

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Andrea C. Bussler for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Business Administration, and Exercise and Sport Science presented on June 8, 1995. Title: Women's Perceptions of Their Needs and Preferences in an Intramural Sports Program: A Critical Analysis of Intramural Sports Participants and Potential Participants at Oregon State University.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved: —

Judith Bowker

The purpose of this study was to determine women's perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences, survey their evaluation of how the Intramural Sports Department accommodates those needs and preferences, and determine if and how intramural sports programming might be adjusted to serve women better. An open-ended survey was administered to female Oregon State University intramural sports participants and potential participants; the survey probed for customer needs, communication aspects, and assessment of program services. Utilizing a grounded theory analysis, five significant findings emerged from the survey results. The first category, women participate in intramural sports for the social aspects, revealed that female respondents participate in the intramural sports program to enjoy the camaraderie that takes place with friends and other participants; this finding is consistent with past research. A lack of opportunities and a desire for a team formation service emerged as the second category; this category indicated a barrier to participation in intramural sports. The third category

that emerged indicated that respondents have a desire for multiple skill levels from which to choose to participate; however, a lack of female participation prohibits a multiple skill level option. Although past research has suggested that women prefer a cooperative playing environment, the fourth significant finding indicated that survey results did not confirm nor disconfirm that theory. Female participants and potential participants reported a desire for both competitiveness and cooperativeness in their playing environments. The final significant finding indicated that women are getting the message about intramural sports; however, the message does not entice them to participate. Interactive interviews with three participants and two potential participants confirmed the research findings and analysis. Suggestions to assist with team formation, increase female participation, reduce participation barriers, provide a mixture of competitiveness and cooperativeness, enhance promotion efforts, and conduct future research are presented.

©Copyright by Andrea C. Bussler
June 8, 1995
All Rights Reserved

Women's Perceptions of Their Needs and Preferences in an Intramural
Sports Program: A Critical Analysis of Intramural Sports Participants and
Potential Participants at Oregon State University

by

Andrea C. Bussler

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Completed June 8, 1995
Commencement June 1996

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies thesis of Andrea C. Bussler
presented on June 8, 1995

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Major Professor, representing Speech/Communication

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor, representing Business Administration

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor, representing Exercise and Sport Science

Redacted for Privacy

Chair of Department of Speech Communication

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Redacted for Privacy

Andrea C. Bussler, Author

Acknowledgement

Many people helped make the completion of this thesis possible. Thanks to the support of the following people, the education and challenge of writing a thesis was a rewarding experience. I thank:

Dr. Judith Bowker for her expertise, guidance, and continual support as my Major Professor.

Dr. Dow Poling, Dr. Richmond Barbour, Dr. Jack Drexler, and Dr. Ilene Kliensorge for their service as members of my thesis committee.

Charley Fisher, Director of Intramural Sports, for his expert advice, mentoring, and support.

Will Holsberry, Natalie Kovac, and Barbara Peltz of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association for their assistance with the collection of sources.

The Intramural Sports Department and staff for the financial support and assistance with survey preparations.

My roommates and friends, *Cass Koch* and *Leslie Heusted*, for their support and patience. *Leslie*'s assistance with the administration of surveys was also appreciated.

And finally, *my parents* for their unconditional support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
History.....	5
Participation Reasons.....	6
Intramural Sports Programming	14
Summary.....	15
3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	16
Methodology.....	17
The Sample Population.....	19
The Survey Instrument.....	20
Pilot Study	23
Survey Administration.....	23
Interview Process.....	29
Sample Size and Demographics.....	30
Treatment of Data.....	32
Research Limitations	35
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	37
Grounded Theory Categorizing.....	37
Summary.....	54
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	56
Five Findings.....	56
Conclusion	68
Future Research Recommendations.....	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	74
APPENDICES.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.1 Representative Sampling	21
3.2 Participation Categories	22

LIST OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Page</u>
A Survey	79
B OSU Sororities and Cooperatives Participation.....	82
C Informed Consent Script.....	83
D Interview Guide.....	84
E Interview Guide-Addendum.....	90
F Customer Need Analysis Questions.....	96
G Communication Questions.....	97
H Program Services Questions.....	98

Women's Perceptions of Their Needs and Preferences in an Intramural Sports Program: A Critical Analysis of Intramural Sports Participants and Potential Participants at Oregon State University

Chapter 1

Introduction

Recreational sports professionals have a responsibility to provide programs that serve all individuals within their respective campus communities (Chestnutt, Nadeau & Taylor, 1985). Upon providing programs that serve all individuals, a common goal of intramural sports programs is to “make the sport experience the best it can possibly be for all participants” (Smith, 1992, p. 92). To fulfill the responsibility and goals, intramural sports administrators are concerned with the identification of current “participant” and “potential participant” needs (Lankford, Rice, Chai & Hisaka, 1993).

An evaluation of why some individuals choose to participate in intramural sports and others choose not to participate is important information when administrators attempt to plan a program that will serve all individuals. Since the trend of females exiting intramural sports continues (Gaskins, 1994 & Smith, 1992), the female population is a particularly important focus group. Although one study suggested that female intramural sport participation numbers have stabilized, or even increased (Kuga & Meacci, 1989), many other researchers have stated that the trend is declining and the percentage of female participation in intramural sports is significantly less than that of male participation (Bialeschki, 1988; Gaskins, 1994; Smith, 1992; & Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990). The research that has been conducted in the past leaves many questions unanswered, as well as

prompting new questions (Bohlig, 1991; Gaskins, 1994; Henderson, 1993; & Smith, 1992). In response to the unanswered questions and the participation gap between males and females, several researchers have indicated the necessity for further research on female participation and nonparticipation in intramural Sports (Bialeschki, 1988; Bohlig, 1991; Lankford et al., 1993; Smith & Missler, 1994; Smith, 1992; Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990; & Tharp, 1994).

In view of all sport opportunities (i.e., organized sport, fitness, informal recreation) the participation gap between men and women is narrowing; however, sport is still largely organized for men and remains a male preserve (Theberge, 1985). In light of the female participation trend, the common goal of intramural sports programs, and future research recommendations, there is a need to determine why women are “participants” or “nonparticipants” of intramural sports and to examine views and programming efforts of intramural sports administrators.

Intramural sports were initially supported by university officials because the programs provided another educational outlet for students (NIRSA: General & Specialty Standards, 1989 & Peltz, 1994). Recreational sports professionals have continued to prove that physical activity is a positive attribute for the human body and the programs professionals offer “contribute to the education and well being of those who participate” (Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990, p. 34). Since large numbers of women are not gaining the expressed benefits of leadership and camaraderie thought to be gained through intramural team sports, administrators need to study the continuing issue of low female participation in intramural sports (Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990).

Though intramural sport participants may communicate program approval and current participation numbers may indicate a quality and

successful program, administrators still must evaluate the program on a regular basis. The characteristics of campus populations vary from school to school and year to year; administrators must remain aware of the physical activity needs and preferences of the current student body. The program qualities that attract some individuals may be the qualities that repel potential participants. Not all people enjoy the same recreational sport activities or participate for the same reasons (Bohlig, 1991); the administrator's challenge is to find a programming mix that accommodates various needs and preferences. Thus, to satisfactorily maintain the goal of providing a positive sport experience for as many individuals as possible, an assessment of what activities and physical needs and preferences participants and potential participants want offered is appropriate.

Although the current participation population is an important group to research, the individuals who do not participate in intramural sports but have been involved in physical activities in the past and/or present represent a population who need to be researched to more effectively evaluate the program (Lankford et al., 1993). The potential participant is one who is inactive in intramural sports but has demonstrated a desire to participate in physical activity. The potential participant may have participated in organized sport during high school, be utilizing recreational opportunities within the informal campus recreation program, or be exercising and/or competing outside of the campus community. Since the implementation of title IX, the number of female participants in athletics has grown tremendously. What happens to the women who participated in high school sports? By participating in organized sports during high school, the individual has demonstrated an interest in sports. If this individual is not participating in collegiate athletics or sport clubs, are her physical activity

needs being met? These are questions asked by the OSU Department of Intramural Sports. Individuals with past or present experience and interest in sports and physical activity are more likely to take an interest in the opportunities offered by the intramural sports program; therefore, these are people with whom intramural sports administrators must attempt to communicate, as this population represents potential participants for the intramural sports program.

To offer a complete and quality intramural sports program, an Intramural Sports Department must be cognizant of what images and messages are being sent to the campus community when promotion and programming efforts are being designed and implemented. To obtain the students perspectives, this study examined what marketing strategies appealed to participants and potential participants; in addition the study analyzed the current strategies with the information gathered from the female research participants.

Female participation in intramural sports has a declining participation trend; to fulfill the goal of satisfaction for all participants, this study focused on the physical activity and intramural sport needs of the female campus community at Oregon State University (OSU). To offer a quality program, the Intramural Sports Department must determine the needs of participants and potential participants.

The purpose of this study is to gather data on OSU women's perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences and their knowledge and interest in the intramural sports program. The data revealed reasons females participate in intramural sports at OSU and may be used by administrators to determine if and how intramural sports programming patterns might be adjusted.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Recreational sports have been an integral part of higher education for decades. They are a vital extension of the higher education process, contributing to the physical and intellectual development of students, enlarging campus relations with local communities, and augmenting the programming opportunities for campus constituencies (NIRSA: General and Specialty Standards, 1989, p. 1).

History

Recreational sports professionals know their programs provide positive contributions to the education and well being of those who participate, and campus recreation programs have proven themselves as important elements of student life (Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990). However, support from university officials was not always the case and has only developed over time and program success. In the 1800's, students organized their own teams and events. Student interest in organized sport continued for years and in 1913 the actual term "intramurals" was officially implemented to apply to "any program of competitive and recreational sports that was organized and with participants within an institution" (Peltz, 1994, p.1). Intramural sport began as an educational tool with the purpose to develop character, promote fitness, foster lifetime recreational habits, instill a sense of pride within the individual, and provide a social interactive and fun activity (Bonnano, 1987; & Smith & Carron, 1990). As recreation programs expanded, "recreational sports" became the term that encompassed a variety of programs, including intramural sports (Peltz, 1994).

Since the success of campus recreational sports was ignited by students and their desires to participate, one can understand why the students' needs and preferences are valued information for program planning. In return, "the program should serve all students" and "the program should exclude no one, honor all who are deserving. . . and show no favoritism whatsoever in regard to sex, race or any other distinction" (Chestnutt, Nadeau, & Taylor, 1985, p. 93). To determine if the program serves and provides equal opportunities for all students, an intramural sports department must determine why individuals choose not to participate (Chestnutt et al., 1985). However, care must be exercised when labeling individuals as nonparticipants. Individuals may be nonparticipants of intramural sports but participants in other recreation activities (Horn, 1992). Therefore, the physically active individuals who are nonparticipants of intramural sports are a priority category to research when evaluating the participation expansion possibilities of a program (Lankford, Rice, Chai, & Hisaka, 1993).

Participation Reasons

Various studies on intramural sports have been conducted to determine participation reasons and participation barriers (Bialeschki, 1988; Chestnutt et al., 1985; Gaskins, 1994; Kuga & Meacci, 1989; Smith & Missler, 1994; & Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990). As research indicates, males and females become involved in organized sport for different reasons. Competition is a primary motivator for males, and males have significantly higher participation rates in organized competitive sport. Sociability and fitness are primary motivators for females, and females prefer cooperative sport and

participate less in organized competitive sport (Bohlig, 1991; Bialeschki, 1988; Gill, 1986; Kuga & Meacci, 1989; Smith, 1994; Tharp, 1994; & Theberge, 1985).

A study conducted on students at Cal Poly State University in San Luis Obispo, California, revealed that the percentage of women participating were identical to the percentage of men; however, women and men participated in different areas of the program (Snodgrass & Tinsley, 1990). Consistent with past research that suggests males and females prefer competitive and cooperative sport respectively, Snodgrass and Tinsley's study (1990) showed that "women participated significantly more in fitness and leisure classes, significantly less in intramural team sports, and somewhat less in the areas of sport clubs and informal recreation" (p. 36).

The results of the Snodgrass and Tinsley study support the views of several researchers. Based on her personal experience in both a woman's athletic organization and a man's athletic organization, Grant (1984) believes that "women's values in sport are significantly different to men's values" (p. 44). The value differences that exist between males and females in sport are not surprising since value differences also exist in society as a whole. The sex role is one of the most important determinants of human behavior (Gilligan, 1982). However, the sex differences are not the cause of concern; the process of evaluating and measuring one category as better or worse provides the reason for concern. Because the evaluation guide has been formed from the male's perspective, researchers have tended to specify male behavior as the 'norm' and female behavior as an aberration of the norm (Gilligan, 1982). Gilligan (1982) contends that "the failure of women to fit existing models of human growth may point to a problem in the representation, a limitation in the conception of human condition, an omission of certain truths about life" (p. 2). Though efforts have been made to reach equality between the sexes,

change is difficult when society has become accustomed to “seeing life through men’s eyes” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 6).

Even when women have formed athletic structures that parallel the values of women [i.e., Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) and International Federation of Women’s Hockey Associations (IFWHA)], eventually the organizations have merged with the men’s athletic structures [i.e., National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and Federation Internationale de Hockey (FIH)]. Following the mergers of women’s and men’s athletic organizations, the male values have prevailed and the male model has become the accepted structure (Grant, 1984).

The structure of a sport organization can and does influence behavior. Grant (1984) explained the female structure of the AIAW and IFWHA as one of cooperation. When the organizations merged with the NCAA and FIH respectively, the structures changed and consequently, the behavior of the participants changed to one of competition and a ‘win at all costs’ attitude. Under the cooperative structure, participants enjoyed the camaraderie of the game and supported the theory of fair play by assisting the official(s) with the appropriate call. On the contrary, the competitive structure made winning more important and players would bend the rules and disagree with the official(s) to gain an advantage over the opponent.

Since competition and cooperation are participation differences between males and females, a description of the two styles clarifies the challenge intramural sport administrators face when programming for a diverse population who seeks both recreational sport climates. A broad definition of competition is “a process through which success is measured by directly comparing the achievements of those who are performing the same physical activity under standardized conditions and rules” (Coakley, 1990, p.

63). Regardless of the sport structure, "competition is a part of sport" (Coakley, 1990, p. 65). Although individuals may have different reasons and goals for participating in sport, the competitive process of sport remains focused on defeating opponents and identifying winners and losers based on who does better than whom (Coakley, 1990).

Considering competition is inherent in sport, one can understand the difficulty of providing a cooperative sport climate. "Cooperation in sport is characterized by the compatibility of goals between the participants" (Smith & Carron, 1990, p. 46). If all participants' values and behaviors are congruent and participants work together to achieve common goals, a cooperative environment transpires. However, if one individual has a different goal than the group goal, a cooperative environment is difficult to maintain (Smith & Carron, 1990).

Intramural sport professionals recognize the differences and values of competitive and cooperative play but struggle with the ramifications of implementing both participation styles. An intramural sports program is a competitive structure by nature. Intramural sports were established to provide the campus population with an opportunity to play organized sports; within this organized structure, individuals or teams are scheduled to compete against other individuals or teams. Regardless of the emphasis placed on "recreational" or "fun" leagues, a winner and loser will be determined at the conclusion of the event, with the exception of games that may end in ties.

The competitive structure is reinforced through other forms of organized sport and media. Competition is widespread in American society; Americans demand winners (Eitzen & Sage, 1986). Professional athletes are paid enormous salaries to help their teams win, are sponsored by wealthy

corporations to present a successful image to the respective company product, and receive fan support when winning. If professional athletes cannot play and win, they are likely to be traded, lose sponsorship support, and experience dwindling fan support. The American society supports a winner and that support does not stop at the high entertainment professional athlete; coaches are fired if their respective teams do not win, collegiate athletes risk losing athletic scholarships for lackluster performance, and Brunswick's research (1988) suggests that small children perceive their parents disapprove of them when they do not play well.

Since winners receive such high praise, winning often becomes the ultimate goal; therefore, adults and children play to win rather than for pleasure (Eitzen & Sage, 1986). Paul "Bear" Bryant's phrase, "Every time you win, you're reborn; when you lose, you die a little," and Vince Lombardi's statement that "Winning is not everything. It is the only thing" (Eitzen & Sage, 1986, p. 60) are indicative of a competitive society that views success in terms of winning.

With the nature of organized sport and society's emphasis on winning, how do intramural sport administrators successfully incorporate a cooperative style into a naturally competitive structure? Several authors believe that competitive and cooperative structures can be combined in sport (Coakley, 1990; Smith & Missler, 1994; & Smith & Carron, 1990). By offering a program that recognizes success and failure in terms other than winning and losing, a competitive and cooperative sport climate can be achieved. Recognition for sportsmanship, consistent participation, or team spirit are incentives that may be used to encourage a cooperative atmosphere (Coakley, 1990; Smith & Missler, 1994; & Smith & Carron, 1990). The combination of competitive and cooperative that works best will vary from program to

program, and an independent evaluation of each program will help determine an appropriate competitive/cooperative style (Smith & Carron, 1990).

The previous discussion and research has established that males prefer competitive activities and females prefer cooperative activities (Bohlig, 1991; Bialeschki, 1988; Gill, 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Grant, 1984; Kuga & Meacci, 1989; Smith, 1994; Tharp, 1994; & Theberge, 1985). Differences in participation preferences are not surprising, as research has shown that the socialization of children encourages females to be noncompetitive and to participate only in feminine activities (Kane, 1990; Kane, 1989; Shaw, 1994; & Wyckham & McGregor, 1980). Kane (1989) recognizes that women have made positive strides toward gender equality in sports; however, she argues that women are still socialized to participate in feminine sport activities. Even though women may be physically skilled and able to compete in masculine sports, unappealing rewards for participation and achievement reinforce the traditional stereotypes of certain sports being labeled acceptable and others unacceptable (Coakley, 1990). Kane (1989) notes that women are not only underrepresented in the media, but that when women are recognized they are often presented in traditional stereotypic ways. Although more women participate in basketball and softball than in golf or tennis, the amount of coverage of women in golf and tennis remains disproportionately higher than coverage to women's participation in more masculine sports such as basketball and softball. Despite an increase in female sport participation, "sport remains highly associated with the so-called 'masculine' elements of our culture, and the female in sport is still considered a woman in man's territory" (Csizma, Wittig & Schurr, 1988, p. 62-63).

Several authors state that the overall image of sport and athletics remains masculine, and this masculine image of sport has placed societal and institutional constraints on female sport participation (Kane, 1989; Matteo, 1988; Messner & Sabo, 1990; & Shaw, 1994). Since masculinity and femininity are considered polar opposites and sport is perceived as masculine, one can understand why throughout history “women who played sports were, by definition, unfeminine” (Kane, 1989, p. 59). According to Tavris (1977), “the ‘polar opposite’ concept has been reflected in psychology for years; virtually every test of masculinity-femininity assumes a continuum of characteristics: ‘very aggressive’ is masculine, ‘not at all aggressive’ is feminine” (p. 178). In relation to femaleness and maleness, gender is “the way in which each of us defines ourselves and others as ranging from feminine to masculine” (Henderson, 1994, p. 121). Henderson (1994) further emphasizes that “the meaning of gender is constructed by society, and each of us is socialized into that construction” (p. 121). The recreational actions and choices individuals make are influenced by self and others’ perceptions. This socialization has led to gender-role conformity which has kept young girls and women locked out of sports for centuries or at least constrained to sport activities with a feminine connotation (Coakley, 1990; & Kane, 1989).

Although the study of women in sport is minimal, feminist analyses has discovered a “hidden history of female athleticism, examined sex differences in patterns of athletic socialization, and demonstrated how the dominant institutional forms of sport have naturalized men’s power and privilege over women” (Messner & Sabo, 1990, p. 2). In the past, women were discouraged from participating in vigorous sport activities because the activity was supposedly harmful to the female body and reproductive organs.

Women were pressured to behave accordingly and to remain delicate or risk being thought unwomanly (Bialeschki, 1990; Freysinger, 1990; & Kidd, 1990).

Though the Victorian era is in the past, women still face challenges and restrictions when entering the arena of sport (Bialeschki, 1990; Kane, 1989; & Kidd, 1990). In the mid-1970's, an increase in health and fitness awareness became reasons to encourage women to participate in physical sport activities. The strength, muscles, and physical development of the female body became more acceptable, but the "traditional ideal of preserving youthful beauty" remains intact as illustrated by clothing fashions and marketing methods for female fitness (Coakley, 1990, p. 18). Many women are still trying to break through the social and facility resource barriers that imply women should only participate in physical activities that enhance femininity and are considered acceptable female sports (i.e., swimming, tennis, and gymnastics).

Special rules that discourage ambitious and aggressive play also illustrate how sport is made more socially acceptable for women (Kidd, 1990). Co-recreational activities have been a popular addition to intramural sports programming; the mixture of males and females competing together has provided an exciting alternative that combines a competitive and cooperative atmosphere. However, co-recreational rules often are modified to imply that one sex is superior over another. Though the intent of special rules may be to encourage equal involvement from both males and females, the rules may send messages that one sex is not as skilled as the other sex which then violates participation growth and development (Smith, 1992).

In summary, the factors that influence females to participate are different than those that influence males to participate. Past research suggests that females prefer a cooperative playing environment, are motivated by

social and fitness aspects, and are socialized to participate in feminine sport activities.

Intramural Sports Programming

Though competitive preferences may differ between males and females, sex differences in competitiveness no longer automatically imply sex differences in sport participation. Individuals with low competitiveness desires might engage in activities that do not require competition (Gill, 1986). Since many females do participate in noncompetitive sport and exercise activities, an intramural sports program has a responsibility to determine the needs of the female campus community (customer) in order to fulfill the goal of participant satisfaction. As Wyckham and McGregor (1980) state, "only on the basis of a clear understanding of the needs of the consumer (both current participants and potential participants)" can a quality program be designed (p. 134).

Unfortunately, the success of an intramural sports program is not solely dependent upon offering appropriate and adequate programming options. Women's participation may be influenced by more than direct programming issues. The methods used to promote intramural sports programs may influence how women perceive their participation choices. Smith (1992) suggests that intramural sports programs "feed the oppressive state of women, not intentionally, but unknowingly" (p. 92). Even though intramural programs do not cause oppression, many programs feed the oppressive conditions by sending overt messages to women which imply they are invited to play but they really do not belong in sport, or women can play but their programs are not as important as the male programs. Oppressive

messages may be detected in media releases, sport fliers, program information sheets or other publicity efforts. The messages may be conveyed through “man”-linked words and phrases which are intended to address both men and women, publicity pictures which are male-dominated or women’s pictures associated with traditionally feminine sport activities (Smith, 1992). Therefore, to offer a complete quality intramural sports program, an intramural sports department must be cognizant of what images and messages are being sent to the campus community when promotion and programming efforts are being designed and implemented.

Summary

Past research has confirmed that women have struggled for social acceptance in the world of sport and recreation. Researchers have demonstrated that women are faced with issues of socialization and gender-role conformity (Kane, 1989). This past cannot be changed or reconstructed. Rather, intramural sports administrators must remain aware of the meanings that encompass the construction of gender, take this pertinent research into consideration, and make the information benefit intramural programs. By considering past information and current participation figures, the issue of declining female participation in intramural sports can be identified and addressed for the current female campus population.

Chapter 3

Design of the Study

Intramural sports is a program that provides various structured sports opportunities to satisfy as many skill levels as possible for men's, women's and co-recreation play (NIRSA: General and Specialty Standards, 1989). The structured opportunities must offer a balance of activities and include individual, dual and team contests, meets, tournaments, and leagues which are limited to individuals within the institution (NIRSA: General and Specialty Standards, 1989). Although these structured events are formatted to provide opportunities for all skill levels and to encourage social interaction and fun, an intramural sports program is a competitive structure by nature. Regardless of the emphasis placed on "recreational" or "fun" leagues, a winner and loser will always be determined at the conclusion of the event. Because women's perspectives about competitiveness and cooperativeness may be effected by these intramural sports events, these perspectives will be discussed in chapter 4.

For the purposes of this study, "participants" refer to those female OSU students who engage in any level of intramural competition, whether on a regular or one-time only basis. "Potential participants" are those OSU female students who played organized sports during high school or currently engage in recreational activities in any organized, informal or self-constructed program, but who are not participants in the intramural sports program. "Nonparticipants" refer to those women who do not participate even casually in any sports or exercise. Nonparticipants may be mentioned in this study but are not a focus category. When the term "women" is used, reference is being

made to the OSU female campus population who are categorized as participants or potential participants.

Methodology

To formulate and implement strategies to increase the number of female intramural sports participants, reasons women do or do not participate in intramural sports needed to be determined. Based on the reasons for participation, physical activity needs, and physical activity preferences of OSU female participants and potential participants, the structure of the intramural sports program was assessed. The collective results will help the OSU Department of Intramural Sports determine if there is a need to restructure the program to better accommodate the needs and preferences of the female population. The following questions provided the research foundation; survey questions were created using these foundation questions, previous research findings, and personal intramural sports experiences.

Topic: Customer Need Analysis

- Q1. In relation to organized intramural sports, what are women's perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences?
- Q1a. Does the current intramural sports program accommodate those preferences and needs?

Topic: Communication

- Q2. Does the management of the intramural sports program include a communication system that effectively reaches women participants and potential participants?
- Q2a. Does the communication method appeal to women participants and potential participants?
- Q2b. Do women have the opportunity to communicate their own perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences to the intramural department?

Topic: Program Services

- Q3. What would persuade the potential participant to become a participant of intramural sports?

Speculation was not the answer to these questions. These questions required more than assumptions and traditional programming actions. The purpose of this study was to determine how the program is perceived by women. For example, what qualities of the intramural sports program do women consider attractive or unattractive? Do participants and potential participants believe the program meets their physical activity needs and preferences? In addition to determining women's perceptions, the research provided administrators the opportunity to hear intramural programming suggestions from both participants and potential participants.

The Sample Population

The OSU female campus population totals 6,242 students (OSU Fact Book, 1995, p. 40). Participants and potential participants were selected from the female campus population based on the amount of their physical sport activities, their living situation, and their educational level (i.e., undergraduate and graduate). The amount of physical sport activities was a critical concept; physically active women are the people most likely to partake in intramural sport activities; thus, they are a target population. Even the individual who exercises 1-2 times per week is a potential participant of intramural sports. Since the majority of intramural sports events are structured as weekly leagues or weekend tournaments, individuals who have a restricted time schedule or prefer exercise on a small scale could benefit from participating in intramural sports.

An individual's living situation was relevant because teams often are formed from members of sororities, cooperatives, or residence halls. Reasons for participation in intramural sports may differ for sorority, cooperative, residence hall, and independent teams; all four categories must be represented in the sampling. From the female student population, approximately 570 women participated in the OSU intramural sports program over a one-year time period (Intramural Participation Summary, 1995). However, individuals who participate in more than one event are counted for each event in which they participate (i.e., an individual who plays football and basketball is counted as two participants). Thus, the participation figure does not represent 570 different people; rather, the figure provides a guide for the number of women who participate over the course of the academic year. Since undergraduate students living in sororities, cooperatives, or residence

halls constitute a large portion of the participation figure, a significant percentage of the sample was selected from women living in Greek, cooperative, or residence hall housing.

Although undergraduates constitute a majority of intramural sports participants, graduate students, faculty, and staff are eligible to participate. The number of faculty and staff members who participate are minimal; this study focused on the needs of the female student body. Surveys were administered to undergraduate and graduate students to gather a sampling of data from both the undergraduate and graduate educational level of the female OSU student body. Originally, data from both educational levels was to be separated and evaluated for potential differences. Since no significant differences emerged from the two groups, the data was compiled and evaluated as a whole.

The Survey Instrument

A 30-question survey (Appendix A) was constructed specifically for this study. To encourage survey respondents to answer in their own words, the survey was open ended. The time to complete the survey was under ten minutes. The first six questions were used to ensure a representative demographics sampling of the OSU female population. The majority of the respondents were undergraduate students, between the ages of 17-25, and Caucasian. Table 2.1 (OSU Fact Book, 1995, p. 40) indicates the similarities between the sample population for this research and the OSU female population.

Table 2.1

Representative Sampling

<u>Female OSU Campus</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Population</u>
American Indian	79	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	424	7%
Black	56	1%
Caucasian	4,754	76%
Hispanic	186	3%
International	458	7%
Declined to respond	285	5%
<u>Sample Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>
American Indian/Alaskan	1	1%
Asian American	9	5%
African American	2	1%
Caucasian	130	79%
Hispanic American	9	5%
•Other	8	5%
Declined to respond	6	4%

•Ethnic identities that were specified under other: Asian/Thai, Asian, Japanese, French, Brazilian, and Celtic.

Table 2.1 illustrates the percentage of women surveyed was comparable to the percentage of female OSU students. For example, three percent of the OSU female campus population is Hispanic; five percent of the survey population was Hispanic American. Therefore, the sample population was representative of the female OSU campus population.

Three questions were included to determine if the survey respondent was a participant, potential participant, or nonparticipant. Regardless of how frequently or recently they had engaged in intramural play, respondents who indicated they had participated in the OSU Intramural Sports Program were categorized as participants. Any respondent who had not participated in the

OSU Intramural Sports Program but who worked out at least 1-2 times per week or participated in any kind of organized sports during high school was categorized as a potential participant. Respondents who indicated they do not work out, did not participate in organized sports during high school, and do not participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program were categorized as nonparticipants.

Following the division of participants, potential participants, and nonparticipants, potential participants were further categorized according to their knowledge of the Intramural Sports Program. Table 2.2 indicates the number of respondents per category.

Table 2.2
Participation Categories

No.	Category description
62	Participants
84	Potential participants-informed about Intramural Sports
13	Potential participants-uninformed about Intramural Sports
6	Nonparticipants-informed about Intramural Sports
0	Nonparticipants-uninformed about Intramural Sports

The target areas for survey administration were designed to reach physically active individuals; therefore, the significant number of participants and potential participants was ideal.

Pilot Study

Prior to administering the official survey, a pilot study was conducted to test whether the instrument was “indeed measuring the concepts [it] intend[ed] to measure” (Frey et al, 1991, p. 119). Distributed to 13 female students, the test pilot survey was examined to determine if the phrasing of the questions was eliciting the kinds of information sought. Adjustments were made on five questions and one question was added. On the test pilot survey, a customer needs analysis question asked “How could the OSU Intramural Sports Program be changed to better serve you?” After review of the test pilot results, I realized individuals with no intramural sports experience had difficulty answering this question. The question was changed to ask “What programs or qualities would your ideal Intramural Sports Program include?” Regardless of an individual’s intramural sport experience, respondents could answer this question because the question did not require an understanding of the current program. Although most changes were not this significant, the adjustments provided necessary clarification’s and increased the survey validity.

Survey Administration

To collect data that would be beneficial in evaluating the current intramural sports program, participants and potential participants needed to be included in the sample population. Prior to administering the surveys, groups that included participants and potential participants were determined. The groups selected were requested to complete a survey that would provide useful information in evaluating the current intramural sports program.

To avoid a homogenous sample population, living groups with a diversified population were sought. For example, the residence halls were a selected sample population because of their active role in intramural sports and for their resident diversity. Directors of the ten OSU residence halls recommended surveying Wilson Hall and Finley Hall to reach first-year students, West International House to reach a minority population, and Hawley Hall to reach the graduate population.

The selection criteria for the sorority chapters was based on past intramural sport participation. The sorority system at OSU consists of 13 housed and 4 unhoused chapters. Sorority chapters who use their Greek name as a team name were identified as intramural sports participants. Though not all sorority members participate in intramural sports, each housed chapter had some members who were active and used their Greek name to represent their sorority in intramural sports competition. Although the 4 unhoused sorority chapters may have had members who were intramural sports participants, no teams could be identified as representatives of those sorority chapters. Appendix B indicates the sports in which each sorority participated over a one-year time period.

The sororities selected were chosen because of their level of activeness in the intramural sports program. Kappa Kappa Gamma was selected to represent an extremely active (i.e., participate in 5 of 5 major team sports) housed sorority chapter, Chi Omega represented an active housed chapter who only participated in one event, and Alpha Xi Delta was chosen to represent an inactive unhoused sorority chapter. By including sorority chapters with different levels of activeness, different participation perspectives were included in the responses. For example, an individual who participated in 5 of 5 sports may be more satisfied with the current program

than an individual who participated in 1 intramural sport; although the individual with more participation experience may have a better understanding of the program and be able to use that experience to better articulate their opinions, a less experienced individual may be less involved because of dissatisfaction of programming aspects. Although no comparisons were made between the extremely active and remotely active individuals, this range of activeness provided responses with different perspectives.

The OSU cooperative houses provide a small-group living situation similar to the housed sorority chapters, but the aura of the living environment is different. Although a similar organizational structure (i.e., house president, committee members, house meetings) exists between the Greek and cooperative systems, Greek organizations have a foundation based on tradition, history, and lifelong commitment that makes the Greek living situation unique to other living groups. Because cooperative houses are involved in intramural sports and have a living situation that differs from sorority houses, two cooperatives were included in the survey process. Cooperative house directors suggested surveying Azalea House (active in 2 of 5 sports) and Reed Lodge (active in 1 of 5 sports). According to the cooperative house directors, house members had experienced frustrations while participating in the intramural sports program and welcomed the opportunity to express their opinions.

Sororities, cooperatives, and residence halls comprised a large portion of intramural sports participants; however, participants independent of university affiliated housing were important as well. Female users of Dixon Recreation Center were the fourth survey population selected. This population expanded the survey pool to include participants and potential participants who lived off-campus in unaffiliated university housing.

Sorority/Cooperative Housing

After selecting the sorority chapters and cooperative houses to be included in the research, a survey distribution time was arranged with the respective sorority president and cooperative house director. To reach a majority of the sorority members and cooperative residents, surveys were distributed during the weekly chapter meetings. The chapter meetings provided convenient times to administer surveys. Most members attend the chapter meetings; this provided easy access to a majority of the chapter members. Although the actual distribution of the survey varied from the beginning to the middle of the meeting, the distribution process was the same. The surveys were administered by myself or a colleague. To remain consistent with my explanation of the survey process and thesis purpose, my colleague read an informed consent script (Appendix C) to the sorority and cooperative members to whom she administered surveys. The consent script expressed the academic purpose of the survey, to whom the survey would be administered, the purpose of the study, the individual who gave permission to approach the respective group, the voluntariness of the survey, the anticipated survey length, the survey confidentiality, and a request for interview volunteers. Limited respondent questions were allowed. For example, specific programming questions such as "Does the intramural program offer women's soccer?" were answered. If a question required an opinion that might influence a survey response, the question was not answered.

Residence Halls

I was the sole person to distribute surveys to the residence halls. The surveys were distributed to residents of Hawley Hall and West International House in conjunction with mandatory residence hall surveys. The mandatory residence hall survey was lengthy (approximately 130 questions) and time consuming (approximately 30 minutes). However, since the survey for this research required less than 10 minutes to complete and the topic was nonthreatening, respondents willingly completed the survey. The Hawley Hall residents completed the Intramural Sports survey prior to the residence hall survey; residents of West International House completed the intramural sports survey following the residence hall survey. This administration procedure may have curbed the quality of the responses. For example, residents of Hawley Hall were aware of the residence hall survey length; to proceed with the lengthy residence hall survey, respondents may have rushed to complete the intramural sports survey. On the contrary, residents of West International House may have exceeded their level of tolerance for surveys prior to receiving the intramural sports survey. The two previous examples were limitations of the distribution process. The distribution of surveys in conjunction with another survey was not a preferred distribution method; however, the process did allow me to introduce the survey purpose in the same manner as the sorority and cooperative house distribution process. Since the residence hall survey was mandatory, a large number of female residents were present for the distribution of my survey.

To reach residents of Finley Hall, the survey was administered during a resident advisor's meeting. The resident hall director of Finley Hall had not arranged for Finley residents to take the mandatory residence hall survey;

thus, the distribution of surveys during a resident advisor's floor meeting was the process used to simultaneously survey a group of female residents. The surveys were distributed prior to the meeting; the introduction of the survey purpose followed the process used for the sororities, cooperatives, and other residence halls. Thirty-nine surveys were gathered from Finley Hall, Hawley Hall, and West International House. In comparison with the number of surveys received from other living situation categories, 39 surveys from the residence halls was a sufficient number. Since Finley Hall and Wilson Hall targeted the same population (first-year students living in residence halls), Wilson Hall was not included in the survey process.

Off-Campus

The sororities, cooperatives, and residence halls provided responses from students who resided in affiliated university housing; participants and potential participants who resided in unaffiliated university housing were tapped by surveying users of Dixon Recreation Center. A table was placed by the facility exit; as female users prepared to exit the facility, I asked them if they would complete a short survey regarding female participation in intramural sports. Users who volunteered to complete the survey were given a brief description of the survey purpose which was similar to the explanation provided to the sororities, cooperatives, and residence hall members. The table provided a convenient writing surface for multiple survey respondents and helped provide a relaxed survey distribution environment. Rather than stand and approach individuals exiting the facility, I sat behind the table and casually asked for volunteers; users were not pressured into completing the survey. By distributing the survey to women

as they were leaving, women were not detained from their work outs. In a one-hour time period, 28 surveys were collected from Dixon Recreation Center users. This survey number was comparable with the number of surveys collected from affiliated university groups and provided repetitive data; thus, the number of off-campus respondents was sufficient.

Students with Disabilities

In an effort to expand the sample population to include female students with disabilities, the Director of Students with Disabilities distributed surveys to her female students. The informed consent script was attached to each survey and placed in each student's mailbox. Seventy surveys were distributed to students with disabilities; however, only 3 surveys were completed and returned. Although only 3 students with disabilities returned surveys, a total of 7 students with disabilities responded in the overall sample population.

Interview Process

Since the survey responses provided clear results, new information was not anticipated from the interviews; rather, interviewee responses were expected to confirm the research analysis, potentially provide information for a slight revision of the analysis, and enrich the research results. The surveys of volunteer interviewees were analyzed for content; the respondents who reported salient or unique statements were contacted to be interviewed. Three participants and two potential participants were interviewed.

After making comparisons throughout the survey data, an interview guide was formed for each interviewee (Appendix D); the interview guides were designed to ask questions to clarify survey results. For example, lack of opportunities/team formation service was a significant research finding; therefore, the following question was presented to one interviewee: In response to improving publicity to appeal to you, you recommended “a class on the sport where all members attend.” Can you give an example of what you had in mind? This question was created to clarify what the respondent meant by her statement and to enrich the lack of opportunities/team formation service data.

Each interviewee was contacted by telephone to arrange a meeting time. To increase the level of comfort for the interviewee, the meeting place was determined by each interviewee. Though two interviews were conducted on campus and three were conducted in the interviewee’s living area, the meeting place appeared to have no significant influence on the interviewees. The interviews varied from 20 to 30 minutes in length. To analyze probe questions and questions that arose based on interviewee responses, each interview was tape recorded. Appendix E illustrates the adjustments to the original interview guides.

Sample Size and Demographics

Theoretical saturation was used to determine when a sufficient amount of data had been gathered. Saturation is the point at which no additional data are being found which develop properties of the category, the category development is solid, and the relationships between the categories are stable and validated (Glaser & Strauss, 1967 & Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Since the surveys from the initial sampling provided diverse and repetitive data, the survey process was complete after surveying 3 sororities, 2 cooperatives, 3 residence halls, 28 Dixon Recreation Center users, and 7 students with disabilities. A total of 186 survey responses were gathered. Following an evaluation of all of the surveys, the number of valid surveys was reduced to 165.

Several criteria were evaluated to determine the survey validity. Distribution of surveys to OSU organizations was utilized to reach members of the female OSU population. Although the surveys were administered to members of OSU organizations, Linn Benton Community College (LBCC) students are eligible to reside in OSU sororities, cooperatives, and residence halls. However, LBCC students are not eligible to participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program; therefore, LBCC respondents were eliminated from the valid survey pool.

Several respondents only completed portions of the survey. Respondents who did not answer a majority of the questions were eliminated. However, if a respondent disregarded a question but then continued on with the survey, the survey was considered valid. Even though some surveys were not complete in full, the responses were valuable; thus, partially complete surveys were acceptable. For example, one respondent had several valuable comments (i.e., I participate “to have fun laid back competition.”); however, she did not respond to the question regarding likable program qualities. If this survey had been eliminated due to one unanswered question, valuable comments and an interviewee would have been eliminated from the data and interview process. The remainder of the invalid surveys were eliminated because the respondents did not appear to understand the survey format. Respondents who fell into this category were

individuals who either completed both the participant and potential participant sections or did not realize the survey was a two-page survey and only completed one of the two pages.

Treatment of Data

The data gathered throughout the research was analyzed using grounded theory, which is the discovery of theory from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Rather than test or verify an existing theory, a theoretical account of the general features of women's participation in intramural sports was grounded in the survey and interview data collected from participants and potential participants. Based on the responses to the survey, general conceptual categories were formed which provided the foundation for an interview guide. For example, one category that continuously emerged throughout the data was a desire for various competition levels. Interview questions were then designed to probe for more information with regard to competitive levels. The conceptual categories are relevant because they derived from comments written by OSU participants and potential participants.

Grounded theory is often referred to as "the constant comparative method of analysis" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 62). The two analytic procedures in the coding process are "making of comparisons" and "asking of questions;" the two procedures are the catalysts in grounded theory, as they give the theory concepts precision and specificity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). By asking questions and comparing the incoming data with previous survey data, the boundaries and properties of each category became more defined. For example, in the first step various participation reasons (i.e., "fun", "meet

people", "My friends play") were listed; only the identical responses were lumped together immediately. When a complete list of the various responses was intact, an overview of the responses was assessable. By taking an overview look of the various responses, similar responses such as "play on teams with your friends", "have fun with people I enjoy being with," and "time with friends" were easily detected, combined, and appropriately labeled as *friends* under the **social aspects** category.

The grounded theory approach provided the latitude necessary to analyze the data and categorize as appropriate. Past research and personal intramural sport experience were used to determine appropriate categories and labels; however, the category labels and category justifications were personal opinions. When a response could have been placed under more than one category, rationale for the respective response label and categorization is provided.

Open coding was used to analyze, name and categorize the data. Open coding allowed me to break up the data, closely examine and compare the data for similarities and differences, and question the responses as reflected in the data. Utilizing personal and others' assumptions, the responses were examined and new categories and discoveries emerged. For example, respondents repeatedly indicated the difficulty involved in finding and joining a team. One respondent suggested utilizing a special event such as "silly Olympics" as a recruiting tool; another stated "if intramural sports sponsored pick-up games it would increase participation"; a third respondent suggested the Department of Intramural Sports coordinate a meeting for individuals seeking a team. Utilizing open coding and personal experience allowed me to question the implications of each response (i.e., How is the silly Olympics a recruiting tool? What population would the silly Olympics

attract? Who would respond to pick-up games?), see the similarities between a silly Olympics event and sponsored pick-up games (i.e., both are recruiting methods that provide individuals an opportunity to meet potential team members and allow individuals to participate in a team event even though they do not know enough potential participants to form their own teams), place the similar responses together, and form a new category called **team formation**.

Conceptualizing the data was the first step in the analytic procedure. Each response received in the survey and interview process was independently and interdependently analyzed and given a name that was representative of a phenomenon. By asking questions about a response's independent meaning and then comparing the response with similar responses, phenomena were labeled. One potential participant responded that an ideal intramural sports quality would include "not high athletic ability." Her statement generalized these questions:

- 1) What does "high" mean?
- 2) Do her other responses clarify or strengthen this statement?
- 3) Can this be interpreted as a request for various skill levels?

Similar phenomenon were given the same conceptual label so groups of similar data began to form. "Not high athletic ability" and "first time players" were similar phenomena that were labeled *beginner leagues*. When all of the data had been analyzed, the conceptual labels were further analyzed for similarities. *Beginner leagues*, *multiple skill levels*, and *teams of equal level* were then placed under the category called **skill levels**. This process of grouping concepts that appear to pertain to the same phenomenon is called categorizing (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The characteristics or attributes relevant to a category are called properties. The properties within categories can be dimensionalized by being placed along a continuum (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The skill level category has properties such as coordination, experience, and execution; the property dimensions may range from extremely low to exceptional. These properties and dimensions were the foundation for making relationships between categories and subcategories.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), the purpose of grounded theory is to “specify the conditions that give rise to specific sets of action/interaction pertaining to a phenomenon and the resulting consequences” (p. 251). Using grounded theory allowed me to provide relevant predictions, explanations, interpretations and applications for the OSU Intramural Sports Department. The final analysis and recommendations are based on a continual evaluation and analysis of research procedures, the sample population, and data.

Research Limitations

Participants and potential participants were categorized based on responses to past and present sport experiences. However, the individual who was involved in organized sports during high school but is no longer active may or may not desire to become active again. Some individuals may have been categorized as potential participants even though they have no interest in participating in organized sports. Similarly, individuals do not like to admit they do not work out; therefore, some individuals may have falsely reported working out and been improperly categorized as potential participants.

The timing of the distribution process was appropriate for the sororities, cooperatives, residence halls, and Dixon Recreation Center users; however, the distribution of surveys to students with disabilities was ill-timed. Since the surveys were distributed at the beginning of a new term, the students with disabilities were overloaded with paperwork that took precedence over the intramural sports survey. Also, the administration of the surveys did not include a verbal presentation; therefore, the students may have been less willing to complete the survey.

Although the survey distribution process was administered as similarly as possible, the process to collect data from off-campus students was different. Unlike the sororities, cooperatives, residence halls, and students with disabilities, Dixon Recreation Center users were individually asked to complete the survey. Since the respondents were not pressured but were approached individually, the respondents may have been more gregarious than the respondents who were approached within a group setting. The different distribution process may have attracted individuals who were less resistant to the survey process; if this occurred, responses from off-campus respondents may have been more detailed and constructive than those of the other respondents.

The data was analyzed using a grounded theory approach. As the data was compiled, some categories began to emerge. However, not all responses clearly fell into a category. The categorizing process required a lot of questions and time before each response was labeled. Justification for response labels and categorization was based on personal opinions and intramural sports experience; analysis variations may exist for other researchers.

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gather data on women's perceptions of their physical activity needs, physical activity preferences, and their knowledge and interest in the intramural sports program. The data collected from OSU participants and potential participants can be used by administrators to determine if and how intramural sports programming patterns might be adjusted.

Grounded Theory Categorizing

The survey was created to gather information from the three topic areas of customer need analysis, communication, and program services. The interviews were conducted to clarify and enrich the data received from the surveys. Although each interview was unique and was based on the survey responses of the respective interviewee, the interviews focused on the three significant categories (social aspects, lack of opportunities/team formation service, and various skill levels) and the competitiveness/cooperativeness theory. Interview information that altered or enriched survey data will be incorporated throughout the survey results and discussion section.

The questions for the customer need analysis topic (Appendix F) probed for motivators of female participation and personal perceptions of the program; the participant and potential participant categories for the various customer need analysis questions are presented respectively.

Customer Need Analysis

Participation reasons

Participants

The categories that emerged from the participant responses were **social aspects, sport enjoyment, competitive environment, cooperative environment, physical activity/fitness, and miscellaneous.**

Social aspect was a dominant category in the participant responses. The obvious responses labeled as social aspects were “fun” (37 responses) and “friends” (12 responses). Other responses labeled as social aspects were “team,” “house unity,” “Greek participation (pride),” and “getting involved.” The social connotations affiliated with “team” are twofold. Many people prefer team sports over individual sports because being a part of a team can give an individual a sense of affiliation and worth among friends. An interviewee who has participated in intramural sports stated that she preferred team sports because she “could play with a group of her friends.” Secondly, a team sport can be a reason to congregate and spend time together. Another interviewee reinforced this rationale when she explained her motivation to join the rugby sport club; she joined the rugby team to have time with her friend. Since the interviewee and her friend maintained busy schedules, they were rarely able to spend time together; by joining the sport club team, the two individuals had a mutual rugby practice time and were able to spend time together.

House unity and Greek participation (pride) are motivators for participation because involvement in intramural sports provides an activity

where members of an organization can have fun with each other. Many individuals join cooperative or Greek houses for the involvement and unity that transpires within the house setting. The unity and participation evokes a bonding and social relationship; therefore, the social aspect label was appropriate for these responses. Finally, getting involved is labeled as a social quality because it implies a desire to be involved with other people.

The second category that emerged from the participant section was **sport enjoyment**. Statements such as “I love volleyball” were placed with responses that indicated a “love for sports” and were categorized as **sport enjoyment**. Although stating a love for a specific sport does not carry the same connotation as a love for sports, a passion for a specific sport is a property of a love for sports. Unique responses that were categorized as **sport enjoyment** were “wanted to play” and “played high school sports and wanted to continue playing.”

The third significant category that emerged was **physical activity/fitness**; this is a category that has emerged in past research. “Exercise” was indicated as a participation reason by 13 respondents; the responses of “working out,” “like physical activity,” “keep in shape,” and “recreation” were also mentioned by a couple respondents. Though recreation could be categorized elsewhere, the **physical activity/fitness** category was appropriate for the OSU campus population. Dixon Recreation Center represents the recreation department on the OSU campus; a reasonable assumption is that OSU students use the term “recreation” to refer to physical activities/fitness.

The literature review revealed that males prefer a competitive environment and females prefer a cooperative environment. Contrary to the results of past research, the data collected from female OSU students indicated a fairly equal desire for competition and cooperation. The program was

interpreted as a competitive environment, thus a participation reason, by 9 respondents; a cooperative environment was a participation reason for 5 respondents. Some individuals perceive the program as competitive and others perceive the program as cooperative; this is a sign that the current program does provide a mixture of competition and cooperation. All the interviewees stated that a mixture of competitiveness and cooperativeness exists in the intramural sports program. One interviewee stated that participating is fun because the recreational league teams “have fun and can laugh at and with each other and it’s a comfortable atmosphere; but there is still competition between the teams.” Although a competitive and cooperative preference was present throughout the overall data, the informed potential participants (4) only indicated a cooperative preference in the survey responses.

Though the response stands alone under the miscellaneous category, the statement that “played since young” was a unique response. The response appeared to be a socialization factor. Unfortunately, the respondent did not specify which organized sports she played during high school nor volunteer as a potential interviewee. Her other participation reasons were the **social aspects** of fun and friends and the **sport enjoyment** of enjoy sports; beyond that information, one cannot determine if the sports she has played since she was young were competitive or cooperative in nature, masculine or feminine labeled sports, or a various combination.

Potential Participants

In order of significance, the categories that emerged from the informed potential participant responses were **time constraints, programming, lack of**

opportunities, cooperative environment, ability/skill level, not interested, and **miscellaneous**. **Time constraints** was an overwhelmingly significant category as a participation barrier. Many respondents (55) indicated various “workloads,” “class loads,” “organizational responsibilities,” and “personal priorities” as time constraints that prevented participation in intramural sports. One interviewee who was a potential participant said she has time constraints because she “is a full-time student and has to pay for school by working three jobs.”

Though the survey numbers would indicate a large gap separates the two most significant categories, the **time constraint** and **programming** category effect each other. Many informed potential participants indicated programming issues as participation barriers; I believe many potential participants do not have the time to participate because the programs offered do not appeal to them or they are unaware of the options available. If the program options appealed or were communicated to these potential participants, perhaps they would find the time to participate.

A category that emerged in the participation barrier question and continued to surface throughout other survey responses was **lack of opportunities**. Several (5) informed potential participants have not participated in intramural sports because they did not have a team or friends with whom to play. One interviewee said there was a lack of opportunities because her and two friends wanted to play water polo but did not know what water polo was or how to get involved. She suggested “a class on the sport where all members will attend.” The class would be arranged to explain the sport rules and allow attendees to meet potential teammates. Since **lack of opportunities** was a recurring response, the issue will be further analyzed in the final chapter.

The final two categories that emerged for the potential participants were **ability/skill level** and **miscellaneous**. The **ability/skill level** category emerged with four responses; although the **miscellaneous** category contained several items (10), the items were not salient in comparison with other data (i.e., “equipment” and “age”). The uninformed potential participants reported “not knowing” about the program as the main participation barrier.

Likable Program Qualities

Participants

Several identical categories formed in the participation reasons and likable program qualities questions; **social aspect**, **competitive environment**, **cooperative environment**, **physical activity/fitness**, and **miscellaneous** were mutual categories. The new category that emerged in response to the likable program qualities was **programming**. Several respondents (10) indicated the program was likable because of a *variety of sports*. Responses that indicated a liking of a specific sport (i.e., basketball, volleyball) were not coded with *variety of sports*; rather, specific sports remained independent listings. An independent listing of specific sports presents the exact part of the program that the respondent found likable. Several other responses that were categorized as likable programming qualities were coded as *communication* and *skill level*. *Communication* aspects were that anyone can be involved (5), organized (2), and a cool staff (2); the *skill level* aspect was a request for different participation categories.

The items that emerged under **social aspects** and **physical activity/fitness** were parallel to their respective categories in the question

regarding participation reasons. A unique response that appeared in the miscellaneous category was “small time commitment.” A majority of the potential participants, 56 respondents, indicated time constraints as a participation barrier. However, two respondents indicated a small time commitment as a likable quality of the intramural sports program. If the program can be perceived as an enjoyable activity requiring a small time commitment, potential participants with time constraints may be more easily persuaded to participate.

Potential participants

Since potential participants had no previous intramural sports experience, they could not comment on the likable qualities of the intramural sports program; informed potential participants were asked to list ideal qualities of an intramural sports program. Uninformed potential participants were not required to answer this question; a lack of awareness or knowledge of the OSU Intramural Sports Program sports program may indicate an unfamiliarity with intramural sports in general. The bulk of the informed potential participant’s responses were programming issues. The major category was labeled **programming**; *events/activities*, *scheduling*, and *communication* were the subheadings placed under the **programming** category.

Though no ideal sport emerged, 28 respondents listed 22 various sports they thought represented an ideal quality of an intramural sports program. A range of similar responses were listed by 12 other respondents; “wide range of activities,” “co-recreational activities,” “more individual events,” and “more

team events" were the similar responses that were categorized as *events/activities* desired.

The second **programming** category that emerged was *communication*. Respondents indicated a desire for "good leadership," "more available information," "registration information," and a "feeling of openness to all who want to participate." Although the latter could be interpreted as a scheduling issue, the item was placed under *communication*. The Intramural Sports Department does encourage individuals of any skill level to participate; however, a common misunderstanding is that an individual must be an "athlete" or highly skilled in sports to participate in the intramural sports program. Thus, communication to potential participants is essential in providing a diverse participation population and range of skill levels.

The third subheading under **programming** was *scheduling*. Only a few respondents indicated a desire for a conducive schedule; however, since 56 potential participants indicated time as a barrier to participation, timely and convenient scheduling is necessary to persuade those individuals to participate.

The second significant category that emerged for potential participants was **social aspects**. Similar to the properties outlined in the **social aspects** category for participation reasons, the usual properties of "fun" and "meet lots of people" were the most frequent responses under **social aspects**. Some unique responses that were categorized as **social aspects** were "residence hall teams," "fun teams," and "teams who played fairly and with good sportsmanship." The fair and good sportsmanship responses were categorized as such because these qualities influence the amount of fun individuals have when participating. Residence hall teams was labeled as a

social aspect because the teams consist of friends and neighbors within a group living environment; these characteristics translate into social qualities.

The third significant category for potential participants was **skill level**; this category is a preview of a unique finding in the overall research. In response to a question of ideal qualities, informed potential participants responded with requests for “multiple skill levels,” “beginner leagues,” “less intimidating leagues,” and to “arrange groups of teams of equal skill level.” Regardless of a competitive or cooperative preference, if individuals participate, they have more fun competing with teams and/or individuals of equal ability. This theory was supported by those individuals interviewed; one interviewee stated, “It’s no fun to get beat by a lot.” The fact that an equal number of respondents indicated a preference for a competitive environment as a cooperative environment supports the idea that participating in an appropriate skill level is more crucial than a competitive or cooperative environment.

Unsatisfying Program Qualities

Participants

From the participant’s perspective, the categories that emerged as unsatisfactory program aspects were **programming, officiating, participation, cooperative environment, competitive environment, and miscellaneous**. When the **programming** category emerged from the likable program qualities, *scheduling, communication, and events/activities* emerged as **programming** subheadings. Although one respondent reported “need better playoff communication,” the remainder of the programming category (8

items) consisted of scheduling frustrations (i.e., “scheduling problems” and “inconvenient game times”).

A second significant category that emerged was **officiating**. The quality and unfriendliness of the officials was mentioned by 5 and 2 respondents respectively; other respondents (3) indicated that officials are biased toward Greek teams. Student development is one of the goals of the OSU Intramural Sports Department; utilizing student officials is one way the department encourages student development. Students with no experience or limited officiating experience are eligible to apply for officiating jobs; frequently, inexperienced officials are trained and hired as sport officials. Although officials are trained, this feedback may indicate a need to increase the pool of officials from which to hire and/or a need to intensify training efforts.

The third category that emerged for participants was **lack of participation**. Lack of female participation in intramural sports was the reason this research originated. Likewise, participants indicated **lack of participation** as an aspect that reduces participation satisfaction. “Lack of participation” (4) and “no show teams” (3) were the responses categorized as **lack of participation**. The lack of participation frustration also was evident throughout the interviews. One interviewee said that she volunteered to be an interviewee because she was frustrated with the lack of female participation and was willing to volunteer for the good of the program.

Although various categories emerged from the unsatisfying program qualities question, a significant number of respondents (29) indicated no unsatisfactory aspects. Also, the majority of the participants (58) indicated their needs or preferences were being met. Since only three respondents indicated specific comments, the Intramural Sports Department appears to be

meeting the physical activity needs and preferences of the female campus community.

Communication

The second topic area was communication. The survey questions regarding communication aspects (Appendix G) asked about publicity and communication with the staff to determine how well the intramural staff was communicating with the female campus community, if the female campus community was receiving that communication, and if the female students reciprocated that communication.

Current Publicity and Communication

In both the participant and potential participant sections, **campus living groups** was a category that clearly emerged as an origination and continual reason for intramural sport awareness and knowledge. An overwhelming number of respondents (48 participants and 41 potential participants) listed an organized living group as the source of awareness. The responses ranged from sorority, cooperative, and residence hall to resident advisors, in-house intramural sports representatives, and house (group) meetings. The responses indicating a specific person as the reason for intramural sport awareness could be interpreted as awareness based on word of mouth; however, the specific people indicated were residents of those living groups and are responsible for disseminating information to those living amongst them. Since respondents were informed through a member of a living group or a living group's organized meeting, the responses were

coded as a group member or group meeting property of a specific living group; the specific living groups were categorized under **campus living group**.

Since three of the four target groups surveyed were campus living groups, a high number of responses indicating awareness through living groups is not surprising. However, a significant portion of intramural sports participants are affiliated with campus living groups; this cyclical process of the intramural sports staff communicating program options with representatives of living groups, who then communicate the program information to group members, indicates a positive flow of communication to an appropriate audience.

The other two notable categories that emerged from participants and potential participants were **word of mouth** and **printed material**. "Friends" and "other participants" illustrate the responses elicited for the **word of mouth** category, which totaled 43 responses. Items categorized under **printed material** were responses such as "fliers" and "barometer;" the **printed material** category totaled 32 responses.

Suggested Publicity and Communication

The publicity methods suggested by the participants and potential participants were similar but more unique than the elements that originated their awareness of the intramural sports program. Although many participants discovered intramural sports through word of mouth, the majority of potential participants (109) listed **printed material** as most likely to reach them. The types of **printed material** requested were conceptualized as *advertising material* and *informational material*. Many potential participants (100) and participants (23) recommended various print material

advertisements; other potential participants (9) and participants (2) suggested program information be more readily available. Although respondents suggested various kinds of printed material to improve publicity, respondents did not comment on the criteria that determined quality or appeal of printed material.

The second category that emerged for participants and potential participants was **verbal communication**. The **verbal communication** category offered a variety of promotion suggestions for both participants and potential participants. Suggestions such as “door to door publicity,” “present information to houses,” and “tell resident advisors/group leaders” were labeled as “living group communication.” Requests to “explain how the system works” and “class announcements” were labeled as “informational” recommendations. Utilizing a public relations individual and promoting team registration were miscellaneous *promotion* ideas. The living group communication and informational communication were coded as *interactive communication*; *interactive communication* and *promotion* were then labeled as forms of **verbal communication**.

A category that only emerged for participants was **team formation service**. Some respondents requested assistance with forming intramural teams; sponsoring pick-up games to increase participation, organizing a meeting for individuals without a team, and circulating sign-ups for women without a team are examples of an intramural sports service that would be publicized to appeal to women. Several of the interviewees suggested the intramural office display a sign up sheet for individuals seeking a team; however, interviewees did not expect the intramural staff to coordinate the team formation. Although this category did not emerge in the potential participant section for this particular question, the category did surface as **lack**

of **opportunities** in response to ideal program qualities and reasons women do not participate in intramural sports. An overall perspective will be presented in the discussion section.

Communication Reciprocation

The questions regarding intramural sport awareness and knowledge were intended to determine how well the Intramural Sports Department promotes the program and communicates with the female campus community. Asking respondents to indicate how they would approach the Intramural Sports Department, if at all, was intended to determine if women are able to reciprocate communication. According to the results, the majority of participants (38) and informed potential participants (62) would communicate with the intramural staff if necessary. Only a few statements indicated a concern for the channels of communication between the staff and the female campus community; “lots of red tape,” “I don’t feel heard,” and “they don’t care” were categorized as **disregarded**. **Uninformed** was the other unreciprocated communication category that emerged. Several respondents (11) who did not feel comfortable communicating with the intramural staff ascribed this discomfort to a lack of program knowledge.

Although the **disregarded** and **uninformed** categories represented individuals unable to reciprocate communication with the intramural staff, the number of respondents who indicated open communication with the staff was impressive. Another survey result that suggested reciprocal communication was the method of communication used to approach the Intramural Sports Department. A high percentage of informed potential participants (61%) and participants (45%) reported **direct verbal**

communication as the preferred communication method. **Direct verbal communication** was further divided into *face-to-face* and *telephone communication*; *face-to-face communication* was the preference of 28 informed potential participants and 20 participants. Since a large number of participants and informed potential participants indicated a comfort in approaching someone in charge (23), stopping by the office to talk with someone (22), or going to the office for an appointment (3), reciprocal communication between the Intramural Sports Department and the female campus community appears to be occurring in a positive manner.

The other two significant categories for participants and informed potential participants were **written communication** and **group representative**. The **written communication** category included responses such as letters and e-mail. Responses from the **group representative** category were unique; respondents cited a communication method that would occur through a designated individual. For example, a concern would be presented to an in-house intramural sports representative or team manager; the representative or team manager would then approach the intramural staff with the concern. This response could be interpreted as a method to avoid personal confrontation with the office or as a method of delegating the communication responsibility to someone with more intramural sports knowledge. **Group representative** and **written communication** are valuable methods of reciprocal communication; however, since **direct verbal communication** is more effective and efficient, a large number of **direct verbal communication** responses was a strong indication that reciprocal communication exists between the intramural staff and the female campus community.

A final question that addressed the communication perspective was regarding the influence of university organizations. This question did not generate any significant responses. The question was created to determine if university organizations such as "Student Government" or "Management Association" were catalysts to students forming teams. Depending on the responses generated, the data may have been helpful in developing promotion strategies. Although the responses may have been limited by the wording of the question, Smith and Missler's (1994) study also reported professional associations as the least important factor contributing to intramural sport participation.

Program Services

The final topic area studied was program services. The intention of the final two survey questions (Appendix H) was to draw an overall picture of what services would continue to attract participants and would persuade potential participants to try intramural sports.

Persuasive Program Qualities

As discussed in the literature review, a competitiveness versus cooperativeness environment has been a perspective considered an important determinant for women participants. However, the compiled data for the final two questions parallel the previous data discussed; the programming options appear to be more crucial than a competitive or cooperative environment. *Events/activities, scheduling, communication,*

and *skill level* were the subcategories that emerged from the **programming** category.

Participants and potential participants both indicated a desire for a variety of sports; “appealing sports/activities,” “expand the types of events,” and specific sports (i.e., “volleyball,” “soccer,” and “ultimate frisbee”), were similar to variety of sports and were coded as *events/activities* under the **programming** category.

The *skill level* of the *events/activities* offered was a recurring request throughout the data; this item was significant for participants and potential participants. The participants statements were general requests for competitive levels; however, the potential participants specifically requested “beginner leagues,” “various skill levels,” “no put downs,” and an “emphasis on encouraging individuals with limited sports experience to participate.”

Communication was the third subcategory that emerged. Respondents requested more publicity and announcements to ensure knowledge and awareness of intramural activities; specific communication requests were for “improved playoff communication” and “registration information.” *Scheduling* was the final subcategory that emerged. Participants and potential participants desired better game times and more games.

The current programming of the events/activities, skill levels offered, communication, and scheduling, may influence a significant category that emerged for potential participants. Potential participants indicated **time constraints** as a barrier to intramural sport participation; potential participants (17) reported limited time as a barrier to being persuaded to participate. However, the results of the final question spark a new question; if the programming issues of events/activities, skill levels, scheduling, and

communication are adjusted to appeal to potential participants, will they find the time to participate?

Another significant category that emerged from the potential participant category was **social aspects**. Potential participants indicated various social items as persuasive qualities; “friends who also participate,” “encouragement from friends,” “fun,” and “playing with a lot of people” were deemed important qualities of intramural participation. The **social aspects** category emerged in the participant’s responses to participation reasons; however, the category was not a factor in participant’s responses to program improvement. Since participants perceive intramural sports as social and fun, there is no need to suggest improvement of social aspects.

Summary

The three categories that emerged throughout the data were social aspects, lack of opportunities/team formation service, and various skill levels. The social aspects category was right on track with past research. Having fun, being with friends, and other various social aspects have been typical participation reasons. However, the team formation service and various skill levels categories were specific to this research.

A barrier to intramural sports participation is the effort necessary to find and join a team. Participants and informed potential participants both stated the difficulty in finding a team on which to participate. If friends or group members do not enter a team, becoming a participant of intramural sports is challenging.

Many respondents stated a desire for beginner leagues or options for inexperienced participants. Lack of participation was the origin of this

research and adds to the difficulty of addressing this programming request. A small number of participants limits the number of skill levels that can be offered.

Although competitiveness nor cooperativeness did not emerge as a significant category, the results did indicate a significant finding. Past research has suggested that women prefer a cooperative playing environment; however, the results did not confirm nor disconfirm that theory.

Another significant finding was the communication to the female campus community. The majority of the potential participants (87%) were aware of the intramural sports program; however, both participants and potential participants showed signs of limited or misconstrued program knowledge.

Responsibilities of the Intramural Sports Department, an analysis of the team formation participation barrier, a discussion of the lack of participants/lack of multiple skill levels problem, the competitiveness/cooperativeness theory, and the communication to the female campus community will be presented in chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

The mission of the Department of Intramural Sports is to provide a variety of structured sports opportunities to enhance personal development and social interaction (Oregon State University, 1994).

Similar to the mission of the OSU Intramural Sports Department, recreational sports professionals aim to provide a program that fulfills the needs of all participants. As the literature review demonstrated, the lack of female participation in intramural sports merits additional research; although a large quantity of participants is not the sole criteria that determines whether or not a program is a successful or quality program, determining why some women participate and others do not provides the information necessary to determine if their lack of participation hinges on lack of interest in physical activity and games or a deficiency in the program available to them.

Five Findings

Five significant findings emerged from the survey data. First, social aspects (i.e., fun, friends, and meeting people) are a key participation ingredient for both participants and potential participants. Second, potential participants indicate a lack of opportunities as a barrier to female participation; participants report difficulties encountered in attempting to create a team as a barrier to female participation. The third finding was more prominent for potential participants; they perceive that multiple skill levels

from which to choose would increase their desire to participate in intramural sports. The fourth finding suggests women perceive that a mixture of competitiveness and cooperativeness is their preferred playing environment. Finally, the fifth finding emerged from the fact that 51% of the potential participants seem to be receiving messages regarding intramural sports but still do not participate. The significant percentage of potential participants who receive messages but still do not participate might be an indication of poor communication between the Intramural Sports Department and potential participants.

Social Aspects

Like the Smith and Missler (1994) and Snodgrass and Tinsley (1990) studies, the results of this study revealed social benefits as a vital participation reason. The nature of intramural sport programs provides a social atmosphere; whether individuals partake in intramural sports events for the competition, sport enjoyment, exercise, stress relief, opportunity to prove their athleticism, or break from other responsibilities, individuals will be interacting with others. Many responses from participants (54) indicated social aspects as participation reasons; similarly, potential participants (16) reported social aspects as ideal qualities of an intramural program. Though the number of responses from participants and potential participants indicate the importance of social aspects, one interviewee captured the importance of social aspects by expressing her dissatisfaction with the social aspects displayed in intramural sports; she expressed how her participation satisfaction decreased when she experienced a lack of interaction among teammates and opponents. She said her experiences have not qualified as positive social

interaction because teammates and opponents have left immediately after the games. To reap the benefits of social interaction, she stated that teammates and/or opponents would have to converse or do some activity following the intramural games. The 54 survey responses from participants, 16 responses from potential participants, and the interviewee statement illustrate that female participants seek this social opportunity and perceive intramural sports as enjoyable because of the social interaction and fun.

Team Formation Service

Although the Intramural Sports Department provides multiple sports opportunities for the campus community, many respondents indicated a lack of opportunities as a barrier to participation. How could women perceive a lack of opportunities when the department offers over 25 different activities/events from which to choose? The survey data revealed that a lack of sports choices was not the cause for lack of opportunities; rather, a lack of opportunities referred to an inability to form or join a team. Although the sports choices are available, individuals do not know enough participants or potential participants from which to form a team; they report struggling to join a team of strangers.

The participant and potential participant responses and perceptions presented on a team formation service indicate a new literature arena; the team-formation finding evolved from the research data and grounded theory analysis. The practice of forming teams may not be as prevalent in the female culture as it is in the male culture. Tannen (1990) explains that these differing cultures develop in childhood; boys band together and play in large groups while girls tend to play in small groups or dyads. The different social

structures that boys and girls maintain coincide with the activities they prefer. Although boys prefer competitive games, “even for activities that [are] not competitive by nature, the boys often [break] into teams to facilitate competition. Girls [are] not much interested in organized sports or games” (Tannen, 1990, p. 157). Boys may be more adept and willing to form groups and teams than girls who may prefer dyadic interaction. As adults, the lack of experience in team formation may interfere with women’s participation in intramural sports.

According to women’s comments on surveys and in interviews, women at OSU do perceive difficulty in forming their own teams. Participants and potential participants report that they do not know enough people to form a team or do not know of a team with whom they can play. The practice of forming teams is a struggle for participants; however, the struggle does not discourage these female participants from participating in intramural sports. On the contrary, potential participants report that the difficulty in forming or joining a team is a barrier that prohibits participation. Although males and females may have different reasons for participating in team sports, the review of literature demonstrated the benefits that arise from team participation; the demonstrated benefit of camaraderie that exists with team participation could be important in determining ways to assist women with team formation. Since participants and potential participants have indicated qualities such as “friends,” “getting involved,” and “lots of people” as desirable aspects of intramural sports, the benefit of team camaraderie is consistent with what women report they desire.

Participant and potential participant respondents recommended a team formation service as an ideal quality of an intramural sports program. The survey information revealed that participants and potential participants

perceive a team formation service provided by the Intramural Sports Department would likely increase participation and enhance participation satisfaction; the next step is to determine if this is a feasible and realistic request. The role of the Intramural Sports Department has always been to provide the facility, limited equipment, staffing, and organization (scheduling). Should the Intramural Sports Department also be responsible for helping to form teams? Assistance with team formation would be a customer service response to the problem of individuals without a team; however, can the department be responsible for this additional task? Intramural sports was originally formed in response to male student initiative. Universities have responded to the student's initiative by providing an organized program. Should intramural staff be expected to do more?

Currently, the Intramural Sports Department does not provide an extensive team formation service. Individuals without a team are encouraged to sign a "free-agent" list; teams with a limited number of players are encouraged to contact free-agent players to fill roster gaps. This method is helpful but does not appear to provide the level of guidance respondents recommended. Respondents reported a few specific suggestions as ideal intramural sports qualities. These suggestions were to organize meetings for individuals seeking a team, coordinate a "silly Olympics event," and conduct classes. These suggestions were labeled as a team formation service because of the intent of the requests; respondents reported a desire for these events because the meetings and events would invoke a gathering of individuals who could simultaneously learn about the intramural sports program, socialize, and get to know potential participants.

Through this process the potential participants report they believe they could form teams. Although these activities were suggested to benefit individuals without a team, there is no guarantee that individuals seeking a team will attend the organized activities. The Intramural Sports Department offers individual events and activities as well as team events. Unfortunately, lack of female participation is also evident in individual events. Participants (12) and potential participants (9) reported they participate or would be more likely to participate if their friends were involved; this theory is captured by the interviewee who accredited her preference for team sports to being able to participate with a group of friends. This interviewee also said she would participate in individual events; however, she would only participate if her friends also participated.

Respondents' comments such as these indicate that special benefits and team camaraderie could be enhanced by a team formation service. The following suggestions may accommodate the reported needs of female participants and potential participants and remain within the capabilities of the Intramural Sports Department. Women reported that an organized activity for individuals without a team might help them to meet potential teammates. If this organized activity were a pre-season event that was open to men and women, the event could accomplish multiple goals. First, opening the event to both men and women reduces the pressure of getting enough people to attend the event in order for it to be successful. Second, co-recreational activities meet the reported social needs of participants and potential participants because co-recreational events tend to encourage a recreational, fun, and social attitude among those participating. Third, participation in the event would not require a pre-established team; rather, individuals without a team could attend the event and be involved in the

team formation process that takes place at the onset of the event. Promoting a team-forming activity during which men can observe women's styles and women can observe men's styles may enrich the process for both groups. Fourth, the event could be promoted to encourage a networking effect among women. By promoting the event as an opportunity to "bring a friend" to play intramural sports and meet new people, the number of participants may increase twofold.

Another suggestion for a team formation opportunity is to provide a pre-season of pick-up games. For example, select a day preceding the registration of league teams and encourage women with or without a team to attend. Those who attend the pick-up games will have the opportunity to meet others interested in the sport. Women with a team may find additional players for their teams; women without a team may meet others who are interested in forming a new team. Both of these suggestions—the pre-season get-acquainted event and the pick-up games—would promote an atmosphere that meets the social needs and team formation service requested by participants and potential participants. Although both ideas are feasible for the Intramural Sports Department to provide, the latter suggestion provides a team formation service that is more desirable for the intramural staff because it requires limited supervision and staff coordination time.

While the Intramural Sports Department can assist with team formation, its primary objective must continue to be organizing the overall intramural sports program. The Intramural Sports Department provides an organized program so individuals may continue to participate in sports; however, the program requires some student initiative. Personal development is a part of the OSU Intramural Sports mission statement; teaching students to become team leaders and managers by organizing their

own teams is an important objective. The proposed team formation services would provide moderate guidance but still encourage student initiative and responsibility. As women developed team-formation skills, the Intramural Sports Department could reduce its intervention. Also, improved communication between the staff and female campus community may improve the satisfaction of the current team formation service provided. Respondents may not be aware of the free-agent list that is available for individuals seeking a team. Interviewees suggested the intramural sports staff emphasize the free-agent list as a team formation service; interviewees reported that they believe this method would be a sufficient service that may ease the participation barrier.

Multiple Skill Levels

The third significant category that emerged was a desire for multiple skill levels. Various skill levels, beginner teams, competitive levels, and teams of equal ability are a few of the statements participants and potential participants reported as important criteria of a quality intramural sports program. Contrary to past research, the importance of a competitive or cooperative playing environment was overridden by a desire for competition of comparable ability. The desire for equal competition was not a request for competitiveness or cooperativeness; rather, the request for equal competition was interpreted as an aspect that heightens fun and sport enjoyment. The perspective that best illustrates this rationale was presented by an interviewee who said, "We played a soccer team that clobbered us and [the game] was no fun; I'm sure it was no fun for them to play us either."

Unfortunately, lack of female participation perpetuates the problem of not being able to offer multiple skill levels. Since there is a lack of female participation in intramural sports, offering more than one skill level is not realistic. Ideally, the OSU Intramural Sports Department offers two skill levels. The "A" skill division is recommended for individuals with advanced sport skills; beginner participants and those with less advanced skills are encouraged to play in the "B" skill division. With the exception of volleyball, female participants have not had the luxury of selecting a skill level division in which to participate. The lack both of female participation and multiple skill levels seems to perpetuate a cause-effect cycle. However, with the implementation of the previous suggestions for a team formation service, the Intramural Sports Department has the potential to interrupt this recurring cycle and better serve needs presented by both participant and potential participant respondents.

Competitiveness and Cooperativeness

The fourth significant finding was that the OSU female population reported a desire for competitiveness and cooperativeness. While the number of respondents who reported information about competitiveness and cooperativeness was small, each topic received equal mention. Although potential participants had more requests for a cooperative environment, a desire to compete with or against an individual or team of similar ability outweighed the expressed desires for either a competitive or cooperative environment. This desire for a combination of competitiveness and cooperativeness is illustrated by the survey respondent who reported a desire to participate "to have fun, laid back competition." The word, "competition,"

suggests the respondent has a desire to play for the competitive spirit involved in sport; however, the phrase, "laid back," suggests a desire to compete with, not against, an opponent. The difference between competing with or against an opponent is determined by the opponents' relationships. If an individual perceives an opponent as an obstacle who stands in the way of achieving a predetermined goal, the individual is perceived to have a desire to dominate and compete against opponents. However, the phrase, "laid back," indicates a desire to compete with an opponent; the goal is to challenge the opponent's best effort against one's own best effort within the spirit of the rules (Smith & Carron, 1990). In an interview with this respondent, she clarified this statement with the phrase "the whole point of intramural sports is to have fun and play with friends." The interviewee further explained that competition was inherent in the sport climate; however, the mixture of a fun and relaxed playing environment within the sport climate provided for a competitive and recreational (cooperative) mix. A cooperative environment is one where participants share the same goal of camaraderie and fair play. The interviewee's statement and explanation reinforces the idea that having fun and playing with friends are the social qualities that encourage a recreational and cooperative playing environment.

Past research suggests that women prefer a cooperative playing environment; however, the results of the present study do not confirm or disprove this theory. Rather, the survey and interview results suggest that female OSU students prefer a competitive/cooperative mix and perceive the OSU Intramural Sports Program accommodates that need. For example, one interviewee stated that her team had several fun games due to the attitude of the other teams. When the competing teams both had the goal "to have fun," the games were cooperative even though the teams were trying to win.

Since this example also illustrates competition with an opponent rather than against an opponent, the theory that competition can be experienced as cooperation is reinforced.

The Intramural Sports Department cannot control nor desires to control how women perceive their participation styles (i.e., competition against or with the opponent). The differing competitive and cooperative styles provide a stimulating diversity within the intramural program. As previously stated, the goal of intramural sports is to provide a program that serves all members of the female campus community. Both participants and potential participants will be better served if they can choose which playing environment in which to participate. Therefore, the lack of female participation and lack of multiple skill levels issue resurfaces. If the suggestions within this research either increase female participation or stimulate new ideas to increase participation, the various competitive and cooperative needs of female students are more likely to be better served.

Communication

The fifth significant finding involved the communication to the female campus community. The respondents perceive lack of skill levels as an unsatisfying program quality; to remedy the lack of skill levels problem, an emphasis on promotion and publicity becomes vital. If an increase in female participation can be achieved, multiple skill levels can be offered to fulfill the requests of individuals who desire a choice of skill division. From the sample population, 92% of the respondents—both participants and potential participants—reported knowledge of the intramural sports program; this figure indicates that the various publicity strategies are reaching participants

and potential participants. Since the marketing efforts are reaching the female campus community, the emphasis needs to be placed on the content and quality of the promotion materials. Most of the respondents reported an awareness of the intramural sports program; however, a comprehensive understanding of the program opportunities was not always apparent. Statements such as “no co-ed soccer reduces my participation satisfaction,” “organize trips out of Corvallis (i.e., hiking) to persuade me to participate,” and “more open classes available would persuade me to participate” suggested that some respondents were misinformed of intramural sports options (i.e., co-ed soccer is an intramural sport) or did not understand the difference between the outdoor recreation service, physical activity courses, and intramural sports. Thus, information and promotion materials that are reaching the female campus community need to be more specific so confusion with other sporting disciplines can be avoided. For example, one interviewee suggested organizing a drop-in activity on the campus quad. Students walking through the quad could be encouraged to stop and play for a few minutes; as the students are leaving the activity, promotional materials could be distributed to them. The interviewee stated that she believed the activity in conjunction with the distribution of promotional materials would clarify what the Intramural Sports Department represents.

According to the survey data, verbal communication (e.g., intramural sports representative talking with campus living groups) and printed material (e.g., school newspaper advertisements and promotional fliers) are the preferred and most appealing publicity efforts. If promotional materials reach participants and potential participants and are informative (i.e., clearly present what the intramural sports program offers and who is eligible to participate), an increase in female participation may be the result.

Conclusion

The significant findings that emerged from this research are all interrelated and influence how participants and potential participants perceive the intramural sports program. The specific responses of “fun,” “friends,” and “meet lots of people” are examples of the social aspects that women perceive as important and instrumental to an enjoyable intramural sport experience. These social aspects are the underlying elements that need to be incorporated into the second significant finding (team formation service); the recommendations for a team formation service are more likely to be successful and serve the desires of participants and potential participants if social aspects remain a foundation of the service. For example, a suggestion to fulfill the team formation service was to offer pre-season pick-up games to encourage individuals to meet other individuals who share a similar sport interest; meeting new people is one of the underlying social elements that makes this option attractive and more likely to succeed than an option that contains no social aspect.

By maintaining the focus of social aspects and offering a team formation service to increase participation, the potential participant’s request for multiple skill levels becomes more feasible. Simultaneously, the capability to offer multiple skill levels provides an opportunity to serve participants and potential participants with various competitive and cooperative playing preferences. For example, if individuals on one team are beginners and/or prefer to compete with other teams who share a common goal of having fun, that team can choose to participate in the “B” level which is distinguished as the league for teams with new, inexperienced, or less skilled players who desire a more recreational atmosphere. By having an

option to choose a league that is appropriate to the preferences and abilities of the team, participants and potential participants perceive they would have more fun participating.

The communication between the Intramural Sports Department and the female campus community emerged as the fifth significant finding; this finding is critical to both participants and potential participants. The final step needed to meet the reported needs of the participants and potential participants is to promote this all-encompassing program to the female campus community in a manner that appeals to them. As the survey results indicated, respondents (92%) are receiving information on the program; however, their knowledge of the program is often limited and/or misunderstood. To prevent misunderstandings, communication and publicity to the female campus community needs to be more specific. A quality program exists at OSU; if the intramural program can further incorporate the women's desired social aspects, increase female participation through a team formation service and multiple skill level option, and provide a competitiveness and cooperativeness playing environment, promoting the program in a manner that appeals to women is simply a matter of telling the female campus community what is available to them.

Future Research Recommendations

This research was beneficial because the data gathered and analyzed can be used to evaluate the current OSU Intramural Sports Program. While this study is specific to OSU, it may be applicable to other intramural sports programs. The findings may suggest ways others can assess their programs with regard to female participants and potential participants. However,

additional research to further examine women's perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences will enhance administrators' understanding of program needs.

Recommendations Regarding Respondents

Regardless of how frequently or recently respondents had participated in intramural sports, they were categorized as participants. Initially, respondents who had not participated within a certain time period or were one time participants were to be categorized as potential participants; the rationale was that these individuals were lost participants or were not repeat customers. However, the survey would need to have been more specific to analyze why these individuals stop participating or were not repeat participants; therefore, these individuals were categorized as participants. In future research, a separation of active participants and inactive participants could be used to more closely examine women's perceptions of their physical activity needs and preferences in relation to the current OSU Intramural Sports Program.

This study did not focus on nonparticipants. To maintain a narrow research focus, participants and potential participants were selected as target populations. However, future research on nonparticipants may be beneficial by providing the research necessary to evaluate the perceptions of all female students.

Although the survey population was representative of the OSU female population, the analysis was not separated into specific perceptions or preferences of various ethnic populations. Further research in this area may help the Intramural Sports Department better understand how to market to all ethnic populations.

Recommendations Regarding Significant Findings

Although this study and past research has established that social aspects are a significant participation reason, additional questions arose from this study. Participants and potential participants indicated that having “fun” was a key ingredient to participation in intramural sports. What does having “fun” mean? What specific activities qualify as fun? Do those activities that qualify as fun occur prior to, during, or after an intramural event? Can those activities be controlled or facilitated by the Intramural Sports Department? If so, can the Intramural Sports Department have more influence on encouraging potential participants to become participants?

The team formation service is a finding unique to this research; therefore, additional research is needed to confirm or disconfirm the need for this service. Is the team formation service specific to the OSU Intramural Sports Program? How do other intramural sports programs accommodate the request for team formation assistance? Men spontaneously generate more teams than women; what reasons explain why women do not also spontaneously form teams? What changes in an intramural sports program can be made to accommodate women’s team-formation styles? Compared to men, what intrinsic or extrinsic rewards do women receive from forming or participating in teams? In future research, interviews with both male and female participants may be beneficial in attempting to answer these questions. By talking with both sexes, differences between male and female team formation tactics may emerge. If differences do emerge, they can be compared and possibly used to benefit both male and female formation processes.

In addition to team formation studies, future research can focus on a comparison of intramural programs that do and do not offer multiple skill

levels; a comparison may help determine if a choice of a skill level does further enhance the satisfaction of female participants and/or entice female potential participants to participate. Also, how does the multiple skill level option influence the playing environment? Do the competitiveness and cooperativeness environments simultaneously exist in a program that offers multiple skill levels?

Since the competitiveness/cooperativeness results of this research were different from previous findings, more research is needed. Is the desire for a competitive and cooperative mix unique to the culture of the OSU female campus population? Did participant and potential participant respondents indicate a desire for competition because that is what they expect from an intramural sports program? Although the desire for competitiveness and cooperativeness is fairly equal for participants and potential participants, participants did have a slightly higher desire for competition and potential participants a slightly higher desire for cooperation. Are potential participants choosing not to participate because they assume the intramural program is solely a competitive program? How do women define competition? How do women define a cooperative environment? Interviews with participants and potential participants may clarify these questions; an understanding of women's perceptions of competitiveness and cooperativeness will likely help to provide a program that is appealing to a variety of female participants and potential participants.

Another area that should be addressed in future research is the communication between the Intramural Sports Department and the female campus community. The results of this study support past research in the types of publicity that reach the female campus community; however, more research needs to be done to determine how the verbal communication

influences participants' and potential participants' decisions to participate or not participate. How can an Intramural Sports Department communicate the details of its program? This research reveals that women know the program exists. What special tactics might be used to inform women about particulars within the program? The communication between the staff and female participants and potential participants is a critical aspect to a successful intramural sports program; additional research should continuously probe for new and successful communication methods between the two parties.

When intramural sports programs originated, activities were structured for male participants. Since women are now active and important participants of intramural sports, ways to adjust intramural programming to accommodate women's perceived needs and preferences are appropriate. Further research should continue to explore the gap between male and female participation in intramural sports.

Bibliography

- Barnhouse, B., Beach, G., Faulhaber, D., & Mallery, M. (1994). *Oregon State University: Fact Book 1995*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.
- Bialeschki, M. D. (1988). Why don't students play in intramurals? *NIRSA Journal*, 12(3), 46-48, 51.
- Bohlig, M. (1991). Recreational programming for women. *NIRSA Journal*, 16(1), 8-10.
- Bonnano, D. (1987). Intramural and recreational sports - perspectives beyond the competition. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 58(2), 49.
- Brunstad, R. J. (1988). Affective outcomes in competitive youth sport: The Influence of intrapersonal and socialization factors. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 307-321.
- Chestnutt, J. T., Nadeau, P. J., & Taylor, W. (1985). An Analysis of nonparticipation campus recreational sports activities. *Management of Recreational Sports*, (pp. 134-146). Corvallis, OR: NIRSA publication.
- Coakley, J. J. (1986). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies (3th ed.)*. St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.
- Coakley, J. J. (1990). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies (4th ed.)*. St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.
- Eitzen, D. S. & Sage, G. H. (1986). *Sociology of North American Sport (3rd ed.)*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., Friedman, P. G., & Kreps, G. L. (1991). *Investigating communication: An Introduction to research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Freysinger, V. J. (1990). A Lifespan perspective on women and physical recreation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 61(1), 48-51.
- Gaskins, D. A. (1994). Can Jennifer come out and play? *NIRSA Journal*, 18(3), 12-14.

- Gill, D. L. (1986). Competitiveness among females and males in physical activity classes. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 15(7/8), 233-247.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Grant, C. H. B. (1984). The Gender gap in sport: From Olympic to intercollegiate level. *Arena Review: The Institute for Sport and Social Analysis*, 8(2), 31-47.
- Henderson, K. A. (1993). A Feminist analysis of selected professional recreation literature about girls/women from 1907-1990. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 165-181.
- Henderson, K.A. (1994). Perspectives on analyzing gender, women, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(2), 119-137.
- Henderson, K. A., Uhlir, G. A. & Greer, D. (1990). Women and physical recreation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 61(1), 41-42.
- Kane, M. J. (1989). The Post title IX female athlete in the media: Things are changing, but how much? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 60(3), 58-62.
- Kane, M. J. (1990). Female involvement in physical recreation-gender role as a constraint. *Women and Physical Recreation*, 61(1), 52-56.
- Kidd, B. (1990). The Men's cultural centre: Sports and the dynamic of women's oppression/men's repression. In M. A. Messner & D.F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*, (pp. 31-44). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.
- Kuga, D. J. & Meacci, W. G. (1989). Intramural sports programming for women. *NIRSA Journal*, 13(2), 45-47.
- Lankford, S., Rice, K., Chai, D., & Hisaka, L. (1993). Barriers to campus recreation and intramural spots participation. *NIRSA Journal*, 17(2), 30, 32-33.
- Matteo, S. (1988). The Effect of gender-schematic processing on decisions about sex-inappropriate sport behavior. *Sex Roles*, 18(1/2), 41-57.

- Messner, M. A. & Sabo, D.F. (Eds.). (1990). *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.
- National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. (1989). *NIRSA: General and Specialty Standards for Collegiate Recreational Sports*. Corvallis, OR: NIRSA publication.
- Oregon State University Intramural Department (1995). *Oregon State University Intramural Participation Summary*. Unpublished manuscript, Oregon State University, Department of Intramural Sports, Corvallis, OR.
- Peltz, B. (1994). *The National intramural-recreational sports association background*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Shaw, S. M. (1994). Gender, leisure, and constraint: Towards a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 8-22.
- Smith, S. R. (1992). Oppression of females in intramural sport programming. *Preface to the Future*, (pp. 91-99). Corvallis, OR: NIRSA publication.
- Smith, S. R. & Carron, M. F. (1990). Comparison of competition and cooperation in intramural sport. *NIRSA Journal*, 15(1), 44-47.
- Smith, S. R. & Missler, S. (1994). Personal meaning in intramural sport participation. *NIRSA Journal*, 19(2), 42-44, 46-47.
- Snodgrass, M. L. & Tinsley, C. E. (1990). Recreation and wellness: Identifying motivations for participation in recreational sports. *NIRSA Journal*, 15(1), 34-38.
- Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Tavris, C. (1977). Stereotypes, socialization, and sexism. In A. G. Sargent, *Beyond sex roles* (pp. 178-187). St. Paul: West Publishing Co.
- Tharp, L. R. (1994). The Effect title IX has had on intramural sports. *NIRSA Journal*, 19(1), 29-31.
- Theberge, N. (1985). Toward a feminist alternative to sport as a male preserve. *Quest*, 37(2), 193-202.

- Weiss, M. R. & Chaumeton, N. (1992). Motivational orientations in sport. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in Sport Psychology* (pp. 61-100). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Wyckham, R. G. & McGregor, I. (1980). Women in recreation: A Marketing analysis. *Intramural-Recreational Sports: New Directions and Ideas*, (pp. 134-140). Corvallis, OR: Benton Printers.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Survey

This survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete and will be used for research and evaluation of women's participation in the OSU Intramural Sports Program. Your information is essential for program analysis and improvement. Respondents' identities will remain confidential.

1. Indicate your living situation.
 Cooperative Greek Residence Hall Off-Campus
 Other (please specify) _____
2. Number of years at OSU (circle) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+
3. University status (circle) undergraduate graduate faculty staff
4. Age (circle) <17 17-25 26-35 36-45 46+
5. What best describes your ethnic identity? (optional)
 Caucasian African American American Indian/Alaskan Native
 Asian American Hispanic American Other (please specify) _____
6. Do you have a disability that affects your decision to participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
 yes no
7. In your typical week, how many times do you work out (a work out includes any physical fitness activity or organized sporting event)?
 7+ 5-6 3-4 1-2 0
8. During high school, did you choose to play organized sports of any kind (i.e., athletics, city leagues, intramural sports)?
 no yes (please list which sports you played)
9. Have you participated in the OSU Intramural Sports Program? no (Go to # 22) yes
 (Answer #10-21)
10. When was the last time you participated in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
11. Has a university recognized student organization ever been a catalyst (influence) in your decision to participate?
 no yes (indicate organization)
12. How did you find out about the Intramural Sports Program?
13. What other sources of information about the Intramural Sports Program have attracted your attention?

Appendix A (continued)

14. What suggestions do you have to improve the publicity so it appeals to you?
15. What are the reasons you participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
16. Do you have physical activity needs or preferences that are not being met by the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
 no yes (Please explain)
17. What do you like about the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
18. Are there aspects of the Intramural Sports Program that reduce your participation satisfaction?
 no yes (please explain)
19. Would you feel comfortable approaching the Intramural Sports Department with your concerns and program comments?
 yes no (please explain)
20. If you wanted to express your opinions of the Intramural Sports Program, how would you communicate with the Intramural Sports Department?
21. How could the OSU Intramural Sports Program be changed to better serve you?
- Intramural Sport Participants Go to #30.*

 22. Do you know that OSU has an Intramural Sports Program? no (Go to # 27) yes
 (Answer # 23-30)
23. How did you find out about the program?

Appendix A (continued)

24. Would you feel comfortable approaching the Intramural Sports Department with your concerns and program comments?
 _____yes _____no (please explain)
25. If you wanted to express your opinions of the Intramural Sports Program, how would you communicate with the Intramural Sports Department?
26. What programs or qualities would your ideal Intramural Sports Program include?
27. What forms of advertising would be most likely to reach you?
28. What are the reasons you do not participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
29. What would persuade you to become a participant of the Intramural Sports Program?
30. I will be conducting a limited number of 20-30 minute interviews to pursue further answers to questions on this survey. If you wish to **volunteer** for such an interview, please provide your name and phone number. **IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO BE INTERVIEWED, PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.**
- _____ I do not wish to be interviewed.
 _____ I volunteer as a potential interviewee. *Please sign below.*
- Name _____ Phone # _____

Thank you!

Appendix B

OSU Sororities and Cooperatives Participation

Sororities 4/94-3/95 Sports Participation

Alpha Chi Omega	VB, FB, BB, SOC, SB
Alpha Delta Pi	VB, FB, SOC, SB
Alpha Gamma Delta	VB, FB, BB, SOC, SB
Alpha Kappa Alpha (unhoused chapter)	Inactive
Alpha Phi	FB, SB
Alpha Xi Delta (unhoused chapter)	Inactive
Chi Omega	FB
Delta Delta Delta	BB, SOC
Delta Gamma	BB, SOC, SB
Delta Sigma Theta (unhoused chapter)	Inactive
Gamma Phi Beta	FB, SB
Kappa Alpha Theta	VB, FB, SOC, SB
Kappa Delta	FB, BB, SOC, SB
Kappa Kappa Gamma	VB, FB, BB, SOC, SB
Pi Beta Phi	VB, FB, SB
Sigma Alpha (unhoused chapter)	Inactive
Sigma Kappa	SOC, SB

Cooperatives 4/94-3/95 Sports Participation

Azalea House	BB
Oxford House	SB
Reed Lodge	VB, SB

Key: VB-volleyball, FB-football, BB-basketball, SOC-soccer, SB-softball

Appendix C

Informed Consent Script

Hello; I'm Leslie Heusted. Andrea Bussler is a graduate student conducting thesis research on female participation in Intramural Sports and has chosen to survey women in sororities, cooperatives, residence halls, and Dixon Recreation Center users. The purpose of the study is to find out the reasons women participate in Intramural Sports and determine if and how Intramural Sports administrators need to adjust programming patterns.

_____ (name of sorority president, cooperative director, residence hall director, Dixon Recreation Center director) has given me permission to distribute the surveys here and your cooperation is appreciated.

This is a voluntary survey and you may choose not to complete one. The survey takes less than 10 minutes to complete and your identity will be kept confidential. In addition to the surveys, Andrea will be conducting a limited number of interviews. If you would like the opportunity to further express your Intramural Sports wishes and concerns, please provide your name and phone number on the attached piece of paper. The names and surveys will be separated immediately and only the researchers will see those names.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendix D

Interview Guide

Survey #5

Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Communication Reception

3. How would you describe Intramural Sports?
- 3a. How did you get that impression?

Customer Need Analysis

4. On your survey you stated that you participated because you "liked the sports." What did you mean by that?
- 4a. What sports have you "liked?"
- 4b. What qualities of the sport(s) make it likable?

Communication

5. In response to improving publicity to appeal to you, you recommended "a class on the sport where all members will attend." Can you give an example of what you had in mind?

Social Category

6. How have you met new people through Intramural Sports?

Customer Need Analysis

7. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
- 7a. Do you have any suggestions?
- 7b. Would you attend special meetings to meet people and form a team?
- 7c. If so, would you be willing to be the team manager?

Customer Need Analysis

8. Time is an aspect that reduces your Intramural participation satisfaction. Can you explain why?

Appendix D (continued)

Program Service

9. To change the program to better serve you, you stated “remind everyone that it is a game and not a win/lose situation.” When does that playing environment occur?
 - 9a. Does your attitude change when you are playing against a team of equal ability versus a team much better or much worse than your team?
 - 9b. If so, how?

Closing Question

10. Do you have any comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix D (continued)

Interview Guide**Survey #24**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Customer Need Analysis

3. You said you participate because it's fun and because of friends. What makes intramural sports fun?
 - 3a. You also mentioned that you like the Intramural Sports Program because it starts out fun. What happens to that level of fun as the season progresses?
 - 3b. Would you participate if your friends were not involved?

Customer Need Analysis

4. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
 - 4a. Do you have any suggestions?
 - 4b. Would you attend special meetings to meet people and form a team?
 - 4c. If so, would you be willing to be the team manager?

Communication Barrier

5. You said you "find lots of red tape and don't feel heard," can you explain?

Closing Question

6. Do you have any comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix D (continued)

Interview Guide**Survey #188**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Customer Need Analysis

3. You stated that you participate "to have fun laid back competition."
Can you explain laid back competition?
- 3a. What attributes give the program a laid back, yet competitive atmosphere?

Communication

4. You suggested improving the publicity with "small prizes-competition, more involvement and effort." How do you suggest this should happen?
- 4a. How do you think prizes would effect competition?

Customer Need Analysis

5. You said "no girl participation" is frustrating. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
- 5a. Do you have any suggestions?
- 5b. Would you attend special meetings to meet people and form a team?
- 5c. If so, would you be willing to be the team manager?

Communication Barrier

6. You stated that "because you're a Freshman, the IM staff doesn't care."
How was that message conveyed to you?
- 6a. What kind of communication would appeal to you?

Closing Question

7. Do you have any comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix D (continued)

Interview Guide**Survey #198**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Customer Need Analysis

3. You stated your ideal intramural sports program would include "Co-ed, fun-not competitive/or high athletic ability." Can you expand on that?
 - 3a. Does a competitive environment make an event less fun?
 - 3b. Does your attitude change when you are playing against a team of equal ability versus a team much better or much worse than your team?
 - 3c. If so, how?

Customer Need Analysis

4. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
 - 4a. Do you have any suggestions?
 - 4b. Would you attend special meetings to meet people and form a team?
 - 4c. If so, would you be willing to be the team manager?

Program Services/Social

5. You might be persuaded to participate "if your friends joined-or had time & went with a group of nonaggressive players." How do you define a nonaggressive player?
 - 5a. If your friends joined and you went with a group of nonaggressive players, would the time constraint be less influential in your decision to not participate.

Closing Question

6. Do you have any comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix D (continued)

Interview Guide**Survey # 212**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Communication Reception

3. You found out about the Intramural Program through other cooperative members. Based on their communication, what do you think the Intramural Program offers?

Customer Need Analysis

4. You said your house didn't get enough people for a team. Why do you think that happened?
 - 4a. Since your house could not form a team, would you attend special meetings to meet people and form a team?
 - 4b. If so, would you be willing to be the team manager?

Program Services

5. You said you have tried to become a participant, do you have a desire to try again?
 - 5a. What were you hoping to gain from participating?

Closing Question

6. Do you have any comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix E

Interview Guide-Addendum

Survey #5

Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Communication Reception

3. How would you describe Intramural Sports?
- 3a. How did you get that impression?

Customer Need Analysis

4. On your survey you stated that you participated because you “liked the sports.” What did you mean by that?
- 4a. What qualities of the sports make basketball and softball likable?
- 4b. What qualities of the sports make basketball and softball fun?

Communication

5. In response to improving publicity to appeal to you, you recommended “a class on the sport where all members will attend.” Can you give an example of what you had in mind?

Customer Need Analysis

6. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
- 6a. Do you have any suggestions?
7. Time is an aspect that reduces your Intramural participation satisfaction. Can you explain why?

Program Service

8. To change the program to better serve you, you stated “remind everyone that it is a game and not a win/lose situation.” When does that playing environment occur?
- 8a. Does your attitude change when you are playing against a team of equal ability versus a team much better or much worse than your team?

Appendix E (continued)

Social Category

9. Have you met new people through Intramural Sports?
- 9a. Is there a social environment within your team?

Closing Question

10. Do you have any closing comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix E (continued)

Interview Guide-Addendum**Survey #24**Opening Question

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?

Customer Need Analysis

2. You just said your house has difficulty fielding a team. What do you do to overcome that barrier to participation?
 - 2a. Do you have any other suggestions?
3. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?
 - 3a. You said you participate because it's fun and because of friends. What makes intramural sports fun?
 - 3b. You also mentioned that you like the intramural sports program because it starts out fun. What happens to that level of fun as the season progresses?
 - 3c. Would you participate if your friends were not involved?

Communication Barrier

4. You said you "find lots of red tape and don't feel heard," can you explain?

Closing Question

5. Do you have any closing comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix E (continued)

Interview Guide-Addendum**Survey #188**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
 - 1a. You volunteered because lack of participation has been frustrating. Do you have any suggestions to increase participation?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Communication

3. You suggested improving the publicity with “small prizes-competition, more involvement and effort.” How do you suggest this should happen?
4. How would you describe intramural sports?

Customer Need Analysis

5. In most sports, we only offer one skill level. How do you feel about that?
6. You stated that you participate “to have fun laid back competition.” Can you explain laid back competition?
7. You said you enjoy soccer and participate in the soccer program. If you were without a team, what would you do?
 - 7a. Do you have any suggestions?
 - 7b. If a special event was offered to encourage participation, would you attend?
 - 7c. Would you take the responsibility (initiative) to form a team from a group of individuals at the special event and be the team manager?

Communication Barrier

8. You stated that “because you’re a Freshman, the IM staff doesn’t care.” How was that message conveyed to you?
 - 8a. What kind of communication would appeal to you?

Closing Question

9. Do you have any closing comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix E (continued)

Interview Guide-Addendum**Survey #198**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?

Program Services/Social

3. If your friends joined and you went with a group of nonaggressive players, would the time constraint be less influential in your decision to not participate.
- 3a. You might be persuaded to participate "if your friends joined-or had time & went with a group of nonaggressive players." How do you define a nonaggressive player?

Customer Need Analysis

4. You stated your ideal Intramural Sports Program would include "CO-ed, fun-not competitive/or high athletic ability." Can you expand on that?
- 4a. Does a competitive environment make an event less fun?
- 4b. How do you perceive the competitive and social aspects fit in to the intramural sports program?
- 4c. Does your attitude change when you are playing against a team of equal ability versus a team much better or much worse than your team?

Communication

5. Have you seen promotional materials on campus?
- 5a. What reaction do you have to the fliers?
- 5b. Do you have any suggestions to make the publicity appeal to women?

Customer Need Analysis

6. If you were interested in a sport but were without a team, what would you do?
- 6a. Do you have any suggestions?

Closing Question

7. Do you have any closing comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix E (continued)

Interview Guide-Addendum**Survey # 212**Opening Questions

1. What prompted you to volunteer as an interviewee?
2. Are there any specific questions on the survey that you would like to discuss?
- 2a. With that limited knowledge of intramural sports, what did you expect from the intramural sports program?
- 2b. How has the program met or not met your expectations?

Customer Need Analysis

3. You said that you liked sports and that was one reason why you tried to participate. Can you expand on that?
- 3a. Do the people with whom you participate need to be friends?
4. You said your house didn't get enough people for a team. Why do you think that happened?
- 4a. Since your house could not form a team, would you attend special meetings or events to meet people and form a team?

Communication

5. Have you noticed promotional materials on campus?
- 5a. Do you have any suggestions of how to reach you with publicity?

Customer Need Analysis

6. What is your impression of the competitiveness of the intramural sports program?

Closing Question

7. Do you have any closing comments or suggestions that we have not already discussed?

Appendix F

Customer Need Analysis Questions

Participant Section

15. What are the reasons you participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
16. Do you have physical activity needs or preferences that are not being met by the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
_____no _____yes (please explain)
17. What do you like about the OSU Intramural Sports Program?
18. Are there aspects of the Intramural Sports Program that reduce your participation satisfaction? _____no _____yes (please explain)

Potential Participant Section

26. What programs or qualities would your ideal Intramural Sports Program include?
28. What are the reasons you do not participate in the OSU Intramural Sports Program?

Appendix G

Communication Questions

Participant Section

11. Has a university recognized student organization ever been a catalyst (influence) in your decision to participate?
12. How did you find out about the Intramural Sports Program?
13. What other sources of information about the Intramural Sports Program have attracted your attention?
14. What suggestions do you have to improve the publicity so it appeals to you?
19. Would you feel comfortable approaching the Intramural Sports Department with your concerns and program comments?
_____yes _____no (please explain)
20. If you wanted to express your opinions of the Intramural Sports Program, how would you communicate with the Intramural Sports Department?

Potential Participant Section

23. How did you find out about the program?
24. Would you feel comfortable approaching the Intramural Sports Department with your concerns and program comments?
_____yes _____no (please explain)
25. If you wanted to express your opinions of the Intramural Sports Program, how would you communicate with the Intramural Sports Department?
27. What forms of advertising would be most likely to reach you?

Appendix H
Program Services Questions

Participant Section

21. How could the OSU Intramural Sports Program be changed to better serve you?

Potential Participant Section

29. What would persuade you to become a participant of the Intramural Sports Program?