

## **Developing an Instrument to Evaluate Leisure Programme Satisfaction**

Sandra L. Hupp, Department of Physical Education, Sport, and Leisure Studies, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99164-1410

### **INTRODUCTION**

With the decline in resources due to inflation and a continued demand for leisure experiences, evaluation of leisure service programmes has become increasingly more important in today's era of accountability. Although review of the literature indicates research on the type of leisure participation, particularly by frequency of participation, and leisure satisfaction in general, there is little evidence of research specifically focused on participants' satisfaction of organized leisure programmes.

Some researchers (Leviton and Santoro, 1980) have voiced concern with research based primarily on frequency of participation because it merely assesses the quantity or frequency of involvement of participants. It is important to understand how participants evaluate satisfaction in programmes to help determine the types of programmes to be included in programme offerings.

Rossman (1982) has reported that satisfaction with community recreation programmes could be described by using a variety of subscales including satisfaction with feelings of Achievement, Physical Fitness, Social Enjoyment, Family Escape, Environment, Autonomy, Relaxation, and Fun. Hupp (1989), using a revised version of Rossman's form, reported that Achievement, Relaxation, and Environment components could be used to predict leisure programme satisfaction for some older women in senior centre programmes.

The purpose of the study reported here was to revise Rossman's Leisure Programme Evaluation Form (Rossman, 1982). The Leisure Programme Evaluation Form is a reliable and valid instrument to measure participant leisure programme satisfaction.

### **METHOD**

In part the methods of this study were a replication of Rossman's initial study in the development of the Leisure Programme Evaluation Form. A jury of 12 experts (practitioners and researchers) was surveyed to determine the content validity of the proposed revision of Rossman's instrument. As a result of suggestions and changes, the pilot instrument included 24 items to measure programme satisfaction and six questions to provide additional information about programme participation. Changes in Rossman's instrument for the pilot test included: (1) make statements consistent with regard to verb tense and use of subject; (2) make the number of statements used for each subscale equal (three items for each subscale); (3) change anchor points for the response options; (4) strengthen the statistical interpretation by using one numerical value for each response choice; (5) modify the second section of the questionnaire based on input from the professional jury; and (6) rename the questionnaire the "Programme Activity Satisfaction Scale".

The following were the same for the pilot test and the second test: (a) programme participants were surveyed after the fifth week and before the last week of the programme; and (b) programme leaders were asked to read a standard instruction sheet on how to respond to the questionnaire.

A pilot test of the revised instrument was conducted during the summer of 1988 with participants in a community recreation department. Programme activities surveyed were representative of summer programme offerings including such programmes as youth day activities, adult exercise programmes, outdoor activities, and sport activities. Factor analysis of the data (87 usable questionnaires) confirmed which statements related to each component of leisure programme satisfaction. The reliability of the programme satisfaction components was examined by using Cronbach alpha and Pearson correlation analysis. A second testing of the revised instrument was implemented during the fall of 1988 in two community recreation departments

selected by convenience.

Activities were representative of programme offerings including adult exercise programmes, art, dance, and trips. Analysis of the data (191 usable questionnaires) included factor analysis and reliability procedures as noted above.

An attempt was made to obtain a stratified sample with regard to age, programme format, and activity type. Such a sample, however, was not possible for this study. The criteria used in the selection of community recreation departments included the following:

1. Community recreation departments that serve over 1,000 participants
2. Programme offerings with enrolment for the data collection period of at least one programme in each of these programme format areas: instructional classes, special events, leader-directed activities, competitive programmes, and drop-in programmes
3. Programme enrolment for the data collection period with participants of various ages ranging from 8 to over 50 years

## **RESULTS**

Based on findings of the pilot test, the subscales were reduced to six: achievement, social pleasure, relaxation, physical exercise, environment, and fun. The subscales autonomy and escape from family were eliminated based on the factor scores.

Utilizing factor analysis and alpha reliability on the second testing yielded a scale of five components of programme satisfaction. The five components included achievement, relaxation, physical exercise, environment, and the components of fun and social pleasure loading on one factor. Overall programme satisfaction reliability was 0.87 with factor reliabilities ranging between 0.95 (fun and social pleasure) and 0.71 (both environment and relaxation).

## **DISCUSSION**

Based on information obtained by use of the Programme Satisfaction Scale (the revised Leisure Programme Evaluation Form) practitioners may be able to determine practical implications for the delivery of leisure services including a demand for various types of programmes, such as health and fitness related programmes. Consideration of aspects that contribute to leisure programme satisfaction may be helpful to meet needs of individuals participating in organized leisure programmes. Those involved with programme planning and implementation may be able to use information gathered from this instrument to determine programmes they will want to continue and may be challenged to consider possibilities for additions or alterations to the current programme offerings.

## **REFERENCES**

- Hupp, S. L. 1989. "Factors contributing to satisfaction of women in recreation programmes at senior centers". RECREATION: Current Selected Research. 1: 139-153.
- Leviton, D. and Santoro, L. C. (eds.). 1980. Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance for the Older Adult: A Modular Approach. Reston, Virginia: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.
- Rossmann, J. R. 1982. "Evaluate programs by measuring participant satisfaction". Parks and Recreation. 17: 33-35.

**PROCEEDINGS**  
**Sixth Canadian Congress on Leisure Research**  
**May 9-12, 1990**

**COMPTE RENDU DU**  
**Sixième Congrès Canadien de Recherches en Loisir**  
**Le 9-12 mai, 1990**

**University of Waterloo**

***Leisure Challenges:  
Bringing People, Resources and  
Policy into Play***

***Les défis des loisirs:  
agencer les personnes,  
les ressources, et les décisions***

**Editor/Le rédacteur: Bryan J. A. Smale**

**©Ontario Research Council on Leisure 1990**  
**©Conseil Ontarien de Recherche en Loisir 1990**

Copyright © 1990 Ontario Research Council on Leisure/Conseil Ontarien de  
Recherche en Loisir

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or used  
in any form without written permission of the editor or ORCOL.

Printed and bound at Graphic Services  
University of Waterloo



Appropriate Use of Documents: Documents may be downloaded or printed (single copy only).  
Please note that this document is copyrighted and CREDIT MUST BE PROVIDED to the originator  
of the document when you quote from it. You must not sell the document or make a profit from  
reproducing it. You must not copy, extract, summarize or distribute downloaded documents outside  
of your own organization in a manner which competes with or substitutes for the distribution of the  
database by the Lifestyle Information Network (LIN). <http://www.lin.ca>