



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

**AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE
ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL/RECREATIONAL
SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN INTERCOLLEGIATE
CONFERENCE**

presented by

Lawrence Sierra

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Doctor of Philosophy degree in Administration and Curriculum

Faculty of: College and
University
Administration

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. L. Nunnally".

Major professor

Date 2/15/92



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

26 APR 1987
7 0201
LE 30 4 030

AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE
ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL/RECREATIONAL
SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN
INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE

By
Lawrence Sierra

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and
Curriculum

1982

© Copyright by
LAWRENCE SIERRA
1982

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL/RECREATIONAL SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE

By

Lawrence Sierra

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to replicate a study completed by Harris F. Beeman in 1960. It was this writer's intention to determine if administrative problems and decision making skills in human relations in the Big Ten Intercollegiate Recreational Sports programs have changed in the past two decades.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to collect and analyze case problems and critical incidents which deal specifically with human relations in the administration of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference Recreational Sports programs. The purpose of the study was: 1) to determine the most prevalent administrative problems of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Recreational Sports Directors, 2) to gather data from administrative problem areas that could be developed into case problems, 3) to offer alternative solutions to those case problems involving human relations, 4) to list the critical incidents in cases which led to satisfactory and

unsatisfactory solutions, and 5) to suggest currently useful generalizations, based upon the case problems so they may serve as guideposts for the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference Directors of Recreational Sports and other Recreational Sports Directors.

MAJOR FINDINGS

In the course of twenty years, it was determined that many of the same problems are present now as they were when the study being replicated was written. The major differences seem to be that the participation in recreational sports has increased dramatically along with tremendous expansion of the professional staffs. The three major problem areas remain the same. They are: 1) protests by the participants, 2) eligibility questions concerning participants, and 3) inadequately written guidelines and rules. The difference between 1960, when the study being replicated was written, and the time of the present study, has been a decrease of occurrences of problems in these three areas.

An additional five generalizations from the problem areas were determined by this study.

1. Directors recognize that discipline problems, especially those that deal with altercations should be dealt with in a strict and swift fashion.
2. Student supervisory reports are an important part of the quality and accuracy of the administrative decision by director.
3. Team managers are an integral part of the communicative process and every effort should be made to include them when rules and regulations are reviewed.
4. Disciplinary action boards should be utilized in the decision making process. The boards should consist primarily of students, with a mix of faculty and administrators.
5. Orientation of student supervisors to facility and program guidelines will assist in servicing the student better.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Richard and Rose Sierra and to my wife Arlene and children Beth and Jeff. Their personal sacrifices and tolerance throughout my educational and professional career has helped me succeed in this endeavor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many individuals to whom I owe tremendous gratitude in and during the completion of this dissertation.

I would like to thank my guidance committee members, Dr. Howard Hickey, Dr. Melvin Buschman and Dr. James McKee. A very special posthumus thanks to Dr. William Sweetland who was always encouraging and a model of excellence for me.

The individual I owe the most gratitude during the entire process is Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, my committee chairman. Dr. Nonnamaker never pushed, but knew precisely when it was necessary to discuss and advise in order to advance the process. I treasure his friendship.

Deepest appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Harris F. Beeman, my mentor, teacher, and above all, my friend. His encouragement and assistance were meaningful to the completion of this dissertation. His permission to replicate his work was an honor.

Others of special interest to me during the writing of this dissertation have been my mother-in-law, Mrs. Ivy Young, who did much of my proofreading. Jean LaRocque, never complained once during the typing chores associated with this dissertation. In addition, I would like to thank Mike 'bad' Combes for his critical analysis of my work and also Dennis Mayer, David Stewart, Juanita Marisch and Julie Pline.

Finally, thanks to the Big Ten Intercollegiate Recreative Sports Directors, who, without their cooperation this would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Limitations.....	3
Importance.....	4
Definition of Terms.....	7
Historical Development of Intramurals.....	8
Summary.....	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Historical Background of the Case Study Method.....	13
Case Study Method, 1960 to Present.....	15
Uses of Case Studies.....	16
Methodology.....	20
The Critical Incident Technique in the Case Study Method.....	23
Summary.....	23
III. METHODOLOGY.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Participants and Samples.....	25
Selection of Problem Areas.....	26
Selection of the Case Problems.....	28
Response to Study.....	32
Treatment of Data.....	32
Summary.....	33
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.....	34
Case Problem #1.....	36
Case Problem #2.....	41
Case Problem #3.....	46
Case Problem #4.....	51
Case Problem #5.....	55
Case Problem #6.....	60

CHAPTER	Page
Case Problem #7.....	65
Case Problem #8.....	70
Case Problem #9.....	75
Case Problem #10.....	79
Case Problem #11.....	83
Case Problem #12.....	87
Case Problem #13.....	92
Case Problem #14.....	97
Case Problem #15.....	102
Case Problem #16.....	107
Summary.....	111
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	112
Purpose of Study.....	112
Limitations.....	112
Methodology.....	113
Summary.....	116
Summary of Significant Statements.....	117
Generalizations.....	125
Conclusion.....	127
Recommendations for Further Study.....	129
REFERENCES.....	130
APPENDICES	
I. Procedure for Securing Necessary Information to Complete the Dissertation.....	132
II. Big Ten Recreational Sports Conference.....	133
III. An Analysis of Human Relations in the Administration of Intramural Sports Programs of the Big Ten Inter-collegiate Conference.....	135
IV. An Analysis of Human Relations in the Administration of Intramural/Recreational Sports Programs of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Program.....	138
V. Case Reporting Form.....	139
VI. Protest of Volleyball Game on Time Limit.....	140
VII. Response Form--Alternative Solutions for Each Case Study	141
VIII. Response Form--Critical Incidents for Each Case Study...	142

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1960, Dr. Harris F. Beeman completed a doctoral dissertation in which he studied problems of human relations as they relate to Intramural Sports and Recreative Services administration in the Big Ten Conference. It is the author's intention to replicate this study to determine if administrative problems and decision-making skills in human relations have changed in the past two decades. It is also a goal of the study to contribute to the content of educational programs designed for the preparation of current and future Recreational Sports administrators.

With the continued demand and increased visibility of today's recreational sports participation, society has begun to give greater acknowledgement to the importance of providing well-designed recreation programs to satisfy these interests. As a result, greater attention is being given to the recreation sports professional's role in providing quality services to universities and communities.

As the job responsibilities of the recreational sports director take on new and broader dimensions, those in the field must address the question: Are we prepared to face the challenges ahead in providing individuals in our society and universities the ultimate in leisure-time services? If we are not prepared to meet these challenges, what steps

must be taken to assure that a high standard of performance can be attained?

Closely aligned with the importance of quality performance is having the ability and the background knowledge on how to handle a variety of situations, when encountered. In acquiring this knowledge, participants will accept the recreational sports professional as the authority in the field. The author, after having been employed as a director in Intramural Sports and Recreative Services for twenty years, feels great importance must be placed on the proper administration of these programs. Continued studies to create an awareness toward administrative skills must be continued in this area.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study is designed to collect and analyze case problems and critical incidents which deal specifically with human relations in the administration of Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference Intramural programs. This study is a replication of the 1960 study, and following the same format, an attempt will be made to determine if findings and generalizations developed in that study are applicable twenty years later.

Specifically, the problem and purposes of the 1960 study were:

1. Determine the administrative problem areas.
2. Gather data from the administrative problem areas that can be developed into case problems.
3. Offer alternative solutions to those case situations involving human relations in light of facts available.

4. List the "critical incidents" in cases which led to satisfactory and unsatisfactory solutions.
5. Suggest currently useful generalizations based upon the case problem studies as guideposts for the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference Directors of Intramural Sports.

This study will address the same problems and purposes.

LIMITATIONS

This dissertation is limited to the intramural-recreational programs of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference institutions as was the study which was completed in 1960. The findings and generalizations determined from this study are related only to the ten member universities which conduct programs involving more than 250,000 participants per year. The same two methods of investigation will be used to gather knowledge concerning the relationships and administrative procedures involved in the conduct of the intramural problems of the ten schools: (1) case problem technique, and (2) critical incident technique.

Further limitations are as follows:

1. Case study research is limited by the ability of the researcher to collect pertinent critical facts about each particular situation. Skill is needed to draw the correct information from responsible participants and to interpret this information correctly.
2. The uniqueness of each situation as presented in all of its complexity makes direct, comprehensive judgment about other situations impractical. Norms or averages concerning these situations

cannot be made in the usual sense. However, generalizations supported by established administrators can be drawn from actual experiences. These statements can be useful to others by alerting them to possible results of various actions.

3. Too often, sweeping generalizations are made after some similarities of behavior are isolated or determined. In this study the writer will limit his generalizations to the problems which actually occurred in the cases involving human relations and the actions taken to solve such cases. Use of the ideas and similarities may be applied by other directors.

It is impossible to reproduce human actions and reactions under laboratory conditions. Other means must be utilized to study clinically the important human relations involved in administration. The case study technique and the critical incident technique are two of the better methods designed to increase our knowledge of the elements involved in the administration of human affairs.

IMPORTANCE

The importance for replication of this study relates to the immense growth in participation of recreational sports activities. In the 1960's, but more recently in the 70's, funding for programs and facilities have increased with regularity. A new awareness, especially in the area of women's participation, has created demands for new programs and sensitivities. Since Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1964, new programs at the scholastic level created more demands at the university level. These same individuals desired similar programs

and availability of participation in the move to higher education. With the dramatic increase in participation, funding, facilities and a positive attitude toward exercise, more administrators are needed to represent these areas with intelligence and skill. As a result, graduate programs have been developed which deal specifically with the educational graduate degree in Intramural Sports and Recreative Services. These programs are important, if not imperative, as nearly every recreational sports director employs, trains, and directs hundreds of students each year.

Directors in the past became aware of intricacies of administration and their related responsibilities largely by trial and error. The responsibility for thousands of participants and millions of budgeted dollars requires efficient methods of administration be assured, safeguarding the privileges of all individuals and insuring proper use of public funds.

Little progress has been made as to solutions, decisions, methods or techniques for solving administrative problems of Recreational Sports administrators. Consequently, pursuance of gathering valid data dealing with the present administrative changes (i.e., budget, participation and facilities) will, hopefully, lend itself to a firm data base and benefit Recreational Sports Administrators in decision analysis approaches. Duties and responsibilities are listed in most intramural texts but no real insight, however, into some of the solutions or methods that are effective in working with people drawn from actual experiences has been available. Ronald D. Bauer, in 1955, stated,

There is a great need for material that throws light on the effect of formal and informal organizations, interpersonal relations, subgroup behavior, and pressures from the environment surrounding the administrative situation. Finally, there is practically no material available that concentrates on and contributes to an understanding of the process of decision making in the college or university setting. Those are the areas in which the development and study of cases may be expected to make a significant contribution (3).

This statement was true in 1955 and presently retains great significance in decision-making concerning problems in intramural sports.

Administrators continually strive to effectively administer Recreational Sports programs at both college and high school levels to insure full contribution to the development of our youth. Since many administrative problems are in the area of human relations, it seems that some "life experiences" be made available for professional preparation and inservice training purposes. Attempting to either expand or add to the existing generalizations by analysis of research case problems will give administrators a clearer insight in understanding their responsibilities. A research case problem contains a sufficient number of established data points determined to be crucial to the problems, to allow objective and systematic analysis.

It is obvious, since the study of 1960, that intramural programs are more than mere "extras" offered by the Athletic departments to mollify critics of varsity athletics. The generalizations derived in 1960 assisted in guiding universities in the direction of greater growth and participation. Since that time little has been written toward enhancing methods or techniques for solving administrative problems of Recreational Sports Directors.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to have a better understanding of the case studies included in Chapter III, important terms have been defined. Some professionals may feel the need to expand or delineate the definitions to better reflect their specific programs. However, these terms can be applied with almost universal understanding.

Intramural-Recreational Sports--An "umbrella" term used to encompass the entire area of recreational sports participation with affiliated students, faculty and staff at the university level. The following five definitions usually are terms that may be categorized as a branch of this definition.

Intramural Sports--Usually referred to as competitive programs that are structured, scheduled and officiated, including sports that are both team and individually oriented. Examples: basketball, touch football, softball, volleyball, tennis, track and wrestling.

Informal Recreation--A term used to identify that area of recreation which is non-structured and available on a "drop-in" basis. Areas in which to participate are usually open on a wait-to-use, challenge, or reserved availability. Examples: swimming, racquetball, squash and basketball.

Facility Co-ordinator--A program director, knowledgeable in all areas of participation including physical education and athletics. Co-ordinates the physical facilities to enhance a blend of space available for competitive and informal recreation.

Sports Club--Usually, self directed organizations of students, faculty and staff. Clubs may compete in a highly organized structure or, purely for recreational purposes. Participation is primarily within the "walls" of the university.

Extramurals--Extensive competition among clubs or organized groups (certified by the university) in conjunction with other institutions.

Student Supervisor--A student assigned to monitor activities in the absence of the full-time director.

Reservation Supervisor--A student employee taking and handing out reservations for certain facilities such as basketball, squash, racquetball and tennis courts.

Sports Supervisor--A student employee who takes charge of team sports activities, primarily during the evening hours, in the absence of a director.

Intramural/Recreational Sports Guidelines--Rules and regulations a recreational sports department have established for informing participants. Eligibility rules are generally a large section in these guidelines.

Campus Police/Department of Public Safety--Law and order agency on a university campus.

Altercation--This term will be used often during the writing of the case problems. It will be used as the oral or physical confrontation between individuals. Altercation does not connote physical activity alone.

Big Ten Conference--Universities of this Intercollegiate Conference are: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan State, Michigan, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue and Wisconsin.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INTRAMURALS

Intramurals and recreation are a "way of life" on most college and university campuses as well as in the public school systems. Intramural personnel no longer need to look for motivational devices to interest the students in the program, rather they must work to diversify the program to meet the physical and social needs of the students. As Colgate (6) has indicated, "Students are very complex organisms who are attempting to promote their development through all available channels." The intramural concept has been expanded to include many areas far beyond traditional programs that included only a few types of activities mostly based on team or individual competition.

Even though it is recorded as far back as 1701 in Boston, that intramural sports existed as a form of sport in the American school system, it wasn't until 1743 that the real emergence came. The father of

many creative ideas and inventions, Ben Franklin recommended that schools have a "healthful situation" with garden and fields, and a provision for students to engage in games, running, leaping, wrestling, and swimming.

The first account of informal (non-organized) intramural activity dates back to 1807 as students played football on the campus at Yale. Conversely, the first-recorded organized intramural competition took place as the freshman class challenged the sophomore class to a game of baseball. This event was followed in 1859 by the formation of intramural boat clubs at Yale.

Other early chronological events concerning the progress of Intramurals were:

1860 - Many appearances of activities between school classes and school groups began to emerge.

1870 - University of Minnesota organized the first intramural football game between the freshmen and sophomore classes.

1886 - Again, University of Minnesota took the leadership and formed the first ski club.

1896 - The first state athletic association was formed in the State of Wisconsin. Faculty control of both inter-school and intramural programs emerged.

1900-1920 - Probably the most productive era ever, as many universities realized the importance of leisure competition. Cornell University, in 1904, assigned coaches to give special emphasis and instruction to non-team students. The first intramural departments were founded in 1913, with faculty sponsorship, at the University of Michigan and Ohio State University. Other progressive events during this period

were commitments by organizations such as the Committee of Intramural Sports of the Athletic Research Society, National Athletic Conference of American Women, National Education Association for the worthy use of leisure recreation. World War I had its influence on intramurals when the Army had to place emphasis on more competitive sports because of the poor physical condition of the young men in the service.

1920-1960 - Big Ten Directors began annual meetings to discuss problems related to intramurals at the college level. In 1925, Elmer D. Mitchell published the first textbook on intramurals. Nineteen-thirty brought special attention to intramurals in high schools across the country. The first building specifically built for intramural activity was constructed in 1928 at the University of Michigan. The 1940's played an important role in the expansion of intramurals as World War II created a need for physically fit young men. This activity had a carry-over as the veterans enrolled in colleges and universities were asking for intramural-type activities. Highlight of the 50's was the recognition of intramural programs by the College of Physical Education Association for Men, the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and the National Association of Physical Education for College Women.

1960-1970 - College and University enrollments, increased by the "war baby boom", created a significant need for an expansion of both facilities and programs designed for recreational sports activities.

During the mid 60's great emphasis was directed toward recreational programs (intramurals) no longer being under the auspices of physical education, recreation, or athletics, but rather reporting directly to an administrative officer at the vice presidential level (10). This was the first major thrust towards altering the directors' role in the university administrative framework.

The 1970's probably produced the greatest need, in terms of more facilities and more graduate educational programs specifically designed to train professionals in the field. Two major changes occurred: (1) women were permitted membership in the National Intramural Association in 1971. (2) Title IX (1972) was written into the Educational Amendments Act of 1964. Title IX states that no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any educational program or activity operated by a recipient of federal support because of sex.

SUMMARY

It has been the intent of Chapter I to discuss the purpose of the replication of the 1960 dissertation and explain why it is of extreme importance to continue further study to assist present and future recreational sports directors. In addition, the first chapter also defined terms which will be used throughout the study; stated the limitations of the study; and presented a brief historical perspective.

In Chapter II a review of the literature is presented. A review prior to 1960 will be included with major emphasis on literature available after 1960. The administrative case method, and the critical incident technique, as instruments to analyze administrative problems, will be reviewed at length.

The methodology and collection of data will be discussed in Chapter III. Included in this chapter will be the sample and technique used. Some techniques used will differ from the dissertation being replicated.

An analysis and interpretation of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. The case studies will be presented along with the formulation of generalizations. Each case will describe the problem, facts, administrative alternatives, critical incidents and pertinent information necessary.

A summary of the findings, conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data, and suggestions for further study will be included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The review of literature is directed to the case study method of research as it relates to human relations in the field of recreational sports. Literature prior to 1960 has been described in the study being replicated. Consequently, the review of literature in this Chapter will be limited essentially to literature which has been published since the original study was completed. The case study approach will be discussed in order to gain a better understanding of its historical perspective, uses and methodology.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CASE STUDY METHOD

The use of the case study to analyze human relations and problems in areas of organization and administration has been utilized for over a century.

The purpose of the case study is an attempt to study human behavior to bring knowledge and enlightenment to the problems involved in human interaction. As a result, generalizations may be suggested for the improvement of such interactions.

It should be noted that the term case study and critical incident technique are used synonymously. In many instances it was found in the literature that there was no difference in the uses, methodology or description of these terms. In succeeding years the term "critical incident" was also defined as the case study approach to the solution of problems.

John C. Flanagan (13), the founder of the American Institute for Research, is recognized as the originator and leader of the case study technique. He states that the technique grew out of studies used by the United States Air Force in their psychological programs.

Other areas which used the case study method very effectively were youth delinquency groups, counseling departments, personnel departments in educational administration and schools of medicine. Even though the case study method may be used, and is used in a variety of ways it is used in determining factors that cause problems for persons in the preparation of leaders in their respective fields.

Gordon W. Allport, a noted researcher, in an article in Social Science Research Council Bulletin in 1942 described the use of the case method in bringing about a better understanding of individual problems and the extent to which predictions could be made (1).

As the case study method began to gain impetus, Sears published in 1950, in The Nature of the Administrative Process, recommendations for the use of the case study in clarifying administrative problems. He stated that "case studies might be slow in mining out ultimate principles, but experience in such studies could hardly fail to make us more discriminating as to what elements are involved, and what nature of these

elements is in any administrative act" (22).

In Robert Dublin's, Human Relations in Administration, C. I. Barnard states that executive decisions are not always made immediately or correctly. Additionally, he says "the fine art of executive decision consists in not deciding questions that are not now pertinent, or in not making decisions that others should make" (12).

CASE STUDY METHOD, 1960 TO PRESENT

More recently, additional uses of the case study approach to problem solving is pointed out by Clarke and Clarke (7). Even though the initial remarks are not positive, they state: the limitations of studies to single individuals, or at most to a very limited number in research, has received wide condemnation in physical education even though the practice is still widely used in the fields of medicine and in physiology.

The authors soften their remarks by stating that certain kinds of problems do not lend themselves to the usual statistical treatment, where a population as such cannot be defined where numbers of individuals is limited. Such studies permit analysis of the total individual (7).

In the Clarke's Developmental and Adapted Physical Education they state the case study method has been used successfully in developmental physical education classes which stress the need for those who are sub-par in physical fitness elements (8).

Uses of Case Studies

In addition, Clarke and Clarke (7) state the following three objectives typify the extent to which case studies may be employed.

1. Conduct intensive studies of individuals within a defined group.
2. Attempt to generalize from a synthesis of the individuals in the group.
3. Contrast data from one group to another group.

There is agreement among many authors that the case study method is used to provide detailed information about an individual, institution or situation. It is also widely stated that this method of problem solving is concerned primarily with determining the unique characteristics of the exceptional rather than the attributes which are typical of many. It has been stated that its use can be recognized to effectively study in detail the unusually successful or unsuccessful person, as a means of identifying the traits which characterize him.

The case approach has perhaps enjoyed the most widespread use in medicine, law and clinical psychology, for in each of these fields the practitioner deals with problems of a highly individualized nature. In schools, the case method has been effectively used in the individual study and guidance of children with reading difficulties, speech problems, or psychological-emotional disturbances. Few research studies using the case method have been reported in physical education literature, although it is a technique which coaches routinely employ in the critical analysis of the performance of their athletic teams.

Although the case study is most frequently used in the solution of individual problems, an accumulation of data from several similar cases frequently furnishes important data for comparative studies and for examining factors intimately associated with specific problems. Many advances in the field of medicine have come from careful study of case records of practicing physicians.

In the behavioral sciences, where identification and isolation of basic factors in behavior problems is extremely difficult, the case method has been used effectively. Alfred Hubbard, chairman of Research Methods in Health, Physical Education and Recreation states that in many fields of human inquiry where precise methods are not available for establishing cause and effect relationships, the case approach has provided sufficient evidence for establishing well-defined hypotheses concerning the interaction of associated variables. He also believes the case method is an effective approach in resolving a particular difficulty and frequently provides valuable data for formulating tentative generalizations concerning individuals or groups of marked similarity in some important respects (17).

The use of case studies continues to have an application to many areas.

Other examples which were frequently cited during the review of the literature was in the area of the delinquent youth. It is a general feeling the problem of delinquency is particularly well suited to the case approach, and as a result many case reports on delinquents are available. One of the early, classical studies in delinquency is the report by Healy and Bronner (15) of a single case referred to the

Judge Baker Foundation in Boston. The report includes a complete record of the personal, social and environmental background of the child. A broad approach to the study of delinquency is illustrated by Lou F. Harvey (14) Journal of Educational Research, who examined records of a large number of socially maladjusted American and Mexican boys in an attempt to gain insight into the physical, psychological and social factors associated with delinquent youth.

In a study closely related to physical education, William Sheldon (23) utilized the case approach in studying the physique of delinquent youth. He collected over 200 cases and feels that delinquency has definite biological roots.

Many research projects were encountered which utilized case studies in order to establish their findings. Studies such as those in which individuals were selected because of their unusual capacities or talents frequently furnish valuable information on the factors associated with these abilities. One of the major studies which gives information on the physical attributes, performance abilities, organic efficiency of athletes and provides insight into the role these variables play in top quality performance was completed by Thomas Cureton (9) at the University of Illinois in 1951. Individual data were provided by a study of 58 male athletes of national championship caliber.

Further studies were made in 1967 by Dill, Robinson and Ross (11) in presenting the athletic and medical case histories of sixteen former champion runners. The study reflected data on changes in physiological functions of the men some twenty years after their competitive years. Case study data is clearly helpful in this longitudinal study to show

widespread difference in the physiological responses of the men in later life associated with the effects of strenuous physical activity earlier in life.

One last study, which shows the individual approach, appeared in the Research Quarterly, authored by Lawrence Rarick and Robert McKee (21). Data was presented on 20 children, 10 high achievers and 10 low achievers in a battery of motor tests. The findings provided information on the differences in the early play experience of the children in the two groups.

Besides studying individual cases the case approach is also an effective method for studying communities, schools, organizations, and the various institutions of our society. An excellent illustration of a comprehensive study of community life and the impact of social institutions upon the lives of adolescents was researched by A. Hollingshead (16). The study centers around 735 youths growing up in a midwestern community and points out the role which family status in the social structure of the community plays in determining such factors as the social behavior of the adolescent in relationship to the school, the church, recreation, peers, and his family.

Deobold B. VanDalen, author of the book, Understanding Educational Research, 1979 (24) believed a case study is difficult to define because it is not a specific technique but rather a method of organizing data for the purpose of analyzing the life of a social unit. In order to relate to the individuality and behavior of the unit, data about the present status, past experiences, and environmental forces must be collected. In addition he feels the case study is similar to a survey, but instead

of gathering data concerning a few factors from large numbers of social units, investigators make an intensive study of a limited number of representative cases.

It is not clearly stated in the literature that the case study approach to problem-solving fits one particular phase of research more than another. Authors such as Walter Borg and Meredith Gall feel the case study technique to be well-suited to many educational problems, particularly those involving the qualifications of school administrators and teachers (5). During the search of the literature, the writer found frequent applications of this method to school or educational settings. One study that discusses at length this attitude is that of Sam Leles, Journal of Teacher Education, which discusses how educators viewed professionalism in the field of education (19). Specifically, he was concerned with whether educators have the same notion of professional and nonprofessional behaviors as do other occupational groups. The case study method technique permitted collection of a large amount of data on this subject. The use of this method was a simple, yet effective alternative to training observers and having them carry out lengthy observations of professional and nonprofessional conduct in a variety of educational settings.

Methodology

Researchers agree that certain steps must be followed in order for the case studies to be effective. Additionally, researchers state that it is easy to become dysfunctional if a precise approach is not taken. Hubbard outlines steps in the conduct of case studies. Hubbard states the following steps should be followed (18).

1. Determine Value - The investigator makes certain that the person, institution, or situation is sufficiently different to warrant detailed investigation. If an investigation of this type is to be of value, it should be directed toward the solution of a real difficulty.
2. Obtaining Relevant Data - Make sure the data is relevant to the problem. When dealing with problems which pertain to individuals the following information can, if appropriate, be used.
 - A) medical examination, B) standardized test, C) interview, D) observe behavior, E) devices to measure traits properly, and F) obtain historical data.
3. Analyzing the Data - An intelligent use of data collected on the case at an earlier time may provide valuable clues in interpreting the findings.
4. Making Recommendations - Case studies are conducted to throw light on a specific problem or difficulty with the view to making recommendations for change or treatment. Accurate records should be kept of all procedures used in the treatment program.
5. Appraising Effectiveness - According to Hubbard this is the final step. This step may be accomplished by testing procedures, observational techniques, or various special purpose devices.

According to the authors, Pigors and Pigors, of Case Methods in Human Relations(20), if analyzing cases is to contribute a full measure

of learning, what specifications need to be met? Pigors and Pigors answer the question this way:

1. Case analysis should be realistic. In order for others using the cases to feel they can make application current and relevant to them.
2. There should be method to the cases. The cases should be methodical so the reader can concentrate on the goal rather than the interpretation.
3. The method of analysis should be comprehensive. Use of a check list to gain consistency is important.
4. Analytical method should be flexible. Individuals should be permitted to think their own answers not to respond to a hardened set of preconceptions.

According to Earl Babbie the case study represents a comprehensive description and explanation of the many components of a given social situation (2). In citing Lloyd Warner's examination of "Jonesville", Babbie feels that by use of the case method he will gain great insight into many aspects of the community, to include the history, its religious, political, economic, geographical, and racial makeup to mention a few. He will seek the most comprehensive possible description of the community and will attempt to determine the logical interrelations of its various components. Babbie states it is important to realize that this approach to social research differs radically from other types of scientific objectives. While most research aims directly at generalized understanding, the case study is directed initially at the comprehensive understanding of a single idiosyncratic case. Where most researchers attempt to limit

the number of variables considered, the case study seeks to maximize them. The researcher executing a case study typically seeks insights that will have a more generalized applicability beyond the single case under study, even though the case itself cannot assure this.

THE CRITICAL INCIDENT TECHNIQUE IN THE CASE STUDY METHOD

In the study being replicated the author of that study used the critical incident technique in the evaluation of case studies he formulated. In order for this author to replicate the original study the same procedure was followed. The critical incident technique as defined in the original study was as follows:

The critical incident is any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing the act. It is an action, or inaction, a set of facts or statements, that can be used by the observer to draw conclusions for a solution to the problem. Finally, to be critical, an incident must occur in a situation where the purpose or intent of the act seems fairly clear to the observer, and where its consequences are sufficiently definite to leave little doubt concerning its effects. This all assists in developing objective approaches for administrative decisions.

SUMMARY

This author also reviewed the literature since 1960, the year the original study was completed, to determine if there were any new trends in the area of solving problems in recreational sports. All new literature, making reference to problem solving, refers only to the 1960 study. No new studies or research were found by this writer. This lack

of literature makes the development of this dissertation all that more important.

The case study technique continues to be used widely in the areas of law, medicine and general studies of education.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to replicate a dissertation completed in 1960 and to determine if any changes have taken place in the area of human relations in recreational sports. The study will concentrate on the development of case studies which will help in arriving at solutions to the problems presented. Once the solutions have been developed an attempt will be made to generalize from them in such a way that they may be used to assist recreational sports directors in the solutions of similar situations.

PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLES

Initially, the recreational sports directors of the Big Ten Conference were contacted and asked to participate in the study.

An outline was submitted to each of the directors which contained the format for the collection of data (Appendix I). The outline was designed to assist the directors in understanding the process which would be used in the study and their involvement in the completion of the study.

All recreational sports directors responded to the initial request indicating their willingness to participate in the study. Subsequently, all ten submitted the requested information.

SELECTION OF PROBLEM AREAS

The problem areas were formulated from three different sources. The first source was the minutes of the Big Ten Recreational Sports Directors meetings from 1960 to 1980. The format for these meetings was dominated by discussions concerning various programs and the solutions to specific problem areas. During the two and one-half day meetings the minutes clearly indicated that at least two days were spent dealing with specific problems and solutions to these problems. The minutes indicated that the format of the conferences has changed slightly during the past ten years and more time has been allocated to problem solving. The meetings have actually taken on a format where the programs are so pre-determined as to allow maximum preparation for each presentation (Appendix II). During the research on the minutes of each of these meetings, each time a problem area was discussed or listed as a concern more than once, it was given consideration for use in the study.

Additionally, the minutes of the National Intramural/Recreational Sports Association were reviewed from 1960 to 1980. The format for this conference is much like that of the Big Ten Conference except the duration of the meeting is four days and there is an opportunity for greater numbers of schools to participate. If a problem area appeared more than once in the minutes it also was given consideration for inclusion in the study.

Thirdly, the author used his twenty years of professional experience to draw from. During this period his primary job experience was in the area of team sports. In addition, a large portion of administrative time was spent dealing with building security, employment, and facility coordination. The overall experience as an assistant and associate director of recreational sports assisted in implementing this portion of the study (problem areas) by adding topics which have recently surfaced and have not appeared frequently in any literature or meetings. As an example, security of facilities has been a new concern of directors around the country but has not appeared more than twice in the minutes of the Big Ten or National Recreational organization. Consequently, it was added to the list of problem areas.

Twenty-one problem areas were developed from the previously cited sources. The problem areas were listed with major topic headings and sub-topic headings designed to assist the participating directors understand clearly the meaning within each problem (Appendix III). Once the 21 problem areas were developed, a questionnaire incorporating the 21 areas was mailed to the ten directors with instructions to indicate which problem area was (1)--most frequently encountered, and (2)--most difficult to solve. The area could receive a check for one or both. Space for additional comments was made available adjacent to each response.

The responses from the ten directors to the problem areas was categorized in four ways to determine the areas in which the directors actually had difficulty in finding fair solutions and in which areas they had frequent problems.

The following were the four rankings:

1. The number of responses in all tabulations.
2. The number of responses in either category.
3. The number of responses from all universities to each problem area.
4. The number of responses from different universities to each problem area.

The problem areas receiving the highest number of responses from the four rankings were those problem areas from which the case studies were developed. The following ten problem areas were then presented to the directors (Appendix IV).

1. Publicity in School Newspaper
2. Security of Facilities
3. Enforcement of Eligibility Rules
4. Allotment of Recreational/Intramural Budgets
5. Building Management
6. Facility--users fee, reservations, and non-university use
7. Relationship with Athletics/Physical Education when coordinated facilities change weekly game schedules
8. Control of contestants by student officials
9. Forming Sports Clubs
10. Checkup in weekly games schedules

SELECTION OF THE CASE PROBLEMS

Each director was then asked to use one or more of the top ten problem areas as a guide for writing the case problems. They were

encouraged to use these problems for the cases. Case reporting forms were submitted to each director (see Appendix V) to be used as guides for the interviews to be held later in the study. The reporting form was designed for use as an instrument for concise and factual outlines of each case. To assist each director a sample of a case problem was enclosed (see Appendix VI). Twenty-three reporting forms were returned. In addition to the reporting forms, in many instances, the directors supplemented the cases with documents such as letters to supervisors and participants, reports from judicial boards and protest boards, to mention a few. These documents were used to further develop the cases which were submitted. These documents were in such form as memos, letters from supervisors, actual protest reports, and hearing board minutes.

Following the director's response, either personal or telephone interviews were arranged. During these interviews the author expanded on the information from the case reporting forms. Additional letters, disciplinary board actions and any written facts pertinent to the cases were obtained when needed.

Eight of the directors were interviewed in person. It was necessary to communicate with only two via telephone. The telephone interviews were tape recorded to ensure greater accuracy. All twenty-three cases were refined and rewritten by the researcher and subsequently returned to the specific director for final proofing. When returned, the author eliminated seven cases due to confusing information or insufficient facts to develop solutions or critical incidents.

The sixteen remaining cases were reviewed and rewritten by the author in such a manner so as not to disclose the institution, individuals or actual solutions. The narrative retained all the original facts, information and quotes.

The original solution to each case study presented by the individual directors was listed among a number of alternative solutions. The original solution may be determined when reading the cases by the placement of an asterisk preceding it. The researcher also developed a number of alternate solutions to each of the selected cases. The directors were asked to rank the solutions from best to worst and offer any additional solutions in the event they disagreed with the solutions listed (Appendix VII). Tables are listed after each case containing the rankings by the ten directors.

Each administrative alternative listed after each of the case problems was designated as either a group (G) action or direct (D) action. The designation of these categories will be located within each of the sixteen tables dealing with responses of the administrative alternatives. The group designation of the administrative alternative was an attempt by the director to involve students in resolving their problems and in determining rules governing their participation. The other category, direct, was individual action taken by the director to make a strict decision concerning the situation related in the case problem.

The original and actual decision (solution) taken by the director submitting the case problem is noted by an asterisk in each table.

Further, the researcher, in refining each of the cases, attempted to determine those critical incidents which went into the solution of the

case problem. The critical incidents were drawn from the case studies as they appeared important to the researcher.

The critical incident technique takes on many definitions and totally depends on how each individual desires to use it. In this study, the author would like to make it clear that in the literature, close relationship is drawn with case studies and critical incidents. It is difficult to separate the two, so it is necessary to make a distinction how the term, critical incident will be used in the study.

The critical incident used in each case study is a set of facts or statements that can be used by the observer to draw conclusions for a solution to the problem. There may be few or many, but in each instance they assist in developing objective approaches for the administrator to make a decision. Each of the directors was asked to check one or as many critical incidents as they determined contributed directly to a recommended solution (Appendix VIII).

To gain a better understanding of the action that leads to a solution, the critical incidents were divided into three categories. The categories were simply a breakdown into areas of how they were initiated: 1) participant, 2) director, 3) supervisor or official. The incidents were summarized and grouped together to describe the same type of action. This procedure followed that of the study being replicated.

The refined cases, alternate solutions, and critical incidents were then resubmitted to the study participants. The participants were then asked to suggest other alternative solutions and other critical incidents which the researcher might have failed to include.

RESPONSE TO STUDY

The respondents in the study, the directors of the Big Ten Inter-collegiate Recreational Sports programs, were asked to respond to a series of requests for information. They responded to a problem area questionnaire, a case reporting form, interviews, and case studies.

In each step of the process, all ten (10) of the directors replied immediately and with completeness. The study received 100% response.

TREATMENT OF DATA

After all the cases were returned the alternate solutions were ranked according to the directors' ratings. Solutions not receiving a ranking were listed in random order. The critical incident responses were listed by the number of directors indicating who felt the incident was critical to the solution of the problem. Additionally critical incidents are listed that were submitted by each of the directors.

Specifically, as stated in the study being replicated, the final data was categorized in the following manner.

1. Summarized the rankings by placing the solutions in the rank order.
2. Where there was agreement of 50% or more on the best particular solution in a given problem area, generalizations about that area were drawn from that solution.
3. When less than 50% agreement was indicated the rankings were listed to show the extent of the disagreement.

4. Generalizations were drawn from the cases and summarized into statements which may be useful to individuals administering similar situations described.
5. A summary of the study was made to indicate the usefulness of the case studies in gaining valid knowledge of human relations in recreational sports administration.

SUMMARY

In summary, it was the attempt of this study to present the case study method of solving or producing alternatives to solutions for problems in the field of Recreational Sports. It was the plan of the study to collect cases from individuals concerned with the administration of recreational sports programs and to gather the administrative procedures and decisions reached by these directors. Useful generalizations have been prepared from the analysis of the cases presented in this study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In Chapter IV the researcher will analyze the case problem submitted by the recreational sports directors of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference. Sixteen case problems are listed as single units and begin with the actual case problem as submitted by the recreational sports directors. The alternative listed first after each case problem is the actual solution used by the submitting director. The remaining alternative solutions recorded are those listed by this writer as possible alternative choices for solutions.

The first table after each case problem ranks the alternatives as chosen by the directors as the best to the worst choice. The actual solution used by the director is noted by an asterisk in the table. An explanation of the rankings, group (G) and direct (D) decision-making options and additional alternatives, follow the table.

The next segment lists critical incidents associated with the case problems. The second table after each case problem lists those incidents ranked most important to the case by the directors.

The analysis of each case problem is then presented. This section evaluates the single administrative alternative which the majority of the directors believe would be most effective as a solution to the case problem. Additional analysis centers on the interpretation of the

ultimate action taken.

Finally, generalizations are drawn as a result of the analysis of the actual incidents and administrative action ranked as the most likely solution for the case. It should be noted that any generalizations derived from the cases should not be interpreted as statements which are answers to solving any or all problems. The generalizations, hopefully, will be extremely useful to students desiring to become professionals in the field of Recreational Sports and those professionals presently working with similar case problems. It is also important to understand that a mix of adequate knowledge, skill and intelligence when dealing with similar case problems, along with the useful generalizations, is necessary to be successful.

CASE PROBLEM #1**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

Team One was playing a soccer game against Team Two on a beautiful, sunny, spring afternoon. Team One was ahead 2-1 with approximately five minutes remaining.

A Team One player was whistled for tripping a Team Two player inside the penalty area. Results — penalty kick. The player called for tripping, charged the lead official and pushed him. The referee red carded the player and disqualified him from any further participation in the game. A penalty kick was awarded to Team Two.

The lead official, then the soccer supervisor, attempted to secure the player's name. He refused to give it, then left the playing fields site. The supervisor then approached the Team One Captain. He also refused to identify the disqualified player by name. The supervisor then informed the captain that the matter would be handled by the Assistant Director.

The penalty kick was missed by Team Two. Team One scored again, and won the game 3-1. Following the game, the supervisor and both officials indicated on paper to the Assistant Director, their views of the incident. They did not confer with each other when filling out the report. Each report contained the same facts concerning the incident. The reports emphasized the official did not provoke or offer any reason for the aggression by the player from Team One.

The following morning the Assistant Director read the reports, called and discussed the incident with the supervisor and both officials. All three reports plus the resultant telephone conversation concurred on the details.

The Assistant Director and graduate administrative associate then met with the Team One captain plus two other players. There was no disagreement on the tripping call, although the captain felt the officiating was biased against his team. The captain also complained that the supervisor was observed rooting for Team Two. The captain refused to give the name of the involved player. The Assistant Director read all names cited on the scorecard and asked the captain if any of these players was the one in question. The captain replied no.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Forfeit the game to Team Two as a result of meeting with everyone involved.
2. Allow the game to remain as a recorded game with Team One winning, but suspend the team manager and the player that pushed the official.
3. Forfeit the game to Team Two and suspend Team One player involved with altercation in addition to Team One manager.
4. Replay game without player alleged to have pushed official.

Table 1. Responses to Case Problem 1 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-G	1	3	4	2
2-G	8(1st)	1	1	
3-G	1	2	4	3
4-G		4(2nd)	1	5

As indicated in Table 1 the second alternative was ranked first by 80% of the participating directors. The directors supported action that involved students and officials concerned, rather than individual action solely by the director.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Suspend team until player in question is identified.
- B - Suspend team 1 from further play until they (team members or team manager) decide to identify the team 1 player. Upon receiving identification of the player, refer his case to the department of disciplinary committee. The game should have been stopped and forfeited to team 2 immediately upon team 1's refusal to identify their player.
- C - Forfeit the game to team 2 and suspend entire team 1.
- D - Suspend team until manager meets with director and discloses name of player involved.
- E - Have a scorecard that lists players by position to aid in identification.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Player called for tripping by official.
2. Player charging lead official and pushing him.
3. Team One captain refusing to give name to supervisor and directors.
4. Not stopping game at the time of incident and refusing to continue until player's name was determined. Forfeit game at that time if information was not obtained.

Table 2. Responses to Case Problem 1 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
2	9
3	9

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

A - All information verified by supervisor and both officials; documented evidence.

B - Act of tripping

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 1

Ranking

Alternative 2 was supported by 80% of the directors as the best way to reach a fair solution. The alternative was as follows:

Allow the game to remain as a recorded game with team 1 winning, but suspend the team manager and the player that pushed the official.

The additional alternatives submitted generally made reference to the fact that the entire team should be suspended until the individual who did the pushing is identified.

Interpretation of Action

It was indicated by the directors with respect to this case problem that student participants in any activity should be responsible for their actions. Errant actions by participants during highly competitive contests are not condoned by the directors. It is apparent the directors feel in this case that the actions of one or a few should not lead to punitive action against the team unless the team fails to cooperate with the solving of the problem.

Critical Incidents

Incidents 2 and 3 received 90% support by the directors as those items most crucial to the case problem. An additional critical incident submitted which seems important to all cases was making sure all facts are well-documented by witnesses and supervisors.

Generalizations

A. Strict disciplinary action should be taken by administrative staff when participants are not cooperative with solving game situations.

B. Predetermined guidelines should be available to a supervisor when participants fail to cooperate during a team sport activity.

C. It is difficult to deal with game problem situations when one student is designated as both a supervisor and official.

D. Directors should have a close and open line of communication with supervisors, participants and officials.

CASE PROBLEM #2**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

On Sunday, February 15, at 3:10 p.m. an Intramural basketball game between Zuber and Bomberg was played. After the game, the team from Zuber verbally abused the official.

The report of the supervisor, recorded after the game, reads as follows:

"The game ended in a one point victory for Bomberg; no particular challenge to specific action by either referee as claimed, however, Zuber was loud and vulgar in their complaints. One player tried to take the scorecard from the referee, Mr. Jones. Verbal abuse continued against the officials, the team surrounded the officials and I stood between them observing no punches being thrown but bumping did occur. Our staff supervisor also witnessed the incident and helped me regain control. Since no protest was filed, we could take no action other than to ask them to leave. They refused my request to leave. Vulgar abuse switched from the officials to myself. We were called everything imaginable. The refusal to leave continued long enough to delay the start of the next game, in fact, players from Zuber refused to leave the court. Amid a storm of vulgarity and a threat of trespass charges, we finally forced them out of the building."

The incident outlined above was deemed worthy of a disciplinary hearing administered by the Student-Staff Disciplinary Board.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Contact manager from Zuber and inform him teams actions such as were demonstrated would not be tolerated. Zuber team was expelled from further participation.
2. The Zuber team, through their manager, was reprimanded for their actions and put on probation. Probation meaning that if either an individual or the team were to get involved with any sort of disruption they would be suspended indefinitely.
3. Call the manager in for a conference and explain the difficulties which could occur from such behavior. Ask the manager to communicate this to his teammates.
4. Obtain the names of those individuals who were most abusive and instigators and take action through the university judicial programs.

Table 3. Response to Case Problem 2 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-D	3	4	3	
2-G	6	3	1	
3-G	1	1	4	4
4-G		2	2	6

Table 3 indicates that administrative alternative number two was ranked first by 60% of the directors as the alternative most likely they would use. After discussing the incident with a team manager and gathering all the facts the disciplinary board felt that probation was severe enough action to deter possible future actions.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Suspend team until captain/manager come in for discussion. After educational discussion of members' responsibilities, if no new information, continue suspension for term and probation for season.
- B - Alternative 2 with the addition of taking individuals involved before the student-staff disciplinary board.
- C.- Suspend entire team for one game; combine Alternatives 2 and 3.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. The closeness of the basketball game resulting in a one point victory for the Bomberg team.

2. One player from Zuber attempting to take the scorecard from the official.
3. No protest being filed.
4. Zuber team refusing to leave the gym when requested by the supervisor.
5. Delaying the start of the next scheduled game.
6. Threatening trespass charges against the Zuber team.
7. Not phoning the campus police for assistance to remove the students from gym and area.

Table 4. Responses to Case Problem 2 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Evaluating Incident as Critical
2	5
4	10
5	6

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Failure to identify principle offenders at time.
- B - Use of language.
- C - Threatening student and staff personnel.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 2

Ranking

Alternative number 2 was supported by 60% of the directors as best way to reach a solution. The alternative was as follows:

The Zuber team, through their manager, was reprimanded for their actions and put on probation. Probation meaning that if either an individual or the team were to get involved with any sort of disruption they would be suspended indefinitely.

The actual solution recommended by the director submitting the case problem was only indicated by 30% of the directors as the action which should have been taken.

Interpretation of Action

It was suggested by the directors supporting Alternative 2 that a more communicative approach be taken in dealing with the incident. The director should speak to the manager of the Zuber team and administer probation rather than the more direct method of contacting the team manager and expelling the entire team for their actions.

In addition, it could be interpreted that if an individual or individuals were involved in future problems they would have to answer for their actions individually.

The directors also supported the approach of permitting further participation while under observation.

Critical Incidents

Support of Incident 4 by 100% of directors indicated it was the most critical to the case. Additional critical incidents stressed the need for identifying principal offenders and concern of supervisor abuse.

Generalizations

A. Strict disciplinary action should be taken against participants when disrespect and unruliness occur.

B. Individual, not team suspension should be taken when possible.

C. Support of supervisors and officials should take place when participants are vulgar and abusive.

D. Teams that get involved with pushing and verbal altercation should be put on probation and individuals involved suspended immediately.

E. Student team managers are an important part of the communicative process between the director and team members.

CASE PROBLEM #3**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

Team A consisted of all black students (most former varsity football players) playing an all white team in the Class A intramural basketball tournament. Two white officials worked the game. They were the two best officials in the gym that night. The game went on with the usual amount of complaining on calls. A few times the black team complained about getting a "whitewash" job. In the second half the complaining picked up but no serious abuse occurred.

The game ended with the white team winning by two points. After the game, the officials were getting the game jerseys back from the two teams. One black player, Jim (6'5" tall, 300 pounds) became irate and grabbed a supervisor present at the game and began striking him and knocked him to the floor. Two game officials pulled the attacker off and the fellow turned on them. Official #1 was knocked to the floor and punched. After this the attacker went after Official #2 and punched him and knocked him to the floor. By this time Supervisor #1 went out and called the police. During this time, the rest of the black team stood by and watched. Players from the white team tried to stop the fights. The black player then left the gym and sat on the steps outside the gym for 5 minutes. Then supervisor #2 came by him. The attacker then grabbed this supervisor and repeatedly bounced his head off the cement block wall. The supervisor fell dazed to the floor. At this time the other black players said, "Here comes the police," and the attacker ran out of the building.

The toll of this attack included four IM employees hurt, the last person attacked went to the hospital for x-rays for head injuries.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Jim, when located, should be arrested and charged with assault and battery. In addition, he should be expelled from further intramural competition. Team A expelled from league.
2. Team A should forfeit the remainder of their games with the student doing the assaulting suspended from further participation in any type of intramural competition.
3. Team A may continue to play the remainder of the season without Jim as a participant.
4. One year suspensions should be incurred by all members of Team A in addition to suspending Jim the remainder of his tenure with the university.

Table 5. Response to Case Problem 3 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-D	8		2	
2-D		8	1	1
3-D	2	2	1	5
4-D			6	4

Table 5 indicates that Alternative 1 (solution used by director submitting case problem) was supported by 80% of the directors. Alternative 2 also received 80% support as the second best direction when determining a fair solution.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Jim, when located should be arrested and charged with assault and battery. In addition, expelled from further IM competition. Team A placed on probation for 1 year.
- B - Jim charged with assault and battery. Team A should forfeit the remainder of games and student doing assaulting suspended from further IM competition.
- C - Team A allowed to play without Jim. Place Jim on probation for remainder of year (expelled from further IM participation). Refer to University Judicial Board for further action.
- D - File disciplinary charges (departmental) against Jim, plus disciplinary charges filed against Jim with the Dean of Students office. Recommend that Jim be arrested by campus police and charged with assault and battery. Recommend to disciplinary board that Jim be dropped from all IM participation both as a spectator and

participant for a minimum of one calendar year. Recommend to Dean of Students Office that Jim be considered for expulsion from the University. Put team on probation for one calendar year.

- E - Jim expelled from IM competition charged with battery. Team put on probation but allowed to continue playing.
- F - Team suspended until coming in for meeting with director. After educational discussion, if no new facts surface, Jim suspended permanently, victim is encouraged to sign complaints, teams put on probation.
- G - Agree with Alternative 1 except not expelling team A, place on probation instead.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. All black team playing all white team.
2. Two white officials working the game.
3. Escalating of the discontentment by Team A, especially in the second half.
4. The officials having to retrieve the game jerseys from the teams.
5. Jim's initial attack on a student supervisor.
6. Phoning and having the police arrive at the scene of the action.
7. Anticipation of potential for such incident to occur and having someone from the professional staff present.

Table 6. Responses to Case Problem 3 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
5	10
7	6

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Jim's additional attacks.
- B - No help by Jim's teammates in restraining him.
- C - The failure of the members of the black team to control their player(s).

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 3

Ranking

The directors ranked the action which was actually used as the best solution to the problem. Alternative 1 was as follows:

Jim, when located, should be arrested and charged with assault and battery. In addition, he should be expelled from further intramural competition. Team A expelled from league.

Two directors suggested taking action only against Jim. This action was supported in Alternative 3.

Interpretation of Action

The directors responded to a deliberate and aggressive action by a participant against a student supervisor with direct, strict action. This case problem received the most suggested alternatives of any other case, each suggesting immediate, strict disciplinary action. This interpretation suggests that aggressive action in the way of an assault should not be tolerated and permitted in a recreational sports program. This type of action is definitely condemned by the directors.

Critical Incidents

All 10 directors felt the obvious incident precipitating the problem was number 5, "Jim's attack on a student supervisor." Additional

incidents suggested as critical were that Jim's teammates failed to control Jim's action.

Generalizations

A. Immediate and strict action should be taken by administrator when any form of assault confronts employees.

B. Individuals involved in any form of assault should be suspended and team put on probation if team members do not respond.

C. When assaults occur the game should be forfeited to opponent.

D. Assaults by participants toward supervisor and officials are not to be tolerated. Individual doing assaulting should not be permitted to participate in further IM activity for at least one year.

E. Student supervisors should be supported when an overt act is committed by a participant.

Case Problem #4**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

Toward the end of the Co-Rec touch football game, a player became irate at an official's judgement in making a crucial call. The irate player went after the official using abusive and threatening language and further proceeding to physically assault the official.

After the player was informed of his automatic and indefinite suspension from all competitive intramural athletics, he stated in his defense that the official had raised his arm towards him and he had interpreted this act as one of aggression. Four days later, the player and two of his teammates stated that the referee had used a racially degrading term and that precipitated the assault.

The official, the supervisor and the other players involved in the game were questioned and no substantiation of the suspended player's claims could be obtained. The player suspension remained.

Subsequently, the player participated under an assumed name in an IM basketball game and refused to own up to it despite positive identification by a Rec Sports staff member. He then verbally assaulted officials in a touch football game where he was present as a "coach". These incidents clearly identified this student as a participant who demonstrated behavior student officials were unable to handle. He appealed the suspension to the associate director of Recreational Sports and threatened higher appeal to unnamed University authorities. He did complain to a University vice president in charge of Student Affairs who after an inquiry decided to let the Rec Sports Department handle the situation.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. The suspension as a result of the player's initial altercation should stand and further action such as indefinite suspension should take place, regardless of the appeals made.
2. Initial suspension should be the only penalty issued, not indefinite.
3. Suspension should remain and the player referred to the Student Judicial Board for further action.

Table 7. Responses to Case Problem 4 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G	6	2	2
2-G	2	1	7
3-G	2	7	1

Sixty percent of the directors favored the first alternative as the best solution in supporting this action. This action also was the actual solution used by the director submitting the case.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Suspension of player until he met with director. If facts stand, suspension for year and probation for next year.
- B - Combine Alternatives 1-3.
- C - Recommend to departmental disciplinary board that they suspend the player from all IM for one calendar year either as a participant or a spectator. Refer to Dean of Students Office for possible further disciplinary action.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Player verbally and physically assaulting the official.
2. Informing player of his automatic and indefinite suspension.
3. The allegation that the official raised his arm as an act of aggression.
4. Allegation that the referee had used a racially degrading remark.

5. Participation under an assumed name during a scheduled intramural basketball game.
6. Verbally assaulting the officials when acting in the capacity as a touch football coach.
7. Appeal to a University vice president in charge of Student Affairs.
8. The vice president deciding to permit the Rec Sports department to handle the situation.

Table 8. Responses to Case Problem 4 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	8
2	6
5	9
6	8

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

A - Failure to inform Vice President of incident immediately after it occurred.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 4

Ranking

The solution supported by 60% of the directors was also the one used as the actual administrative solution in the case. Alternative 1 was as follows:

The suspension as a result of the player's initial altercation should stand and further action such as indefinite suspension should take place, regardless of the appeals made. The third listed alternative was ranked as the second best solution.

Interpretation of Action

By ranking Alternatives 1 and 3 as the first two most favorable solutions, it indicated that strict, immediate action such as suspension and potential further disciplinary process take place.

The directors felt so strongly concerning further disciplinary action that additional recommendations indicated suspension up to one year.

Critical Incidents

Critical incidents 1, 5 and 6 received at least 80% support indicating the directors felt the participant initiated the aggressive action.

An additional comment concerning a critical incident was submitted indicating such situations should be reported immediately to the Vice Presidential level.

Generalizations

A. An automatic and indefinite suspension should occur when threatening and abusive language is used by a participant.

B. Further disciplinary action by the Dean of Students or disciplinary boards should be used for repeated offenders of structured guidelines and social norms.

C. Student supervisors and officials should be supported when unprovoked and unnecessary aggressive action is initiated by a participant.

D. Physical and verbal abuse by a participant cannot be tolerated.

CASE PROBLEM #5**ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES**

Before the start of a semi-final championship hockey game, members of the opposing teams were dressing in the same area. The captain of Team A casually asked a player what team he played for. The player said he didn't know because he hadn't played here much, and then handed what was supposed to be his own student identification to another player, instructing him to return it to someone else.

The Team A captain became even more curious when this player he talked to skated for the opposing team. Team A lost the game and the captain requested the office to check out the player in question.

The captain of Team B was contacted and when the situation was explained to him, he said Bill Jones was the only player on their roster who had not played in nearly every game. However, the captain said "Jones was at the site, but I don't think he ever played."

At this time, the game officials were contacted and one of them felt he could probably recognize a player from the game. The Team B captain was, however, becoming more insistent that Jones never had really played.

The program coordinator then requested that Jones come into the office and be placed among several non-players. The game officials would then be asked to pick out from that group anyone they had seen playing in the game. This would also be done separately, with the game supervisor and the captain of Team A. Also, another player from Team B, who had not heard about the protest, came into the office about another matter. The program coordinator said, "We are having a problem with the Jones fellow on your team. Did Jones say anything to you last night in the game?"

"No, he didn't."

"Did you speak often to him?"

"Sure. He skated on my line."

Confronted with this, the Team B captain admitted Jones had played and used false identification because he had left school.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. After meeting with all parties the manager of Team B should be suspended because of his attempt to deceive. Replay the hockey game with Team A.
2. Team B will forfeit the game because of the ineligible player and Team A advance to the finals.
3. Eliminate Team B from the playoffs and have Team A play Team C, the team which lost to B, play A in the semi-final game.

Table 9. Responses to Case Problem 5 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G		7	3
2-G	5		5
3-G	5	3	2

Fifty percent of the support was indicated for Alternative 2 and fifty percent for 3. Both alternatives supported; stated that team B should not participate further in the play-offs.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Team B will forfeit the game because of ineligible player and A advance to the finals. B players suspended from IM for one semester.
- B - Suspend team until manager meets with director. If facts help continue suspension of manager and Jones and forfeit game to A.
- C - All eligibility protests must be filed prior to the start of the contest. Disallow protest and player in question should not be permitted to play in final game.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Opposing teams dressing for the game in the same locker room.
2. The player from Team B, Bill Jones, stating he didn't know which team he played for when asked by the captain of Team A.
3. Jones asking a teammate to return a piece of I.D. to another person.

4. Team A losing the game.
5. Team A not asking the officials or supervisor to check Jones out prior to the contest so possibly the incident would have never occurred.
6. Having Jones stand in a line-up with other participants and have the game officials determine if he had played in the game.
7. Teammate from Team B dropping by the office stating that Jones had skated on his line.

Table 10. Responses to Case Problem 5 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
2	8
3	6
7	7

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

No additional critical incidents noted.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 5

Ranking

There was not a clear decision as to which alternative should be ranked as the one that would determine the most fair solution. Two points were very clear, 1) Team B should be eliminated from further competition, and 2) the solution submitted along with the case problem was rejected by those participating directors. Alternatives 2 and 3 were as follows:

Team B will forfeit the game because of the ineligible player and Team A advance to the finals.

Eliminate Team B from the playoffs and have Team A play Team C, the team which lost to B, play A in the semi-final game.

An alternative suggestion was that the protest be rejected because it was requested after the contest. Replay the contest without player in question.

Interpretation of Action

The directors felt that when an ineligible player presents itself the team should be penalized if it can be determined all individuals were knowledgeable concerning the incident. When administrators have to go to near interrogation tactics the team should suffer paralleling consequences. Intentional, illegal participation is condemned by the directors.

Critical Incidents

Three critical incidents were supported by at least 60% of the directors. Each of the three indicated that the deliberate deception by Jones was the primary issue in this case.

Generalizations

A. Contests should be replayed when it is apparent an individual, not entire teams are responsible for attempts to deceive structured guidelines and regulations.

B. Identification procedures should be clear and foolproof when being used.

C. Group confrontation, such as all individuals involved with game difficulties, should be arranged when possible.

D. Participants will use drastic methods to deceive directors in an attempt to participate in recreational activities.

CASE PROBLEM #6

ENFORCEMENT OF ELIBILITY RULES

As Assistant Director of the Intramural Program I was faced with the following incident during the intramural basketball season. The problem arose in the Men's Residential Hall League during the Flight A playoffs. The members of Team A, who had already advanced to the finals of the playoffs, were scouting a semi-final game (between Team B and Team C) to get a look at the teams since they would be playing one of the teams in the finals of the Men's Residential Hall Flight A playoffs. During the scouting process one of the Team A players thought one of the Team B players looked familiar. As the game progressed the player from Team A realized why the Team B player looked so familiar. The Team A player was sure he had seen the Team B player (Jim Smith) on television the year before playing in a Mid State Conference game for Bowling Over University. The Team A player informed his team manager that he was sure Jim Smith had played college basketball last year for Bowling Over University. This would be a violation of the Intramural Guidelines which states that a player who earns a letter in a varsity sport cannot participate in that same sport in the intramural program for a five year period.

Team B won the semi-final game and after the game, the Team A manager approached the Team B manager to ask him if Jim had played varsity basketball at Bowling Over University the year before. The Team B manager said Jim did attend Bowling Over University but did not play varsity basketball there. The Team A manager then called Jim over to ask whether he played varsity basketball for Bowling Over University and Jim replied he had not played varsity basketball for that University. Still unconvinced, the Team A manager called me at the Intramural Office the next morning to inform me of what has transacted the night before. Team A still believed Jim had played varsity basketball for Bowling Over University and they wanted the Intramural Office to be aware of their concern.

As Assistant Director I felt it was important to solve Jim's eligibility question before Team A and Team B squared off for the championship. I immediately called Jim and asked him if he played varsity basketball for Bowling Over University. Jim at first said no. After I asked him further questions, Jim changed his story and said that he did play basketball for the varsity, but he said he did not receive his letter in the sport. I then asked him if he was absolutely positive that he did not receive his letter and Jim informed me he was positive.

At this time I brought the Associate Director into the case and informed him of what had transpired so far. We did not know whether to believe this person or not since he had already lied to us once when he at first stated he had not played varsity basketball at all. This was a special case in that most incidents of this nature involve former athletes of our own university whose eligibility can be easily checked. The staff was not sure of the procedure to use in checking whether Jim was a varsity letter winner or not. Was it in our domain to call Bowling Over University to ask about Jim's eligibility or should we just

take the young man's word? The decision was made to place a call to the Sports Information Director at Bowling Over University, and acquire information about Jim Smith. We talked to the Sports Information Director who informed us that Jim had indeed received a letter in varsity basketball the previous year from Bowling Over University.

Jim Smith had played on Team B illegally and thus Team B had participated in a violation of the Intramural Guidelines. A call was placed to Jim and we told him of the information we had attained and he admitted that he had received a varsity letter. We then called the manager of Team B in to discuss the situation with us. We explained the rules to him and explained that his team was in violation of the rules.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

After discussing the facts with all concerned;

1. Replay the game between Team B and Team C, but Team B has to play without the services of Jim Smith. The winner of the game would meet Team A in the finals.
2. Forfeit the game between B and C to C and have them (C) advance to the finals against A.
3. Advance Team B to the finals against A and have B play without the services of Smith.

Table 11. Responses to Case Problem 6 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G	1	9	
2-G	7	1	2
3-G	2		8

The directors felt that Alternate 2 would be the most fair. Seventy percent of the directors supported this alternative. Alternative 1 received 90% support as the second best solution to the case problem.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Forfeit the game between B and C to C and have C advance to finals against A. Suspend Jim from IM for 1 year. Place B on probation for 1 year.
- B - Suspend team B manager and place him on probation for season. Forfeit game to team C and suspend Jim from IM for year.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Playing the semi-final games on different evenings, so one could scout the other.
2. Having a rule that does not permit past varsity players from participating in like sports.
3. Team B winning the game over A.
4. The manager from Team C pursuing the incident with the assistant director.
5. Jim Smith stating to the manager of Team C that he had not participated on the varsity basketball team at Bowling Over University.
6. Phoning the Sports Information Office at Bowling Over University to determine Jim Smith's eligibility.
7. Not have a league which ex-varsity players can participate in sports in which they have lettered and are skilled.

Table 12. Responses to Case Problem 6 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
2	7
4	6
5	7
6	9

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

None.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 6

Ranking

The directors ranked Alternative 2 as the best solution to this problem. Seventy percent indicated they would have made the decision as explained in this alternative. Alternative 2 was as follows:

Forfeit the game between B and C to C and have them (C) advance to the finals against A.

The actual solution recommended by the director submitting the case problem was viewed as the second best approach to the problem by 90% of the directors.

Interpretation of Action

The directors have indicated by their majority choice of Alternative 2 that they support forfeiture of a contest when it is clear that intramural guidelines have been deliberately violated. Additional support was recommended by at least two directors that the individual in question, Jim Smith, be suspended from any type of formal intramural competition.

Critical Incidents

The critical incident deemed most important by 90% of the directors was 6. By supporting this incident it could be conceived that every effort must be made to determine an individual's eligibility. Additional incidents were concerned with intramural rules covering like sport eligibilities and pursuance of these situations by team managers.

Generalizations

- A. Guideline and rules are used to protect IM level athletes.
- B. It is important to investigate all ineligibilities thoroughly prior to contests occurring. Individuals involved should have the availability to discuss these problems with the recreational sports directors.
- C. Teams should not be penalized for the actions of one or few team members.
- D. Games should not be replayed when a player's ineligibility is detected.
- E. Team managers should have total knowledge and control of their team members.

CASE PROBLEM #7**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

On Tuesday, January 21, the director found the following report on his desk from the basketball supervisor.

During the 6:00 p.m. game in Gym I, Court 2, a serious problem occurred. Randy O'More, of Mac's Bar, slam dunked the basketball and hung on the rim. Not only did he bend the rim downward but the backboard broke as well. The official, Dave Ruggles, called a technical foul on Randy in accordance with our rule against dunking. In addition, all backboards have stenciled on them, "DO NOT HANG ON RIM."

The game was stopped at this point while the officials came to get me. When I got to the gym one member of the Mac's Bar team was on the shoulders of a teammate while trying to bend the rim back in an upright position. This proved futile because of the backboard being broken where the rim is attached.

During this period of trying to readjust the rim I asked the official what exactly happened. Dave told me that earlier in the second half Randy was complaining to him about being fouled on a shot and no call was made. Dave wouldn't argue the point with him so finally Randy said that next time he would "slam one" to show him. About five minutes later in the game Randy received a long pass on a fast break, went up to stuff a shot, and then hung on the rim after dunking. The entire rim was hanging in an awkward position after that.

Since there were only two minutes left in the game we finished it on that court. The real problem was the remaining four games scheduled for that court. Since there were no open courts available I looked for a forfeit on another court to move the next game to. There were no forfeits so amid the complaints from the teams we played the next game on that court broken rim and all. I was able to move the last two games off that court and into another gym because volleyball was done in that gym.

I think Randy should be suspended for a game or games. He would also have to pay for that damaged rim and backboard. And shouldn't he apologize to the teams that played on that court after his game?

Sincerely, Supervisor

The director reported that he inspected the damaged rim and backboard first thing in the morning. He then called Randy and asked him to come into the office to discuss the incident. Randy said he would be in that afternoon after 3:00 p.m.

Next, the director called Dave, the official, and asked him to explain what happened. His explanation was the same as the supervisors.

Randy never came into the office that afternoon nor the next day. The director then called the manager of Mac's Bar, Charley Van, to explain that since Randy did not come into his office to discuss the incident he was not eligible to play in the team's next game or any game thereafter until the matter was resolved.

Randy did not come into his office to discuss the incident he was not eligible to play in the team's next game or any game thereafter until the matter was resolved.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Mail letter to Randy informing him of costs to replace the rim and backboard. The letter should also inform him that if an appointment with the director was not made to discuss payment he could not participate with Mac's Bar or any other basketball team the remainder of the term. Also, an administrative hold card would be placed on his enrollment until payment is made.
2. Contact team manager explaining that if restitution was not made for basket and rim, the team, Mac's Bar, would not be permitted to participate in the intramural leagues the remainder of the season.
3. Mail a letter of reprimand to Randy and team manager, explaining the inconvenience it caused to the remaining teams yet to play their games. Also explain if a similar incident occurred their team would be disqualified.

Table 13. Responses to Case Problem 7 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G	8	1	1
2-G	2	6	2
3-G		3	7

Alternative 1 was determined to be the best possible solution to the case by 80% of the directors. The second alternative was listed by 60% of the directors as being the second best approach to solving the case.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - In addition to 1 the team would not be permitted to play until Randy discussed situation with staff.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Slam Dunk Rule and backboards stenciled.
2. The lack of opportunity of the department to replace the backboard and rim immediately.
3. Randy not keeping his appointment with the director.
4. The director phoning the manager and informing him that Randy was no longer eligible to participate in the intramural basketball program.

Table 14. Responses to Case Problem 7 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	7
3	7

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Rim and backboard broken by dunking.

- B - Randy saying he would "show the ref."

Team's displeasure that had to play on a broken rim.

- C - Randy showing his displeasure of the officials' calls by slam dunking.

- D - Rim and backboard broken by dunking.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 7

Ranking

The following alternative for administrative action was listed by 80% of the directors as the most fair solution. Alternative 1 was as follows:

Mail letter to Randy informing him of costs to replace the rim and backboard. The letter should also inform him that if an appointment with the director was not made to discuss payment he could not participate with Mac's Bar or any other basketball team the remainder of the term. Also, an administrative hold card would be placed on his enrollment until payment is made.

This administrative action was the original solution used by the director who submitted this case problem.

Alternative 2 gained considerable support. The difference between 1 and 2 was that 1 dealt specifically with the individual in question while 2 included a team suspension.

Interpretation of Action

The interpretation of this action shows that the directors feel the individual involved with the rim breaking should shoulder the burden of responsibility. This solution gave Randy the availability to respond to the problem and also gave the director a chance to educate the participant concerning other repercussions concerning his actions. It also is clear that student participants should bear the costs when university property is destroyed.

Critical Incidents

Only 70% of the directors supported numbers 1 and 2 listed as critical to the case. Additional incidents indicated by the directors

support the concern that the rim and backboard were broken by dunking, therefore, causing a delay in succeeding games.

Generalizations

A. When there is damaged equipment as a result of a participant's action they should be given the opportunity to make restitution.

B. All individuals involved in problem situations should be contacted and permitted an explanation prior to making a decision.

C. Team managers may be used to enforce decisions directed at team members.

D. Supervisors' reports are important in the decision-making process when they are complete and accurate.

E. Participants will react in a negative way when in disagreement with officiating or supervising.

CASE STUDY #8**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

Team A and B are playing an intramural basketball game. Player #1 from Team A and a player from Team B became involved in a shouting match. Various "racial" and "maternal" slurs are exchanged escalating into a shoving incident. One official restrained the player from Team B and another (official) moved toward player #1 from the A Team in an attempt to separate him from the B Team member. As the official attempted to restrain player #1 (of the A Team), player #2 (of the A team) rushed to the official's blind side and struck him in the face breaking his nose. At this time, the player from Team B was restrained by his teammates, and the non-injured referee escorted Team A to the locker room. The I.M. supervisor called Public Safety for assistance and personally insured that the two teams were kept separated until the police arrived.

The intramural supervisor then gathered written statements from all involved, and prepared an incident report. Both teams were then escorted out of the gym by the officers from Public Safety.

The director received the incident report the next morning and notified the parties involved that they would be contacted as soon as the incident was reviewed.

The situation was further complicated in that the #2 player of the A Team was a University staff member and the B Team player was an off duty intramural official. Our Hearing Procedures were designed to handle student disciplinary problems. This was the first recorded incident of a staff member assaulting an official. There was no precedent case from which to draw guidelines.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. After a review of the incident it was decided to treat the staff member as any student intramural participant. Refer staff member to Intramural Student Disciplinary Board. Suspension for player #2 to be two years from competitive play.
2. Reprimand player #2 for his action and establish a staff/faculty disciplinary procedure in addition to preliminary discussions.
3. Because of the nature of the incident (racial and maternal slurs) player #2 was excused for his aggressive behavior.
4. Suspend player #1, player #2 and Team B player from further competition in basketball and put on probation for the next scheduled team sport.

Table 15. Responses to Case Problem 8 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-G	7	3		
2-G		4	3	3
3-D		3		7
4-G	3		7	

Seventy percent of the directors felt that Alternative 1 was the best possible of the four available. The first three received almost an equal spread from the directors as a possible second choice.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Treat staff member as any student IM participant. Review staff guidelines.
- B - Treat staff as IM participant. Refer case to University office responsible for cases involving conduct of University staff members and request a review.
- C - Refer player 2 of the A team to a student/staff disciplinary board. Recommendation to be that player 2 of team A be dropped from all IM participation both as a spectator and participant for one calendar year. Place the B team player on probation for a short period of time.
- D - Suspend player 2 permanently and suspend player 1 and team B player for one game.

- E - Send full report of incident to player 2's department head. Reschedule game from point of incident, excluding players from both teams who were involved in the incident. Suspend player 1 and initial B player for season.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Players from opposing teams getting in shouting match and exchanging vulgar remarks.
2. Officials attempting to do a good job by breaking up a shoving match and consequently getting involved.
3. Phoning and asking the campus police for assistance.
4. Gathering written statements from all involved so an incident report could be prepared.
5. Not have policy designed to assist with problems which center around faculty and staff personnel.

Table 16. Responses to Case Problem 8 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	5
2	8
4	7

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Permitting students and staff to play against one another in a student IM program.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 8

Ranking

The support from the directors participating indicated administrative solution 1 as the fairest solution (70%). Alternative 1 was as follows:

After a review of the incident it was decided to treat the staff member as any student intramural participant. Refer staff member to Intramural Student Disciplinary Board. Suspension for player 2 to be two years from competitive play.

This administrative action was the solution used by the director submitting the case problem.

Interpretation of Action

It was clear, even by the three directors who cited alternate solution 4 as their first choice, that immediate suspension and direct action take place. Other suggestions with merit were to review guidelines which should have contained information on how to handle staff involvement in disciplinary situations. Another suggestion was to send a follow-up report to the department head of the staff person involved.

Critical Incidents

Of the suggested critical incidents, numbers two and four received more than 50% support from the directors as critical to the case. An additional incident suggested was the participation of a staff/faculty against students should be studied.

Generalizations

A. All IM participants should be treated equally with regards to discipline. Staff/faculty should participate within the same guidelines

as students.

B. Supervisors play a very important role in handling problem situations.

C. Written statements should be obtained from individuals involved in an incident so decisions by directors can be fair and accurate.

D. Guidelines should be written for all participants permitted to play in intramural games.

E. Players involved in altercation should be suspended from further participation.

CASE STUDY #9**ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES**

As director of the Recreational Sports Volleyball program the following protest was presented to me by the Sigma volleyball team coach.

Our protest surrounds the eligibility of one of the players on the Clo team. Their star player, Mr. V., is a veteran of international competition, having played in the 1976 Olympics and as a member of the 1979 Groan National team. He has admitted that he played for this team representing the country of Groan as late as November, 1979.

At this point in time, the eligibility rule states that no varsity sport player may compete in intramurals in that sport. No mention is made of players such as Mr. V. who did not play for a varsity team in a collegiate setting, but rather for a national team in an international setting. It is our contention that the intent of the Intramural Governing Board in the eligibility rules is to promote fair competition by placing individuals of equal caliber together in athletic events. Also, members of each team should have equal opportunity regarding practice facilities. Part of the reason for disallowing varsity players is that they have an advantage in getting practice facilities and are allotted more practice time.

We contend that the rule as stated should be extended beyond the varsity level, to the international level as well. Looking toward the intent of the Governing Board and the purpose of intramural athletics, we feel tht Mr. V. should be ineligible to play volleyball against individuals, such as ourselves, that have had no previous experience on the varsity, national or international level. Thank you for your consideration.

As director I referred this incident to the Governing Board.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Player from Clo team, Mr. V., is eligible because rule was not written which stated international play as well as varsity. Consider writing rule to take in all levels of competition.
2. Uphold protest and play volleyball game over without Mr. V.
3. Uphold protest and eliminate Clo team from championship game. Since game was the all-university championship game the team that lost to Clo team will be given the opportunity to play Sigma for the championship.

Table 17. Responses to Case Problem 9 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G	6	3	1
2-D	4	6	
3-G		1	9

Alternative 1 was determined to be the best solution as 60% of the directors supported this action. The second alternative was placed second by 60% of the directors indicating that if the protest was upheld the game should be replayed without Mr. V. It (2) was also deemed second best as a solution.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

A - Meet with captains and Mr. V to explain philosophy and intent behind rules. Reschedule game without Mr. V.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Mr. V. being skilled to the degree that he was a member of the 1976 Olympic volleyball team and the 1979 Groan National volleyball team.
2. Having availability to equal the practice facilities.
3. Not stating that international or olympic players are ineligible for intramural competition.
4. Referring incident to Governing Board.

Table 18. Responses to Case Problem 9 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	6
3	9

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

A - Failure to have written philosophy of intent of rules.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 9

Ranking

The action taken by the director who submitted the case was supported by 60% of the directors. Because the rule was not clear or complete, the directors felt the participant did not deliberately violate the eligibility rules. Alternative 1 was as follows:

Player from Clo team, Mr. V., is eligible because rule was not written which stated international play as well as varsity. Consider writing rule to take in all levels of competition.

This administrative action was the actual solution used in the case problem.

Interpretation of Action

It was clear that the majority of directors felt that when a rule is unclear 'it' should be re-written and the team/participant should not be penalized because of this.

When intent to circumvent a rule or guideline is clear then appropriate action can be taken but when it is not clear a team should not be penalized. It should be noted that consideration was given by 40% of the directors to uphold the protest and replay the game. This is an indication that where possible, teams should not be penalized, but individuals suspended.

Critical Incidents

Ninety percent of the directors indicated the importance of properly written rules and guidelines by citing incident 3 as the most critical.

Generalizations

A. IM guidelines and participation regulations are often incomplete.

B. Rescheduling of games should be done without certain individuals rather than forfeiting games where entire team is eliminated.

C. Protests of ineligibility often are submitted after the contest rather than prior.

D. Individuals should not be held accountable when guidelines and/or rules are unclear.

CASE STUDY #10**ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES**

Recently an incident occurred which needed a decision by the Recreational Sports Protest Board.

Marcia appealed the decision made by the Intramural Staff that she would not be allowed to participate on a men's basketball team.

The representative of the staff stated in his defense that the Guide to Participation Manual states there will be three kinds of programs available for intramural participation: Women's; Men's; and Co-Intramural. Title IX also states that there be separate but equal sports programs available for men and women. The last point the staff representative brought up was that the entire intramural program should be looked at as a whole and if women are allowed to participate in men's programs the reverse could easily occur and cause a great deal of trouble.

Marcia then presented her side of the case. She believed the purpose of intramural sports is for fun and exercise and this is all she wants to do. Unfortunately, since she is a graduate student, she has been unsuccessful in finding other women players to form a team. Marcia feels she should be able to play with her friends who happen to be men.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. After a protest board hearing it was decided to uphold the directors decision not to allow Marcia to participate on a men's basketall team.
2. Allow Marcia to participate with the team of her choice.
3. Since Marcia finds it difficult to find acquaintences of the same sex who play basketball, make every effort to get her new participation friends, i.e. phone managers of the women's teams and ask if Marcia could play with them.
4. Ask male team to move to a co-rec league.

Table 19. Responses to Case Problem 10 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-G	4	4		2
2-G	2	1	7	
3-G	2	3	2	3
4-G	2	2	1	5

The directors did not rank an alternative that was clearly a fairer solution than any other.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

No additional alternatives offered.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Appealing decision made by the intramural staff to not permit Marcia to play on a men's team.
2. Staff member stating that guidelines were specific in their alignment.
3. Men then being permitted to participate on women's teams.

Table 20. Responses to Case Problem 10 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	7
2	6
3	6

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

A - Marcia's request to participate with men's team.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 10

Ranking

Only 40% of the directors felt that the solution used by the director submitting the case problem would be the best solution. The remaining six directors split their votes equally among the remaining three choices. Alternative 1 also received 40% support as the second best solution. No additional alternatives were submitted.

Interpretation of Action

It was not a clear indication that the directors felt Marcia should not compete with the men, but did make it clear they supported attempting to help her either find new friends or move to a co-rec league. Only two directors stated she should have the availability to participate with the league of her choice.

Critical Incidents

The three suggested critical incidents were indicated only by 60 or 70% of the directors. Only one additional incident was submitted and that dealt with Marcia making the request to participate on the men's team.

Generalizations

A. Issues are difficult to resolve when they involve cross sex participation.

B. Title IX is an unclear executive order regulation.

C. Alternatives vary greatly when participation of women on men's teams arise.

D. Participation regulations are often incomplete and need re-writing.

CASE STUDY #11**ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES**

Recently, a few fraternities have asked to permit pledges to participate as regular members. Before a decision is made to change the existing recreational sports guidelines, which state pledges may not participate with their potential house, the president of Inter Fraternity Council was contacted and asked to respond.

The major potential problem is some fraternities would "pick-up" a pledge for only a particular sport, then "drop out" at the end of the season.

The following is the response from the president of Inter Fraternity Council.

Dear Recreational Sports Director,

The following are the reasons utilized to justify the decision of the Inter Fraternity Council to allow pledges to play intramural sports:

1. Improvement of "inner fabric" of the Greek System. If the Greeks have a particular appeal to the students of the University (aside from the social life), it is the idea that a group of people can work together, getting things done while being friends and growing together... brotherhood. This is our purpose. To better this goal, we must make pledges aware of our workings and spirit as much as possible, so they too will become integral people to this way of life. The fellowship of sport is as close as any model to the goal of daily brotherhood. The inclusion of pledges in this level is good for them and us.
2. Improvement of overall level of athletic competence.

Probable Arguments

1. "It would be too difficult to enforce fairly." True, details would have to be worked out. The Inter Fraternity Council would help where needed. Each house would be required to submit a pledge list by the 10th day of each term. Those not registered may not participate.
2. "This is merely a trick by the Greeks and a take advantage...they break most of the rules anyway". No, we are asking what we think is fair in the spirit of responsibility. We are the object of many athletic controversies mostly because we enforce ourselves so heavily. One really can't equate the dorms with frats on this level. In the dorms, the norm is slightly toward apathy (with obvious exceptions) and rule infractions have little importance. In the Greek system, the team is a vital part of the house and is followed by all members. Success is important. Also, the inter-relatedness of the system makes familiarity common and infractions very visible.

3. "People will change houses, or pledge different houses to play on better teams." This is not the attitude of the Greek system and is essentially sac-religious. Realistically, it would happen sometime as an exception. However, we can see no difference between pledging for sports reasons and joining an independant team for sports reasons. To permit one and not another is a discriminatory double standard.

We only ask for an understanding of our motivation here and approval with the realization that we are a vital, enthusiastic aspect of the I.M. program (as the statistic show) and deserve a fare, equitable deal.

Thanks,

Robert, IFC President

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Continue to use present guidelines and not allow pledges to participate with the bonifide fraternity members.
2. Acknowledge the fact that strength could be built in the system and it could be controlled enough to permit pledges to play.
3. Develop a pledge league which could be played at different times than the regular fraternity league so entire house support could be established.

Table 21. Responses to Case Problem 11 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-D	1	4	5
2-G	7	2	1
3-D	2	4	4

Table 21 indicates alternative 2 was supported by 70% of the participating directors. The second choice to be determined as a fair solution was not clearly defined with only 40% as the highest received.

¹The Asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Try on trial basis with provision that if "switching" or dropping of pledges occurs, pledge playing would stop.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENT

1. Asking that pledges be permitted to play in competitive leagues as regular members of the fraternities.
2. Have a possible preconception that fraternities are going to abuse the existing guidelines.
3. That the Inter Fraternity Council president took the time to justify the move for the pledge program.

Table 22. Responses to Case Problem 11 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	7
3	7

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Intramural fraternity system reflecting the wishes of the Greeks.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 11

Ranking

The directors did not support the actual solution used (1) as the best solution for the case. Solution 2 was supported by 70% of the directors. Alternative 2 was as follows:

Acknowledge the fact that strength could be built in system and it could be controlled enough to permit pledges to participate. Continue interaction with I.F.C. Board.

There was a willingness by the directors to allow participation to take place (by pledges) but it would be closely observed and evaluated periodically.

Interpretation of Action

An organization which takes the time to make a presentation, with justification for participation, along with willingness to evaluate its progress should be given an opportunity to implement the program.

There was a willingness of the organization to work within the system rather than participating outside the guidelines.

Critical Incidents

Incidents 1 and 3 received 70% support from the directors.

Interest from the fraternity system to better their leagues and competition was an additional point made by some directors.

Generalizations

A. Directors acknowledge that student groups have serious recommendations and that they should be recognized.

B. The willingness of the Recreative Sports Department to cooperate with student groups emulate its basic existence.

CASE STUDY #12**ENFORCEMENT OF STUDENT ELIGIBILITY**

On Tuesday night the following incident occurred. Pre Stock played Fine in a quarter-final softball game. Before the game, Fine's managers wanted to protest a player from Pre Stock. Pre Stock couldn't believe it and asked if they were serious. The manager from Fine said they were. Then Pre Stock protested one of Fine's players eligibility. The game was played under protest. Fine won the game 7-4.

As director of the softball program the following is a scenario of what then transpired. Wednesday morning, 9:00 a.m. Brad, the supervisor, came into my office and we began to look through the game sheets. We found two players from Pre Stock to be ineligible. One player, Paul, played for Fine at the beginning of the year and then played for Pre Stock the rest of the season. Another player, Kevin was on Pre Stock all season and the playoffs, but then played two playoff games for the team Meatloaf. This made Pre Stock ineligible for further competition. I called Roger, Pre Stock's manager to inform him of the two players and he admitted knowing about their ineligibility. He also said that Darrell Heart was ineligible for Fine. I asked him why and he explained. Before the season Darrell went to one of his players, Fred, and asked him to sign a work authorization form saying that Darrell worked for him in the dorm. Fred told him no. Roger, another teammate, works for the Science Department and Darrell asked him to sign him up as a worker and Roger said he wouldn't. Therefore, either someone illegally signed Darrell on as a worker or someone else did it illegally because they claimed he did not work on campus. Roger then said he was sorry for causing this hassel and apologized for any inconvenience.

Next, I talked to the Rec-Sports Department payroll clerk and asked him to check with the Payroll Department and find out if Darrell was working on campus. He reported that the computer said Darrell was not a student, he was not issued any checks since November 1979, and nor was he authorized to work on campus.

I then called Mr. Heart and told him his eligibility was being protested. I asked him how he was eligible to play in the softball league. He replied that he was working on campus. I asked where he worked and he said Peach Hall (Residence Hall). I asked who he worked for and he said Dick, Supervisor of Maintenance and Bob. I asked if he had been working yet and he said no not yet. I then asked when he worked and after stumbling for words he said last Saturday so he'll get a check this Friday when it's payday. I told him that he's been around long enough to know that if he worked last Saturday he won't get a check this Friday. I accused him of lying to me and he said I was just out to get him. I told him that wasn't true, I was simply following normal procedures when another team has reason to question someone's eligibility.

The Recreational Sports director came into my office and told me to ask Darrell again if he worked for Dick D. He said yes. The director had called Dick D. while I was on the phone with Darrell and Dick D. said that he never has worked for him. I informed Darrell about what Dick D. had said, so he said that he really worked for Bob. The director called Bob L. and he also said he has

never worked for him, I told Darrell I had lost all respect for him because of his lying and deceitful practices. I told him I would check things out further and be back in touch.

The director, payroll clerk, and myself checked everything out and confirmed that Darrell Heart was not eligible to play according to the eligibility rules.

The eligibility rules state that a participant must be either a student, faculty or staff of the university to participate in the program.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Having discussed the facts with everyone concerned the decision to eliminate both teams from further competition and advance waiting semi-finalist to final was made. Suspend Darrell from further competition until he speaks with director to make final decision.
2. Advance the Fine team to semi-finals and have them play without Darrell.
3. Advance the Pre Stock team to semi-final game and have them play without ineligible players. Rational being that Pre Stock's players were enrolled students and the manager did not know they played for other teams.

Table 23. Responses to Case Problem 12 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives		
	1st	2nd	3rd
*1-G	10		
2-G		4	6
3-G		6	4

Unanimous support by the director's of administrative Alternative 1 was indicated. This solution was the original one used in the case problem.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Replay game without any of the ineligible players involved.
- B - Have player eligibility list on field for playoffs.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Game being protested by each of the managers.
2. The director in charge of softball contacting the alleged employers of Darrell Heart and disclosing the fact that Darrell had not been employed by them.
3. Additionally, checking with the university's payroll department and determining that Darrell was not employed at that particular time.
4. Darrell Heart lying to the director concerning his status.
5. Additional phone call being made by director to alleged employer while softball director was conversing with Darrell.
6. Rules being written and clear concerning eligibility of individuals who are either student, faculty or staff.

Table 24. Responses to Case Problem 12 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	9
2	9
3	8
4	7
6	8

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

None.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 12

Ranking

It was apparent by the 100% support of Alternative 1 that the directors felt immediate and severe action should take place. The Alternative follows:

Having discussed the facts with everyone concerned the decision to eliminate both teams from further competition and advance waiting semi-finalist to final was made. Suspend Darrell from further competition until he speaks with director to make final decision.

The second best solution as indicated by the directors was the third alternative. The difference basically being that only one team be suspended and only eligible players participate.

Interpretation of Action

Enforcement of eligibility rules are of a major concern to those directors participating in the study. Flagrant and deliberate acts to deceive will not be tolerated within a recreational sports program. The unanimous support of Alternative 1 clearly indicates that teams should not be permitted to advance in play-offs (or participate) when there is a clear indication of knowledge, concerning the acts to deceive, by the majority of team members. Rapid decision-making is necessary when teams are waiting to advance during play-offs.

Critical Incidents

Five of the six listed incidents were deemed critical by the directors. The protest of the game by each of the managers and subsequent investigation by the directors were two of the most important.

Generalizations

A. Sports supervisors are important in the operation of a team sports activity.

B. Rulings pertaining to individuals and units are to be discussed by all concerned before rulings are invoked.

C. Suspensions and team forfeitures take place only after communication and facts of the incident are complete.

D. Participants who deliberately deceive, in an attempt to participate, should always be suspended.

E. Guidelines are written with the intent to protect the eligible participant.

CASE STUDY #13**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

The following reports reflect an incident which occurred between a student participant and student official.

Report #1 - Submitted by the reservation student supervisor is an explanation of circumstances:

A student wanted to sign up for a second hour of paddleball court use. After a discussion concerning the regulation for making reservations, i.e. one court per day per student, he threw materials off the counter and when I tried to obtain his name he threatened me and attempted to spit water on me. After a short conversation between this person, the head student supervisor (who was a witness) phoned the campus police for assistance. When they arrived they tracked him down and discussed the situation with him. The details of the talk are not known to me.

I recommend disciplinary action for this individual.

Signed, Reservation Supervisor

Report #2 - Head Building Supervisor

The reservation supervisor asked a participant for an I.D. The participant commented that he had already been playing and didn't feel he should have to show it again. The supervisor (reservations) then explained the regulation concerning one court use per day!

At this moment the participant knocked a pile of papers at the supervisor. The supervisor retaliated by calling the participant an —hole. The participant then filled his mouth with water and spit it at the supervisor. The supervisor asked for his name but received no response. At this particular moment I interceded and asked the participant why he would do such a thing at which he responded he thought the supervisor had gotten indignant and was being a hard _____. Shortly thereafter, the campus police arrived and apprehended the participant.

Report #2 - Summary of Police Report

Code: - Bob - Supervisor (reservation)

Pete - Supervisor (head)

Mike - Participant

Joe - Fictitious name

Bob advised that Mike had requested to sign up for a paddleball court, and he questioned Mike as he thought Mike had already used a court. Students are only allowed to sign up once a day. Bob advised Mike and he became irate and threatening. Bob further advised that Mike refused to show an I.D. Mike then

pushed papers off Bob's desk and spit water on him as he was leaving. Mike returned to apologize, and Bob let Mike sign for a court to get his name. Mike signed a fictitious name (Joe). I located Mike and he stated that Bob would not show him respect, and his actions were meant to show his lack of respect for Bob. Mike was advised that any further problems from him would result in his removal.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Have the Director write Mike a letter stating that in the event any future altercations occur disciplinary action will be taken. Additionally, a letter be written to Bob reminding him of the importance of diplomacy in handling such individuals.
2. Not permit Mike to make reservations of any type for at least one month.
3. Not take any action concerning Mike but suspend Bob for his aggressive action toward a participant.
4. Remind the reservation supervisor and participant that their actions could result in disciplinary for each of them and dismiss the case as closed.

Table 25. Responses to Case Problem 13 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-D	9	1		
2-D	1	3	2	4
3-D		4	1	5
4-D		2	7	1

As indicated in Table 25, a direct, firm approach was agreed to by 90% of the directors.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Combination of suspension of reservation rights and letter to both Bob and Mike.
- B - Notify Mike he is denied the use of reservation facilities until he meets the directors. If situation occurred as reported, continue suspension for team and place on probation for year.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Having a regulation that a participant may only reserve one court for one hour per day.
2. The participant knocking papers off the reservation counter and spitting water on the student employee.
3. Phoning the campus police for assistance in dealing with this individual.
4. Having the head building supervisor present during the incident and assisting to keep track of the participant.
5. Campus police advising Mike that if he caused any further disturbance he would be removed from the facility.

Table 26. Responses to Case Problem 13 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	8
2	8

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Use of language by Bob as stated by Pete.
- B - The lack of maturity by the reservation supervisor by calling Mike an a--.
- C - Permitting Mike to sign for court to "Get his name".
Mike signing "Joe".

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 13

Ranking

Alternative 1, the solution used by the director submitting the case problem, was determined to be the best solution as 90% of the directors supported this action as being most fair. Alternative 1 was as follows:

Have the Director write Mike a letter stating that in the event any future altercations occur disciplinary action will be taken. Additionally, a letter be written to Bob reminding him of the importance of diplomacy in handling such individuals.

The second best solution was not clearly indicated by the directors. They apparently decided both individuals had participated in the problem sufficiently that Alternative 1 was the only credible solution.

Interpretation of Action

Because of the completeness of the written reports the directors felt direct action could be taken. It was interesting to note that the student employee was sent a letter concerning the incident. It is also important to directors that the guidelines be followed and letters be administered to individuals when violations occur.

Critical Incidents

Eight of the ten directors felt incidents 1 and 2 were the most meaningful of the critical incidents. Additional incidents indicated the directors were concerned with the maturity of the student supervisor.

Generalizations

A. Supervisors should not react to participant's discontent concerning regulations.

B. Participants privileges should be suspended when regulations are intentionally violated.

C. Campus police should be contacted for assistance when a participant is aggressive toward a supervisor as a result of questioning in regards to violating IM regulations.

D. Directors should support supervisors who are attempting to help enforce existing regulations.

E. Participants should be denied the use of facilities if they fail to follow use of guidelines.

F. Supervisor must have authority to adjust to special problems.

G. Clearly post regulations.

H. Written reports of incidents are extremely important to director needing to make decision.

CASE STUDY #14**ENFORCEMENT OF STUDENT ELIGIBILITY**

As a participating member of the Recreational Sports Protest Board the following incident occurred halfway through the touch football season. The eligibility of a student by the name of Joe Don was protested because: (A) he was in the varsity team photo which is taken prior to each varsity season, (B) the varsity football coach did not submit a letter to the recreational sports office declaring his non-membership on the varsity team. As a result, Joe Don's fraternity was penalized with the forfeiture of the three games he played in.

The fraternity involved with Joe Don and forfeitures are appealing the decision. The appeal is as follows:

TO: Recreational Sports Protest Board
FR: Phi Who
RE: Response to protest

This is to serve as a petition of response to a protest over the participation of Joe Don in the September intramural football game between Phi Who and Sigma Do.

The petition is based on three main contentions, all of which lead to the conclusion that the protest is invalid.

First, the rules regarding intercollegiate athletic ability in the guidelines are ambiguous. For example, rule 2 states that a person who has received an athletic scholarship or is a member of an intercollegiate athletic team... will not be allowed to compete in that sport for one year following such competition. In this respect, Joe Don would be ineligible.

However, under rule X-3 it states to be a team member an athlete must have practiced 2 weeks prior to just regularly scheduled athletic contest. Joe Don did not, therefore he is not a member.

Further, rule Z-4 states a student may quit an athletic team prior to the second week preseason period and be eligible to play any intramural sport. Joe did. Rule X-1 states if a student practices with a varsity team but does not letter they are ineligible to compete in said sport unless a letter is secured from the varsity coach stating that he is not, nor will ever be varsity material. Upon inquiry into this matter, we asked the officials in the IM Sports Office when the letter would be necessary and complied thereafter. It was after the season started.

Despite these discrepancies, rule F-1 appears to be the most clear example that Joe Don should be eligible. It states that a freshman participating on an athletic team will be permitted to play that sport and its related counterpart in intramurals their sophomore year if a letter is secured from their coach stating that they are not varsity material and that they qualify for intramural competition. No time element is issued for the freshman athlete and a letter is in the hands of the IM Sports Office.

Secondly, intramural manager Tom Jones has followed explicitly the instructions of the intramural office. The rules haven't been changed for at least 4 years and we have secured evidence of such participation by other athletes in other sports and now these athletes are in blatant rule violation.

Thirdly, the theme of IM sports is to promote recreation for the nonsuperior, non-varsity material athletes. Given the ambiguities in the rules presented and given the examples of blatant violations in the past, perhaps each case is decided best on an individual basis. Joe never played one second in a varsity game; he never made one road trip; he never was listed on the depth chart. He did participate in spring football, but no football player ever is released regardless of ability from spring workouts.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES FOR ADMINISTRATION ACTION

1. After reviewing petition and further discussion with individuals reject Phi Who's response to the protest lodged by the Alpha's and uphold initial decision of declaring Joe Don ineligible and penalizing the fraternity with a three game forfeiture.
2. Reverse the ineligibility and game forfeiture due to new evidence produced by the Phi Who's.
3. Allow the ruling in number one to stand but clarify the eligibility rules so they are clear and concise.
4. Reverse ruling as in number two but additionally make clarification in the eligibility rules.

Table 27. Responses to Case Problem 14 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-G	2	3		5
2-G		5	3	2
3-D	3		4	3
4-G	5	2	3	

Administrative Alternative 4 was ranked by 50% of the directors as the one most likely they would use as the solution for the case problem. The actual solution of the case was ranked last by 50% of the directors.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties,

including professional staff in the decision-making process. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - Meet with football coach to get clear facts on Joe's participation with team. Make decision based upon this information and an intent of rule regardless of wording.
- B - Reject the protest and re-write the eligibility rules to get rid of all discrepancies. Apologize to both teams for not having clean, concise rules.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

- 1. Joe Don being photographed with the varsity football team.
- 2. Letter from varsity football coach stating Joe Don's non-membership arriving late to the recreational sports office.
- 3. Phi Who fraternity asking for a reversal of the protest board's initial decision.

Table 28. Responses to Case Problem 14 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
2	7
3	7

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Inadequacy of eligibility rules.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 14

Ranking

The ranking of Alternative 4 by 50% of the directors indicated a change in the guidelines should be written. Alternative 4 was as follows:

Reverse ruling as in number 2 but additionally make clarification in the eligibility rules.

Alternative 2 received 50% support as the second best solution that would be used.

Interpretation of Action

The suggestion of the directors by their ranking of Alternatives 4 and 2 as the top choices for the case was that the guidelines were poorly written. In addition, any logical request from a group(s) involved with situations presented will be reviewed and likely used. Reversals of action will be instituted if it can be clearly viewed a fair solution.

Critical Incidents

Only 70% of the directors supported incidents 2 and 3. Additional incidents submitted related to the inadequacy of the eligibility rules.

Generalizations

A. Rulings pertaining to individuals and units are to be discussed by all concerned before rulings are invoked.

B. Directors recognize and seriously consider recommendations from student organizations.

C. Directors must decide fair actions if rules are inadequate.

D. Eligibility rules should be adjusted or rewritten when it appears they could be misinterpreted.

E. The director should communicate with the head coach of a varsity sport when the eligibility of a participant is questionable.

F. Responses to eligibility rules by student groups should be seriously considered.

CASE STUDY #15**CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS/SUPERVISORS**

After learning of an altercation between a student supervisor and a student participant, I felt the best way to obtain all the facts concerning the incident was to ask the supervisor to verbalize in writing what had happened. This supervisor was a graduate student with impeccable credentials and had always related extremely well to all his peers. The following is a report submitted by him.

Dear Director,

On Wednesday morning, I was working at the Recreational Sports reservation desk from 8:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon or whenever Carole, my relief person, appeared at work. On this day I was located in the small booth instead of at the long reservation desk in the lobby of the building. As usual, all morning long I received a great number of telephone calls as well as passers-by who wanted to make a reservation for a tennis court, softball area, volleyball court, badminton court, or a squash court. As always I tell the inquiring party that all reservations for those facilities do not begin until 10:00 a.m. for the following day. I tell them that a line forms early for reservations as well as both phones ringing constantly. It is also made known to them that two people in line are taken for every one person that calls on the phone.

It has been my experience that all of the possible reservations for the tennis areas are taken by 10:15 a.m. Only squash courts are left after this. For people who come to the desk or call in after 10:15 and subsequently after all the reservations have been filled, I tell them that they have to get in line early or call right at 10:00 because all of the reservations are gone by 10:10. This is to impress upon them that they must get here in line early or call early if they want a space. We have an enrollment of over 30,000 students with only a possibility of 18 reservations for the tennis area and even less than that figure for tennis are II.

On this particular Wednesday I was tired of sitting in the booth so I opened the door and stepped out into the hallway where I could view the paddleball match on court one as well as keep my eye on the desk for the phone or for people coming to the desk. This was approximately 12:20 when I stepped outside to stretch my legs. At 12:30 a young black male stepped up to me in the hallway and in a very soft voice asked if I was working at the reservation desk. I replied "Yes sir, may I help _____" and before I could finish this man slapped me across the face! I was stunned and sort of mumbled wondering what the hell did he do that for. He then raised his voice and said that he called this morning and asked when he could make a reservation for the tennis area and I told him at 10:00. So he said, "I sent my man over here after 10:00 and you told him that all the reservations were gone at ten to ten." I started to tell him that this was not true, that I didn't get the reservation sheets until minutes before 10:00. He then started at me again with a clenched fist and I backed off. At this time he was just calling me names and I was trying to explain things. He then raised his hand as if to hit me again so I went back into the ticket booth and the man took off down the hall. I began to dial the police but then hung up because I did not know if this would be proper procedure with regard to the Recreational Sports

Department by whom I was employed. So I wanted to ask someone but everyone was out to lunch and not available. All the directors were gone to lunch as well as Joan the secretary, and the graduate assistant had not come into the office yet that day. So I was alone in that situation.

At about 12:45 Carole reported to work at the reservation desk so I went upstairs to the office. About five minutes after I got to the office Ike (student supervisor) came in the office for work and I told him what had happened and he said nothing apparently thinking I had told my superiors the story. After this I left the office and went home wanting to get as far away from the building as possible. I was very confused about the whole situation, not really hurt (a slightly cut lip), but just in a confused state of mind.

I drove home and told my roommate, David, the whole story. Later on that day Dave told the Director what had happened earlier and he called me to talk to me about it. After we talked at great length he called the campus police and told them what happened. They told him to have me call them and they would send a man over to the building to make a report of the incident since I would be at work in the office later that night. The Director called me and explained what to do if I so desired. That night at 6:30 p.m. I called the police and they sent an officer over to write up a report. I repeated the incident to him as well as gave them a description of the man.

At the present time I am looking for this man on campus somewhere because we do not know who he is which makes it impossible to deal with him. Hopefully, this man will be identified and finally be brought before the Student Judiciary Board and some type of disciplinary action taken against him. I would also like to see him barred from using the facilities or being able to participate in the program while he is a student for as long as he is here.

Thank you,

Student Supervisor

The student involved in the altercation was identified within the week.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. Suspend the student participant from availability to make reservations, use of facilities or participate in competitive leagues.
2. Pursue the complaint with the campus police and prosecute the student participant.
3. Put the student on probation, meaning any other type of altercation will automatically suspend him from further facility use.
4. Take the incident to the student judiciary and pursue dismissal of the student from school.
5. Have the student participant apologize to the supervisor and drop the issue.

Table 29. Responses to Case Problem 15 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives				
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
*1-D	4	3	3		
2-D	4	2	1		3
3-D	2	2	4	2	
4-G		1	2	6	1
5-G		2		2	6

The directors did not agree which administrative action proved likely to be the most fair solution.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

- A - In addition to Alternative 1, suspend participant for one month.
- B - Suspend student until he meets with director. After discussion, if facts were correct, continue suspension for term with probation for year.
- C - File disciplinary charges against the student. Recommend that the student be prohibited from using the facilities for a short duration. Probation for one year. Suggest to the student supervisor he file criminal charges. Refer the case to the Dean of Student office for possible further action.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Reservations for the area which the participant was attempting to obtain did not begin until 10:00 a.m. the day before.

2. Participant phoning the reservation desk earlier in the day, prior to 10:00 a.m., then sending an intermediary to do his work.
3. The reservation desk supervisor being a bit cramped and tired decided to step away from the booth to observe other activities going on.
4. The participant which wanted to reserve the facility striking the supervisor.

Table 30. Responses to Case Problem 15 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
1	6
4	10

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

A - Unclear procedure so police were not called immediately.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 15

Ranking

Alternatives 1 and 2 were shared by 40% of the directors as the best solution for the case. This case problem does not meet the 50% criteria established in order to determine a fair solution. Because of the spread attempting to determine a favorable solution it could be assumed that some disciplinary action should be taken. A combination of Alternatives 1 and 2 could read:

Substitute Alternative--After identifying the student, arrange a meeting to inform him he has terminated the availability to make reservations and participate in structured activities. In addition, his case will be referred to a disciplinary agency.

Interpretation of Action

The directors responded to this deliberate act with direct and strict reaction. Even though a specific solution could not be reached, it was clear that an assault, regardless of its nature, would and should not be tolerated.

Critical Incidents

The directors ranked Incident 4 as most critical. By doing so, it indicated the supervisor handled his service properly while working as a reservationist. An additional incident submitted by a director, was that perhaps a set procedure of action should have been known by the supervisor.

Generalizations

A. Participants physically assaulting a student employee should be suspended from using facilities.

B. Altercations toward student supervisors by participants should not be tolerated and strict disciplinary action should be taken.

C. Any altercation between a participant and student supervisor should be referred to a disciplinary board or Dean of Students.

D. Supervisors should be supported by directors and administrators.

E. Regulations should be clearly posted.

F. Supervisors should have clear guidelines on direction to take if an altercation occurs.

CASE STUDY #16**ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES**

Late one evening I received a phone call from the assistant director who was on call during team sports (basketball) activities. He stated that certain difficulties had arisen and he had handled them to the best of his ability, but was not totally satisfied with the outcome. At this point, after listening to him explain a portion of the problem, I asked that he write a report and we would discuss it the next day.

The report follows concerning player eligibility:

On the evening of Thursday, February 27 during the game between the winner of Fraternity A, Theta and Fraternity B, Sigma, Tim Mac, the sports supervisor reported that Sigma had a player in the game who was on the game sheet and that when he had committed a foul, his team spotter had given another name. I recognized the player as Rich Power, a former football player. I questioned the SAE player representative who turned out to be Steve Leak, the house president.

Steve indicated that the man's name was indeed Power and that he had reported it wrong because he had forgotten to sign him up. The Sigma's were assessed a technical foul and the game continued. I went up stairs and checked the previous night's game sheet to see if Power's name was on it. It was not. I went back down and asked Steve if Power had played the previous night. He said he had, but that he hadn't signed up the team that night. I spoke to Jon Tarp who said he had signed the team up but that he hadn't known Power was coming and that he came late. I asked them if Rich was a student and they both said he was a Sigma and as far as they knew he was in school. I said if they were straight, no problem. If not, that they'd be hearing from me.

The next day, February 28, I checked with the registrar and found that Rich Power was not in school this term and that he had graduated in December. I called Jon and he said that Rich had told him the same thing the previous night. I set up a meeting with the director, Jon, Steve and myself for the following Tuesday. On Tuesday, March 4, the four of us met to discuss the situation. Both Steve and Jon said they had thought Rich was a student. Jon mentioned that he was on a previous game sheet. His name appears on the January 23 game sheet against Kappa. After some discussion we told them that we'd put the matter under consideration.

Signed, Tom
Assistant Director

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

1. After serious discussion the decision was made to replay the game without Rich Power.
2. Forfeit the game to Theta who would reign as all-fraternity champions.
3. Forfeit the Theta vs. Sigma game and permit the B championship game to be replayed.
4. Disqualify Sigma from further participation.

Table 31. Responses to Case Problem 16 by the Recreational Sports Directors

Administrative Alternative ¹	Directors' Responses Ranking the Administrative Alternatives			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
*1-G	2	5	3	
2-G	3	3	1	3
3-G	3	1	2	4
4-D	2	1	4	3

This case problem received the least amount of support of any one particular solution than did the previous fifteen. Alternatives 2 and 3 gained the support of only 30% of the directors each.

¹The asterisk indicates the originally recommended solution of the case problem submitted by the recreational sports director. The letter 'G' indicates that the solution involved students, or other parties, including professional staff in the decision-making process. The letter 'D' indicates that the solution had little or no involvement by non-professionals. It was an individual action taken by the director in solving the case problem. A detailed explanation of each is located in Chapter III, page 30.

ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVES SUBMITTED BY PARTICIPATING DIRECTORS

A - Disallow Power from further participation. No action against Sigma as Theta did not protest prior to start of game. The result stands.

- B - Suspend Leak for season with probation for year. Probation for Sigma for one year. Forfeit game to Theta.

SUGGESTED CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. The Assistant Director who was in charge of the basketball program did not phone the director in charge of basketball until after the incident occurred.
2. The supervisor recognized the player from Sigma as not being on the game sheet but in fact playing.
3. Rich Power was not a student and had graduated the previous term according to the registrar.
4. Having a meeting in which all individuals pertinent to the situation met to discuss the incident.

Table 32. Responses to Case Problem 16 (Critical Incidents)

Critical Incidents	Number of Directors Indicating Incident as Critical
2	6
3	10

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENTS DETERMINED BY DIRECTORS

- A - Disorganization before playoffs.
- B - Giving fictitious name when committing foul. Tarp and Leak saying Power was a student.

ANALYSIS OF CASE PROBLEM 16

Ranking

Since there was little consensus by the directors concerning the best alternative it can be assumed that number 1 (original) perhaps was the best at the time. Additionally, 50% of the directors ranked 1 as the second best.

Interpretation of Action

The action in this case indicates that individuals should be dealt with separately, when possible, and teams permitted continuance of their participation. When a team is involved with what could be interpreted as misleading intent, they should be disqualified.

Critical Incidents

All ten directors indicated that the major item deemed critical was that Powers, in fact, was not a student. Perhaps some safeguard should be built into the system to easily determine who is a student.

Generalizations

- A. Directors' facts should be clear before decisions are made.
- B. Directors should exhaust all available avenues or checking of facts prior to reaching suspensions.
- C. Team should not be penalized because of an individual action.
- D. Team managers must have knowledge of all players eligibility.
- E. Contests should not be determined as a result of an individual's attempt to deceive regulations.

SUMMARY

In the above, sixteen (16) case problems have been analyzed. I may be noted that the prominent problem areas were: 1) human relations, 2) inadequate regulations, 3) ineligibility of participants, and 4) altercations between participants or participants and student employees.

A summary of the analysis of these case problems appears in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter is devoted to a summary of the study, a discussion of the conclusions from the data collected, and recommendations, generalizations and implications for future study.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Specifically, this dissertation is a replication of a study written in 1960 which investigated human relations in the administration of recreational sports in the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference. It was the purpose of both this and the original study to formulate generalizations which would be useful to individuals administering or working as professionals in recreational sports programs. The generalizations of both studies were developed in such a way as to be useful in the administration of recreational sports programs.

LIMITATIONS

The recreational sports directors of all of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Conference participated in this study. The results of this study can be generalized only to the Big Ten Intercollegiate Recreational Sports Departments.

METHODOLOGY

Prior to developing the case problems for this study the Recreational Sports directors of the Big Ten Conference were issued a list containing various problem areas that were significant in the field of recreational sports. The problem areas were formulated from three different sources: the minutes of the Big Ten Intercollegiate Recreational Sports meeting, the minutes of the National Intramural/Recreational Sports meetings, and the writer's experience. The minutes of the above meetings were reviewed from 1960 to 1980. Any time an area of concern was repeated more than three times in the minutes it was given consideration for the study. The third source for the development of problem areas was the experience drawn from this writer's experience of some twenty years in the field of recreational sports. In all, twenty-one problem areas were compiled from this research.

Once the twenty-one problem areas were developed, a questionnaire incorporating the twenty-one areas was mailed to the ten directors with instructions to indicate which problem areas were the most difficult to solve and the most frequently encountered. The responses from the ten directors to the problem areas were tabulated in four ways to determine the areas in which the directors had difficulty determining fair solutions. The four ways in which the responses were tabulated were as follows:

1. The number of responses in all tabulations.
2. The number of responses in either category.
3. The number of responses from all universities to each problem area.
4. The number of responses from different universities to each problem area.

Those ten problem areas receiving the highest number of responses as to difficulty and frequency were then submitted to the directors. Each director was asked to use the ten problem areas as a guide for writing case problems. Twenty-three case problems were returned to this writer for potential use in the study. Sixteen of these case problems were determined to contain enough facts and elements of interest to present a valid case study.

The sixteen case studies were then refined by this writer. In addition to the administrative solution to the case which was recommended by the director submitting it, the writer also developed alternative administrative solutions. This writer, in addition to developing alternative administrative solutions, also developed, and listed, incidents which he deemed critical in coming to a solution to each case.

The refined case, the alternative solutions, and the critical incidents were then returned to the ten directors. The directors were asked to rank the administrative solutions from best to worst and to also select those critical incidents they considered important to the case solution.

Each of the directors returned the cases to the writer indicating the rank order of the administrative solutions to each case and selecting those incidents which they believed most critical to each case's solution.

The writer then analyzed the responses to the cases to determine the responses which were both most common and significant in the case problems. In the original study nine such responses or significant statements were developed. This writer, following the same analytical format as that used in the original study, identified the same nine significant statements.

Further, the writer also isolated and identified five additional significant statements.

In the following summary the nine significant statements appearing in the original study are compared with the same statements found in this study. The problem dealing with the point system is included but no comparison is made. In addition, the writer will summarize the five significant statements which were developed in this study but which do not appear in the previous one.

SUMMARY

The 1960 study being replicated listed nine elements or statements considered significant which were drawn from the responses by the directors participating in the study at that time. The following is a listing of the original statements and the percentage of times each statement was reflected in those case problems. For the sake of comparison, this writer has included the number of times similar statements were reflected in this study.

1. Human relations are clearly involved in Western Conference Intramural Administration as eighty-seven (87) percent of the cases in the original study were concerned with team and individual conflict. The present study supported this type of statement one-hundred (100) percent of the time as all sixteen case problems dealt with some team or individual type conflict.
2. Inadequate regulations caused seventy-three (73) percent of the administrative problems involving intramural rules and regulations in the original study. The case problems from the present study related to inadequate regulations and rules sixty-three (63) percent of the time. Guidelines, participation rules and regulations are often incomplete and many of the problems which arise in the Recreational Sports Program cannot be solved by their use. The director of the program has the responsibility for making decisions when the rules do not directly apply to a certain

situation. The director is forced to interpret the rules and guidelines in such a way as to find a solution for those cases which cannot be solved by the existing guidelines, rules or regulations. Despite not having a direct ruling to base a decision, the director must render a decision which is fair, quick and consistent. He must use knowledge, common sense, and past cases to help him arrive at the correct solution.

3. The student protest, which is a procedure by which a student may protest either an official or administrative ruling, is a definite part of the intramural regulation system. There were ten case problems that involved team or individual violations in the 1960 study. Seven or seventy (70) percent of these were reported to the director by means of a protest. In the present study, ten case problems also had some form of rule misinterpretation or ineligibility, but only fifty (50) percent of these were reported to the director by means of a protest.
4. The original solution of the case problems in the study being replicated was supported thirty-two (32) percent of the time as being the best and most fair solution. The present study ranked the actual solution fifty-six (56) percent of the time as the best and most fair.
5. The Western Conference Directors recommend and encourage student participation in the determination of decisions and regulations concerning eligibility and conduct violations. Sixty-two (62) percent of the case problems required student participation by the directors in the original study. The present study permitted student participation in the decision making process eighty-seven (87) percent of the time. From their responses to the cases, the directors have indicated the importance of the team managers in competitive intramurals. The team managers are not merely the individuals who organize, sign the team up, and draw up the starting line-ups. The directors see the team managers as the leader of the team who is responsible for the conduct and action of his team. The team manager must make sure his team complies with the Recreational Sports rules and regulations. The team manager is responsible that his team acts in a sportsmanlike manner during athletic contests. When problems with a team occur, the team manager will be called in to converse with the Recreational sports staff. The team manager becomes involved in the decision making process as to how his team will be disciplined for infractions. The team manager also becomes responsible for explaining the sanctions levied on his team by the Recreational sports staff and for seeing that the team complies with their sanctions. The directors have definitely placed a huge burden of responsibility on the team managers.

6. Pressures created by point systems are a significant source of problems to the directors. (Point systems are methods used to award individuals or teams points for either winning, placing high or participating.) Thirteen problems which involved team protests, or individuals' problems had its main concern with point systems seven times in the original study or fifty-four (54) percent of the time. The present study did not include a case problem concerned with point systems. The directors participating in the present study felt point systems did not pose as difficult a problem as those case problems from the previous study.
7. The directors indicated they were reluctant to award a contest to a team by rule alone. In the original study six games were protested which could have been determined by a rule. The directors rescheduled three of them, fifty (50) percent, in part or completely. The present study has nine case problems which could have been decided by a rule or regulation. In seven or seventy-one (71) percent of the time, the director did some rescheduling, in part or completely.
8. Student supervisors and officials are a significant source of administrative problems in forty-four (44) percent of the case problems from the 1960 study. Of the sixteen case problems presented in this study, student employees were involved nine times or fifty-six (56) percent of the time.
9. Problems involving the control of the participants, such as ineligibility, make up the most difficult single problem area for the directors. Forty-four (44) percent of the case problems were concerned with eligibility in the original study while fifty (50) percent of the case problems in the present study dealt with eligibility.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT STATEMENTS

It may be noted in the study being replicated that the first significant statement involved human relations in eighty-seven (87) percent of the case problems while the present study indicated one hundred (100) percent involvement of the case studies. This thirteen (13) percent increase in human relations encountered by the directors of the Big Ten Recreational Sports departments could be explained by at least three

different reasons. They are: 1) there is a greater consciousness by the directors to involve students to make decisions which relate directly to the programs in which they participate, 2) with an increase of individual and/or team conflict there is a demand to confront more participants with the issues, and 3) having the knowledge of confrontation and protest which took place during the late 1960's and early 1970's a greater awareness for due process is being demonstrated in decision making.

The second statement involved administrative problems which were caused by inadequate rules and regulations. The study being replicated indicates that inadequate regulations caused seventy-three (73) percent of the administrative problems involving rules and regulations while the present study lists sixty-three (63) percent. The ten (10) percent decrease can be explained by a number of reasons. These are: 1) annual refinement of the rules and regulations have taken place during the twenty years between the two studies, consequently, less ambiguity should exist, 2) proliferation and specialization of recreational sports staffs have occurred creating a greater awareness for the need to refine existing rules and regulations, 3) with growing student enrollments and increased participation, particularly during the 1970's, greater stress was placed on informal and less regulatory type of recreation, and 4) tremendous growth on the professional level has created better understanding of the participant's needs. It should be noted that a ten (10) percent decrease is significant since participation has increased so dramatically.

The third statement involves team or individual violations being reported to the director by means of a protest. The study being replicated lists ten case problems dealing with team or individual violations

with seven being reported to the director by way of a protest. The present study also lists ten case problems but only five reached the directors by means of a protest. This decrease of twenty (20) percent could be accounted for in a number of ways. These were: 1) fewer protests reach the director because the student supervisors are more knowledgeable and better trained to handle protest situations. After twenty years and the many problems encountered, the directors recognize the need to do better jobs with student employee training which ultimately saves them administrative time, and 2) since guidelines for participation are written with greater ease for understanding, solutions for the protests can be clarified at the time of incident.

The fourth statement from the study being replicated explains that the actual solution used in the case problems was supported thirty-two (32) percent of the time versus fifty-six (56) percent in the present study. This increase of twenty-four (24) percent can be explained by: 1) greater participation by the professional staffs from the Big Ten Recreational Sports departments in state, regional, and national conferences and meetings, and 2) while at these conferences common problems and situations are discussed which creates similar thought processes to develop fair solutions.

Statement number five of the study being replicated, listed sixty-two (62) percent of the case problems that recommended and encouraged student participation in the determination of decisions concerning regulations, eligibility and conduct violations. The present study listed student participation in the decision making process eighty-seven (87) percent of the time. The reasons for this dramatic increase of twenty-five (25) percent can be explained by four points. These are: 1) awareness that

the student should be involved as to meet basic elements of due process, 2) a belief that rules and regulations are better supported by those who participate in writing those guidelines, 3) raising the consciousness of the directors to the needs of the participants is bound to increase the students' participation, and 4) larger programs, larger university enrollments create growth in participation which increases the need for the directors to become closer to the student.

Pressures created by point systems were a significant problem to the directors of the 1960 study as in fifty-four (54) percent of the time, significant statements involving problems concerning individual or team protests occurred. The present study did not find point systems as an area of concern. This omission can be accounted for in a number of ways:

1) the directors obviously believe that point systems put too much stress on winning at all costs and therefore have eliminated them, 2) point systems entice students to participate in programs and since recreational facilities are being taxed to their limits there is no need for this encouragement, 3) the proliferation of outdoor leisure activities, such as backpacking, jogging, cross-country skiing and camping, do not fit into a point system involvement, and 4) point systems tend to structure rigid competitive programs where during the 1970's students desired more flexibility of how to gain physical fitness.

Statement seven indicated the directors were reluctant to award a contest to a team by rule alone in fifty (50) percent of the games protested in the 1960 study. The present study found the directors reluctant to have these games decided by a rule or regulation seventy-one (71) percent of those protested. The twenty-one (21) percent difference by the directors

can be explained by various points. These are: 1) stressing recreational opportunity and physical activity is the primary concern of the directors in the present study. The directors seem more concerned for the playing opportunity rather than stressing winning at any cost concepts, 2) the directors would rather end a contest by playing than by a paper technicality, and 3) the student teams are more accepting of total or partial replay rather than awarding the contest because of a rule or regulation.

Student supervisors and officials are a source of administrative problems much of the time. The 1960 study listed this to be true in forty-four (44) percent of the case problems in comparison to fifty-six (56) percent in the present study. This increase of twelve (12) percent occurred because a number of situations transpired over the past twenty years. These are: 1) there has been a significant increase of student employees working in areas which are stressful, i.e., reservation desks, equipment check-out areas, officiating, 2) more facilities have been built during the past twenty years for recreational opportunity which automatically increases student involvement, and 3) with more teams playing there are a greater number of games which increases the situations the student employee can encounter.

In the ninth statement, the control of the participant, specifically ineligibility made up forty-four (44) percent of the case problems in the study being replicated. The present study was concerned with eligibility problems in fifty (50) percent of the case problems. The increase is negligible considering the tremendous increase in participation throughout the Big Ten Recreational Sports departments. This status quo can be explained by various reasons, they are: 1) a better understanding of the

rules and regulations by the student participants lessens the problems, and 2) a continued effort by the directors to take rigid controls from the rules and regulations.

In addition to the previous nine statements which were significant to the study being replicated, this writer, based upon the data provided from the previous study and the present one, believes five additional statements should be reported as significant.

Following the same format, this writer has listed what he believes are significant statements relevant to this study that had not been presented in the study replicated.

1. Altercations between student participants or a participant and employee is a source for major administrative concern. In eight cases which centered around an altercation, the directors recommended disciplinary action in seven of them or eighty-seven (87) percent.
2. Student employees are often, if not always involved during program problem situations. Thirteen case problems related to the importance of supervisor's report in the decision making process. This was eighty-one (81) percent of the total cases.
3. Problems that surround individuals who have been involved with an altercation or some form of eligibility could cause team suspension or game forfeiture. In ten cases this type of situation presented itself and in seven or seventy (70) percent of the instances the directors took action against the individual rather than the team.
4. A better orientation of the supervisor in charge of an activity or additional knowledge of how a director desired a problem solved, could have eliminated the director having to make an administrative decision. This occurred in five cases or thirty-one (31) percent of the time.
5. The previous study had two case problems which went before a board for a decision. Of the sixteen cases in the present study or forty-four (44) percent, seven decisions were made by a recreational sports board.

The following is a summary of those significant statements which were not included in the study being replicated.

Altercations between student participants or a participant and employee is a source for major administrative concern. There were eight cases in the present study which centered around an altercation. In seven of the case problems or eighty-seven (87) percent of the cases the directors recommended disciplinary action. This high number of altercations and disciplinary action following the act can be explained in various ways. They are: 1) the surge by individuals to be physically fit, in addition to a lack of facilities during the 1970's created much tension which led to altercations and unrest, 2) racial unrest contributed to altercation type situations, especially between 1969 and 1973, 3) the attempt to emulate collegiate and professional hostility as viewed in stadiums and on television, and 4) disciplinary action by directors was deemed necessary to protect individual's rights and an attempt to set examples in anticipation for lessening these hostile acts.

Directors depend on accurate, structured reports to assist in the decision making process. Thirteen case problems or eighty-one (81) percent of the time these reports were necessary as stated in additional significant statement number two. The reasons for this need can be explained as follows: 1) expanded programs, greater participation and longer hours of operation dictate the need for a detailed, accurate and prompt student employee reporting system, and 2) the importance to deal with negative situations soon after they happen, with an accurate reporting system, assists with the implementation of due process.

The third additional statement from the present study stated that the directors took action in seven out of ten cases or seventy (70) percent, to discipline individuals rather than forfeit games or discipline the

entire team. This approach can be explained by the following reasons:

1) a proliferation of staffs has lead to a specialization of professional involvement, more personal contact and better investigation of the facts helps for refinement of the decision making process, 2) a consciousness of the professional recreational sports staff not to group one individual's shortcomings with that of their teammates, and 3) a better reporting system by the officials and supervisors avail the directors to greater and clearer facts of information.

Five of the sixteen case problems from the present dissertation directed itself to the proposition that student supervisors could have been better oriented and be more knowledgeable so the director can avoid involvement in making administrative decisions. In reality, this is a small percentage, thirty-one (31) percent, for the amount of employment time students have while supervising activities. Directors are attempting to lessen this problem by promoting a number of approaches. They are: 1) supervisory or student employment handbooks are becoming a part of every recreational sports department, 2) case books, with examples of problem potentials and methods of handling them, are available, 3) meetings to orient and review students of their responsibilities during the employment process, and 4) hiring students who are enrolled in graduate programs directed toward recreational sports or athletic administration. These students have a greater sensitivity of the potential problems they may encounter.

The decision making process goes beyond the director at many universities. The present study utilized groups of individuals, called boards, to assist and/or make the decision concerning disciplinary cases in seven of

the case problems or forty-four (44) percent of the time. Boards have names such as protest boards, disciplinary boards and governing boards, to mention a few. Reasons for these boards being implemented more now than in the previous study, when boards were only used twice, are:

1) awareness for the individual's rights to due process by the directors, 2) the directors, along with the participants, believe those involved with problem situations should be judged by their peers, and 3) with pressures of expanding activities and economically troubled programs, the directors are finding less time to deal equitably with these problem situations.

GENERALIZATIONS

Dr. H. F. Beeman, author of the study being replicated, drew the following generalizations as a result of at least three repetitions in the case problems.

1. Directors recognize and seriously consider recommendations from student organizations.
2. Intramural game rules and participation regulations often prove to be incomplete and are not infallible.
3. An equitable all-year point system is difficult to devise and a point system tends to create tensions among units.
4. Errors caused by supervisory mistakes and inadequate regulations do not cause units or individuals to be penalized.
5. Strict disciplinary action is invoked for direct intentional violations of rules and exhibitions of disrespect of the director and his administrative staff.
6. Direct lines of communication are to be maintained between the director, students, and officials concerned with student affairs.

7. Rulings pertaining to individuals and units are to be discussed by all concerned before rulings are invoked.
8. Game rules or regulations proven unworkable should be modified immediately.
9. Consideration is given to the replay of contests under protest because of rule misinterpretation rather than determining the winner by rule alone.

In addition to the nine generalizations Dr. Beeman wrote from the 1960 study this writer has added an additional five from the present study. These generalizations are the result of an analysis of the new significant statements and three or more repetitions from the case problems.

1. Directors recognize that discipline problems, especially those that deal with altercations should be dealt with in a strict and swift fashion.
2. Student supervisory reports are an important part of the quality and accuracy of the administrative decision by the director.
3. Team managers are an integral part of the communicative process and every effort should be made to include them when rules and regulations are reviewed.
4. Disciplinary action boards should be utilized in the decision making process. The boards should consist primarily of students, with a mix of faculty and administrators.
5. Orientation of student supervisors to facility and program guidelines will assist in servicing the student better.

The additional generalizations are important as a continuing process to enhance the educational process of those interested in administering Recreational Sports programs. Even though they do not create an answer to every and all problems encountered while administering these programs, they do add another potential dimension to the general knowledge of recreational sports directors.

CONCLUSION

In a course of twenty years it was determined that many of the same problems are present now as they were when the study being replicated was written. Glaring differences seem to be that the participation has increased dramatically, along with a tremendous expansion of the professional staff. The three major problem areas remain the same: 1) protests by the participants, 2) eligibility questions concerning participants, and 3) inadequately written guidelines and rules. The difference between 1960, when the study being replicated was written, and the time of the present study, has been a decrease of occurrences in these three areas. The directors are more experienced and have greater staff availabilities to cope with the problems. In addition, the directors of recreational sports are recognized as professionals in their fields, not sharing appointments with athletics or physical education. Other significant changes see programs greatly expanded and facilities which are only used by recreational sports programs, i.e., students, faculty and staff.

Much like Dr. Beeman concluded in the 1960 dissertation, this writer believes that he has not discovered a set of cure-all statements or generalizations. He does believe rather that the study has contributed to the understanding of intramural personnel in dealing with common and significant problems. Experiences of those individuals involved in this present study can strengthen those experiences of others in the every day work world. While compiling the case problems and having had the opportunity to interact with the leading professionals in

the field of recreational sports, this writer broadened his own experience and knowledge. The directors participating in this study reacted very favorably concerning their participation in this dissertation. Three of the university directors have implemented sections of the study into the undergraduate and graduate recreational sports programs they teach. The recent Big Ten Recreational Sports meeting in Chicago, December 1981, had two presentations on the agenda utilizing the case problem approach. This writer was told the format for these presentations were stimulated as a direct result of the present study.

The case problems which were presented, the administrative alternatives, critical incidents, and the analysis of each case problem have much value to the prospective, new and even experienced professionals in the field of recreational sports.

Intramurals and recreational activities are a vital part of the entire educational system at the University. Students are not limited to learning only in the classroom setting. Much of the student's learning occurs outside of the classroom in such areas as the dormitories, student centers, and at the intramural fields and recreational sites. It is the duty of the recreation professional to organize, implement, conduct and supervise activities in such a way that a student learns from his or her involvement in the Recreational Sports Program. In order to operate a program which will achieve this, recreation professionals must be able to take action and make decisions when confronted with problems. The case study method allows professionals and prospective professionals an opportunity to view sample problems and to arrive at solutions to these cases. Going through the decision making process in

a practice setting will make the professional better able to handle actual problems which occur in his or her program.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Programs in recreational sports have expanded beyond anyone's wildest dreams. Rather than just providing small competitive programs they encompass branches such as competitive programs, informal, co-recreational, club sports, outdoor education and leisure learning centers to mention a few. Recreational sports is truly not just an umbrella but a huge tent.

This writer would recommend for further study:

1. Further intensive study compiling case problems and suggested solution to be used as a professional guide and classroom test.
2. Investigate the women's role in the area of recreational sports.
3. Investigate ethnic roles and competitive values in the participation of recreational sports.
4. Economic pressures and student support of programs be investigated with possibility of determining where unmarked dollars might be obtained for new programs.
5. The investigation of use of student boards (protest, advisory, eligibility) to provide decisions concerning alleged misconduct by participants.
6. Development of a case problem form which would be consistent within the National Intramural/Recreational Sports Programs to better utilize other's experience in handling problem situations.
7. Compare the age, experience, educational background, program size, facilities, staff size of present directors to those in 1960.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. Allport, Gordon, "The Use of Personal Documents in Psychological Science," Social Science Research Council, Bull 49 (New York, 1942), p. 19.
2. Babbie, Earl R., Survey Research Methods, (Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 37.
3. Bauer, Ronald C., Cases in College Administration (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955), p. 29.
4. Bauer, Ronald C., Cases in College Administration (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955), p. 44.
5. Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research, An Introduction (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1976), p. 249.
6. Colgate, John A. Administration of Intramural and Recreational Activities: Everyone Can Participate (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978).
7. Clarke, David H. and H. Harrison Clarke, Research Processes in Physical Education, Recreation and Health (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 119.
8. Clarke, H. Harrison and David H. Clarke, Developmental and Adapted Physical Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), Chapter 6.
9. Cureton, Thomas K. Jr., Physical Fitness of Champion Athletes (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1951), p. 458.
10. Daughtrey, Greyson and John B. Woods, Physical Education and Intramural Programs: Organization and Administration (Philadelphia, London, Toronto: W. B. Saunders Co., 1976).
11. Dill, D. B., S. Robinson, and J. C. Ross, "A Longitudinal Study of 16 Champion Runners," Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 7:4-47, 1967.
12. Dubin, Robert, Human Relations in Administration (2nd ed., New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., June 1957), p. 203.
13. Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51, No. 4 (July, 1954), p. 325.

14. Harvey, Louise F., "The Delinquent Mexican Boy," Journal of Educational Research 42:573, April 1949.
15. Healy, William A. and Augusta F. Bronner, The Judge Baker Foundation Case Studies (Case Study No. 1), Boston, Mass., 1922, p. 42.
16. Hollingshead, A., Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949), p. 480.
17. Hubbard, Alfred W., Research Methods in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER Publications, Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 275.
18. Hubbard, ibid., pp. 277-80.
19. Leles, Sam, Using the Critical Incidents Technique to Develop a Theory of Educational Professionalism: An Exploratory Study (Journal of Teacher Education, 19, Spring 1968), pp. 59-59.
20. Pigors, Paul and Faith Pigors, Case Method in Human Relations: The Incident Process (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961), p. 29.
21. Rarick, Lawrence and Robert McKee. "A Study of 20 Third Grade Children Exhibiting Extreme Levels of Achievement on Tests of Motor Proficiency," Research Quarterly 20:142-152, May 1949.
22. Sears, Jesse B., The Nature of the Administrative Process (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950), p. 56.
23. Sheldon, William H., Varieties of Delinquent Youth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), Reprint New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1970.
24. Van Dalen, Donald B., Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979), p. 294.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

PROCEDURE FOR SECURING NECESSARY INFORMATION TO COMPLETE THE DISSERTATION, " AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE."

1. Written correspondence asking permission of each intramural director if they would participate in the study (general dissertation outline).
2. Written correspondence outlining specific participation necessary by each director.
3. Problem areas obtained from:
 - a. Problem Areas used in 1960 study
 - b. Additional problem areas obtained from Big Ten and National Intramural proceedings between 1960-1980
 - c. Additional problem areas this writer has encountered during the past 18 years of professional involvement
4. Have participants denote each problem that for them is:
 - 1) most frequently encountered or
 - 2) most difficult to solve
5. Case studies will be drawn from the problem areas receiving the most concern.
6. Mail coded "case reporting form" so participant can prepare for interview.
7. Interview (case studies).
8. Transcribe interviews (case studies).
9. Case studies will be sent to participant with the real solutions and alternate solutions for rankings of each.
10. Analyze
 - 1) rankings of the administrative alternatives by the directors;
 - 2) interpretation of the type of action (group or direct) supported by the directors;
 - 3) refining and categorization of the critical incidents;
 - 4) formulation of generalizations; and compare findings to study completed in 1960.

APPENDIX II

BIG TEN RECREATIONAL SPORTS CONFERENCE

December 1975

Members Present

What's New Report

The University of Chicago
Indiana University
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
Northwestern University
The Ohio State University
Purdue University
University of Wisconsin

Utilization and Purchase of Equipment

Harry Ostrander

Informal Recreation PROGRAMMING

Dave Matthews and Ben McGuire

Sports Clubs

Kathy Beardsley, Rod Grambeau, Barb Hinton, and
George Haniford

Facilities-Securities and Supervision Sharing

Dave Matthews, Mike Stevenson, and George Haniford

Humanizing Sports - Deemphasizing Competition

Tom Weingarten

Safety Training - Intramural and Recreation

Dave Griner and Bruce Maurer

Co-Rec Sports - Changes in Rules

Dixie Bennett and Tony Clements

Officiating - New Ideas, Training

Dan Wilcox and Jim Marciniak

APPENDIX II - Cont'd.

Publicizing Programs

Barb Hinton, Mary Daniels, Linda Bishop

Exchange of Program Ideas--New Ideas

Jack Nowka

Professional Preparation

Carol Harding, Kathy Beardsley, Dave Matthews, and
Rich Mull

Assistant Director's Meeting

Mini Reports

Summation

APPENDIX III

AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE

Problem Areas

I am attempting to determine the ten or so most frequently encountered and most difficult to solve problem areas from which to draw the case studies. This does not mean that if you have a case which does not fall into one of the "Top Ten" that you cannot use it.

Please check boxes as you feel appropriate. Mark one, both or none.

	Most Difficult to Solve	Most Frequently Encountered
1. <u>OFFICE MANAGEMENT</u>		
Secretaries' grasp of Intramural policies	[]	[]
Secretaries' efficiency in completing priority work first		
Assistants expect secretary to do assistants' work (calling, checking)		
Making arrangements for sharing of extra work (night work, week-ends)		
2. <u>RELATIONS WITH SUPERIORS</u>		
Relations with superiors in evaluation of IM program	[]	[]
Relations with superiors in evaluation of IM program--securing additional areas, facilities, primarily for IM use.		
3. <u>ALLOTMENT OF INTRAMURAL BUDGETS</u>		
Division of funds to supplies, labor, awards	[]	[]
4. <u>SELECTION OF SUPERVISORS AND OFFICIALS</u>		
Obtaining unanimous approval for potential supervisors	[]	[]
Method of selection of officials, supervisors		

APPENDIX III - cont'd

	Most Difficult to Solve	Most Frequently Encountered
5. <u>RELATIONS WITH COACHES' AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION STAFF IN USE OF ACTIVITY AREAS</u>		
Determination of priority		
Coordination of use of areas	[]	[]
Resolving of schedule conflicts		
6. <u>RELATIONS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND FACULTY</u>		
In use of intramural areas		
Arrangement of students' conflicting interests	[]	[]
Use of intramural game equipment		
7. <u>RELATIONS WITH STUDENTS INTERESTED IN FORMING SPORT CLUB TEAMS</u>		
Processing of requests for aid, recognition		
Reaction to student pressure for support for group	[]	[]
8. <u>COORDINATION WITH WOMEN'S INTRAMURAL PROGRAM</u>		
Cooperation with Women's Director		
Combined use of facilities for both sexes	[]	[]
Solution of problems involving both sexes		
9. <u>BUILDING MANAGEMENT</u>		
Procedure for securing building in evening, week ends		
Custodial responsibility--arranging hours to have building cleaned, guarded	[]	[]
Use of building for various programs		
10. <u>PREPARATION OF FIELDS, FACILITIES</u>		
Direction of Groundsmen--determination of priority of work	[]	[]
Procedure to have fields lined, bleachers erected, backstops erected, pool cleaned, lights maintained		
11. <u>CONTROL OF CONTESTANTS BY STUDENT OFFICIALS</u>		
Procedure of handling disputes in game area		
Ejection of player by official	[]	[]
Protection for official from personal abuse		
12. <u>HANDLING OF PROTEST</u>		
Notification at game area		
Obtaining reports from officials, participants	[]	[]
Method of determining decisions		
13. <u>ENFORCEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY RULES</u>		
Discussion with unit presidents and managers when ineligible player is detected	[]	[]
Discussions with students questioning rules		

APPENDIX III - cont'd

	Most Difficult to Solve	Most Frequently Encountered
14. <u>ORGANIZATION OF TEAMS AND LEAGUES</u>		
Placement of teams in various flights		
Seeding of teams and individuals for tournaments and playoffs	[]	[]
Division of teams into leagues		
15. <u>CHANGES IN WEEKLY GAME SCHEDULES</u>		
Method of notification and explanation to teams involved	[]	[]
Acceptance of rejection of requests for changes		
Protest Procedures		
16. <u>HEALTH CLINIC</u>		
Cooperation in handling injuries		
Coverage in handling injuries	[]	[]
Relations with student reporting injury		
Support of intramural program		
Training employees in life saving techniques		
17. <u>PUBLICITY IN SCHOOL PAPER</u>		
Relation with Sports Editor		
Relations with Faculty Advisor of paper	[]	[]
Relations with student reporters covering events		
18. <u>RECOVERY OF ISSUED EQUIPMENT</u>		
Procedure for establishing responsibility for losses	[]	[]
Discussion with participant losing equipment		
19. <u>SECURITY OF FACILITIES</u>		
University responsibility		
Budget	[]	[]
Employment and training of student		
Participant reaction		
20. <u>FACILITIES</u>		
Non-university use		
Users fee	[]	[]
Reservation procedures		
21. <u>LITIGATIONS</u>		
University support		
Facility liabilities	[]	[]
Club Sports programs		

APPENDIX IV

AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTRAMURAL/RECREATIONAL* SPORTS PROGRAMS OF THE BIG TEN INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAM.

****PROBLEM AREAS**

Publicity in School Newspaper
Security of Facility
Enforcement of Eligibility Rules
Allotment of Recreational/Intramural Budgets
Building Management
Facility - Users Fee, Reservations and Non-University Use
Relationship with Athletics/Physical Education when Co-ordinated Facilities
Changes in Weekly Game Schedules
Control of Contestants by Student Officials
Forming Sports Clubs

*Title has been changed to reflect present interpretation of
Intramural/Recreational programs.

** Random Order

APPENDIX V

CASE REPORTING FORM

THIS FORM IS TO BE USED MERELY AS A RAPID AND SHORT MEANS FOR YOU TO RECORD THE ESSENTIAL FACTS ABOUT A PARTICULAR CASE. IF YOU WILL JOT THE IMPORTANT FACTS DOWN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, THE BACKGROUND CAN BE BROUGHT OUT BY OUR INTERVIEW.

Cases that have occurred recently may also be recorded on this form.

CASE ABOUT _____ YOUR CODE NO. _____

PROBLEM AREA OF _____

USE NO REAL NAMES

1. Who saw what actually happened and what did they report?
2. Who said what?
3. Who wrote what?
4. Who actually acted in what way?
5. What were the actual consequences in what was said and done?
6. What action did Director take in attempting to solve the problem?
7. What was said or done in reaction to the Director's decision?
8. What critical incident (CI) occurred that hastened or retarded either the development of the problem or the solution of the solution of the problem? (Incidents that were outstandingly effective or ineffective with respect to the specific situation.)

APPENDIX VI

PROTEST OF VOLLEYBALL GAME ON TIME LIMIT

Team One was twelve minutes late in reporting to the correct floor for their contest with Team Two. Team One had gone to the wrong floor and the ten-minute forfeit time had expired by two minutes before Team One corrected their mistake.

Team Two had, at the end of the ten minute period, requested the floor manager to credit them with a forfeit. A forfeit would cost Team One their participation points, as well as the loss of a game.

At this point, the floor manager said, "the other team will show up in a minute and you'll still have time to finish your game." Moments later Team One reported. Team Two still insisted on claiming a forfeit.

The floor manager then said, "go ahead and play the game and if you don't finish before the next game is scheduled, then you can request a forfeit."

The game was not finished and the next day the manager from Team Two submitted a protest to the Intramural director. At this time the Team Two manager mentioned that the two teams were only one-half point from each other in the yearly participation point race.

The director asked the manager, "Do you have the support of the rest of your team on this protest? "There will be some hard feeling over this type of protest." The manager replied that "There were bad feelings already between the two units."

The director then called the protest board consisting of two athletic managers from units outside the league involved. The director's "only responsibility is to read the protest and the rule which applies to it. But, I did say that if this protest was granted there would be a lot of problems on teams reporting even one, two or three seconds late."

APPENDIX VII

RESPONSE FORM

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR EACH CASE STUDY

Please use this form for the ranking of alternative solutions and listing of additional alternative solutions. The original administrative action is included in the list but not designated.

Case No. _____

Suggested Alternative Solutions

*Ranking

- | | |
|----|-------|
| 1. | _____ |
| 2. | _____ |
| 3. | _____ |
| 4. | _____ |
| 5. | _____ |

*Ranking - Rate the Suggested Alternative Solutions from best to worst.

IF YOU HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION PLEASE LIST HERE.

APPENDIX VIII

RESPONSE FORM

CRITICAL INCIDENTS FOR EACH CASE STUDY

Suggested Critical Incidents - Please use the following definition for a critical incident. "The critical incident is an action, or in-action, a set of facts or statements, that can be used by the observer to draw conclusions for a solution to the problem. They assist in developing objective approaches for administrative decisions."

Case No. _____

1.

2.

Check the corresponding critical

3.

incident number if you feel the

4.

statement was useful in developing

5.

a solution.

6.

7.

8.

LIST ANY ADDITIONAL CRITICAL INCIDENT YOU FEEL PERTINENT TO THE SOLUTION OF THIS CASE THAT HAS NOT BEEN LISTED.