this is the purpose of the study.

Purpose of Study

The importance of adequate physical facilities in college unions is paramount to any plans for a new building or the addition of new facilities to an existing structure.

The problem of physical facilities is further complicated because of the nature of college unions. Mr. Porter Butts, a recognized authority on college unions, has stated:

The 'big' money is saved in union planning by conceiving the whole building in the first place as a center capable of multi-functions and deciding to plan it and use it, where the situation is not

already irrevocably committed in terms of prior existing physical structures, not as a 'student' union but as a 'college' union--a general social-cultural-recreational center for 'all the members of the college family--students, faculty, administration, alumni, and guests', as the Association of College Unions has declared the union function to be.

This means, particularly, restraining the impulse to build large separate single-purpose buildings like conference centers, faculty clubs, and theaters.¹

The purpose of this study is to determine how students at Eastern Illinois University, one part of the college family, view the physical facilities of the University Union at Eastern Illinois University. It is also an opportunity to express their views on additional facilities that can be found in other unions.

Methods of Procedure

Development of Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed in two parts to survey student attitudes. The first part of the questionnaire (see Appendix) consisted of listing fifteen physical facilities being used in the University Union as of July 1, 1967. Each facility was to be rated by a set of five values ranging from essential to unnecessary.

The second part of the questionnaire (see Appendix) consisted of listing twenty-five physical facilities that may be found in other college unions, but not presently located in the University Union at Eastern Illinois University. Each facility was to be rated by a set of five values ranging from essential to unnecessary.

¹Association of College Unions-International, Planning College Union Facilities for Multiple-Use, A study developed and published by the Association of College Unions-International (Menasha, Wisconsin: Earl Litho Printing Co., 1966), p. 19.

The personal data were requested on the covering letter sent with the questionnaire (see Appendix). The letter included residence (on-campus, off-campus, commuter) and marital status (single, married).

Definition of Terms

On-Campus Students: Those students residing in University dormitories.

Off-Campus Students: Those students living off campus but within the city limits of Charleston, Illinois. This included students residing in married student apartments at Eastern Illinois University.

Commuter Students: Those students living outside the city limits of Charleston, Illinois.

Underclassmen: All freshman and sophomore students enrolled at Eastern Illinois University during summer school, 1967, as taken from the IBM list provided by the Data Processing Center.

Upperclassmen: All junior, senior, and graduate students enrolled at Eastern Illinois University during summer school, 1967, as taken from the IBM list provided by the Data Processing Center.

Selection of Sample

An IBM listing of summer school students was obtained from the Data Processing Center. This list included all students enrolled at the University during the summer quarter of 1967.

It was decided to survey approximately one hundred students from a total aggregate of 2,855 enrolled. By selecting every 26th student from the list, a sample of 110 was procured. The numbers 1 through 26 were placed on slips of paper and one of them drawn at random. Number

15 was drawn and the selection of 109 students began with number 41 on the list. This represented a random sample of 3.85 percent of the total enrollment.

A list of addresses was obtained from the Records Office at Eastern Illinois University. The questionnaires were mailed with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope enclosed.

As questionnaires were returned, responses and personal data were marked on a standardized answer sheet. IBM cards were then punched from the answer sheet. The Data Processing Center then computed and processed a tally and percentage listing. The statistics obtained provided the data for the study.

Limitations

No effort was made to define the five values so that uniformity and purpose of each could be transmitted to the participants. "Essential" to one participant may have been defined by another as something entirely different.

The random sample was taken from the total summer school enrollment for 1967. The results can be interpreted only for that aggregate.

The University Union has just begun partial operation of a new addition to the existing facility. In addition, remodeling of the original building is in progress. Judgment on such temporary facilities as the cafeteria and formal dining room may have been biased. Since the Snack Bar (Panther Lair) serves as all three facilities, judgment of its need could be biased.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Much of the American educational system is unique to our shores. But the college union* had a different origin. Research has shown that the college union originated in England at Cambridge University in 1815.

The members of three Cambridge debating societies used to gather before a debate to compare notes, and afterwards to carry on the argument--usually in a dingy back room of the Red Lion Inn, where they could have something to eat and drink (the forerunner of the snack bar found in almost every union today). But the Red Lion wasn't very satisfactory. Students needed more elbow room. They wanted club rooms and a debate hall of their own. The first union was literally the uniting of the three debating societies to establish their own quarters. Thus the name--fifty years, by the way, before there was such a thing as a labor union.¹

Gradually other facilities were added to the "union" at Cambridge. These facilities included libraries, dining rooms, lounges, and offices.

Major emphasis in the English unions was, and to some extent still is, on debate and discussion. The art of living and the education of students with the idea that they were responsible for the welfare of their country was a major goal of the Union.²

* The term "union" or "college union" will be used throughout the study. It is not unusual, however, to find them defined as: University Union, University Center, Student Center, and Student Union.

¹Porter Butts, "The College Union Story," American Institute of Architect's Journal (March, 1964), p. 59.

²Ibid.

At the turn of the century America became interested in developments that were taking place in British unions:

'If one were to name the most fundamental characteristic of these English institutions (Oxford and Cambridge),' Wisconsin's President Van Hise said at his inaugural in 1904, 'it would be the system of halls of residence and unions. The communal life of instructors and students in work, in play, and in social relations is the very essence of the spirit of Oxford and Cambridge. If Wisconsin is to do for the sons of the state what Oxford and Cambridge are doing for the sons of England, not only in producing scholars but in making men, it must have halls of residence and to these there must be added a union.'¹

In 1896 the first American facility built specifically for a Union was completed at the University of Pennsylvania. It was called Houston Hall.

By 1913 approximately eleven unions had been built in the United States.² The University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, and the University of Ohio were among the schools to build unions within this period.

In 1914 the Association of College Unions was founded at the University of Ohio Union.³ The organization has continued to function as the only national organization devoted solely to the welfare and betterment of the college union. In 1963 the word "International" was added to the national organization, since approximately thirty unions outside the United States were full members of the Association.

¹Ibid.

²Boris C. Bell, "Administration and Operation of the College Union," Association of College Unions-International (1965), p. 1.

³Chester R. Berry, Planning a College Union Building (Bureau of T.C. New York City: Columbia University, 1966), p. 3.

Since its inception the college union has developed in four fairly distinct movements:

The Debate Stage - 1815-1895. This formative stage was oriented toward the early concept that debate and the debating societies were the core of the Union.

The Club Stage - 1896-1918. After Houston Hall was opened in 1896, the concept of the Union as a club emerged. The Union's primary function was meeting the needs of the various clubs on the campus.

Campus Democracy Stage - 1919-1929. This stage of Union development emphasized the Union's role to all of the student body. The philosophy that Unions could develop as a compliment to the classroom began to be accepted.

The Community Recreation Stage - 1930-present. The concept that the Union serves the entire campus community became widespread. Emphasis on out-of-class recreation in the Union gained acceptance.¹

Today, there are more than 700 Union buildings in the United States. Currently, Union construction is going forward at the rate of 60-70 new buildings and 30-40 major additions to existing buildings a year.²

In 1956, the Association of College Unions, at its national convention, adopted a resolution which has become known as the "Role of the College Union" (see Appendix). Since that time, the membership of the Association has utilized the "Role of the College Union" as a basis for their existence on college campuses.

Point two of the resolution is as follows:

As the 'living room' or 'hearthstone' of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the

¹L. H. Horton, Jr., Planning the University Union at Western Illinois University, (Department of Student Personnel Services, Western Illinois University (Macomb, Illinois: by the author, 1963), pp. 4-5.

²Association of College Unions-International, College Unions . . . Fifty Facts, A brochure by the Association of College Unions-International, (Menasha, Wisconsin: Earl Litho Printing Co.), paragraph 5.

campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.¹

Since services, conveniences, and amenities are directly associated with the physical facilities necessary for their function, this point served as an impetus for this study.

In 1965, Mr. T. F. Mitchell, then Assistant Director of the University Union at Eastern Illinois University, indicated in his Master's thesis the following statement: "It would be beneficial to the Union's program of providing for the needs of the University to periodically survey the opinions of the students, faculty, and administration of the University and to adjust the Union's program accordingly."² This statement also provided encouragement in the formation of this study.

Eastern Illinois University

In 1957 Eastern Illinois University received permission from the Teacher's College Board of the State of Illinois to build a union. The new structure was to replace a temporary wooden building erected soon after World War II.

In November of 1958 the building was officially opened. The original structure contained approximately 45,000 square feet and was built at a cost of \$775,000.

In 1963 an \$800,000 addition was proposed and approved. A portion of the addition was opened in June of 1967. It is anticipated that the entire addition will be opened by September, 1967.

¹Frank Noffke, Planning for a College Union (Ithaca, New York: The Association of College Unions-International, 1965), inside front cover.

²T. F. Mitchell, "The Extent to Which the Union at Eastern Illinois University Meets Its Stated Objectives" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Guidance, Eastern Illinois University, 1965), p. 40.

In June of 1967, a remodeling of the original structure began. The remodeled portion of the building will open in September, 1967.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF STUDY

Analysis of Returned Questionnaires

The return of ninety completed questionnaires represents 81.8% return of the total sample and 3.15% of the total summer school enrollment. It was necessary to initiate a follow-up one week after the original mailing since only sixty questionnaires were returned as a result of the original mailing.

The return of only seven questionnaires which indicated the participant was married posed a dilemma. A meaningful comparison of married versus single participants could not be obtained. Since class standing was available and could be incorporated into the study, the participants were classified into underclassmen and upperclassmen for comparative purposes.

Analysis of Table 1

Class Standing

Thirty-seven of forty-three underclass participants returned questionnaires which increased their percentage of participation since only fifty-three of sixty-seven upperclassmen responded.

Residence

Twenty-eight of twenty-nine on-campus students responded which increased their percentage of participation by 4.6%. Off-campus and

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE AND RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

PERSONAL DATA	TOTAL SAMPLE		RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent*
Class Standing				
Underclassmen (Freshmen and Sophomores)	43	39.1	37	41.1
Upperclassmen (Juniors, Seniors, and Graduates)	67	60.9	53	58.9
Residence				
On-Campus Students	29	26.4	28	31.1
Off-Campus Students	55	50.0	44	48.9
Commuter Students	26	23.6	18	20.0

* Percentage of total returned questionnaires

commuter students responded less favorably which consequently lowered their percentage of participation.

Analysis of Table 2

The responses expressed by the participants indicated favorable attitudes on all fifteen facilities.

A mean of 80.6% indicated that the facilities were "essential" or "desirable." This ranged from 93.3% for the snack bar to 55.5% for the food service rooms.

Only 6.4% "questioned" or felt any of the fifteen facilities were "unnecessary." This ranged from 16.6% for the patio extension to 1.1% for the snack bar and the ballroom (dancing).

In every facility the total of "essential" and "desirable" percentage exceeded 50%.

Analysis of Table 3

The responses expressed by the participants indicated favorable attitudes on several facilities and unfavorable attitudes on others.

A mean of 29.4% "questioned" or felt "unnecessary" the twenty-five facilities not presently in the University Union. A high of 53.3% for an outdoor barbecue area to a low of 7.8% for bowling lanes and table tennis represented the extremes.

A mean response of 17.0% of the participants indicated "no opinion" for the total twenty-five facilities.

Of the additional facilities 81.1% felt the bowling lanes were "essential" or "desirable." The bookstore ranked next at 78.9%.

A mean response of 53.6% felt that the total additional facilities were "essential" or "desirable."

TABLE 2

RESPONSE OF ATTITUDES ON PRESENT FACILITIES (BY PERCENT)*

FACILITY	Essential	Desirable	No Opinion	Questionable	Unnecessary
1. Snack Shop	73.3	20.0	5.6	1.1	0.0
2. Cafeteria	55.6	27.8	11.1	4.4	1.1
3. Food Service Rooms	24.4	31.1	36.7	3.3	4.5
4. Ballroom (banquets)	47.8	37.8	11.1	2.2	1.1
5. Patio Extension	15.6	55.6	12.2	12.2	4.4
6. Billiard Room	24.4	44.4	26.7	3.3	1.2
7. Games Area	28.9	46.7	17.8	5.5	1.1
8. Lounge	60.0	30.0	6.7	2.2	1.1
9. Ballroom (dancing)	45.6	44.4	8.9	1.1	0.0
10. Television Room	23.3	53.3	7.8	11.1	4.5
11. Meeting Rooms	40.0	47.8	7.8	3.3	1.1
12. Lobby Shop Desk	51.1	36.7	7.8	4.4	0.0
13. Cloak Rooms	48.9	36.7	6.7	6.7	1.0
14. Bulletin Boards	54.4	33.3	5.6	5.6	1.1
15. Ticket Office Area	33.3	36.7	22.2	3.3	4.5
Mean Percentage Per Value	41.8	38.8	13.0	4.6	1.8

* Total Returned Questionnaires 90

TABLE 3

RESPONSE OF ATTITUDES ON FACILITIES (BY PERCENT)
NOT LOCATED IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION*

FACILITY	Essential	Desirable	No Opinion	Questionable	Unnecessary
1. Canteen or Vending	16.7	51.1	8.9	12.2	11.1
2. Outdoor Barbecue Area	5.6	24.4	16.7	25.5	27.8
3. Formal Dining Room	13.3	31.1	17.8	23.3	14.5
4. Faculty Dining-Lounge	12.2	30.0	32.2	12.2	13.4
5. Nightclub Room	18.9	44.4	10.0	11.1	15.6
6. Fireplace Lounge	16.7	51.1	7.8	15.5	8.9
7. Browsing Library	27.8	43.3	6.7	13.3	8.9
8. Alumni Office-Lounge	6.6	27.8	27.8	27.8	20.0
9. Radio Facilities	10.0	30.0	31.1	16.7	12.2
10. Organizational Offices	28.9	32.2	20.0	14.4	4.5
11. Bowling Lanes	16.7	64.4	11.1	6.7	1.1
12. Table Tennis	12.2	68.9	11.1	5.6	2.2
13. Outing Facilities	7.8	44.5	2.2	14.4	11.1
14. Swimming Pool	14.4	40.0	10.0	11.1	24.4
15. Auditorium	31.1	38.9	7.8	7.8	14.4
16. Listening Rooms	12.2	43.3	13.3	14.5	16.7
17. Post Office	22.2	36.7	14.4	11.1	15.6
18. Guest Rooms	18.9	41.1	12.2	13.3	14.5

TABLE 3--Continued

FACILITY	Essential	Desirable	No Opinion	Questionable	Unnecessary
19. Work Room	6.7	35.6	24.4	15.5	17.8
20. Darkroom Facilities	3.3	2.2	28.9	20.0	25.6
21. Barber Shop	6.7	22.2	21.1	17.8	32.2
22. Commuter Facilities	11.1	28.9	32.2	16.7	11.1
23. Art Gallery	12.2	35.6	20.0	11.1	21.1
24. Craft Shop	4.4	32.2	24.5	17.8	21.1
25. Bookstore	37.8	41.1	7.8	4.4	8.9
Mean Percentage Per Value	15.0	38.6	17.0	14.4	15.0

* Total Returned Questionnaires 90

Analysis of Table 4

The mean value for each category of personal data and per facility was computed to compare residence and class standing. In addition, a mean value per facility would provide a method of ranking the facilities.

A mean response of 4.12 was expressed by the participants. A mean of 4.66 for the snack bar to 3.66 for the patio extension and 3.68 for the food service rooms represented the extremes.

The mean for commuting students on all facilities represented the lowest degree of approval at 3.99. Upperclassmen represented the highest degree of approval at 4.20.

A mean of 4.12 for all categories of personal data indicated a high degree of approval for the present facilities.

Analysis of Table 5

A mean response of 3.27 was expressed by the participants. A mean of 3.94 for the bookstore to 2.53 for the barber shop and 2.54 for the outdoor barbecue areas represented the extremes.

The mean for upperclassmen represented the lowest degree of approval at 3.14. Underclassmen represented the highest degree of approval at 3.39. The mean for commuting students was 3.38 or .01 less than that of the lowerclassmen.

A mean response of 3.27 for all categories of personal data was .85 less than the mean response of the present facilities.

Analysis of Table 6

A ranking of the facilities by mean response was constructed to indicate the levels of approval for both parts of the questionnaire.

TABLE 4

PRESENT FACILITIES LOCATED IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION
AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
MEAN VALUE OF WEIGHTED RESPONSE*

FACILITY	On-Campus	Off-Campus	Commuter	Underclassmen	Upperclassmen	Mean
1. Snack Shop	4.79	4.68	4.39	4.54	4.74	4.66
2. Cafeteria	4.29	4.34	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.32
3. Food Service Rooms	3.21	3.91	3.83	3.62	3.72	3.68
4. Ballroom (banquets)	4.39	4.39	3.89	4.27	4.30	4.29
5. Patio Extension	3.46	3.73	3.78	3.51	3.75	3.66
6. Billiard Room	4.18	3.84	3.50	3.92	3.85	3.88
7. Games Area	4.11	4.00	3.67	3.84	4.06	3.97
8. Lounge	4.50	4.43	4.44	4.54	4.40	4.46
9. Ballroom (dancing)	4.39	4.45	4.00	4.27	4.40	4.34
10. Television Room	3.64	3.86	3.89	3.76	3.83	3.80
11. Meeting Rooms	4.18	4.34	4.00	4.22	4.23	4.22
12. Lobby Shop Desk	4.46	4.36	4.11	4.27	4.40	4.34
13. Cloak Rooms	4.43	4.16	4.22	3.92	4.49	4.26
14. Bulletin Boards	4.57	4.30	4.11	4.19	4.45	4.34
15. Ticket Office Area	3.96	3.95	3.72	3.57	4.15	3.91
Mean	4.17	4.18	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.12

* Essential 5.0
Desirable 4.0
No Opinion 3.0
Questionable 2.0
Unnecessary 1.0

TABLE 5

FACILITIES NOT LOCATED IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION
 AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
 MEAN VALUE OF WEIGHTED RESPONSE*

FACILITY	On-Campus	Off-Campus	Commuter	Underclassmen	Upperclassmen	Mean
1. Canteen or Vending	3.54	3.45	3.56	3.54	3.47	3.50
2. Outdoor Barbecue Area	2.61	2.45	2.67	2.57	2.53	2.54
3. Formal Dining Room	3.14	3.07	2.89	2.81	3.23	3.06
4. Faculty Dining-Lounge	3.25	3.14	3.06	3.30	3.06	3.16
5. Nightclub Room	3.61	3.32	3.28	3.68	3.21	3.40
6. Fireplace Lounge	3.61	3.36	3.72	3.78	3.32	3.51
7. Browsing Library	3.43	3.70	4.00	3.89	3.53	3.68
8. Alumni Office-Lounge	2.61	2.84	3.17	2.73	2.91	2.83
9. Radio Facilities	2.96	3.11	3.22	3.05	3.11	3.09
10. Organizational Offices	3.39	3.68	4.06	3.78	3.58	3.67
11. Bowling Lanes	4.14	3.80	3.56	3.92	3.81	3.86
12. Table Tennis	3.96	3.77	3.78	3.89	3.79	3.83
13. Outing Facilities	2.89	3.32	3.56	3.35	3.15	3.23
14. Swimming Pool	3.04	2.98	3.44	3.68	2.68	3.09
15. Auditorium	3.93	3.39	3.83	4.19	3.26	3.64
16. Listening Rooms	3.18	3.11	3.44	3.49	3.00	3.20
17. Post Office	3.36	3.41	3.39	3.68	3.19	3.39
18. Guest Rooms	3.57	3.25	3.33	3.54	3.25	3.37

TABLE 5--Continued

FACILITY	On-Campus	Off-Campus	Commuter	Underclassmen	Upperclassmen	Mean
19. Work Room	2.96	3.00	2.94	3.00	2.96	2.98
20. Darkroom Facilities	2.43	2.61	2.72	2.73	2.47	2.58
21. Barber Shop	2.39	2.52	2.78	2.78	2.36	2.53
22. Commuter Facilities	3.21	2.89	3.56	3.24	3.04	3.12
23. Art Gallery	2.79	3.14	3.33	3.24	2.94	3.07
24. Craft Shop	2.71	2.82	2.94	2.89	2.75	2.81
25. Bookstore	3.93	3.82	4.28	4.00	3.91	3.94
Mean	3.23	3.20	3.38	3.39	3.14	3.27

* Essential 5.0
 Desirable 4.0
 No Opinion 3.0
 Questionable 2.0
 Unnecessary 1.0

Of the fifteen facilities in the University Union, nine received a mean response of 4.0 or higher. These represented a wide divergence of functions.

None of the additional facilities received a mean response of 4.0 or higher. Five of the facilities did receive a response higher than the lowest response of the present facilities. Sixteen facilities ranked within the range of "no opinion." Two facilities ranked within the range of "questionable."

TABLE 6

RANK ORDER OF ATTITUDES
(BY MEAN VALUE OF WEIGHTED RESPONSE*)

PRESENT FACILITIES		FACILITIES NOT PRESENTLY LOCATED IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION	
1. Snack Shop	4.66	1. Bookstore	3.94
2. Lounge	4.46	2. Bowling Lanes	3.86
3. Ballroom (dancing)	4.34	3. Table Tennis	3.83
4. Lobby Shop Desk	4.34	4. Browsing Library	3.68
5. Bulletin Boards	4.34	5. Organizational Offices	3.67
6. Cafeteria	4.32	6. Auditorium	3.64
7. Ballroom (banquets)	4.29	7. Fireplace Lounge	3.51
8. Cloak Rooms	4.26	8. Canteen or Vending	3.50
9. Meeting Rooms	4.22	9. Nightclub Room	3.40
10. Games Area	3.97	10. Post Office	3.39
11. Ticket Office Area	3.91	11. Guest Rooms	3.37
12. Billiard Room	3.88	12. Outing Facilities	3.23
13. Television Room	3.80	13. Listening Rooms	3.20
14. Food Service Rooms	3.68	14. Faculty Dining-Lounge	3.16
15. Patio Extension	3.66	15. Commuter Facilities	3.12
		16. Radio Facilities	3.09
		17. Swimming Pool	3.09
		18. Art Gallery	3.07
		19. Formal Dining Room	3.06
		20. Work Room Facilities	2.98
		21. Alumni Office	2.83
		22. Craft Shop	2.81
		23. Darkroom Facilities	2.58
		24. Outdoor Barbecue Area	2.54
		25. Barber Shop	2.53
* Essential	5.0		
Desirable	4.0		
No Opinion	3.0		
Questionable	2.0		
Unnecessary	1.0		

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The results of the study indicate that the participants highly approve the existing facilities of the University Union.

None of the existing facilities was rated unfavorably although moderate disapproval of the patio extension and television room was noted.

In judging the present facilities, the participants have had the opportunity to judge the facilities as they exist in the present building (see Table 2). This factor may have influenced judgment. If so, the participants have given approval to the facilities as they exist.

The attitudes of the participants in reference to the additional facilities were less favorable (see Table 3). Although the mean for all additional facilities was .27 less than the present facilities (for the value of "desirable"), only 15% responded that they were "essential" (compared to 41.8% for present facilities).

The mean value of weighted response difference between the present facilities and the additional facilities was .85. Since the participants have not observed these facilities nor seen them in operation, this factor may have influenced their judgment. The comparatively high degree of "no opinion" (17.0%) is an indication of this judgment (see Table 3).

Residence

The results of the study indicate little difference between on-campus and off-campus student attitudes concerning the existing facilities (see Table 4). The commuting students did respond less favorably in comparison with the other two categories. This response may indicate a lack of use of the present facilities. The commuting student is rarely on campus during the evening and weekend hours.

The commuting student's attitude on the additional facilities was higher than that of on-campus or off-campus students (see Table 5). Little difference in attitude on the additional facilities was noted by on-campus and off-campus students.

The attitudes of the on-campus and off-campus students were similar for both the existing and the additional facilities.

Class Standing

The upperclassmen's attitude on the existing facilities was higher than that of the underclassmen (see Table 4). However, on the additional facilities, the upperclassmen rated the facilities less favorably than the underclassmen (see Table 5).

It is important to note that the upperclassmen who have attended Eastern Illinois University for a longer period have approved the existing facilities but are less enthusiastic in their attitude toward the additional facilities. The underclassmen who have attended Eastern Illinois University for a shorter period are less enthusiastic with the present facilities and more positive in their attitude toward the additional facilities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of this study:

1. Further investigation into the needs of the commuting student is necessary. The commuting student is a vital part of the University and can take an active part in the functions of the University Union.
2. In the fall of 1967, the University Union will become totally operable after a period of expansion and remodeling. It is recommended that a more comprehensive study be made sometime after this date. This study should include both students, academic faculty, and administrators. The study could provide valuable information in helping the University Union to meet the needs of the university community.
3. It is recommended that a "frequency of use" study combined with personal habit patterns (amount of money spent in the University Union, amount of time spent in the University Union, location of leisure time activities) would provide additional insights into the needs of the university community.
4. If another addition is considered for the University Union it is of vital importance that a comprehensive study of this nature be conducted. Although several of the additional facilities will be in that portion of the building which will open in September, 1967,

the study has shown that several additional facilities are desired by the sample.

5. The positive attitude of the sample towards the present facilities should be transformed into an active "programming" board to assure that the center of student activities is the University Union. This board could not only provide programs for the student body but also provide a valuable function for the university community.

APPENDIX

ROLE OF THE COLLEGE UNION

1. The union is the community center of the college, for all the members of the college family--students, faculty, administration, alumni, and guests. It is not just a building; it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a well-considered plan for the community life of the college.

2. As the "living room" or the "hearthstone" of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

3. The union is part of the education program of the college.

As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in a democratic society.

Through its various boards, committees, and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program, aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education.

In all its processes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects.

The union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college.

Residence: On-Campus _____
Off-Campus _____
Commuter _____

Marital Status: Single _____
Married _____

July 1, 1967

Dear Student:


This is an invitation to participate in a study of the facilities of the University Union at Eastern Illinois University, and an opportunity to express your opinions on other facilities that are found in university unions.

This questionnaire is being submitted to a selected sample of summer school students enrolled at Eastern Illinois University. The results will be tabulated and hopefully will provide some insights into the needs of the above people relative to the University Union.

Before proceeding to the questionnaire, please keep this in mind: don't try to represent the entire campus opinion by yourself. The survey will attempt to do this. Just answer for yourself, question by question, and the final statistics will tell the overall results.

Thank you for your cooperation in this most important project. After you have completed the questionnaire, please return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,


Ronald R. Robinson
Graduate Student

RRR:dmk

Enclosure

FACILITIES IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION
AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AS OF JULY 1, 1967

The following facilities are presently located in the University Union. Please "X" the appropriate circle indicating your feeling about them.

	Essential	Desirable	No Opinion	Questionable	Unnecessary
A. Food Service Facilities					
1. Snack Shop (Panther's Lair)	0	0	0	0	0
2. Cafeteria (Temporarily located in Snack Shop)	0	0	0	0	0
3. Food Service Meeting Rooms (Adjacent to Snack Shop)	0	0	0	0	0
4. Ballroom (For banquets, coffee hours & luncheons)	0	0	0	0	0
5. Patio Extension (Off north end of Snack Shop)	0	0	0	0	0
B. Recreational Facilities					
6. Billiard Room	0	0	0	0	0
7. Games Area (Cards, chess, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0
C. Social and Congregating Facilities					
8. Lounge	0	0	0	0	0
9. Ballroom (Dances & jukebox dancing)	0	0	0	0	0
10. Television Room	0	0	0	0	0
11. Meeting Rooms (Used for organizational meetings, classes & conferences)	0	0	0	0	0
D. Service Facilities					
12. Lobby Shop Desk	0	0	0	0	0
13. Cloak Rooms	0	0	0	0	0
14. Bulletin Boards	0	0	0	0	0
15. Ticket Office Area	0	0	0	0	0

FACILITIES NOT PRESENTLY LOCATED IN THE UNIVERSITY UNION

Please indicate how you feel about these facilities not presently found in the University Union.

A. Food Service Facilities					
16. Canteen or Vending Machines	0	0	0	0	0
17. Outdoor Bar-B-Que Area	0	0	0	0	0
18. Formal Dining Room (With table service)	0	0	0	0	0
19. Faculty Dining Room & Lounge (But available to students)	0	0	0	0	0
B. Social and Congregating Facilities					
20. Nightclub Room (Programmed with student activities)	0	0	0	0	0
21. Fireplace Lounge (With stereo & FM facilities)	0	0	0	0	0
C. General and Organizational Facilities					
22. Browsing Library (With periodicals, magazines, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0
23. Alumni Office & Lounge	0	0	0	0	0
24. Radio Station & Related Facilities	0	0	0	0	0
25. Offices for Student Government, Union Board & other Campus Organizations	0	0	0	0	0
D. Recreational & Game Facilities					
26. Bowling Lanes	0	0	0	0	0
27. Table Tennis	0	0	0	0	0
28. Outing Facilities (Hiking, skiing, boating)	0	0	0	0	0
29. Swimming Pool	0	0	0	0	0
30. Auditorium (For movies, concerts, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0
31. Music Listening Rooms (With pianos, stereo & FM facilities)	0	0	0	0	0
E. Service Facilities					
32. Post Office (Rental boxes & sub-station)	0	0	0	0	0
33. Guest Rooms for Visitors	0	0	0	0	0
34. Work Room (For making posters, banners & special publicity)	0	0	0	0	0
35. Darkroom Facilities	0	0	0	0	0
36. Barber Shop	0	0	0	0	0
37. Complete Commuter Facilities	0	0	0	0	0
38. Art Gallery	0	0	0	0	0
39. Craft Shop	0	0	0	0	0
40. Bookstore	0	0	0	0	0

Please place in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope and return immediately.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bell, Boris C. Administration and Operation of The College Union. Ithaca, New York: The Association of College Unions-International, 1965.
- Butts, Porter. Planning College Union Facilities for Multiple-Use. Menasha, Wisconsin: Earl Litho Printing Co., 1966.
- _____. State of the College Union Around the World. Ithaca, New York: The Association of College Unions-International, 1967.

Articles and Periodicals

- Butts, Porter. "The College Union Story," American Institute of Architect's Journal, March, 1964.
- Noffke, Frank. "Planning for a College Union," College Unions at Work - 50th Anniversary Monograph Series (Ithaca, New York), 1965.

Report

- Berry, Chester Arthur. Planning a College Union Building. A report for the Institute of Field Studies Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1960. Published by Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Unpublished Material

- Horton, L. H., Jr. "Planning for the Operation of the University Union at Western Illinois University." Macomb, Illinois, 1963. (Multilithed).
- Mitchell, T. F. "The Extent to Which the Union at Eastern Illinois University Meets Its Stated Objectives." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Guidance, Eastern Illinois University, 1965.

Other Source

- Association of College Unions-International. College Unions . . . Fifty Facts. A brochure by the Association of College Unions-International, Menasha, Wisconsin: Earl Litho Printing Co.