

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

James R. Tobery for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in the co-departments of Health and Human Performance, Sociology, & Business Administration presented on January 22, 1990.

Title: An Analysis of the Relationship Between Corporate Sponsorship and Intramural Event Participation.

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: \_

✓  
Dow P. Poling

More Americans are participating in sport every year and several organizations have made it their mission to provide the opportunity for organized sport participation. College and University intramural departments are one of those organizations. They provide participation opportunities on nearly every college campus. The review of literature identifies the sociological and psychological rationale for involvement in sport and reflects the manner in which the participation environment is changing and thus creating the need for research pertaining to this field.

The present study is an initial investigation designed to compare the levels of participation for intramural events administered with and without the aid of corporate sponsors. It was necessary for the investigator to employ two surveys in order to collect data for the study. Personnel from the Oregon State Survey Center were consulted regarding the

development of the survey instruments.

The research procedures performed were a mail-out survey to all colleges and universities listed in the 1989 Recreational Sports Directory, published by the National Intramural Recreation Sports Association (NIRSA), with enrollment over 10,000. A second survey was administered to 1989 Oregon State University intramural softball participants. The subjects of the OSU participants survey were selected from softball leagues offered by the OSU Intramural Department and included; Fraternity A & B, Independent A & B, Resident Hall A & B, Womens A & B, Graduate/Faculty/Staff, and Co-Recreational.

The study investigated: 1) the relationship between corporate sponsorship and intramural event participation, 2) the contributions made by sponsors to the intramural departments, 3) the contributions which most enticed the OSU participants to participate in intramural events, and 4) the OSU softball participant's motives for participating. Investigation of the data indicated a positive relationship between intramural participation and the involvement of corporate sponsors. There was an average of 20% increase in participation in the events that added corporate sponsorship.

The data from the OSU intramural softball participants survey revealed that OSU softball players participate more for the opportunity to socialize than for competitive release or for health and fitness reasons. It also revealed that the OSU participants are more enticed to participate by the opportunity for advanced competition than by any of the other contributions made by sponsors.

The results of this study indicate that corporate sponsorship may have a positive relationship with intramural participation levels. This may be due to the sponsors' offering intramural participants appropriate enticements and by assisting the intramural department with materials required in administering the event.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORPORATE  
SPONSORSHIP AND INTRAMURAL EVENT PARTICIPATION

by

James R. Tobery

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Arts  
in Interdisciplinary Studies

Completed      January 22, 1990  
Commencement      June 1990

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

---

Associate Professor of Exercise and Sport Science in charge  
of major

Redacted for privacy

---

Associate Professor of Business Administration in charge of  
co-field

Redacted for privacy

---

Instructor of Sociology in charge of co-field

Redacted for privacy

---

Chairman of Department of Exercise and Sport Science

Redacted for privacy

---

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis was presented January 22, 1990

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background .....	2
Significance of the Study .....	4
Objectives of the Study .....	5
Limitations of the Study .....	6
Areas of Investigation.....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
The Sociological Significance of Sport .....	9
Psychological Basis of Competition in Sport.....	15
Interorganizational Relationships Developed Between Corporate Sponsors and Intramural Departments.....	16
Summary of the Review of Literature .....	23
III. METHODOLOGY .....	24
Overview of Design .....	24
Subjects .....	25
Procedures .....	25
Treatment of Data .....	26
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	27
Part One - Intramural Department Survey ...	27
Part Two - OSU Intramural Softball Participant Survey .....	30
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	34
Conclusions .....	35
Researcher's Observations .....	36
Recommendations for Further Study .....	38

	<u>Page</u>
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	39
APPENDICES.....	41
A. OSU Intramural Softball Participants Survey .....	41
B. Intramural Department Survey.....	44
C. Listing of the Event, Sponsor, and Yearly Participation Numbers for the Schools Listed in Table 1.....	45

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>	
Table 1	Participation Statistics for Previously Nonsponsored -- Currently Sponsored Events.	28
Table 2A	Contributions by Corporate Sponsors to Intramural Events Operated From the Onset With Corporate Sponsorship.	29
Table 2B	Contributions by Corporate Sponsors to Intramural Events: Specific to the 25 Institutions Which Added Corporate Sponsorship to Ongoing Intramural Events.	30
Table 3	Break Down of Completed Participation Surveys by OSU Softball Participants by Leagues.	31
Table 4	Psychological Motives for Intramural Participation of OSU Softball Participants.	32
Table 5	Participation Enticements for the OSU Participants.	33
Table 6	Initiator of Interorganizational Relations.	36
Table 7	Summary of Corporate Sponsors Business Base.	37

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP AND INTRAMURAL EVENT PARTICIPATION

## INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes a factor of our society, sport participation, which involves nearly 50% of the U.S. population. Sport participation has been credited with the development of such positive social values as enhancing team work, building character, teaching self-discipline, and promoting physical fitness (Edwards, 1978, pp 68). However, the role of sport in the socialization process does not receive universal agreement. This investigation will review the development of sport in the American society and the many theories developed on its significance to the culture and describe one of the organizations that coordinate sports for a sector of our society, intramural departments. Intramural departments have been founded to organize recreational and competitive sporting events for the students, faculty, and staff on almost every college campus in the United States. It is significant that many Recreational Sports Departments and Intramural Departments are suffering from budgetary restrictions and/or cuts. Thus, they have been forced to develop new means of financing programs or to enact program cut backs. To combat the proposed program cut backs, intramural directors have begun to develop business relationships with corporations who are interested in spreading their name and products to the ever expanding industry of participation sports. It is the researchers objective to analyze the factors of the interorganizational link between the event sponsor and the event coordinator, the intramural department, and to



determine what relationship this interorganizational linkage has with the participation numbers of such sponsored events.

BACKGROUND:

The act of competing in organized sporting events can be traced back to the earliest days of the Greek and Roman empires including the birth of the Olympic Games (Mandell, 1971, pp 1). As was evident in those ancient days, the human desire for competition exists today with great fervor.

"Recreational" sports, sports developed for the sake of participation and fun, began their rise in the 1920's and gained needed support in the 1930's. Robert Boyle (1963) attributes the growth of participation sports to the following:

The Depression and the New Deal began to turn the trend away from spectator sport toward participation sport. Although millions were out of work, the average employed worker gained added leisure time because of increased industrial efficiency, legislation, and union agitation. (pp.43)

Legislation played a significant role in the change to participation sports witnessed by the little publicized recreational effects of the Works Project Administration (WPA), one part of Roosevelt's New Deal. The WPA built 10,000 tennis courts, 3,026 athletic fields, 2,261 horseshoe courts, 1,817 handball courts, 805 swimming pools, 318 ski trails, and 254 golf courses (Boyle, 1963, pp.45).

Worker rights legislation enacted in the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Wagner Act also helped promote the growth in participation sports. These acts awarded workers increased rights and powers at the work place which resulted in increased time away from the work place and thus more time to enjoy the new recreational facilities.

The really significant boom in participation sports occurred in the period after World War II. Increased leisure time and income due to post war prosperity and industrialization were the two main factors for this growth period. It is also around this era that Boyle (1963) traces the development of organized recreational sports which he calls "intramurals". These organized recreational games were established to take the place of the "varsity" teams that were sponsored by many businesses at this time. "Intramural" sports were intended to include all interested employees of a firm in the activities, changing from the "varsity" team practice which limited participation to a chosen few (pp 49). In addition, the mission of providing recreational activities for the total population was adopted by Intramural Departments, the Park and Recreation branches of local governments, and clubs such as Boy's and Girl's Clubs and YMCA's and YWCA's.

Intramural sports departments, one of the organizations that provide recreational and competitive sporting opportunities to a sector of our society, were developed to offer varied opportunities for people involved in a college's affairs. The purpose of intramural programs can be summarized as providing a wide range of recreational and competitive sports opportunities to help those eligible enjoy fitness as part of their campus lives. Intramurals offer an opportunity to learn new skills, enhance current skills, meet new friends, or just to relax at the end of the day. All levels of skill and ability are welcome in intramural competition, and involvement depends only on one's readiness to participate and challenge oneself.

Intramural departments have structured programs of physical activity which meet the sociological and physiological needs of their clientele. These needs include the need to exert physical energy, the need to compete, and

the desire to engage in activities in a social setting. As understanding of the different needs of people has grown, so has grown the understanding of the positive aspects of sport participation. As one of the providers of competitive and recreational sports opportunities, intramural departments have grown more aware of their responsibilities to provide the social and/or competitive experience desired by participants.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

The results of this study will assist intramural directors in their decision processes regarding the addition of corporate sponsors to their programs. Several philosophical questions are associated with these processes and may include the loss of total control of the program and the significance of the contributions made by corporate sponsors. It is obvious to most that corporate sponsors provide quality materials that assist intramural departments in providing a quality program. What is not nearly so obvious is the relationship between corporate sponsorship and event participation. This study will examine the relationship between corporate sponsorship of intramural events and intramural event participation.

#### CURRENT EXISTENCE OF CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP:

Budget limitations coupled with increasing demands for participation opportunities have made it necessary for many intramural departments to search for alternative sources of funding to maintain or to meet the increasing demands on their departments (Hayden, 1987, pp 42). One of the most available sources of alternative funding for intramural competitions has been corporate sponsorship. Corporate

sponsorship aids the intramural department by adding money and/or other resources such as promotional materials to the sponsored programs. In a study published in the "NIRSA Journal" on corporate sponsorship of intramurals, it was revealed that of the institutions with fewer than 5,000 students, 19.6% have used support of corporate sponsors. In institutions of 5,000 to 9,999, nearly 50% have had corporate sponsors. Of the institutions with over 10,000 enrollment, 62.5% have had corporate sponsors involved in their programs. (Hayden, 1987, pp. 42).

#### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The growth of corporate sponsorship of intramural events has stimulated this study. The purpose of this study is to determine if an increase in participation in intramural events exists after adding corporate sponsorship. This purpose has been developed to ascertain if the contributions of corporate sponsors have simply assisted the intramural departments in meeting budgetary needs or if the physiological and sociological needs of the participants are also being met.

Corporate sponsors add certain factors to intramural events that were either not present before the sponsor is involved or were present to a lesser extent. These factors include: publicity and organizational materials; the opportunity for advanced competition such as regional tournaments; the opportunity to play before home town athletic crowds in the collegiate athletic arena (referred to as show casing the event); the granting of participation and/or championship awards; the addition/improvement of equipment; and donations of funds for administration of the sponsored athletic event.

It is also an objective of this study to determine which of the sponsor's contributions are most frequently offered and which are preferred by the Oregon State University (OSU) intramural softball participants.

Another objective of this study is to determine which of the motivations of participation, competition, fitness and health, or the opportunity to socialize, (these motives are covered later) is considered the greatest motivator of participation for OSU intramural softball participants.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The study is subject to the following limitations:

1. Surveying institutions with enrollment over 10,000 for intramural participation statistics will limit the research population. Results could vary for institutions with enrollment less than 10,000.
2. Surveying current participants will not include those who might participate in corporate sponsored events but do not choose to currently participate in intramurals. They could have a set of desires that are different from those of current OSU intramural participants.
3. Surveying only the current OSU intramural softball participants will limit the research population.
4. The list of contributions from corporate sponsors, added publicity, awards, equipment, the opportunity for advanced competition, and cash donations, are not universally contributed by all sponsors. The analysis of the relationship between participation and the existence of sponsors may not consider this.

AREAS OF INVESTIGATION:

1. Will adding corporate sponsorship to intramural events show any relationship to the participation levels of intramural events ?
2. Will corporate sponsors be more will likely to contribute promotional materials and awards to intramural programs ?
3. Will OSU intramural softball participants claim that their primary motive for participation is for the release of competitive energies ?
4. Will the current intramural softball participants at OSU show a preference for the contributions made by corporate sponsors to intramural departments ?

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is divided into three sections. The first section will discuss the social significance of sport in our society and the various theories that have been developed to explain our involvement in sports. This section will be used to develop an understanding of why it is believed that organizations such as intramural departments play an important role in the educating and socialization processes.

The second section will investigate the psychological basis of competing in sporting events. This section will be used to develop and describe the variables that are considered by individuals before they participate in an event. It is from the material in this section that the survey, which will be used as the data collecting device for the second portion of this study on the motives for intramural participation, will be developed.

The third section will investigate the interorganizational relationship that exists between event coordinators and corporate sponsors. This section will be used to describe the environment that will be established. This section will also describe the motives and actions included in the formation of an interorganizational relationship and explain how an effective environment can be created for intramural sports competitions.

## THE SOCIOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF SPORT:

The significance of sport can be traced back to the Greeks and their philosophical ideals. The Greeks believed the ideal man must be developed through the perfection of spirit, mind, and body. Each facet demands and deserves its own time for development and nurturing.

As outlined in the introduction, the development of participation sport as an important part of our society has been a progressive development. Those who study sport and question what makes sport a significant and positive part of our society, if indeed it is, have developed many different theories. The social significance of play, of which sport is a part, has interested philosophers, psychologists, and sociologists since the time of Socrates. The efforts to explain play as a human phenomenon has resulted in the development of many theories on the role of play.

Spencer held that play was needed to get rid of surplus energy. Trade pointed out the role of imitation in play. Lazarus felt play was "recreative" and a means of recovering from fatigue. Groos held that play was preparation for adult life. Appleton assigned to play a physical basis and associated it with bodily changes occurring during growth. Hall developed the "Recapitulation Theory" in which play was viewed as a reliving of our savage ancestral activities. Shand saw play as expressing joy. McDougall felt play was motivated by the instinct of rivalry. Alder held play was used to overcome inferiority complexes. (Loy and Kenyon, 1969, pp 25)

The belief that value formation and building of positive personal characteristics, such as the ones listed above and ones to be outlined below, can be attributed to participation in sports has been ingrained as a permanent part of our society. John Brodie, ex-quarterback for the 49er's, sums up the role of sports in the following way.



"Life is not a football game but by playing football you can learn a whole lot about life" (Novak, 1976, pp 211). Such beliefs have become nearly standard in our society with recognition of the importance of sports participation and physical fitness coming from people of more significant status than professional athletes, including the President of the United States. John F. Kennedy used "Sports Illustrated" as a forum in 1960 to warn Americans that they were becoming soft; he stressed the importance of physical fitness and claimed that it provided the foundation for the "vitality of the nation" (Leonard, 1984, pp 4). "Sports Illustrated" was again used as the vehicle for a Vice Presidential message by Gerald R. Ford as he praised the social significance of sport competition. In his article, Vice President Ford stressed many of the character building attributes supported by noted authors in the Sociology of Sport. Some of these factors were: developing discipline, leadership skills, cooperation, and promoting physical fitness (Leonard, 1984, pp 6).

The emphasis on sports as a foundation to lay the competitive groundwork for a society is not unique to the United States. Hitler and Mussolini encouraged physical fitness, pagan athleticism, games, and contests in an attempt to rebuild the glories of Roman athleticism (Mandell, 1979, pp 1). Both leaders emphasized the creation of competitive attitudes believing it to be an important part in creating the ultimate race to rule the world.

Although researchers attribute sport with a diverse variety of social functions, it is unlikely that they are all equally significant and universally important. Stevenson and Nixon (1972) elaborate on five wide spanning social functions of sport: (1) socioemotional, (2) integrative, (3) political, (4) social mobility, and (5) socialization. (pp 119)

The socioemotional function refers to the ways in which sport affects the social and psychological states of individuals. This function is broken into three interrelated dimensions. One, the cathartic function of sport is rooted in psychoanalytical thought, which views sport as a physical form in which frustration, conflict, anxiety, tension, and aggression can be expressed in socially acceptable manners. Two, sport may create feelings of belonging, a sense of camaraderie. Three, a ritualistic function of sport may help aid a feeling of psychological stability and security in a frequently chaotic and rapidly changing world.

The integrative function focuses on the development of a "team" perspective through the coalescing of isolated individuals into a group. Depending on the competition, this could create an in-group consisting of a single team, school, city, region, county, or country. The team perspective can be manifested in the development of rivalries and the symbolic integration through banners, clothing, hats, and other memorabilia.

The political function refers to the use of sport as a tool to demonstrate power. Despite the argument that sport and politics should exist independently of one another, it is obvious that this is not practiced. A look at the Olympic movement does, without a doubt, prove this point. With the recent boycotts based on political activities and the emphasis on the production of superior athletes by emerging nations, it is clear that countries perceive that athletics will help develop national character and strength in their political-economic systems. This same argument can be applied to college administrators. It is not unusual to hear college authorities claim that winning sports teams attract students to their schools.

Social mobility as a function is based on the escalation of social status of the athlete. Some label sport as the pipeline from the ghetto but studying the statistics on the actual number who escape through sport severely diminishes this function.

The socialization function refers to the manner in which individuals are taught to be socially viable members of society. Stevenson and Nixon (1972) note that in Western society "sports are believed to socialize participants towards such desirable social values and personality characteristics as leadership, cooperation, respect for opponents, respect for rules, sportsmanship, self-control, achievement drive, a collective orientation, and a negative attitude toward racism" (pp 126).

As these theories have developed, skepticism has arisen to the actual effectiveness of sport and its role in the socialization process. Loy, McPherson, and Kenyon (1978) have reached the following conclusions after surveying the existing literature on this topic.

There is little, if any, valid evidence that participation in sport is an important or essential element in the socialization process, or that involvement in sport teaches or results in character building, moral development, a competitive and/or cooperative orientation, good citizenship, or certain personality traits. (pp 244)

It is all too obvious that studies on socialization through sport are incomplete and inconclusive. Although it is pleasing to the intellect of many sport's professionals and sport's sociologists that sports play a significant role in the socialization process, it is far from an axiom. However, as Nixon (1976) explains his support of sports as an important factor of socialization, he uses his rationalized approach to derive the following:

Human society cannot persist without social order, or without patterning and predictability in human relationships. Social order in the various group, institutional and societal contexts which constitute human society, is made possible by the establishment of social identities and the acquisition of culture through the process of socialization. A social identity is a person's conception of who he or she is in a given social setting, for example, viewing themselves as a star athlete, a mediocre coach, or a rabid fan. (pp 216)

Thus, Nixon builds his support for sports as an important factor in socialization because it is one of the processes available for people to find out who they are and to find a place for themselves in society. He believes that sports set limits for them to live within and helps to create social order. Many other sociologists and philosophers support the importance of sport in a manner similar to Nixon. Hans Lenk (1979), in his book The Social Philosophy of Athletics, describes the significance of sport as the search for one's "authentic being". (pp 12) Through sport, Lenk believes that people learn about themselves, develop themselves, and through this learning can then apply themselves better to other facets of life. Lenk (1979) claims that "sport offers the opportunity through free choice, through spontaneous deliberate personal activity, through progressive self mastery and self improvement, and through deep involvement in the face of anxieties and risk, to achieve authentic being" (pp 28).

There are so many different theories on the importance of sport that it is impossible to touch upon them all. This section has attempted to cover a wide variety that span the diverse explanations. It would not however, be complete without looking at one developed from the Marxist perspective. Marxist sports critic Paul Hoch (1972) argues that sports participation was a "tool of exploitation" by the ruling class, who encouraged mass sports participation

as a way of defusing, redirecting, or muting mass alienation or discontent that might have been directed against the power structure and the established order of society that gave the ruling class its privilege and authority (pp 222). This analysis is typical of Marxism and as it deserves review it should lose some credibility when the massive participation in sporting events by the elitist class is considered. (Theberge and Donnelly, 1984, pp 44)

As with any factor of society, it is important to know the impression of the people on sport. Spreitzer and Synder (1975) researched the status of sport as defined in positive contribution terms. Their research revealed that 90% believed sport was of value because it taught self-discipline, 80% felt it cultivated fair play, and about 70% believed sport nurtured respect for authority and good citizenship (pp 88). Both males and females had generally similar value perceptions. The difference between the sexes was that the females tended to emphasize the social control functions of sport (discipline and respect) while the men were more likely to emphasize the value of sports as a means of relaxation and diversion from the tensions of the day.

Although it is impossible to determine which of the theories best describes the relationship that exists between sport and the socialization process, through the observation of our society it is obvious that sport plays a significant factor in the daily lives of many people. It is also apparent that sport shall continue to do so at an equal if not increasing magnitude. Coakely (1978) expresses this opinion with his point, "the continued existence and growth of sport is taken as proof that it must be contributing to the well being of society and its members in some way" (pp 16). Though the contributions of sport to the socialization process are questioned as to levels of influence and significance, it is intuitively apparent that

sport provides a context in which values compatible with the American way of life are learned, supported, and perpetuated.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS OF COMPETITION IN SPORT:

Many different factors are considered to be motives of participation. It is impossible to evaluate the relative importance of the various factors or to derive a universal motive or set of motives. Mathes and Battista (1985) have succeeded in grouping the nearly standard list of motives including: social experience, health/fitness, thrill/risk, release of tension, pursuit of victory, demonstration of ability, need for competition, and love of the beauty of movement, into three subgroups. These subgroups are, 1) the thrill of competition, 2) the desire for health/fitness, and 3) the desire for the social experience (pp 721). They believe that these three subgroups encompass all the motives listed above and that grouping them as they have makes them easier to understand and explain.

The thrill of competition is described by Hans Lenk (1979) as the following.

The competitive relationship is a measuring operation in which each person, measuring himself against another, measures himself by means of the other, and the other by means of himself, and the unit of measurement is provided by the element of superiority (pp 28).

The competitive spirit does not only have to be measured against another but can also be derived from competing against oneself. Many athletes claim that a "personal best" in a competition can almost be as rewarding as a victory. Whether that is true or not is impossible to tell but competing against personal goals is indeed a form of competition. The need for competition also encompasses the

desire for awards and recognition. Many people compete solely for the thrill and pride of winning a trophy or some other memento.

Health and fitness are probably the most obvious reasons for people to participate in sporting events. This includes both physical and mental health and fitness. This group covers many of the participation factors listed earlier such as relaxation, release of anxiety and aggression, escape from pressures, as well as the much publicized effects like improved self image and increased physical attractiveness.

The social experience of sport includes the opportunity to meet new people, the opportunity to express oneself in a socially acceptable manner, and the opportunity to integrate into a group (as described in the social function section).

Mathes and Battista (1985) surveyed college athletes and non-athletes to attain what they, the students, determined were the most popular reasons for participation. The study determined that the number one reason was for health and fitness. These results were contrary to the background study of Mathes and Battista which predicted that the number one reason would be for competitive release. In this study they stated that there may be a bias toward the competitive motive on college campuses, more so than would be found off of college campuses, because of the achievement orientation of college students.

#### INTERORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS DEVELOPED BETWEEN CORPORATE SPONSORS AND INTRAMURAL DEPARTMENTS:

##### THE CORPORATE SPONSOR:

Sponsorship of athletic events became a factor in North America in the 1940's as the economy began to recover from the depression in the post war boom. At that time a new

breed of sports entrepreneur stepped on to the sport's scene to advance the sport's industry into a more competitive business atmosphere. Soon sports developed into a viable activity for the average individual as well as an accepted entertainment option.

Today, businesses that become corporate sponsors are most often profit seeking firms that are pursuing many different means of introducing their name and products to their targeted markets. It is a general belief that sponsorship in the past was practiced simply because the CEO liked a certain sport and wanted the prestige that was linked with its sponsorship. Those involved now, however, intend for their sponsorship to bring them measurable benefits.

When a corporation is considering event sponsorship they have a variety of goals or purposes. These include: enhancing the company's image with targeted customers; increasing customers' awareness of their organization and products; promoting educational and physical fitness; meeting social responsibilities; and creating goodwill (Ukman, 1984,pp 21) (Beyer, 1986,pp 11). Marketing experts predict that corporate sponsorship will soon become one of the standard items in every corporation's promotional mix. This opinion is linked to an analysis of the total sports industry that is expanding at an incredible pace and is now a 50 billion dollar industry (Sandomir, 1988,pp 15). With a 6.1% growth rate in 1987 and an even higher increase expected in 1988, it is understandable for firms that have targeted sports-minded clientele to be interested in sponsoring events. Not only are firms aiming at the "arm chair quarterbacks", they are now taking an aggressive marketing approach at the expanding group of active participants.



### THE EVENT COORDINATOR:

The event coordinator can be from a variety of organizations. These include the Park and Recreation divisions of local governments, YMCA's and YWCA's, University and College Intramural and/or Recreational Departments (some are the same department, some are separate), and private sports clubs. Since the emphasis of this paper is on the relationship between intramural departments and corporate sponsors, the goal of intramural departments shall be the only ones identified. The goal of intramural programs is to provide a comprehensive and varied experience that will meet the recreational and competitive needs of sports-minded persons on college campuses. Obviously this is a difficult process due to the potential for different motives for participation. The incentives or goals of the participants are derived from both their sociological and psychological desires, and their personal preferences in the types of competitions they enter. As Coakley (1978) states in his definition of sport, "participation is motivated by a combination of the intrinsic satisfaction associated with the activity itself and the external rewards earned through participation" (pp 12).

### THE INTERORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIP:

The interorganizational relationship occurs when a potential sponsor targets a certain type of customer, current or potential, whose demographics are similar to the participants in a sporting event. Thus exists the opportunity to create an alliance that will allow both the event coordinator and the corporate sponsor to benefit. Several management journals outline similar criteria for the

basis and requirements for interorganizational relationships. These criteria include; internal and external legitimation, resource exchange, and a defining of the domain of each organization's activities (Hunter and Wiewel, 1985,pp 482). The internal legitimation refers to an analysis made by both parties, the event coordinator and the corporate sponsor, with both realizing sufficient benefit from the interactions to make it practical and feasible. The external legitimation refers to acceptance by the clientele or participants of the relationship. This issue has grown significantly in importance as the public has become more involved in evaluating the external legitimacy of interorganizational ties. An example of an unattractive though successful match is the sponsorship of women's tennis by Virginia Slims, a cigarette brand. The linkage is internally legitimate, with both the event coordinator and the sponsor satisfied with their results, but externally unacceptable. The linkage is questioned due to the obvious negative health effects of smoking. The public's reaction is that women's tennis should not be backed so profoundly by a product believed to be the biggest single cause of breast cancer: cigarettes (Stogel and McManus, 1988,pp 30). Another example of the external legitimation issue is the NCAA's current actions to ban all beer sponsors from their productions in an attempt to break the tie between sports and alcohol. The concern for external legitimization of the interrelationship has made event coordinators more aware of their social responsibility - not just their internal concerns. This concern is prevalent on most, if not all, college campuses as most college Presidents have frowned on involvement with sponsors who provide negative influences such as alcoholic beverage companies.

The internal relationship between sponsors and coordinators is developed to be a win/win exchange. The sponsor is entering into what is often a preexisting relationship between the coordinator and participants and is contributing resources to that program for the benefit of themselves, the coordinator, and the participants. It is the exchange of resources that creates the internal legitimation in this relationship. The sponsor aids the coordinator with cost covering resources such as publicity and organizational materials, and by adding attractive incentives such as awards and the potential for advanced participation in regional competitions (Schechter, 1986, pp 38). While providing the event coordinator with valuable materials for the running of the competitions, the sponsor is linking its name to an event that will attract the potential customer with the targeted demographics. The sponsor is not interested in setting up its own tournaments but believes that involvement with ongoing events will optimize the productivity of their resources while creating a resource exchange that will benefit all of the parties involved.

Two reasons for the increase of corporate involvement with sporting events are the increasing levels of participation, (it is believed that over fifty percent of the adult population of America participates in one or more sports) and the growing awareness of the linkage between the sport participant and customer demographics. Beer and sports apparel promoters are obviously tied to sports but many linkages are less obvious. An example of a less visible linkage is with automobile companies. They look very closely at the particular demographics when choosing which of their car lines, or individual cars, should be featured as a sponsor car. Plymouth is used at events like skiing and baseball whereas Chrysler is targeting the higher

income crowd that frequent golf and equestrian events (Beyer, 1986,pp 11).

A specific example of such a linkage is Pontiac's sponsorship of the Spring Games USA, a four year old championship of intramural sports. Pontiac believes that its sponsorship fits well with its youth oriented marketing strategy. They want to make an impression on the youthful participants before they begin the process of buying their first new car. Sponsors believe that creating an impression now will carry over until the time of that purchase. A second example is Chrysler's move to take over Mazda's sponsorship of Senior Tour events. "Golf matches our target demographics," states Phil Bockborn, the consumer promotions manager for Chrysler (Stogel and McManus, 1988,pp 2). As stated before, Chrysler aims at the higher society consumers who are known to frequent golfing events.

#### THE DOMAINS:

The domains of the event coordinators and the corporate sponsors have already been briefly but insufficiently covered. The domain of the two organizations includes their roles and duties in the interorganizational linkage. Event coordinators, as defined earlier, are the promoters and directors of the activity. They are responsible for the set up and supervision of the event. They do the advertising of the event, handle the sign-ups, develop the league or tournament structure, hire the referees or officials as needed, and supervise the competitions.

Corporate sponsors are enterprises that pay to have their name recognized with a particular sporting event. Sponsors bargain for a price that will make them a sole or co-sponsor of a competition. Their money (or materials) is then used to help cover the costs of the events. The

"price" may be in terms of dollars or value of materials contributed such as awards, promotional devices, or equipment used in the tournament such as balls, etc. For their contributions, sponsors receive the right to promote their name at the event by giving out small tokens that bear corporate insignia or through literature and publicity flyers.

A recent trend has seen a shift in the domains of both corporate sponsors and event coordinators. This has occurred because corporate sponsors have grown more cost conscious and have begun to evaluate the cost effectiveness of their programs with greater scrutiny. As sponsors have called for greater return on the dollar, they have begun to bargain for input in what was once the event coordinator's domain. The major area of change is in the tournament structure. Sponsors want to have input into this facet of the event to guarantee a satisfactory event duration that they believe will create the greatest benefit and exposure.

In the interorganizational process between event coordinators and corporate sponsors, internal and external legitimization is often achieved. This is achieved through the sharing of resources and expertise. Sponsors contribute an agreed upon sum to the coordinators and in return receive recognition and exposure at a sporting event filled with the sponsor's targeted consumers. Event coordinators use the sponsor's contributions to successfully advertise and administer the event. The end product of the interorganizational relationship makes the participants the biggest winners. The participants have the opportunity to compete and thus fulfill their competitive desires, and do so in what should be a positive environment created by the event coordinators, whose goals are to please the participants, and the corporate sponsors, whose goals are to gain exposure with potential clientele through name

identification with a positive event.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

The existence of interorganizational relationships between intramural departments and corporate sponsors has been fostered to promote an important part of our society, the participation in recreational and competitive activities. No matter what a person's motivation is for participating, it is crucial that the opportunity exists. Forming relationships with corporate sponsors may be the only way that event coordinators may continue to offer comprehensive programs to meet the ever growing demand.

## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW OF DESIGN:

The first portion of this study investigated the relationship between corporate sponsorship and intramural event participation. Data were obtained through a sampling of all institutions listed in the 1989 Recreational Sports Directory, a NIRSA publication, with enrollment over 10,000. This group was chosen as the survey population to correlate with an article by Hayden published in the "NIRSA Journal". Hayden (1987) determined that intramural departments located on universities with enrollment over 10,000 were more likely to have interorganizational relationships with corporate sponsors with 62% being involved (pp 42). This portion of the study was based on the findings of the Hayden article in an attempt to target the population that is more frequently involved with corporate sponsors.

The institutions surveyed were asked to supply participation statistics on events that involved corporate sponsors. Results were requested from before and after involvement of corporate sponsors and analyzed through a percentage analysis to determine if participation levels changed in events that had added corporate sponsorship. The institutions were also asked to respond to questions which outlined the contributions of the sponsors and the sponsors business base (local, regional, national). (See Appendix B for survey).

A second analysis employed a descriptive study to ascertain the participation motives of OSU intramural softball participants. The data were used to determine if a

consistency existed between the desires of OSU participants and the offerings of corporate sponsors. These offerings investigated included awards, promotional material, the opportunity for advanced competition, name identification with the sponsor, and showcasing the event (played at local coliseum/stadium in front of home crowd).

#### SUBJECTS:

The subjects used for the before and after participation survey were all institutions listed in the 1989 Recreational Sports Directory with student enrollments over 10,000. This group numbered 182 institutions and covered the entire nation.

The subjects for the participation motive survey were selected participants of OSU intramural softball. (A non-sponsored event). Respondents were selected from every league offered by the OSU intramural department during the Spring term of 1989 and included Fraternity A and B, Independent A and B, Resident Hall A and B, Womens' A and B, Graduate/Faculty/Staff, and Co-Recreational.

#### PROCEDURES:

The survey sent to 182 institutions with student enrollments over 10,000 was mailed April 27, 1989. A follow up letter was sent May 15, 1989 to expedite and encourage returns. The number of completed surveys received was 96, a return rate of 53%.

The descriptive study of the OSU intramural softball participants was administered to 230 participants on the intramural softball fields. It was administered in a cluster sample style to make it more feasible to conduct the survey procedure. Both the survey and survey procedure were



developed with the assistance of the Oregon State University Survey Center and the survey was administered during the week of May 15 - 19, 1989. A pilot test on Friday, May 12, 1989, was used to evaluate the ability of the participants to understand and answer the questions, and to determine the most effective time to administer the questionnaire. The pilot test data implicated that the participants were much more willing to carefully fill out the survey after they participated than prior to participating. This phenomenon may be attributed to the initial focus on pregame warm up which did not allow the necessary time for completion of the survey. The surveys were administered by Intramural Sport Supervisors who were instructed to survey one softball team per hour and to distribute the surveys to each team member after the teams had completed their games. Each team member was given the survey, a brief descriptive cover letter, and a pencil with which to complete the questionnaire. (For Survey see Appendix A). The intramural teams were randomly selected from the league schedules to guarantee that all ten leagues offered by the OSU intramural department were appropriately represented in the study.

#### TREATMENT OF DATA:

The first area of investigation was investigated through a percentage analysis using the data compiled from the institutions surveyed to determine if any relationship existed between participation numbers in intramural events and the existence of a corporate sponsor.

Simple compilations of data were used to examine the other areas of investigation pertaining to the contributions made by corporate sponsors, obtained from the institutions surveyed, and the OSU participant's motives for participation, derived from the survey of OSU participants.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the data collected from the two surveys and compare the results to the areas of investigation. Part one of this chapter analyzes the results collected from the survey sent to all institutions listed in the 1989 Recreational Sports Directory with enrollment over 10,000.

#### PART ONE - INTRAMURAL DEPARTMENT SURVEY:

Of the 96 surveys returned, 75 had involvement with corporate sponsors. However, of these 75, only 25 had added corporate sponsorship to an ongoing event.

The results from the 25 institutions that returned both before and after participation figures from a corporate sponsored intramural event, were analyzed to determine the average change in intramural participation from adding a sponsor to an event. From this analysis it was determined that the average increase in participation from adding a corporate sponsor was 20%. The data indicate that adding corporate sponsorship may have a positive relationship to event participation.

Table 1 shows the analysis of participation changes due to the development of an interorganizational link between a sponsor and an intramural department. It displays the participation statistics for the 25 institutions that added corporate sponsorship to a previously non-sponsored event.

TABLE 1

Participation Statistics for Previously  
Non-Sponsored -- Currently Sponsored Events.

<u>University</u>	<u>Average Per Yr Before Sponsored</u>	<u>Average Per Yr After Sponsored</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
Uof Alabama	31	53	+42%
UC San Diego	383	591	+35%
Uof Florida	52	59	+12%
Florida St.	2925	3575	+18%
Florida St.	800	1400	+43%
N. Illinois	2550	3800	+33%
S. Illinois	105	144	+27%
Indiana St.	29	19	-35%
James Madison	132	217	+40%
Marquette	74	141	+48%
E. Michigan	28	67	+58%
Uof Mississippi	80	120	+33%
Uof Missouri	43	37	-14%
Uof Nebraska	108	112	+4%
Uof New Mexico	432	427	-1%
UNC Greensboro	26	38	+32%
Oregon St.	40	87	+54%
Penn St.	150	150	0%
Southern Cal.	269	283	+5%
Syracuse	11265	10500	-7%
Uof Tennessee	303	234	-23%
Uof Texas	3011	3570	+16%
Uof Texas	289	346	+16%
Uof Texas	3475	3593	+3%
Uof Texas	3678	3876	+5%
Uof Texas	290	295	+2%
Uof Texas	2679	3018	+11%
Texas A&M	38	66	+42%
Towson St.	25	25	0%
Villanova	3000	3000	0%
Weber St.	20	50	+60%

Average % Increase Per Event +20%

\* Institutions that are listed more than once have more than one sponsored event.

\*\* Institutions that show a 0% change have limited the number of participants in their events.

\*\*\* Refer to Appendix C for listings of the event, sponsor, and yearly participation totals for each of the schools listed in Table 1.

Tables 2A and 2B outline the contributions made by corporate sponsors to intramural events and examine the second area of investigation which pertained to the two most contributed items by corporate sponsors. Two tables have been developed to compare the contribution results and percentages to determine if the contributions were similar for institutions that offered a sponsored event after first staging the event without sponsorship to those who offered the event with sponsorship from the origin of the event. The results from this comparison show that contributions by sponsors are similar with the two most contributed items being promotional materials and awards.

TABLE 2 A

Contributions by Corporate Sponsors to Intramural Events Operated From The Onset With Corporate Sponsorship				
<u>Contribution</u>	Number of Events		Percentage	
	<u>Receiving Contribution</u>		<u>Receiving Contribution</u>	
Promotion Material	58		76%	(58/76)
Awards	56		74%	(56/76)
Equipment	21		28%	(21/76)
Cash	7		9%	(7/76)
Funds for Facilities	3		4%	(3/76)
Expenses for Travel	3		4%	(3/76)
Other:				
Opportunity for Advanced Competition	7		9%	(7/76)
Food	5		7%	(5/76)
Newspaper recognition	5		7%	(5/76)
Referee Fees	5		7%	(5/76)

TABLE 2 B

Contributions by Corporate Sponsors to Intramural  
Events: Specific to the 25 Institutions Which Added  
Corporate Sponsorship to Ongoing Intramural Events:

<u>Contribution</u>	<u>Number of Events Receiving Contributions</u>	<u>Percentage Receiving Contributions</u>
Promotional Material	22	88% (22/25)
Awards	21	84% (21/25)
Equipment	10	40% (10/25)
Cash	4	16% (4/25)
\$ for Facilities	0	0%
Expenses for Travel	1	4% (1/25)
 Other:		
Food	4	16% (4/25)
Newspaper Coverage	2	8% (2/25)

PART TWO - OSU INTRAMURAL SOFTBALL PARTICIPANT SURVEY:

The data from this portion of the study were used to examine two areas of investigation developed pertaining to the motives for intramural participation of the OSU softball participants.

Table 3 reveals the break down of the individuals who completed surveys. The individuals were selected from all ten league categories offered by the OSU Intramural Department.

TABLE 3

Break Down of Completed Participation  
Surveys by OSU Softball Participants by Leagues.

<u>League</u>	<u># of Completed Surveys</u>
Fraternity A	24
Fraternity B	25
Independent A	20
Independent B	38
Resident Hall A	18
Resident Hall B	16
Grad/Faculty/Staff	17
Co-Recreational	30 (18 male, 12 female)
Womens A	16
Womens B	7
<hr/>	
Total Surveyed	212 (177 males, 35 females)
Total # of Softball	
Participants at OSU 2,304 (1872 men, 432 women)	

Table four addresses the third area of investigation, the motive for participation. The data show that 65% of the OSU intramural participants surveyed play for the socializing aspects. For every league, socializing was the number one selected psychological motive for participation. (For eight of the ten groups the opportunity to release competitive energies was the second most indicated reason for participation). Responses under the "other" category were for intramural fraternity points, which are only tabulated for the fraternities, and the remaining responses were for "fun". (The numbers represent the actual number of respondents on the question about the participants psychological basis for participation from each league).

TABLE 4

Psychological Motives for Intramural  
Participation of OSU Softball Participants

---

<u>League</u>	<u>Fitness</u>	<u>Social-izing</u>	<u>Competitive Release</u>	<u>Other</u>
Fraternity A	1	13	8	2 IMpoints
Fraternity B	2	15	5	3 "
Independent A	2	9	3	6 (Fun)
Independent B	1	31	4	2 "
Resident Hall A	1	11	4	2
Resident Hall B	0	12	2	2
Grad/Faculty/Staff	2	11	1	2
Co-Recreational	1	20	8	1
Womens A	1	12	3	0
Womens B	0	4	3	0
Totals and %	11 (5%)	138 (65%)	41 (19%)	20 (9%)

Table five shows what the OSU intramural softball participants consider to be the most enticing offerings by corporate sponsors, the fourth area of investigation. The data show that the OSU participants prefer the opportunity for advanced competition over the other contributions made by corporate sponsors.

TABLE 5

<u>League</u>	<u>Participation Enticements for the OSU Participant</u>				
	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Pub- licity</u>	<u>Advanced Compet- ition</u>	<u>Show- casing</u>	<u>Other (Fun)</u>
Fraternity A	5	3	12	2	2
Fraternity B	3	1	12	4	5
Independent A	2	1	9	3	5
Independent B	4	5	16	2	11
Resident Hall A	1	0	10	3	4
Resident Hall B	4	3	4	1	4
Grad/Faculty/Staff	2	1	3	0	11
Co-Recreational	8	2	13	2	5
Womens A	5	1	9	0	1
Womens B	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	35	17	92	17	51
%	(17%)	(8%)	(43%)	(8%)	(24%)

\*The survey included name identification of the sponsor in this question but it was never chosen by those surveyed.



## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With an ever increasing number of Americans participating in sporting activities, it is important that research be done to determine different ways of meeting their recreational needs while providing the opportunity for the event coordinator to operate effectively and efficiently. The review of literature developed the social significance of sport, the psychological motives for participation, and the opportunity, purpose, and structure of interorganizational relationships developed between intramural departments and corporate sponsors.

Areas of investigation were developed to examine the relationship and interaction between corporate sponsors and intramural departments and the motives for participation of the OSU intramural softball participants.

The data collecting devices used were descriptive surveys. One survey was sent to 182 colleges and universities with enrollment over 10,000 with the mission of collecting participation results from events that were started without sponsors but have added sponsors in the recent past. Of the 96 returned, 76 expressed relationships with corporate sponsors. Only 25 of that 76 had started and run the event without a sponsor before becoming involved with a sponsor. The participation statistics from those 25 institutions were subjected to a percentage analysis to determine the relationship between corporate sponsorship and intramural event participation.

The second portion of the study used a survey that was structured to compile data on the motives for participation

from OSU intramural softball participants. The data was used to determine what the psychological basis for participation was for the participants at OSU and to determine which of the contributions made by corporate sponsors would entice the greatest participation.

#### CONCLUSIONS:

Within the limitations of this study and to the extent that the sample populations represent the intramural departments on campuses with enrollment over 10,000 and the OSU intramural softball participants, the following conclusions have been derived from the results of the research.

1. Adding sponsorship to an intramural event is associated with an increase in participation.
2. The most contributed goods to intramural events by corporate sponsors are promotional materials and awards.
3. OSU intramural softball participants are more motivated to participate by the opportunity for advanced competition than any other factor contributed by corporate sponsors.
4. The most common motive for participation for OSU participants is the opportunity to socialize.

RESEARCHER'S OBSERVATIONS:

The interorganizational relationships formed between the corporate sponsor and the intramural department have been pursued primarily by the corporate sponsor up to this time. Over 70% of the interorganizational relationships between these two groups have been initiated by the sponsor. The researcher believes that this initiation percentage will shift more toward the intramural department in the future. Intramural directors have begun to realize that contributions by corporate sponsors are legitimate means of funding portions of their programs. This realization should lead more intramural departments to actively pursue interorganizational relationships with corporate sponsors.

Table 6 outlines the initiator tendencies of the interorganizational relationship. It shows that a large percentage of the relationships have been initiated by the sponsor for every business base. (These data are drawn from the survey of NIRSA members, see Appendix B).

TABLE 6

<u>Business Base</u>	<u>Initiator of Interorganizational Relations</u>	
	<u>Initiated by Corporate Sponsor</u>	<u>Initiated by Intramural Dept.</u>
Local	20 (71% of local)	8 (29% " )
Regional	11 (85% of regional)	2 (15% " )
National	<u>23</u> (66% of national)	<u>12</u> (34% " )
Totals	54 (71% by CS)	22 (29% IM)

Table seven portrays the sponsors business base (local, regional, national).

TABLE 7

Summary of Corporate Sponsors Business Base			
<u>Sponsors Business Base</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	
Local	28	37%	(28/76)
Regional	13	17%	(13/76)
National	35	46%	(35/76)

There would seem to be some contradiction in the results derived from this study. The results seen in Tables 2A and 2B show that the most contributed item to intramural events is promotional material, with 78% of all sponsored events receiving promotional materials to aid the efforts, yet OSU intramural softball participants rated increased promotion as the least influential factor motivating their participation (See Table 5). It is believed that such contributions by sponsors are usually considered by the participant to be informative but not necessarily participation enticing. However, many intramural departments believe that promotion of the event may be the key to its success.

The number one desire of the OSU intramural participant, receiving 43% of the surveyed opinion, is the opportunity for advanced competition. This result could have been biased due to the current structure of OSU intramurals. Many OSU intramural participants have voiced that they would like to see more teams advanced to the playoffs. (Currently only the top team from each league qualifies). This survey may have caught many of the OSU softball participants at a time when they were realizing that their seasons were soon to be over yet they were longing for more.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY:

It would be beneficial to complete a study on the participants of sponsored events to determine if their desires differ from participants of non-sponsored intramural events. This could help to better link the desires of participants to the offerings of sponsors and enable intramural departments to best use sponsor's contributions to entice participation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beyer, C. (1988). "Event Sponsorship Trends", Public Relations Journal. July 1986. Volume 40.
- Boyle, R., (1963). Sport - Mirror of American Life. Toronto: Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Coakley, J. (1986). Sport and Society: Issues and Controversies. 3rd Ed.. St. Louis: C.V Mosby.
- Hayden, D. (1987). "Corporate Sponsorship of Intramurals: Summary of Current Research". NIRSA Journal. Spring 1987. Volume 11 #3.
- Hoch, P. (1972). Rip Off the Big Game. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hunter, A., Wiewel, W. (1985). " The Interorganizational Network as a Resource: A Comparative Case Study on Organizational Genesis", Administrative Science Quarterly. December 1985. Volume 30.
- Lenk, H. (1979). Social Philosophy of Athletes. Illinois: Stipes Publishing Co.
- Leonard, W., (1984). A Sociological Perspective of Sport. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co.
- Loy, J., Kenyon, G. (1969). Sport, Culture, and Society. Macmillan Co. Collier Macmillan Ltd. London.
- Loy, J., McPerson, B., Kenyon, G. (1978). Sport and Social Systems. Reading: Addison - Wesley Publishing Co.
- Mandell, Richard (1971). The Nazi Olympics. New York: Macmillan Books.
- Mathes, S., Battista, R. (1985) "College Men's and Women's Motives for Participation in Physical Activity". Perceptual and Motor Skills. December 1985. Volume 61.
- Nixon, H. (1976). Sport and Social Imagination. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc.
- Novak, M. (1976). The Joy of Sports. New York: Basic Books.

- Rees, R., Miracle, A. (1986). Sport and Social Theory. Illinois: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Sandomir, R, (1988). "Sports Industry", Sports Inc. November 14, 1988. Volume 43.
- Schecter, Sid, (1986). " Schick Super Hoops: Bringing Support to Intramural Sports". NIRSA Journal, Fall 1986. Volume 11 #1.
- Spreitzer, E., Snyder, E. (1975). "The Psychological Function of Sport as Perceived by the General Population". International Review of Sport Sociology. Volume 10.
- Stevenson, C., Nixon, J. (1972). A Conceptual Scheme of the Functions of Sport. Sportswissenschaft.
- Stogel, C., McManus, J., (1988). "Chrysler to Join Senior Tour", Sports Inc. November 14, 1988. Volume 43.
- Theberge, N., Donnelly, P. (1984). Sport and the Sociological Imagination. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.
- Ukman, L. (1984). "The Special Event: Finding Its Niche", Public Relations Journal. June 1984. Volume 40.

## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

OSU INTRAMURAL SOFTBALL PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR INDIVIDUAL REASONS FOR PARTICIPATING IN INTRAMURAL EVENTS AND PARTICIPATION ENTICEMENT.

1. In which league are you participating? (Circle one number)

- 1 FRATERNITY A
- 2 FRATERNITY B
- 3 INDEPENDENT A
- 4 INDEPENDENT B
- 5 RESIDENCE HALL A
- 6 RESIDENCE HALL B
- 7 WOMENS A
- 8 WOMENS B
- 9 GRADUATE/ FACULTY/ STAFF
- 10 CO-RECREATIONAL

2. Which one of these best describes your primary reason for participating in intramural events? (Circle one number)

- 1 FITNESS AND HEALTH REASONS
- 2 SOCIALIZING AND RECREATION
- 3 RELEASE OF COMPETITIVE ENERGIES
- 4 OTHER (Please specify.....)

3. Does the awarding of prizes ever influence you to enter an intramural event? (Circle one number)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO

4. For the following statements please respond by circling the number that best describes your level of agreement or disagreement to that statement. (circle one number for each)

	<u>STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
a. The more promotion and publicity an event receives the more likely I am to enter that event.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. I am more likely to enter events that offer advanced competition such as regional championships and opportunities to play other college intramural teams..	1	2	3	4	5
c. The reputation and name familiarity of a corporate sponsor would attract me to an event that I would not have entered if not sponsored.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. I will be more likely to enter a tournament if the championship is to be played before a OSU crowd at Gill/Parker.....	1	2	3	4	5
e. If prizes are to be awarded I am more likely to enter the event.....	1	2	3	4	5

5. Which of the factors listed below influences your participation the most? (Circle one number)

- 1 AWARDS FOR PARTICIPATING
- 2 INCREASED PUBLICITY OF THE EVENT
- 3 THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCED COMPETITION
- 4 NAME IDENTIFICATION WITH THE SPONSOR
- 5 OPPORTUNITY TO PLAY AT GILL/PARKER
- 6 OTHER (specify \_\_\_\_\_)

6. Are you (Circle one number)

- 1 MALE
- 2 FEMALE

7. What is your age ?

\_\_\_\_\_AGE

8. Is there anything you would like to add about your participation in intramural events?

## APPENDIX B

INTRAMURAL DEPARTMENT SURVEY

Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

1. Name of event \_\_\_\_\_, sponsor \_\_\_\_\_,  
local \_\_\_\_\_, regional \_\_\_\_\_, or national \_\_\_\_\_ business  
base.  
Did you actively pursue this sponsor. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
2. Contributions by sponsor. (Please check for each  
event)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cash donation \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Promotional materials  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Awards  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Equipment  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Funds for facilities rentals  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Expenses for players to compete off campus  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)
3. Participation results prior to adding sponsorship to  
the event.
- 1 year prior to sponsorship of the event. # \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 years prior to sponsorship of the event. # \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 years prior to sponsorship of the event. # \_\_\_\_\_
4. Participation results since adding corporate  
sponsorship to the event.
- 1 year after adding sponsorship to the event. # \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 years after adding sponsorship to the event. # \_\_\_\_\_  
 3 years after adding sponsorship to the event. # \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you!

## APPENDIX C

LISTING OF EVENT, SPONSOR, AND YEARLY PARTICIPATION  
NUMBERS FOR THE SCHOOLS LISTED IN TABLE 1

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>BEFORE CS</u>		<u>AFTER CS</u>	
			<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>	<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>
Uof Alabama	B-Ball	Schick	32	85	52	88
			32	84	60	87
			28	83	48	86
UC San Diego	Softball	Budweiser	425	85	650	88
			400	84	550	87
			325	83	575	86
Uof Florida	Slam Dunk	Gatorade	52	87	59	88
Florida ST.	Softball	Chenoweth	2925	87	3575	88
"	Volleyball	Dist. "	800	87	1400	88
N. Illinois	All IM's	GM	2700	87	3800	88
			2400	86		
			2500	85		
S. Illinois	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	30	85	49	88
					39	87
					35	86
Indiana St.	Co-Ed Volleyball	Churchill Downs	296	85	224	88
			208	84	104	87
			192	83	128	86
James Madison	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	132	87	217	88
Marquette	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	74	85	165	88
					133	87
					126	86
E. Michigan	3pt shoot	Nike	33	87	67	88
			27	86		
			25	85		

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>BEFORE CS</u>		<u>AFTER CS</u>	
			<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>	<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>
Uof Miss.	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	98	85	168	88
			91	84	105	87
			70	83	88	86
Uof Missouri	5k Run	Dammon Yogurt	45	85	40	88
			41	84	36	87
			42	83	35	86
Uof Nebraska	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	98	87	112	88
			115	86		
			112	85		
Uof New Mexico	B-Ball	GM	464	85	432	88
			448	84	424	87
			384	83	424	86
UNC Greensboro	Golf	AKA, Inc.	26	86	48	88
					27	87
Oregon St.	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	40	87	87	88
Penn St.	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	150	87	150	87
Southern Cal.	Co-Ed Volleyball	GM	280	85	280	88
			256	84	288	87
			274	83	280	86
Syracuse	General Campus Rec.	GM	10215	87	10500	88
			11980	86		
			11600	85		
Uof Tennessee	Softball	Coke	4290	86	3146	88
			3900	85	2925	87
			3640	84		
Uof Texas, Arlington	Football	GM	3011	86	3840	88
					3300	87
"	Swim Meet	GM	289	86	391	88
			287	85	300	87
			290	84		

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>EVENT</u>	<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>BEFORE CS</u>		<u>AFTER CS</u>	
			<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>	<u>#'S</u>	<u>YR</u>
Uof Texas, Arlington	B-Ball	GM	3480	86	3686	88
			3470	85	3850	87
			3475	84		
"	Softball	GM	3675	86	3901	88
			3670	85	3850	87
			3689	84		
"	Track Meet	GM	300	86	280	88
			290	85	310	87
			281	84		
"	Soccer	GM	2708	86	3046	88
			2700	85	2990	87
			2682	84		
Texas A&M	Softball	McDonalds	59	85	66	88
			35	84	74	87
			19	83	57	86
Towson St.	3 on 3 B-Ball	Schick	25	87	25	88
Villanova	IM Tournament	Miller Lite	3000	87	3000	88
Weber St.	Hot Shot/ Free Throw	Schick	20	87	50	88