

re file February

OSA Research Bulletin  
Office for Student Affairs

University of Minnesota  
Volume 23  
Number 1  
Date 2/15/83

ADMISSIONS RECORDS  
RESEARCH CENTER  
280 WILSON DRIVE



THE FALL 1982 UNIVERSITY POLL:  
STUDENT SERVICE FEES AND BOYNTON HEALTH SERVICE

RONALD MATROSS  
AND  
JON ROESLER

DATA AND REPORTING  
SERVICES

The Fall 1982 University Poll: Student Service Fees and  
Boynton Health Service

Ron Matross and Jon Roesler  
Data and Reporting Services  
University of Minnesota

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Four hundred and seventy-six students, 95% of a random sample of Twin Cities campus students, were surveyed by telephone on their usage of fee-supported services and their attitudes toward them. Key findings included:

Attitudes toward Student Services Fees

A majority of respondents expressed a willingness to pay in order to maintain current levels of service. Seventy-two percent said that the Student Services Fee should be raised enough to keep up with inflation or to expand services.

However, if given a choice 77% would prefer a funding system with a lower mandatory fee and more user fees.

Student Finances

When asked to characterize their ability to pay their college expenses, 42% said that they were doing OK, paying their expenses without much difficulty; 44% said that they were coping with their expenses, but making some definite sacrifices to do it; 14% said that they were just barely able to meet their expenses by making large sacrifices.

Student Service Priorities

Students assigned the highest priority for fee funding to problem-oriented services: Services to help with University problems (SOS), (65% high priority); Boynton Health Service (63% high priority); and student legal aid (49%).

Lowest priorities were assigned to student magazines, (8% high priority), student television training (5% high priority) and debate (5% high).

Students' priority ratings were compared with those from a similar survey conducted in 1981. Among comparable fee-paying, continuing groups, services gaining in the ratings were student government, foreign student programs, and minority student programs, legal aid, services to help with university problems, and student exchange programs. Among those lower in priority this year were music programs, health service, and recreational sports.

Recreational Sports

Usage figures for recreational sports programs were comparable to 1981. Among continuing, fee-paying students, 52% reported participating in team or self-service sports during the past year, compared with 54% in 1981. Among all students surveyed in 1982 45% reported participation.

As in the previous survey, student opinion on the need for new recreational sports facilities and the appropriateness of fee funding for them was divided. Forty-two percent said there was a need for new recreational sports facilities, 42% said there was not, and the remaining 16% were not sure. Forty-nine percent said that fee money should be used for new facilities, and 47% said it should not.

However, support for new facilities was much higher, among those who had used recreational sports facilities in the past year. Fifty-eight percent of those who had participated in self-service sports said new facilities were needed, and 63% said that fees should be used for them.

#### Boynton Health Service

Fifty-five percent of the continuing fee-paying students said they had used Boynton Health Service in the past year. Light usage (fewer than 6 times a year) was down slightly when compared to 1979 figures, while heavy usage (6 or more times) was up.

Satisfaction with the health service among users remained high. Ninety-three percent said that they were either very or moderately satisfied with the Health Service.

Approximately half the respondents (47% of the continuing, fee-paying group) did not know that it is possible to get a partial refund of the Boynton Health Service fee. Forty percent also erroneously believed that it is possible to get a full refund of the Boynton fee.

#### Child Care

Seventy-two percent of the respondents said that it was moderately or very important for the University to offer child care services to student parents. Fifty-seven percent approved of using student fee money for child care services.

#### Awareness of Fees Supported Services

Approximately two thirds of the students said they had read or looked at a list of services and organizations funded from the Student Services Fee.

The Fall 1982 University Poll: Student Service Fees and  
Boynton Health Service

Ron Matross and Jon Roesler  
Data and Reporting Services  
University of Minnesota

BACKGROUND AND CONTENT OF THE STUDY

This is the report of the Fall 1982 University Poll survey. The University Poll is a regular telephone survey of random samples of University of Minnesota students. The Fall 1982 survey examined student attitudes toward student services and the fees charged for these services. The survey was jointly commissioned by the Student Services Fees Committee and Boynton Health Service.

One focus of the survey was the size of the Student Services Fee. The fee has been steadily increased over the past few years in order to maintain service levels in the face of inflation. Of concern is whether students are willing to continue this policy. Perhaps they would prefer to cut service levels in order to hold down the fee size. This issue was directly posed to students in a survey question which asked what they thought should be done with the fee in the future: Should it be raised enough to expand services? Raised just enough to keep up with inflation? Frozen at its present size? (meaning a gradual erosion of service) Or should it be reduced? (meaning an immediate cutback in services).

Two other questions focused on general financial issues. The first asked about the idea of user fees: Would the student prefer the current system with a single general fee and few user fees, or would he/she prefer a system with a lower general fee and more user fees. The last general financial question asked students to characterize their ability to pay their college expenses as "OK, paying expenses without too much trouble"; "Coping--Meeting expenses, but making some definite sacrifices to do it"; or "Just barely meeting expenses by making some large sacrifices.

Attitudes toward individual services were probed first in a series of questions about student priorities. The questions asked students to say whether each of several types of services should have a high, medium, or low priority for student fee funding.

Besides these priority questions about the whole range of services, a number of other questions focused on selected services. At the request of the Boynton Health Service, several questions sought detailed information about students' health care usage and attitudes. Among the issues addressed were: Usage of Boynton Health Service and satisfaction with its services; sources of information about Boynton; usage of other health care providers; reasons for choosing a health care facility; types of student health care insurance coverage; and awareness of options for refunding part of the Boynton Health Service fee assessment.

A second service singled out for attention was the Recreational Sports Program. Plans have been made for new recreational sports buildings to be partially paid for from student services fees collected over a period of several years. The

survey asked students whether a new building was needed and whether student fee money should be used for it. Students were also asked about their current usage of recreational sports facilities.

The final service given special attention was child care for children of University students. Students were asked how important they thought it is to provide child care services for student parents, and then whether they approved or disapproved of using student fee money for student child care.

Many of the questions in the present survey were repeated from a similar University Poll study conducted in Fall 1981 for the Fees Committee. Whenever possible this report compares the data from the 1982 study with the 1981 data.

### SURVEY PROCEDURES

The survey was conducted by telephone by Koser Surveys, a professional polling firm, between December 2 and 15, 1982. A random sample of 500 students was selected from among all domestic students enrolled in day school at the University for the Fall 1982 quarter. Foreign students were not included in the sample because previous surveys have encountered language difficulties among this group in telephone studies. Six students were subsequently dropped from the sample because they were no longer enrolled. Among the 494 remaining students, interviews were conducted with 476, yielding a response rate of 96.4%.

The data in this report are presented for the total group of respondents and for a subgroup of special interest with regard to fee issues. This subgroup includes 303 students who are continuing students (enrolled during the previous academic year) and who paid the student services fee (because they had taken 6 or more credits). This subgroup can be assumed to be both somewhat familiar with student services and interested in fee issues. Thus inferences can be made both about University students in general (excluding foreign students) and those who might be especially concerned with fee issues. The subgroup also permits direct comparisons with the 1981 fees survey, since the earlier survey was confined to continuing, domestic, fee-paying students.

#### Margin of error

The data in this study are subject to two kinds of error: sampling, and non-sampling. Sampling error varies with the number of persons surveyed, the nature of the question, and the proportion of respondents answering in a given way. For the total group of respondents the average sampling error is approximately 5%, and for the subgroup of 303 approximately 6%.

The non-sampling error in the study cannot be estimated. Errors of this type include keypunching and coding errors, unclear question wording, and respondent duplicity. Careful survey procedures can minimize such errors, but cannot eliminate them entirely.

#### Report Format

The remainder of this report presents response percentages for the total group of respondents, the 1982 CFP (continuous fee-paying) subgroup, and data are compared to 1981 CFP responses for all questions repeated from the previous survey. Selected significant subgroup comparisons are also presented. A copy of the survey instrument is appended.

## RESULTS

### General attitudes toward fees

On the general question of taxation versus reduced services student responses were quite consistent with 1981 responses. As seen in Table 1, a strong majority (over 70%) continued to be willing pay to maintain current levels of service. In fact, the percentage willing to pay to maintain services in the face of inflation even increased slightly from the previous survey.

Some understanding of this willingness to pay for services can be gained from students' characterizations of their own ability to their college expenses. (See Table 2) Over 80% said that they were either doing OK in paying their expenses or else coping with some sacrifices. Fewer than 20% said that they were just barely making expenses with large sacrifices. (It should be remembered that students who might have been suffering the most financial distress might no longer be enrolled). Significantly more women (17%) than men (12%) said that they were just barely paying.

However, a very strong majority (over 75%) said that given a choice, they would prefer a fee system with a lower mandatory fee and more user fees. (Table 3) Thus the majority of students seemed to be saying that they wanted to continue the current levels of service, but they would prefer that more of the burden of paying for them be shifted to the persons who directly benefit from them. Non-commuters were more in favor of user fees (81%) than were commuters (69%).

Table 1

In the future do you think the \$74.57 (1) fee should be increased enough to expand services, increased just enough to expand with inflation, held at its present level, or reduced? (2)

	Percent -----		
	1981 cfp(3) (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Increased enough to expand services	8.5	8.9	10.1
Increased enough to keep up with inflation	59.9	64.0	62.1
Held at its current level	17.1	18.8	18.3
Reduced	12.6	7.9	9.5
No opinion	1.9	0.3	0.2

Notes. (1) 1981 fee was \$70.30.

(2) The question was prefaced with the following introduction:  
"We would like to know your views about the future of the student services fee. Because of inflation the fee will have to be gradually raised over the next few years to maintain current services. If services are expanded, the fee will need to be raised more. If the fee is held at its current level, inflation will cause services to be gradually reduced. If the fee is cut, services will be reduced more."

(3) cfp = continuous fees paying students. (This was the only group surveyed in 1981.)

Table 2

Overall, how well are you doing in paying college expenses?  
 Would you say you are doing:

- 1) OK - Paying your expenses without much difficulty;
- 2) COPING - paying your expenses, but making some definite sacrifices to do it;
- 3) ARE YOU JUST BARELY - meeting your expenses by making large sacrifices.

	<u>Percent</u>	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
OK	38.3	41.9
COPING	45.2	44.0
JUST BARELY MEETING EXPENSES	16.5	14.1

Table 3

Under the current system students who pay the required fees can use most services without paying additional costs. An alternative system would lower the required fees and would charge additional user fees to those who use a service.

In general which system would you prefer--  
 the current system or one with lower required fees and more user fees?

	<u>Percent</u>	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Current system	22.5	21.5
User fees	75.8	77.1
Not sure	1.7	1.5

## Student priorities

When compared with 1981, student priorities show some consistencies and some discrepancies. (Table 4) The consistencies are in the general ordering of services. Highest priority continued to be given to widely used services (Boynton Health Service, Unions, Recreational Sports) and to practical, problem-oriented services such as the University Student Legal Service and the Student Ombudsman Service (described as a service to help with University-related problems. Small, specialized educational services such as student television and debate continued to be low in student funding priorities.

Within this consistent overall pattern were some noteworthy changes in ratings of individual services. Three of the highest rated services lost percentages in the high priority category from 1981 to 1982: Boynton Health Service (-13%), Student Unions (-10%) and Recreational Sports (-5%). In contrast, two other traditionally high rated services gained support: Student Legal Service (10% in the high priority category) and services to help students with University-related problems (5%).

Some traditionally low-rated services registered gains, including student exchange programs (13% in the high category), foreign student programs (3%) and minority student programs (4%) and student government (4%).

Differences in priority ratings were noted for sex and age subgroups. Women assigned higher ratings than did men to the Daily, band/music, and womens' programs. Those in the middle age group (22-29) assigned lower priorities to the Daily and TV Training.

Table 4

### Student Priorities for Fee Funding<sup>1</sup>

		<u>Percent</u>		
		<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>
		<u>Priority</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Priority</u>
Student Health Service	1981(CFP)	77.3	16.4	6.3
	1982(CFP)	64.7	28.1	7.3
	1982(A11)	63.4	30.3	6.3
Services that help students with problems with the University	1981(CFP)	60.2	31.7	8.2
	1982(CFP)	65.3	29.7	5.0
	1982(A11)	65.3	29.2	5.5
Student Unions	1981(CFP)	47.4	40.3	12.2
	1982(CFP)	38.0	40.2	15.8
	1982(A11)	35.7	47.7	16.6
Minnesota Daily	1981(CFP)	36.9	51.3	11.8
	1982(CFP)	39.3	43.2	17.5
	1982(A11)	42.1	40.6	17.3
Legal aid for students	1981(CFP)	38.2	45.7	16.1
	1982(CFP)	48.2	39.3	12.5
	1982(A11)	48.9	37.4	13.7

		<u>Percent</u>		
		<u>High</u> <u>Priority</u>	<u>Medium</u> <u>Priority</u>	<u>Low</u> <u>Priority</u>
Recreational sports program	1981(CFP)	36.0	45.1	18.9
	1982(CFP)	31.4	44.9	23.8
	1982(A11)	31.7	46.8	21.4
Student government	1981(CFP)	33.7	46.9	19.5
	1982(CFP)	37.3	41.4	20.8
	1982(A11)	39.4	42.2	17.9
University band and music programs	1981(CFP)	30.5	53.7	15.8
	1982(CFP)	22.4	56.8	20.8
	1982(A11)	22.3	55.5	22.3
Child care for students' children	1981(CFP)	25.7	41.0	33.3
	1982(CFP)	24.4	43.9	31.7
	1982(A11)	26.7	43.9	29.4
Programs on minority student issues	1981(CFP)	19.7	51.4	28.8
	1982(CFP)	23.8	56.8	20.8
	1982(A11)	25.5	52.2	22.3
Student exchange programs with foreign universities	1981(CFP)	17.3	47.6	35.1
	1982(CFP)	30.4	42.2	27.4
	1982(A11)	33.8	42.2	23.9
Program on foreign student issues	1981(CFP)	10.3	48.3	41.3
	1982(CFP)	13.9	50.5	35.6
	1982(A11)	14.9	50.0	35.1
Student television training and production	1981(CFP)	9.0	34.2	56.7
	1982(CFP)	5.3	38.5	56.2
	1982(A11)	5.3	37.9	56.8
University debate team	1981(CFP)	5.5	29.1	65.4
	1982(CFP)	5.0	36.9	58.1
	1982(A11)	5.1	36.5	58.4
Student magazines <sup>2</sup>	1982(CFP)	7.7	34.8	57.5
	1982(A11)	8.3	38.9	52.8
Programs on womens issues <sup>3</sup>	1982(CFP)	19.8	60.4	19.8
	1982(A11)	21.2	59.0	19.7

<sup>1</sup>Question was introduced with the statement: "I am going to read a list of services. For each one, please tell me if you think it should be a high, medium, or low priority for funding from the Student Fee."

<sup>2</sup>Not asked in 1981 - combined with newspapers.

<sup>3</sup>Not asked in 1981.

## Recreational Sports

Both the usage of recreational sports facilities and attitudes toward new facilities remain highly consistent with the previous survey. About 33% of the continuing fees paying students in both years said they participated in sports teams and clubs, and about 40% in both years said that they participated in self-service sports programs. Overall participation rates (in either self-service or teams) were 44.8% for all students and 52.1% for CFP students. The latter figure is close to the 1981 figure of 53.7%. (Tables 5-7)

A number of subgroup differences were found in recreational sports participation. More men than women participated in team sports (31% vs. 22%), but not in self-service sports. Fewer commuters than non-commuters participated in both team sports (18% vs. 46%) and self-service sports (27% vs. 54%). Those aged 29 or older participated less often than did younger students in both types of sports (5% in team sports, and 27% in self-service).

Table 5

Within the past year, have you belonged to an intramural sports team or sports club at the University?

	Percent -----		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	34.5	33.3	26.7
No	65.5	66.7	73.3

Table 6

Within the past year, how often have you used the facilities at the 'U' for self-service sports such as swimming, handball, or running?

	Percent -----		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Never	57.1	64.5	58.7
Less than once a month	*	10.5	11.2
1 to 3 times a month	*	11.8	13.9
Once a week or more	*	13.2	16.2

Note. \*For reporting purposes these categories were combined in the the 1981 survey. Total number in these categories was 42.9%.

Table 7

Combined recreational sports participation.

	Percent		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Participated in both self-service and team sports	23.7	22.4	17.3
Participated in either	30.0	29.7	27.5
No participation	46.3	47.9	55.2

Students continued to be nearly evenly divided on the questions of the need for new recreational sports facilities and the funding of new facilities from student fees. As in 1981 40-45% came down on either side of these issues, with the remainder not sure. Also as in earlier surveys there was a strong relationship between recreational sports participation and attitudes toward new facilities. As seen in Tables 7-9, among those who had participated in sports clubs and teams, some 58-60% said new facilities were needed and should be funded, while only about 30-32% of the non-participants supported the need and fee funding.

Table 8

Do you think there is a need for new recreational sports facilities?

	Percent		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	40.4	42.6	41.8
No	40.6	42.9	42.2
Don't Know	19.0	14.5	16.0

Do you think that part of the required Student Services fee should be used to help pay for them?

	Percent		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	45.3	46.0	48.6
No	49.2	50.0	47.2
Don't Know	5.6	4.0	4.2

Note. The question was introduced with: "A proposal has been made to build new recreational sports facilities on campus. These would be for most indoor sports, and would include a gymnasium, swimming pool, and handball courts."

Table 9

Do you think there is a need for new recreational sports facilities?

	Percent -----	
	Belong to sports teamclub (n=127)	Don't belong to sports teamclub (n=348)
Yes	57.5	36.2
No	37.0	44.3
Don't know	5.5	19.5
	Used self service sports facilities (n=169)	Not Used self service sports facilities (n=307)
Yes	58.6	32.6
No	36.1	45.6
Don't know	5.3	21.8

Table 10

Do you think that part of the required Student Services Fees should be used to help pay for them?

	Percent -----	
	Belong to sports teamclub (n=127)	Don't belong to sports teamclub (n=348)
Yes	59.8	44.7
No	37.0	50.7
Don't know	3.1	4.6
	Used self service sports facilities (n=169)	Not used self service sports facilities (n=307)
Yes	63.1	40.7
No	33.3	54.7
Don't know	3.6	4.6

Boynton Health Service

Comparison data from 1981 were not available for most of the questions asked about Boynton Health Service. However, some questions were repeated from a 1979 survey of continuing fee-paying students. Tables 11-12 compare responses from the two surveys on usage of the Health Service and satisfaction with it. A majority of both 79 and 82 respondents said they had sought care or information at Boynton at least once during the previous year. Majorities of those who used Boynton also said that they were satisfied with the Health Service, and fewer than 7% in both years said that they were not at all or only slightly satisfied.

Several subgroup differences in Boynton usage were significant: Among age groups the highest proportion of usage was in the 22 to 28 age group. Fifty-five percent of this group said that they had used Boynton in the last year, compared to 41% of those under 22 and 29% of those 29 or over. More women than men (52% vs. 44%) had used Boynton in the past year. Among the heaviest users (6 or more times) 67% were women. Finally 61% of non-commuters used Boynton compared with 45% of the commuters.

Table 11

Within the past calendar year, how many times have you gone to Boynton Health Service for health care or information?

	Percent		
	1979 cfp (n=190)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
None	42	44.7	53.7
1 or 2 times	30	25.8	25.1
3 to 5 times	24	18.2	13.3
6 or more times	5	11.3	8.0

Table 12

In general, how satisfied are you with Boynton Health Service?

	Percent		
	1979 cfp (n=90)	1982 cfp (n=167)	1982 all (n=220)
Not at all	0	0	1.4
Slightly	6	6.6	5.9
Moderately	43	37.1	38.2
Very	51	56.3	54.5

Note. This question was asked only of those who had used Boynton Health Service.

In the 1982 survey, those who had not used the Boynton Health Service in the past year were asked why they had not used it. Nearly all cited two reasons unrelated to Boynton itself: Having prepaid care elsewhere (54.8%) and not needing medical care (41.1%).

Table 13

What is the main reason you have not used the Boynton Health Services this year? (Asked only of those who had not used Boynton)

	Percent	
	1982 cfp (n=133)	1982 all (n=252)
Did not need medical care	41.4	46.4
Covered for care elsewhere	54.9	46.8
Didn't know about Boynton	2.3	1.6
Didn't like Boynton/somewhere else better	0.8	0.4
Not on campus	-	0.8
Other	0.8	4.0

When asked where they would go first for health care, 58% of continuing fee-paying students and about 55% of all students said that they would go to either the Minneapolis or St. Paul Boynton Health Service offices. The two most frequently cited reasons for choosing a health care vendor were prepaid care and convenience.

Table 14

If you need outpatient medical care, where are you most likely to go first for your care?

	Percent	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Boynton Health Service on Minneapolis Campus	52.5	49.3
Boynton Health Service on St. Paul Campus	5.6	5.3
Somewhere else	41.6	45.3
Don't know	0.3	0.2

Table 15

What is the main reason you would go to this vendor for care?

	Percent	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Care is paid for there	33.9	34.6
High Quality	3.2	2.3
Convenient location	39.0	38.2
Easy to get appointment/don't need appointment	0	0.5
Have specialized service	1.4	1.6
Other	22.4	22.9

Approximately 29% of the respondents said they were covered by an HMO (Health Maintenance organization). Of those who were not covered by an HMO, over 70% said that they were covered by a non-University health insurance policy.

Table 16

Are you covered by an HMO and health maintenance organization such as Group Health?

	Percent	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	28.8	29.3
No	65.2	64.8
Don't know	6.0	5.9

(If NO)--Are you covered by a non- University insurance policy?

	Percent	
	1982 cfp (n=220)	1982 all (n=344)
Yes	71.4	73.8
No	26.8	24.7
Don't know	1.8	1.5

Students were asked to say whether they had seen or read about Boynton Health Service from each of several sources, and which of these sources was their main source of information about Boynton.

The most frequently cited sources in both questions were the Minnesota Daily and (63% had seen Boynton information in the Daily and 31% said it was the main source) and friends (54% had heard about Boynton from friends and 26% said friends were their main source).

Table 17

Within the past year, have you seen or heard something about Boynton Health Service in/from...

	Percent		
	-----		
	1982		
	cfp		
	(n=303)		
	Yes	No	Which was the Main Source?
...the Minnesota Daily?	62.7	37.3	30.5
...Health Service brochures?	28.1	71.9	13.5
...University class schedules?	38.9	61.1	12.4
...new student orientation?	23.9	76.1	9.8
...notices on bulletin boards?	30.4	69.6	2.6
...from a friend?	53.5	46.5	26.3
...somewhere else?	9.3	90.7	4.9

With regard to knowledge of the partial fee refund option for the Health Service, a large number of students were apparently uninformed. (See Table 18) Some 40% of the continuing fees-paying group incorrectly said that a full refund was possible. Over 40% also did not know that the partial refund was actually available. However, 33-34% said they did try to get the partial refund this year.

Table 18

The Health Service fee is \$37.50 per quarter. From what you know, is it possible for students to get a refund/or exemption of:

	Percent	
	-----	
	1982	1982
	cfp	all
	(n=303)	(n=476)
All of this fee?		
Yes	40.1	36.4
No	43.7	44.4
Don't know	16.2	19.2

Part of this fee?		
Yes	53.5	49.5
No	22.1	22.7
Don't know	24.4	27.8

Table 19

Students who belong to an HMO or who have equivalent health insurance can be exempted from \$22.25 of the health service fee.

During this fall quarter did you try to get this exemption?

	Percent	
	-----	
	1982	1982
	cfp	all
	(n=239)	(n=353)
Yes	33.9	34.3
No	66.1	65.7

Note. This question was asked only of those who said there was an exemption.

When asked whether they approved of offering a partial refund of the Boynton fee to students with health care coverage, 90% of the students said that they did approve.

Table 20

Do you approve or disapprove of allowing students with other health coverage to be exempt from part of the health care fee?

	Percent	
	-----	
	1982	1982
	cfp	all
	(n=303)	(n=476)
Approve	91.1	89.9
Disapprove	7.1	8.0
Not sure	1.7	2.1

Child Care

As seen in Tables 21-22, a majority of students (over 70%) said that it was very or moderately important to offer child care services to student parents. A smaller majority (57%) said that student fee money should be used to support University child care services. As would be expected, older students were significantly more in favor of child care than were younger students. Sixty-five percent of those 29 or older considered child care very important vs. 42% for those 22-28, and 27% of those under 22. Women were also more supportive of child care services than were men (47% very important vs. 31%).

These findings should be interpreted in conjunction with the service priority ratings described in Table 4. When placed in the context of other services, child care was given a middle priority, with more students assigning it a low priority (33%) than a high priority (25%).

Table 21

In your view how important is it that the University offer a child care service to students?

	Percent	
	-----	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Very important	37.2	38.0
Moderately important	33.2	34.6
Slightly important	21.3	19.6
Not at all important	8.3	7.8

Table 22

Do you approve or disapprove of using student fee money to support a child care service?

	Percent	
	-----	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Approve	57.4	57.6
Disapprove	39.6	39.1
Not sure	3.0	3.4

Awareness of fee-supported services

Students were asked two general questions about their knowledge of fee-supported services. (Tables 23-24). As in 1981 approximately two-thirds of the respondents said that they had looked at or read a list of the services funded from fees. Only about one-third, however, said that they had read or heard anything about the Student Services Fees Committee. In interpreting this latter finding it should be remembered that students are not likely to have any reason to know about most of the major committees in the University. Compared to other committees, awareness of the Fees Committee might be relatively high.

Table 23

Have you looked at or read a list of the services and organizations funded from the student services fees?

	Percent -----		
	1981 cfp (n=414)	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	65.5	66.0	64.1
No	33.8	34.0	35.7
Don't Know	0.7	0	0.2

Table 24

This survey was sponsored by the Student Services Fees Committee. Before had you read or heard anything about the Student Services Fees Committee?

	Percent -----	
	1982 cfp (n=303)	1982 all (n=476)
Yes	35.3	29.4
No	63.7	69.7
Don't know	1.0	0.8

## ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

If one were to choose a single word to characterize student opinion toward fees issues, that word might be "moderate". The students surveyed continued to take a moderate, balanced stance on most of the central fees issues. On the basic question of reducing services versus keeping pace with inflation, the majority reaffirmed its preference to continue to pay to maintain current levels of service. There was no surge of sentiment favoring radical cutbacks.

Students also struck a moderate tone in their ratings of priorities. Compared to 1981, the 1982 respondents showed a greater willingness to assign higher priorities to small services oriented toward special groups such as foreign and minority students. Despite difficult financial times, students do not appear to be as consumed with self-interest as they are sometimes portrayed.

Two explanations come to mind for the apparently moderate flavor of the data. The first is that the majority of students do not describe themselves as suffering financially. Over 8 out of 10 said that they were doing OK in paying their expenses or else coping with them by making some sacrifices. Students can literally still afford to be understanding of the needs of their fellow students. A second explanation for the findings on general fees issues is that a moderate, balanced approach has so far characterized the state's response to fiscal crisis. Students may be reflecting the general mood of the state's citizens toward fundamental fiscal issues, especially those involving education.

However the moderate tone of the student mood may be more complex than a simple "stay the course" mandate. In open-ended comments about fees in the 1981 survey the most frequent suggestion was that service users ought to pay more of the costs of services. Because of this finding, the 1982 survey addressed the issue directly. The result was that over three quarters of the respondents said that they would prefer a system with a lower mandatory fee and more user fees to cover the present system of spreading the costs across users and non-users alike. A practical user fee system would be very difficult to design. Yet the message from students appears to be that they would welcome serious explorations in this direction.

Student opinion toward proposed recreational sports facilities remained quite consistent with the 1981 findings. Students continue to be divided fairly evenly on the need for the new facilities and desirability of funding them from fees. But knowing the current recreational sports facilities tends to alter opinions toward them. Current recreational sports participants were considerably more supportive of new facilities than were non-participants. It should be noted that students were surveyed on general issues about the proposed facilities, and not about specific funding plans. Students could not be expected to be able to offer quick, informed opinions about the several complex funding plans now under discussion.

Despite a drop in its priority ratings, Boynton Health Service continues to enjoy a high usage rate and a high degree of satisfaction among its users. Students' basic views of the service would seem to be most positive.

The one point where improvement is clearly indicated for Boynton is in publicizing the availability of the partial fee refund option. Large numbers of

respondents had the misconception that all the fee was refundable, or worse, did not know that any refund was available.

Student child care was seen by most students as important and worthy of fee funding, although a lower priority than several other services. Naturally, older students were significantly more in favor of child care services than were younger students.

In sum, given the severity of Minnesota's economic difficulties, it is almost surprising that University of Minnesota students continue to be as willing to pay for services as they are.

Fees Survey, Fall, 1982. Conducted by the University Poll for the University of Minnesota.

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ from the University of Minnesota Opinion Poll. We're doing a short survey on the \$74.57 in Student Services Fees charged each quarter.

1. How many credits are you registered for at the "U" this Fall Quarter?

- IF NOT REGISTERED, . . . . . ← NONE, NOT REGISTERED \_\_\_ 1 (12)  
TERMINATE
- NONE, THESIS ONLY OR CONTINUOUS REGISTRATION \_\_\_ 2
- 1 TO 5 CREDITS \_\_\_ 3
- 6 OR MORE CREDITS \_\_\_ 4

2. Were you registered at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus for the following quarters?

- |                      |       |       |      |
|----------------------|-------|-------|------|
|                      | YES   | NO    |      |
| LAST FALL QUARTER?   | ___ 1 | ___ 2 | (13) |
| LAST WINTER QUARTER? | ___ 1 | ___ 2 |      |
| LAST SPRING QUARTER? | ___ 1 | ___ 2 |      |

3. Do you consider yourself a commuter student?

- YES \_\_\_ 1 (14)
- NO \_\_\_ 2

4. Have you looked at or read a list of the services and organizations funded from the student services fees?

- YES \_\_\_ 1 (15)
- NO \_\_\_ 2
- DON'T KNOW \_\_\_ 3

One part of fee goes to the Recreational Sports Program.

- 5. Within the past year, have you belonged to an intramural sports team or sports club at the University? YES \_\_\_1 (16)  
NO \_\_\_2

- 6. Within the past year, how often have you used the facilities at the "U" for self-service sports such as swimming, handball, or running?  
--never, less than once a month, 1 to 3 times a month, once a week or more--  
NEVER \_\_\_1 (17)  
LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH \_\_\_2  
1 TO 3 TIMES A MONTH \_\_\_3  
ONCE A WEEK OR MORE \_\_\_4

- 7. From what you know, how would you rate the facilities for recreational sports at the "U"?  
--poor, fair, good, excellent--  
POOR \_\_\_1 (18)  
FAIR \_\_\_2  
GOOD \_\_\_3  
EXCELLENT \_\_\_4  
DON'T KNOW \_\_\_5

A proposal has been made to build new recreational sports facilities on both the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. These would be for most indoor sports, and would include a gymnasium, swimming pool, and racquetball courts.

- 8. Do you think there is a need for new recreational sports facilities? YES \_\_\_1 (19)  
NO \_\_\_2  
DON'T KNOW \_\_\_3

- 9. Do you think that part of the required Student Services Fees should be used to help pay for them? YES \_\_\_1 (20)  
NO \_\_\_2  
DON'T KNOW \_\_\_3

Another one of the student fees goes to Boynton Health Service.

10. Within the past calendar year, how many times have you gone to Boynton Health Service for health care or information? --none, 1 or 2 times, 3 to 5 times, 6 or more times--

Ask 10-A Below . . . . . ← NONE \_\_\_ 1 (21)

Skip to 10-B . . . . . ← { 1 OR 2 TIMES \_\_\_ 2  
3 TO 5 TIMES \_\_\_ 3  
6 OR MORE TIMES \_\_\_ 4

10-A (If NONE)--What is the main reason you have not used the Boynton Health Service this year? (Code one only)

DID NOT NEED MEDICAL CARE \_\_\_ 1 (22)

WAS NOT ON CAMPUS/NOT STUDENT \_\_\_ 2

DIDN'T KNOW ABOUT BOYNTON \_\_\_ 3

NEEDED SERVICE WASN'T AVAILABLE \_\_\_ 4

DON'T LIKE BOYNTON/SOMEWHERE ELSE BETTER \_\_\_ 5

COVERED FOR CARE ELSEWHERE \_\_\_ 6

OTHER (Write in) \_\_\_ 7  
below

(23)

10-B (If 1 TO 2, 3 TO 5, 6 OR MORE TIMES)--In general, how satisfied are you with Boynton Health Service? --not at all, slightly, moderately, very--

NOT AT ALL \_\_\_ 1 (24)

SLIGHTLY \_\_\_ 2

MODERATELY \_\_\_ 3

VERY \_\_\_ 4

11. If you need outpatient medical care, where are you most likely to go first for your care? Would it be Boynton Health Service on the Minneapolis campus, Boynton Health Service on the St. Paul campus, or somewhere else?

BOYNTON HEALTH SERVICE ON MINNEAPOLIS CAMPUS? \_\_\_ 1 (25)

BOYNTON HEALTH SERVICE ON ST. PAUL CAMPUS? \_\_\_ 2

Where else? (Write below) ← SOMEWHERE ELSE? \_\_\_ 3

(26-27)

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_ 4

12. What is the main reason why you would go to \_\_\_\_\_ for care?  
(Insert name from 11 above)  
(Code one response only)

CARE IS PAID FOR THERE \_\_\_ 1 (28)

HIGH QUALITY \_\_\_ 2

CONVENIENT LOCATION \_\_\_ 3

EASY TO GET APPOINTMENT/DON'T NEED APPOINTMENT \_\_\_ 4

HAVE SPECIALIZED SERVICE \_\_\_ 5

← OTHER \_\_\_ 6

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Write in)

13. Are you covered by an HMO and health maintenance organization such as Group Health?

13-A (If YES--Which HMO?) \_\_\_\_\_ (30) YES \_\_\_ 1 (29)  
(Write in name)

\*Ask 13-B ← NO \_\_\_ 2

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_ 3

\*13-B (If NO)--Are you covered by a non-University health insurance policy? YES \_\_\_ 1 (31)

NO \_\_\_ 2

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_ 3

14. The Health Service fee is \$37.50 per quarter. From what you know, is it possible for students to get a refund/or exemption of:

All of this fee? \*YES \_\_\_1 (32)

NO \_\_\_2

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_3

\*If YES to either ask 14-A below.

Part of this fee? \*YES \_\_\_1 (33)

NO \_\_\_2

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_3

If NO or DK to both skip to 15.

\*14-A Students who belong to an HMO or who have equivalent health insurance can be exempted from \$22.25 of the health service fee.

During this fall quarter did you try to get this exemption? YES \_\_\_1 (34)

NO \_\_\_2

15. Do you approve or disapprove of allowing students with other health coverage to be exempt from part of the health care fee?

APPROVE \_\_\_1 (35)

DISAPPROVE \_\_\_2

NOT SURE \_\_\_3  
(Don't Offer)

16. Within the past year, have you seen or heard something about Boynton Health Service

YES NO

IN THE MINNESOTA DAILY? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (36)

HEALTH SERVICE BROCHURES? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (37)

UNIVERSITY CLASS SCHEDULES? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (38)

NEW STUDENT ORIENTATION? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (39)

NOTICES ON BULLETIN BOARDS? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (40)

FROM A FRIEND? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (41)

ANYWHERE ELSE? \_\_\_1 \_\_\_2 (42)

WHERE ELSE? \_\_\_\_\_ (43)  
(Write in)

17. Which one of these sources has been your main source of information about the Health Service? (Read YES answers from 16 & check one in MAIN SOURCE column below)

MAIN SOURCE

\_\_\_1

\_\_\_2

\_\_\_3

\_\_\_4

\_\_\_5

\_\_\_6

\_\_\_7

\_\_\_8 (44)

18. Do you have any comments about Boynton Health Service?

Ask, What Comments? ← YES \_\_\_ 1 (45)  
(18-A below)

NO \_\_\_ 2

18-A If YES what comments?  
(write in)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_(46-47)

Another part of the student fees help pay for a child care center for children of students.

19. In your view how important is it that the University offer a child care service to students--Very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not at all important?

VERY IMPORTANT \_\_\_ 4 (48)  
MODERATELY IMPORTANT \_\_\_ 3  
SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT \_\_\_ 2  
NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT \_\_\_ 1

20. Do you approve or disapprove of using student fee money to support a child care service?

APPROVE \_\_\_ 1 (49)  
DISAPPROVE \_\_\_ 2  
NOT SURE \_\_\_ 7  
(Don't Offer)

21. I am going to read a list of services. For each one please tell me if you think it should be a high, medium, or low priority for funding from the student fee.

	<u>HIGH</u>	<u>MEDIUM</u>	<u>LOW</u>	
a. University band and music programs . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(50)
b. Programs on minority student issues . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(51)
c. Recreational sports programs . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(52)
d. The <u>Minnesota Daily</u> . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(53)
e. Student magazines . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(54)
f. Legal aid for students . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(55)
g. Services to help students deal with problems with the University . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(56)
h. Student unions . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(57)
i. University debate team . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(58)
j. Student health service . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(59)
k. Student television training and production . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(60)
l. Services and programs for women students . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(61)
m. Programs on foreign student issues . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(62)
n. Student exchange programs with foreign universities . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(63)
o. Student government . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(64)
p. Child care for students' children . . . . .	___1	___2	___3	(65)

---

22. We would like to know your views about the future of the student services fees. Because of inflation the fees will have to be gradually raised over the next few years to maintain current services. If services are expanded, the fee will need to be raised more. If the fee is held at its current level, inflation will cause services to be gradually reduced. If the fee is cut, services will be reduced more.

In the future, do you think the \$74.57 fee should be increased enough to expand services, increased just enough to keep up with inflation, held at its present level, or reduced?

INCREASE ENOUGH TO EXPAND SERVICES   1   (66)

INCREASE ENOUGH TO KEEP UP WITH INFLATION   2  

HELD AT ITS CURRENT LEVEL   3  

REDUCED   4  

NO OPINION   7    
(Don't Offer)

---

23. Under the current system students who pay the required fees can use most services without paying additional costs.

An alternate system would lower the required fees and would charge additional user fees to those who use a service.

In general which system would you prefer--the current system or one with lower required fees and more user fees?

CURRENT SYSTEM   1   (67)

USER FEES   2  

NOT SURE   3    
(Don't Offer)

---

And now--a question about college in general

24. Overall, how well are you doing in paying college expenses? Would you say you are doing:

1. OK-Paying your expenses without too much difficulty;
2. COPING-paying your expenses, but making some definite sacrifices to do it;
3. ARE YOU JUST BARELY-meeting your expenses by making large sacrifices.

OK \_\_\_ 1 (68)

COPING \_\_\_ 2

JUST BARELY MEETING EXPENSES \_\_\_ 3

---

Finally we have one last question

25. This survey was sponsored by the Student Services Fees Committee. Before now had you read or heard anything about the Student Services Fees Committee?

YES \_\_\_ 1 (69)

NO \_\_\_ 2

DON'T KNOW \_\_\_ 3

THANK YOU!

OSA Research Bulletin  
Office for Student Affairs

University of Minnesota

Volume 23

Number 3

Date 5/16/83



DINING ON THE BRIDGE: A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD A RESTAURANT ON  
THE WASHINGTON AVENUE BRIDGE

RON MATROSS AND JON ROESLER

DATA AND REPORTING SERVICES  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DINING ON THE BRIDGE: A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD A RESTAURANT ON  
THE WASHINGTON AVENUE BRIDGE

RON MATROSS AND JON ROESLER

DATA AND REPORTING SERVICES  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

University Food Services conducted a survey of 2448 persons crossing the Washington Avenue Bridge and eating in two food service restaurants on their attitudes toward a restaurant on the bridge. Key findings of the survey were:

- ° Three out of four respondents (75.8%) said that the restaurant should be built. Students and faculty/staff favored the concept in equal numbers.
- ° Three out of four (77.6%) also said that they would patronize the restaurant once or week or more.
- ° If built, the most frequent use of the restaurant would be short snacks or quick-stop carry-out food.
- ° The most frequently endorsed menu items were cold beverages (70%), hot beverages (64%), fruit (55%), and sandwiches (53%).
- ° Most respondents reported that they cross the bridge 5 or more times a week. Crossings in the late morning and early afternoon were more frequent than crossings in the early morning or late afternoon.
- ° Respondents raised several issues concerning them about the proposal, including safety, aesthetics, food quality, and accessibility.

DINING ON THE BRIDGE: A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD A RESTAURANT ON  
THE WASHINGTON AVENUE BRIDGE

RON MATROSS AND JON ROESLER

DATA AND REPORTING SERVICES  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

This is the report of a survey of opinions toward a restaurant proposed for the Washington Avenue bridge between the East and West bank campuses of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. The survey was conducted during a two day period among two groups: those crossing the bridge and those eating in two campus restaurants. The study was conceived and conducted by the University Food Services. Data and Reporting Services consulted on the study's design and analyzed the data.

The proposed restaurant would be built and operated by University Food Services. It would be placed on one end of the bridge, connected to the enclosed walkway on the bridge's upper level. The restaurant would seat about 200 people and would probably be open from 8 am to 3 pm on weekdays. Pedestrians would continue to have access to the walkway at all times. Food Services estimates that the costs of building and operating the restaurant would be recovered from food sales.

The survey reported here was designed to help answer the following questions:

1. Do students and faculty think the restaurant should be built? By all accounts the bridge walkway is ugly and unappealing, but is a restaurant the preferred way to improve the space?
2. How many students and faculty would use the restaurant? What is the size of the market for the restaurant? Would it be large enough to justify building it?
3. If the restaurant were built, what should it serve? Should it emphasize snacks or meals? "Fast" food or "natural" food? Take out or eat in food?

The questionnaire asked three types of questions: (a) Background characteristics and behavior--University affiliation, typical campus location, and numbers of bridge crossings. (b) Potential usage of the service--how often, when and for what purpose the respondent might use the restaurant. (c) Opinions of the menu--whether each of several food items should be served. (d) Opinions on the desirability of the restaurant--a direct question on the proposal, and an opportunity to offer free-answer comments.

The remainder of this report presents the survey findings, organized as follows:

1. Opinions of the proposed restaurant.
2. Projected usage of the service.
3. Menu/design suggestions.
4. Analysis and discussion of the findings.

## METHOD

The survey was conducted on Wednesday, March 2 and Thursday, March 3, between 8 a.m. and 3 p.m. each day. Questionnaires were handed out by Food service surveyors to those crossing the bridge and to those eating in the Brown Jug restaurant (in Coffman Union on the East bank) and in the River Bend restaurant (in Wiley Hall on the West bank). On the bridge, questionnaires were handed out by a surveyor on each end and returned to another surveyor on the other end. In the restaurants the questionnaires were handed out at the cash registers when patrons paid and were returned to the cashier when they were completed.

In total, 4000 questionnaires were distributed and 2448 were returned, a response rate of 61%. Among these completed questionnaires, 28.5% were from persons going from west to east on the bridge, 28.5% were from those going from east to west on the bridge, 23.5% were from those eating in the River Bend restaurant, and the remaining 19.5% were from those eating in the Brown Jug. Six hundred and ninety five of the responses were from the 8-10 a.m. time period (both days combined), 697 (28.9%) were from the 10-12 time, (32.6%) were from the 12-2 period, and 9.8% were from the 2-3 pm time slot. 89.8 percent of the respondents were University of Minnesota students, 8.0% were faculty/staff, and 2.2% were not affiliated with the University.

The survey method was chosen on the basis of convenience, cost, and ability to target the most likely users of the restaurant. The sampling rationale was that the restaurant would most likely draw from those who either have reason to cross the bridge or who are already patronizing the two main campus restaurants on either side of the bridge. The survey would go to both those who come to campus on a Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule, and those who come only on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Despite the large number of respondents, the survey data should be treated only as suggestive. There is no way of knowing whether the respondents are representative of all students, all faculty, all bridge crossers, or all Brown Jug and River Bend patrons. The sampling was not random, and those who responded might be systematically different from those who did not respond or were not sampled.

## RESULTS

### Opinions of the proposed restaurant

When asked whether the proposed restaurant should or should not be built, three out of four respondents said that it should be built. Table One shows the the response percentages on this question for the total group and separately for faculty, students, bridge crossers, and food service patrons. Support for the restaurant was consistent across each of these subgroups. In general few significant differences were noted among the subgroups in response to the survey items. Thus the remainder of the report does not break out the separate responses for each group.

Table One

Should or should not the restaurant be built on the bridge?

	Total (N=2448)	Student (N=2168)	Faculty Staff (N=192)	Bridge Crossers (N=1396)	Restaurant Patrons (N=1052)
Should	75.8	75.8	78.8	75.6	76.0
Should Not	24.2	24.2	21.2	24.4	24.0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Opinions about the restaurant did differ, however, according to how often respondents crossed the bridge and how often they anticipated eating in the new facility. The more often respondents crossed the bridge and expected to eat in the new restaurant, the more likely they were to approve of the restaurant. For example, 82.8% of those who cross the bridge 8-10 times in fall quarter favored the restaurant, compared to 61.9% of those who said they did not cross the bridge at all in the fall. Similarly, 92.4% of those who said they would eat in the restaurant 4-5 times a week approved of the restaurant versus 29.7% of those who said they would eat there less than once a month.

Expected Usage of the Restaurant

A majority of respondents (55.3%) said that they would patronize the restaurant twice a week or more (see Table 2).

Table Two

Expected Usage of Proposed Restaurant  
(N=2448)

	Total
4-5 times	11.6%
2-3 times a week	43.7
About once a week	22.3
1-2 times a month	12.5
Less than once a mo.	4.8
Never	5.1
	<u>100%</u>

Expected usage of the restaurant was related to how often the person crossed the bridge and what time of day he crossed. For example, 70.3% of those who cross the bridge 9-10 times a week in the fall would eat in the restaurant 2 or more times a week, compared to 41.2% of those who cross the bridge 1-2 times in the

fall. For all time periods considered, those who crossed during that time were more likely to say they would use the restaurant than those who did not cross the bridge during that time. For example, 60% of those who cross the bridge during the 12-2 time during a typical week said they would use the restaurant 2 or more times, compared to 47% among those who typically did not cross during that time.

It would appear that the restaurant would draw from both people who typically cross the bridge frequently and from those who do not. However, it would draw a higher proportion of bridge crossers than non-bridge crossers. Thus it is useful to look at the data on frequency of bridge crossings to gain a sense of the size of this primary market.

### Bridge Crossings

Table 3 shows the frequency of bridge crossings by respondents for each of four typical quarters.

Table Three  
Bridge Crossings per Quarter  
(N=2448)

Crossings	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer
0	11.9	9.9	10.8	40.3
1-2	15.1	16.7	14.9	14.5
3-4	16.4	17.6	17.7	11.8
5-6	14.0	13.9	13.4	7.1
7-8	7.6	7.5	7.9	4.6
9-10	11.8	11.4	11.4	6.1
11+	23.4	23.0	24.0	15.7
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Except for summer, the number of bridge crossings reported by respondents was fairly consistent across the quarters. Approximately a third of the respondents crossed 9 or more times a week. Somewhat more, approximately 37%, said that they crossed the bridge each quarter from 3-8 times a week. The remaining group, slightly over a quarter, said they crossed 0-2 times a week.

Table 4 shows the percentage who cross a bridge during a particular time of day in a typical week. (The question asked only how often a person crossed at different times during a typical week--not broken down by quarter).

Table Four

Percentage Who Typically Cross The Bridge at a Given Time of Day

Time Period	Percentage Crossing
Early morning (8-10 a.m.)	56.8
Late morning (10-12 a.m.)	70.9
Noon/early afternoon (12-2)	70.9
Mid/late afternoon (2-4 p.m.)	52.1

The most frequent crossing times are the late morning and early afternoon, suggesting that lunchtime would be the time of heaviest usage.

It should be remembered that the bridge crossing percentages are very high because bridge crossers were the main group of persons surveyed. The percentage of people who cross the bridge in the total campus population is surely lower, although by how much is uncertain.

**Menu Suggestions/Perceptions of the Restaurant**

Respondents were asked for what purposes they might use the proposed restaurant if it were built. Over four out of five respondents (84.8%) said they would use the restaurant for quick stop carry away food or a short snack/meal (84.1%). Considerably fewer, but still a majority (52.7%) said they would use it for extended meals and socializing.

Another question designed to understand possible usage of the restaurant asked respondents what purposes the restaurant might serve for them. Naturally enough, the most frequently cited purpose was as a food stop (cited by 58.5%); the next most frequent purposes were using it as a meeting place, (47.8%), a warm-up (37.7%), and a time saver (37.3%). For some others the restaurant would be a view point (23.1%) and a a break in a long walk (20.5%). Ten percent of the respondents checked that the restaurant would be nothing noteworthy to them.

Respondents were also asked to read a list of various food items and to circle those which they would like to see available in the new restaurant. Table 5 lists the percentages of respondents who suggested each item.

Table 5

Percentage Suggesting Menu Items  
(N=2448)

Cold beverages	70.1
Hot beverages	64.4
Fruit	55.5
Sandwiches	52.7
Ice cream	45.1
Hamburgers	42.6
Popcorn	42.3
Soups	41.4
Shakes	39.5
Salad Bar	38.9
Pastries	35.4
Packaged snacks	34.2
Hot entrees	29.6
Other (volunteered)	12.4

The most frequently mentioned items are consistent with a planned usage of the restaurant as a quick-stop carry out service. Beverages, sandwiches, and fruit were the items mentioned by a majority of respondents, and are typical take-out lunch fare. Items that would be for breakfast (pastries), sit down meals (hot entrees), and snacks were less frequently recommended.

Respondents' free answer comments on the back of the questionnaire offered some further menu suggestions. The majority of the menu comments either complained about the quality of food in the present food services, or advocated a more "natural" cuisine. Illustrative of these comments were the following:

"I know institutional cooking requires certain sacrifices, but I generally find the food overly processed (American cheese, turkey roll), or too bland, or too 'white bread', and there's LOTS of sugar."

Or "Would like low salt, low sugar, healthy foods!" Some others argued that they would prefer better quality food in existing services to having food service money spent on a brand new facility.

"Instead of building a new restaurant facility, why don't you work on making the food better and cheaper in the existing ones."

A few respondents also had some highly specific suggestions for menus, some of which deviated from the general emphasis on more healthful foods:

"Add pizza to the menu (frozen, maybe-microwave processed)." or "Beer and brats in the spring are a must!"

## ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

The implications of the survey data are generally positive toward the bridge restaurant proposal. A strong majority of those responding said they favored building the new restaurant and would use it if it were built. Additionally, the number of bridge crossings respondents reported was sufficient to suggest a large drop-in, take-out market, especially at lunchtime.

These positive findings need to be qualified in several important ways. The first is that the survey is an informal one, not a "scientific" study using a random sample and effective follow-up techniques. Those included in the survey were only those who were already eating in food services or crossing the bridge during a given two-day period. Other than economy, the rationale for this sampling procedure was that bridge crossers and current food service patrons would be the most likely to use the new restaurant. However, their views are not necessarily representative of all students or faculty. The data do not permit formal projections of the entire potential market in the campus area.

Another important qualification is that the survey asked only about the restaurant proposal and not about other things which might be done with the bridge. It was not a survey about possible uses for the bridge, and thus it can't be said that the strong support for the restaurant represents a clear preference for the restaurant over a range of other alternatives for developing the space.

Thus the survey findings are limited in the extent to which they can be generalized. Nevertheless, the strength of the support for the restaurant among the surveyed group (75%) certainly suggests that the proposal merits further serious analysis. Some guidance for such an analysis can be gained from the free answer comments volunteered by respondents (by approximately 25%). A number of the comments were very general statements of approval or disapproval of the idea of the restaurant. (e.g. "I think it's a super idea!" or "A bridge food service? C'Mon! Get Serious! How Ludicrous!") Others, however, offered more detail on their reasons for favoring or opposing the restaurant concept. These more specific responses are helpful in understanding the ways in which the campus community views the proposal. They are discussed below.

### Reasons for supporting the restaurant

Some persons supported the restaurant because they saw a need for more food services on campus. Representative of their views was,

"In this busy, time short University community of some 60,000 people there are simply not enough food service seats available between the hours of 11 a.m. and 1 p.m."

Other reasons for supporting the bridge restaurant included the the possibility that the restaurant could offer some unique features not found in other campus food services. One person succinctly summarized these reasons:

"I think the idea of a bridge restaurant is a good idea because--  
(1) We need more restaurants in different locations, yes, there are a

lot of places to eat at CMU, but who can get there, and the Riverbend is always overcrowded." (2) Maybe it would serve to deter some of the rampant vandalism" (3) I like the idea of having that viewpoint-- it could be very pretty. (4) It would provide a new source of employment for students, and also for people who need full-time work."

Others particularly noted the possibility of having an appealing place with a view, in contrast to the other campus food services.

"We could use another airy, scenic spot. Most of the university restaurants I frequent are underground and very claustrophobic".

The possibility of developing a uniquely appealing atmosphere was highlighted by several respondents:

"Great idea. Emphasis on lots of windows overlooking the river. (The view can be fantastic up here!). Also since structure will necessarily be light, design should stress linear direction along the bridge with perhaps some sitting terraces for deck chairs in warm weather."

1. Make it an appealing place to go (within budgetary limits).
2. Retain all the **window openings** possible for airiness and river vistas.
3. Set up the mood of **Parisian Sidewalk Cafes** to attract customers.
4. **Air condition it**, if only with window units."

In this vein, one respondent even went so far as to attach a newspaper clipping on sidewalk cafes to reinforce the desire for a design emphasizing openness, airiness, and a unique atmosphere.

### Reasons for opposing the restaurant

The most frequent reason given for opposing the restaurant was concern over money. Some of the comments reflected a misunderstanding (or suspicion) of the self-supporting economics of the restaurant:

"I thought the University was supposed to cut down spending. Why build this food service? My tuition could be used better?"

Or "What can I say in times like this? If it could pay for itself, then build it. If it any way uses funds that might go other (academic) parts of the U, please don't. I'm here to get an education first; I like to eat lunch second."

Others understood that the restaurant would not take money from other University programs, but were concerned that food prices throughout the University's food services would be raised to subsidize the new cafe:

"The proposal indicates that the unit would be self-funding. If so, prices will have to be set so as to recover the capital costs involved in construction of the unit, as well as the operating costs and costs

of products/services sold. Even under optimistic revenue assumptions, these prices would have to be set far too high. If, as I suspect, the costs would be spread throughout food services as it exists, the result would be higher prices throughout the system. . ."

Respondents raised a number of other concerns about the restaurant proposal including litter, exhaust fumes, access to the walkway, and safety. Many of these concerns were stated not so much as reasons for opposing the proposal as much as issues to be resolved before the proposal is approved.

A sampler of these comments is as follows:

"Ventilation would be a problem. Right now I walk outside instead of inside when I cross the bridge because of the exhaust fumes."

"If such a food service is built, care should be taken to ensure that paper wastes are not allowed to clutter/litter up the bridge!"

"The bridge is too narrow to accomodate any further construction on it, unless an upper level on top of the enclosure would be built."

"This idea is fine except for the fact that you will bottle-up traffic between the two campuses unless build it awfully narrow, but I think this would not be appealing to your patrons. If you can work this problem out I think it's a great idea."

"At least set up a food service that is practical for traffic flow. East Bank cafeterias (hosp., Bldg. A, Coffman) are usually badly set up for traffic. Probably will need restroom facilities. Adequate trash containers along the way so the river won't fill up totally with papers."

Finally, some respondents suggested that alternatives to the restaurant plan be considered:

"I honestly think we have enough food service areas in the campus already. Perhaps the space could be used for a study area instead."

"There are plenty of places to eat on campus. What might be a good idea--and all that would be necessary--would be a small cart or truck for people rushing between the 2 banks. You could eliminate unnecessary junk food, beverages, fruit & maybe cheese and crackers or popcorn are the only foods you'd need."

## Conclusions

In sum, the surveyed bridge crossers and food service patrons supported the bridge restaurant concept but they had a number of concerns about the design, aesthetics, menu, and cost of the project. While the survey findings are not precise enough to be considered a mandate for the proposal, they are strong enough to give further impetus to the development of the concept.

U OF M FOOD SERVICE BRIDGE SURVEY Hello, gopher guest . . .

University Food Services is considering building a food service on the bridge between the East and West Banks. The food service would seat about two hundred people. It would be open Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., heated in winter, and would offer a medium-size food selection. Like other U of M food services, its costs would be paid from the money it takes in. FOOD SERVICES WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR IDEAS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL . . . .

1. You are primarily: (Circle one) (5)

- U of M student . . . . . 1
- U of M faculty/staff . . . . . 2
- Not affiliated with the U of M . . . . . 3

2. How many times A WEEK do you cross the bridge during: (Circle one for each quarter) (6-9)

- Fall Quarter . . . . . 0 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11+
- Winter Quarter . . . . . 0 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11+
- Spring Quarter . . . . . 0 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11+
- Summer Quarter . . . . . 0 1-2 3-4 5-6 7-8 9-10 11+

3. During a TYPICAL WEEK, do you cross the bridge in: (10-13)

- |                                       |     |    |   |
|---------------------------------------|-----|----|---|
|                                       |     | 1  | 2 |
| Early Morning (8-10) . . . . .        | yes | no |   |
| Late Morning (10-12) . . . . .        | yes | no |   |
| Noon/early afternoon (12-2) . . . . . | yes | no |   |
| Mid/late afternoon (2-4) . . . . .    | yes | no |   |

4. On the Minneapolis Campus, do you spend MOST of your time on: (Circle one) (14)

- East Bank . . . . . 1
- West Bank . . . . . 2

5. Which of the following foods would you like to see available at the proposed food service: (Circle all that apply) (15-30)

- |                 |                |                       |            |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| hot beverages   | cold beverages | fruit                 | sandwiches |
| packaged snacks | pastries       | popcorn               | ice cream  |
| shakes          | hot entrees    | salad bar             | soups      |
| hamburgers      | hot dogs       | Other (specify) _____ |            |

6. If you were to use the new food service, would you use it for: (31-34)

- |                                      |     |    |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----|
|                                      | 1   | 2  |
| quick stop carry away food . . . . . | yes | no |
| short snack or meal . . . . .        | yes | no |
| extended meal, socializing . . . . . | yes | no |

7. For you a bridge restaurant might be: (Circle all that apply) (35-41)

- a time saver    a warm up    a meeting place    a food stop
- a break in a long walk    a view point    nothing noteworthy

8. How often do you think you would patronize a bridge food service? (Circle one) (42)

- |                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 4-5 times a week       | 2-3 times a week      |
| About once a week      | Once or twice a month |
| Less than once a month | Never                 |

9. Based on what you know, do you think that a bridge food service should or should not be built? (43)

- Should be built . . . . . 1
- Should not be built . . . . . 2

10. Please write any comments about the bridge proposal on the reverse side. (44-45)

Thank you for being a Food Service guest and giving us your thoughts. PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY TO THE CASHIER OR HOSTESS AT THIS UNIT OR THE POLL TAKER AT THE OPPOSITE END OF THE BRIDGE. ENJOY YOUR DAY!