

379  
N81d  
No. 669

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS AT NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

James Harold Harrison, B. B. A., M. S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1972

BCT

Harrison, James H., A Descriptive Study of Inter-collegiate Football Participants at North Texas State University, Doctor of Education (College Teaching), December, 1972, 135 pp., 79 tables, bibliography, 40 titles.

The problem with which this investigation is concerned is that of providing a current academic and racial description of the intercollegiate football participants at North Texas State University and the construction of a current participants' profile.

The subjects employed were 259 football participants from the 1966 Fall Semester through the 1971 Fall Semester. The descriptive analysis is based upon 234 participants; the profile is a composite of eighty-one currently (1971) enrolled participants.

This study has a twofold purpose. The first is to provide a current description of the academic status of both white and non-white participants; the second is to construct a current profile of the participants. The study is designed with the idea that the findings could be of use to coaches and administrators of this university in football programming.

Transcripts, coaches, and the Public Information Office of this university provided the data used in the descriptive analysis. Eighty-one participants answering self-report questionnaires provided data for the profile.

Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, the purposes of the study, questions to be investigated,

definition of terms, limitations of the study, basic assumptions, and the background and significance of the study. A review of related research is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III presents the methodology. Statistical analysis of data is presented in Chapter IV, and the summary, findings, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

The findings include the following conclusions:

1. Academically, the sophomore playing semester was the most difficult for the participants.

2. The mean and median grade points were the highest for non-playing semesters.

3. Senior participants had a high tendency, 54.41 per cent, to withdraw from college after their senior playing semester.

4. Mean and median grade points failed to reach a grade of C until the junior and senior years.

5. Academic probation affected 16 per cent of the participants.

6. A larger per cent of the participants were suspended than probated (24.79 to 15.81).

7. The percentage of non-whites has almost doubled since 1966.

8. Proportionally, 96.67 to 90.23 per cent more non-whites have received scholarships than have whites.

9. Only 6.82 per cent of the participants received a degree in four years.

10. Ninety-three per cent of the players tendered pro-football contracts were non-degree holders.

11. Upon entering this university, 93 per cent of the junior-college participants were either C or D students.

12. Football participants' grade point means in non-academic courses were higher than in academic courses.

Profile findings include the following observations:

He was white, single, and a junior between 20-21 years of age majoring in physical education with a minor in biology. His family's annual income was likely to be from \$10,000 to \$12,999. He had neither an older brother or father who had participated in intercollegiate football. His decision to play football was primarily influenced by economics considerations, an ambition to play pro-football, and the desire to obtain a college education. He was a scholarship recipient and approved of the scholarship program at this university. He would not be able to play without a scholarship. He did not transfer from a junior college. He expected to receive a degree in four years. He believed playing football prevented his participation in other campus activities, and he did not engage in part-time work.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. The Athletic Department should maintain academic and personal records on all football athletes.

2. Research should be done to determine whether low academic achieving athletes or high academic achieving athletes perform better on the playing field.

3. Research should be conducted to determine the feasibility of accepting low academic achieving junior-college football prospects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Questions to be Investigated	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations of the Study	
Basic Assumptions	
Background and Significance	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH . . . . .	27
III. METHOD . . . . .	39
Description of Subjects	
Procedures for Collecting Data	
Procedures for Analyzing Data	
Description of the Measuring Instrument	
IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	44
V. SUMMARY . . . . .	112
Findings	
Recommendations	
APPENDIX . . . . .	126
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	132

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Grade Point Distribution of Freshman Intercollegiate Football Participants for Playing and Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	44
II. Grade Point Distribution of Sophomore Intercollegiate Football Participants for Playing and Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	45
III. Grade Point Distribution of Junior Intercollegiate Football Participants for Playing and Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	46
IV. Grade Point Distribution of Senior Intercollegiate Football Participants for Playing and Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	47
V. Playing Semester Grade Points Compared Between First-String Varsity Intercollegiate Football Players and Other Varsity Intercollegiate Football Members. . . . .	48
VI. The Mean and Median Grade Points of White and Non-White Intercollegiate Football Participants for Playing Semesters . . . . .	49
VII. The Mean and Median Grade Points of White and Non-White Intercollegiate Football Participants for the Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	50
VIII. The Cumulative Grade Point Distribution of White and Non-White Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	51
IX. The Grade Point Distribution of Single and Married Intercollegiate Football Participants During Playing Semesters. . . . .	52
X. The Grade Point Distribution of Single and Married Intercollegiate Football Participants for the Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	52

Table	Page
XI. The Cumulative Grade Point Distribution of Single and Married Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	53
XII. Playing Semester Grade Point Distribution of Intercollegiate Football Participants With a Football Scholarship and Those With No Football Scholarship . . . . .	54
XIII. Academic Probational Status of White and Non-White Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	55
XIV. The Academic Suspensory Status of White and Non-White Intercollegiate Football Participants. . . . .	56
XV. The Combined Racial Composition of Freshman and Varsity Intercollegiate Football Participants from 1966 to 1971 . . . . .	57
XVI. The Racial Composition of the First-String Varsity Intercollegiate Football Participants from 1966 to 1971 . . . . .	57
XVII. Per Cent of Whites and Non-Whites Receiving Football Scholarships Between 1966 and 1970 . . . . .	58
XVIII. The Years Involved in Obtaining a Degree Among Intercollegiate Football Participants from 1966 to 1971 . . . . .	59
XIX. The Racial Composition and Degree Status of Those Intercollegiate Football Participants Tendered a Pro-Football Contract. . .	61
XX. The Continuation of Academic Study and Football Participation Among Freshman Intercollegiate Football Participants from 1966 to 1970 . . . . .	62
XXI. Grade Point Averages of Junior-College Transfer Intercollegiate Football Participants from 1966 to 1970 . . . . .	64
XXII. The Cumulative Grade Point Average at North Texas State University of First Year Junior-College Transfer Intercollegiate Football Participants Compared With the Cumulative Grade Point Average of Similar Non-Transfer Football Participants . . . . .	65

Table	Page
XXIII. The Cumulative Grade Point Average at this University by Second Year Junior-College Transfer Intercollegiate Football Participants Compared with the Cumulative Grade Point Average of Similar Non-Transfer Football Participants . . . . .	66
XXIV. Student Classifications and Racial Composition Among 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	66
XXV. Areas of Specialization Among the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants. . . . .	68
XXVI. Age Distribution of the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	69
XXVII. Marital Status of the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	69
XXVIII. Percentage of Football Participants Who Possess a Car . . . . .	70
XXIX. Economic Background of the Football Participants Based Upon Their Estimate of Parents' Yearly Income . . . . .	70
XXX. Percentage of the Football Participants With an Older Brother or Father Who Participated in Intercollegiate Football . . . . .	71
XXXI. Personal Factors Influential in the Decision to Play Football . . . . .	72
XXXII. Social Factors Influential in the Decision to Play Football . . . . .	73
XXXIII. Rank Order of Factors Most Influential in the Decision to Play Football . . . . .	73
XXXIV. Percentage of 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants Interested in Playing Pro-Football. . . . .	75
XXXV. Percentage of the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants on Scholarships . . . . .	75
XXXVI. Evaluation of the Scholarship Program by 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	76

Table	Page
XXXVII. The Football Player's Evaluation of his High School Football Ability With That of His High School Teammates. . . . .	77
XXXVIII. Reasons Given by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants for Choosing to Attend this University . . . . .	78
XXXIX. Responses From Junior-College Transfer Football Participants as to the Difficulty in Maintaining Their Junior-College Academic Status at this University . . . . .	79
XL. Utilization of the Tutoring Service Offered at this University by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	80
XLI. Hours of Tutoring Service Utilized Per Week by the Football Participants . . . . .	80
XLII. Football Participants' Evaluation of the Tutoring Received at this University. . . . .	81
XLIII. Evaluation of the Tutoring Program at this University by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	82
XLIV. Per Cent of the Football Participants Who Expect to Receive a Degree in Four Years. . . . .	82
XLV. Per Cent of the Football Participants Who Would Encourage a Son to Play Intercollegiate Football . . . . .	83
XLVI. The Percentage of Football Participants Who Feel That Their Participation is Necessary in Order for Them to Obtain a College Education . . . . .	84
XLVII. Opinions Among the Football Participants as to the Availability of Time for Participation in Other Campus Activities . . . . .	84
XLVIII. Per Cent of the Football Participants Interested in Participating in Other Campus Activities . . . . .	85
XLIX. The Number of Other Campus Activities Which Engage the Football Participants . . . . .	86

## Table

## Page

L.	Organizations in which the Football Participants Indicate Participation . . . . .	86
LI.	Number of Office Positions Within Campus Organizations Held by the Football Participants . . . . .	87
LII.	Participation in Part-Time Work During the Playing Semester by 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	87
LIII.	Participation in Part-Time Work During the Non-Playing Semester by 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	88
LIV.	1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants' Evaluation of their Football Ability with Ability in Other Sports . . . . .	88
LV.	Participation in Other Intercollegiate Sports Among 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	89
LVI.	Prevalence of Academic Probation Among 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	90
LVII.	The Occurrence of Academic Probation at the End of a Playing Semester for 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	90
LVIII.	Semester Hours Generally Carried by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants During the Playing Semesters . . . . .	91
LIX.	Semester Hours Generally Carried by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants During the Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	92
LX.	Summer School Attendance Among 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	92
LXI.	Attendance of Both Summer Terms Among 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants . . . . .	93
LXII.	Number of Semester Hours Generally Carried by the 1971 Intercollegiate Football Participants During the Summer. . . . .	93

Table	Page
LXIII. Educational Attainments Among the Two Hundred Thirty-Four Intercollegiate Football Participants Between the 1966 Fall Semester and the End of the 1971 Fall Semester . . . . .	94
LXIV. Curricular Course Enrollments Among Intercollegiate Football Participants From 1966 to 1970 . . . . .	96
LXV. Semesters in Which the Intercollegiate Football Participants Failed to Meet Academic Requirements and Were Placed on Probation or Suspension . . . . .	97
LXVI. Intercollegiate Football Participants Placed on Probation Without Getting Suspended and Those Placed on Suspension Without Being Put on Probation . . . . .	98
LXVII. Dropout Aspects of Those Intercollegiate Football Participants Placed on Probation or Suspension . . . . .	99
LXVIII. Aftereffects of Intercollegiate Football Participants Who Dropped out of Football . . . . .	100
LXIX. A Comparison of Cumulative Grade Point Averages Between Transfer Football Participants and Non-Transfer Football Participants . . . . .	101
LXX. Comparison Between the Grade Point Average of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Freshman Football Participants During Playing Semesters . . . . .	103
LXXI. Comparison Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Freshman Football Participants During Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	103
LXXII. Comparison Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Sophomore Football Participants During Playing Semesters . . . . .	104
LXXIII. Comparisons Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Sophomore Football Participants During Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	105

Table	Page
LXXIV. Comparisons Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Junior Football Participants During Playing Semesters . . . . .	106
LXXV. Comparisons Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Junior Football Participants During Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	107
LXXVI. Comparison Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Senior Football Participants During Playing Semesters . . . . .	108
LXXVII. Comparisons Between the Grade Point Averages of Academic and Non-Academic Courses of Senior Football Participants During Non-Playing Semesters . . . . .	109
LXXVIII. The Racial Composition of Varsity Intercollegiate Football Teams From 1966 to 1971. . .	110
LXXIX. The Racial Composition of Freshman Intercollegiate Football Teams From 1966 to 1971. . .	111

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

American educators are confronted with an ambiguous picture of intercollegiate football participation and academic achievement. In addition, current profiles of football teams are lacking even though studies for a particular college or university could be of specific value to that institution. Intercollegiate football has been both praised and condemned in the literature of both educational and popular periodicals, in the pages of proceedings of national conventions, in the bulletins of learned societies, in the columns of the sports pages of newspapers, and in chapters of many books. Although many educators as well as many ex-players have expressed their opinions on college football, there is, nevertheless, a dearth of objective research or empirical data on this subject. A need, therefore, exists for extensive research into the academic achievement and current profiles of intercollegiate football players; such research will provide more pertinent data regarding this intercollegiate activity and its participants.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to provide an academic and racial description of the intercollegiate football players at

North Texas State University from 1966 to 1970 and to construct a current profile of the 1971 players.

#### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are to determine the following:

1. What has been the academic status of players from 1966 to 1970?
2. What semester seems to present the athletes with their greatest difficulty in the maintenance of an acceptable academic status?
3. What changes, if any, appear to be needed in the tutoring program?
4. What has been the retention rate of football players from 1966 to 1970?
5. What difference occurs in the academic status of junior college transfer players and that of non-transfer players?
6. What does a current (1971) profile of football athletes at North Texas State University reveal?

#### Questions to be Investigated

The following questions have been formulated to describe the academic status of football athletes from 1966 to 1970:

1. Is there a difference in the grade point average (GPA-I) of freshmen intercollegiate football participants during the semester of participation and the grade point averages (GPA-II) of the non-playing season?

2. Does a difference occur in sophomore intercollegiate football players' GPA-I and their GPA-II?
3. Does a difference occur between junior intercollegiate football players' GPA-I and GPA-II?
4. Does a difference occur between the senior intercollegiate football players' GPA-I and GPA-II?
5. Does a difference occur between the GPA-I of first-string varsity players and that of other varsity team members?
6. Does a difference occur in the GPA-I of white football players and that of non-white players?
7. Does a difference occur in the GPA-II of white players and that of non-white players?
8. Does a difference occur in the cumulative GPA (GPA-III) of white players and that of non-white players?
9. Does a difference occur in the GPA-I of married players and that of non-married players?
10. Does a difference occur in the GPA-II of married players and that of non-married players?
11. Does a difference occur in the cumulative GPA (GPA-III) of married players and that of non-married players?
12. Does a difference occur between the GPA-I of intercollegiate football players who are on a scholarship and the GPA-I of intercollegiate football players who are not on a scholarship?
13. What percentage of football players are placed on academic probation?

14. What percentage of white players are placed on academic probation?

15. What percentage of non-white players are placed on academic probation?

16. What percentage of players are placed on academic suspension?

17. What percentage of white players are placed on academic suspension?

18. What percentage of non-white players are placed on academic suspension?

The following questions pertain to racial composition, awarding of degrees, and participation in pro-football:

1. What is the proportion of whites and of non-whites on the football roster?

2. What is the proportion of whites and of non-whites on the first-string varsity team?

3. Do more non-whites proportionally receive scholarships than do whites?

4. What percentage of players receive a degree within four years of college work?

5. What is the percentage of white players and the percentage of non-white players who receive a degree within four years of college work?

6. What percentage of players receive a degree within five years?

7. What is the percentage of white players and the percentage of non-white players who receive a degree within five years?

8. What percentage of players receive a degree within six years?

9. What is the percentage of white players and the percentage of non-white players who receive a degree within six years?

10. What is the percentage of football players who have participated in pro-football?

11. What is the percentage of football players who have participated in pro-football but have not received a degree?

12. What has been the racial composition of those participating in pro-football?

The following questions pertain to freshmen football participants:

1. What percentage of freshmen players continue to participate in intercollegiate football until their eligibility expires?

2. What percentage of the players discontinue football participation?

3. What percentage of the players who discontinue playing football resume their college education at North Texas State University?

The following questions were formulated to describe the academic status of junior college transfer players in contrast to the non-transfer players:

1. What is the academic status of the beginning junior-college transfer players?

2. After one year of intercollegiate football participation at North Texas State University, does the cumulative GPA at North Texas State University of junior-college transfer players differ from that of the non-transfer players?

3. After two years of intercollegiate football participation at North Texas State University, does the cumulative GPA at North Texas State University of junior-college transfer players differ from that of the non-transfer players?

The following questions were formulated to determine a current profile of the 1971 intercollegiate football athletes at this University:

1. What is the student classification composition?

2. What are the major fields of study?

3. What is the average age of the players?

4. What is the marital status of the players?

5. What percentage of players possess automobiles?

6. What is the racial composition of the team?

7. What modal income background is indicated among the players by using their estimates of parents' yearly income?

8. Does the player have an older brother who participated in intercollegiate football?

9. Did the player's father participate in intercollegiate football?

10. What personal factors were most influential in the players choosing to play intercollegiate football?

11. What social factors were most influential in their choosing to play intercollegiate football?

12. Of the personal and social factors, which three were the most influential?

13. Is the player interested in playing pro-football?

14. Is the player on a football scholarship?

15. Would the player participate in intercollegiate football without being awarded a scholarship?

16. What is the evaluation of the football scholarship program at North Texas State University?

17. How does the player evaluate his football ability while in high school with that of his high school teammates?

18. What influenced him to choose to attend North Texas State University?

19. Is the junior-college transfer student able to maintain an academic status at this university similar to his junior-college status?

20. What utilization do football players make of the tutoring service offered at this university?

21. What is the evaluation of the tutoring received by the players at this university?

22. What is the evaluation of the tutoring program offered by this university?

23. What is the percentage of players who anticipate receiving a degree within four years of college work?

24. Would a player encourage his sone to play inter-collegiate football?

25. What percentage of football players believe that their participation in football is necessary in order for them to acquire a college education?

26. Does participation in football tend to discourage the player from participating in other campus activities?

27. Do players generally engage in part-time work during the playing season?

28. Do players generally engage in part-time owrk during the non-playing semester?

29. Do players tend to believe that they have equivalent talent in other sports?

30. To what extent does academic probation prevail among the players?

31. When does academic probation tend to occur the most frequently?

32. How many semester hours generally are carried during the playing season?

33. How many semester hours generally are carried during the non-playing semester?

34. Do the players generally attend summer school?

35. Do the players generally attend both summer periods?

36. How many semester hours do the players generally take during the summer?

#### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are used:

Varsity players--those players playing above the freshman level.

First-string varsity players--those players selected by the coaches as the starting team players at the close of the football season.

Athletic dropouts--those football players who are not reported on the football roster the following year.

College dropouts--those football players who are not listed by the Registrar of this university the following semester, except those on suspension.

Academic status--grade point averages.

Education attainment--formal education at this university.

GPA-I--the grade point average during a football playing semester.

GPA-II--the grade point average during a non-playing semester.

GPA-III--the cumulative grade point average during the time a student has been a football participant.

Semester--either a fall or spring term, never a summer term.

Non-academic courses--courses taken in the School of Home Economics and in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to intercollegiate football participants at North Texas State University whose names have appeared on the football brochures beginning with the year 1966 and continuing through 1971. The study is limited to these years to obtain a current perspective of the players at this university; the availability and accuracy of data necessitate working within this period of time.

#### Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that studying the players over the past five-year period would enhance the presentation of a more accurate description.

It is further assumed, due to anonymity, that the subjects answering the self-report profile questionnaire would respond honestly to the instrument.

In addition, it is assumed that the coaches were able to correctly identify the players according to the following criteria: years in football, race, pro-football contracts; too, the coaches were able to identify those who were first-string members and scholarship recipients.

### Background and Significance

The relevant literature is replete with references to the physical talents of various football players, and points out that college players of today are much more sophisticated than at earlier times. Attention is given to how high-school football has become more like college football in its tactics; it is noted that players, by watching television programs and films, have become more adept in their playing abilities. These reports, however, do not provide insight into the level of academic achievement by those who participate in intercollegiate football.

The frame of reference for this study is limited to the college milieu. Although a few other studies (5, 10, 19, 34, 35) of college players have dealt with their high school participation and established their theoretical framework and background, this study, on the other hand, does not use high school results for any basis in establishing a theoretical framework or background. Since the college milieu is completely different from the secondary-school environment, it is believed that if a feasible basis for projection in college football participation and academic success can be made, then it should be based on college results. This study is concerned only with an academic and racial description of intercollegiate football participants at North Texas State University from 1966 to 1970 and with providing a current profile of the 1971 players.

Two views are most frequently encountered when discussing the merits of intercollegiate athletic participation and academic achievement. One view may be described as a negative attitude toward intercollegiate sports and the other as a positive attitude toward sports and academics.

#### The Negative Viewpoint

Associated with the negative viewpoint is the fact that many college administrators have thought it necessary to abandon certain intercollegiate sports. A strong statement of this position was presented in an editorial in the December, 1963, issue of The Journal of Higher Education (6), advocating complete severance of higher education and intercollegiate athletics. Ryan (32) reports that two-thirds of the college athletic programs are operating in the red and that intercollegiate football has been discontinued at forty-two colleges during the past ten years because of inflated costs. Within the 655 National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) member colleges, 400 colleges operate their athletic programs in the red. Among the expenses that have increased are the recruiting and tutoring bills at major colleges, as well as a major increase in the number of athletes receiving scholarships (32, pp. 19-20). Consequently schools have been cutting their athletic budgets. At the same time that costs increase, student support in some universities is dwindling. For example, students in some places have voted to withhold fees allotted to intercollegiate sports

(4, p. 38). Whereas athletic departments in the past have relied on the university regents, alumni, and students to fund athletic programs, these donations are decreasing. This decrease is a result of the economic climate and of alumni disaffection with many college attitudes. Thus, college football teams are similar to publicly held corporations in that they must keep the stockholders satisfied (32, p. 19).

Jack Scott, who studies sports and society, points out, "Since 1967, the athletic programs at more than 100 schools have been rocked by some form of disturbance. Most have involved athletes protesting what they consider racism and unfair disciplinary rules" (18, p. 89).

Coleman (3) suggests that the rewards given athletes, as opposed to those given scholars, divert adolescent energies in general from the pursuit of scholarship.

Sports Illustrated has described big-time college football as relying "on the pros to leave college athletes alone, and in turn the pros depend on the college to operate a de facto farm system" (11). A no-raiding agreement exists among college athletes which prohibits a player from signing a pro contract until he has been out of high school at least four years (11).

Jack Scott maintains that "only a tiny percentage of big-time college athletes graduate with their class, and not many more appear to graduate at all." Dave Meggyesey (31),

an ex-pro football player, questions the basic worth of football in Out of Their League. He finds overwhelming fault with the game and the society that has glorified it.

The former president of the University of New Hampshire and of Louisiana State University, Harold W. Stoke (36), states that "conceived as education, athletics are inexplicable, corrupting and uncontrollable." He contends that participation in college sports is bound to detract from an athlete's education because of the time he must devote to practice and the time he spends away from the campus.

Stinson says that there is no more justification for providing an athlete with free tutoring than a non-athlete. Tutoring causes trouble for the athlete because he uses it as a crutch and, therefore, depends on it rather than making the necessary effort to learn on his own (32, p. 23).

#### The Positive Viewpoint

Those persons having a positive viewpoint toward college sports see them as having a definite part in the educational process. This view is supported by Fawcett, Stevenson, Fall, and Barnes (28, 8, 7, 1). President Novice Fawcett (28) outlined his views on athletics in a meeting of the Board of Trustees of Ohio State University on March 12, 1957, by emphasizing that students come to the University primarily for an education and that sports and other activities are a definite part of, even though incidental to, the gaining of an

education. President William E. Stevenson (8) of Oberlin College expresses the view that the educational purposes of athletics should be stressed and that the prestige of winning should be de-emphasized. Furthermore, Charles W. Fall (7), Associate Professor of Education at the University of Buffalo, says that once intercollegiate athletics are accepted "into the family of educational procedures completely and sincerely," the way will be cleared for administrators to attack whatever problems may arise. Samuel E. Barnes (1) concludes that an agreement exists among individuals in institutions which affirms the idea that sports have educational values and make a profound contribution to the campus life of colleges and universities. Barnes, however, believes this agreement is obscured by divergent practices that have developed in various colleges and universities throughout the United States. Joseph Kaplan (30) believes athletics to be representative of our culture.

Harden, Marco, and Plant (8, 23, 27) lend support to the positive viewpoint on athletics, but they do suggest that more faculty control of intercollegiate athletics is needed. Hickman (9), a former coach, states that "there is nothing rarer than a football team composed entirely of students." In other words, the football team is rare that does not include boys who attend college after having been brought in for the specific purpose of playing football.

Murphy states that "sport provides potential sources of meaning for the individual which are unique and significant and allow for true realization of self, and sport is an enduring and important social phenomenon of man" (26, p. 27). McCormick (25, p. 55) follows a similar line of thought in which he states that "sport has become a normal, natural part of life, including student life, and that is probably exactly as it should be." He goes on to say, "The modern fullback is not the broken-nosed bruiser of legend, communicating only in grunts, but an articulate, even elegant, gent who gives as much thought to his future after his playing days as to the team's playbook" (26, p. 59).

Singer (33, pp. 40-41) sees a definite need existing for coaches to improve their communications with administrators and to make sure that they are aware of the coaches' efforts and plans. Such communication will lead administrators to become more understanding and sympathetic to the physical educator's problems. In addition, an attempt to provide information to other faculty members can bring respect for the profession, the program, and for the coach. The public will then be able to distinguish fact from fantasy.

Prothro (17) believes that coaches would rather have a boy come to them as a freshman rather than as a junior. However, the junior colleges play good football, and these players are recruited in the way that high school players are. "They don't always help you. For every great one you can name, there are many more who never do the job" (17, p. 38).

It is necessary that a football candidate possess the mental capacity to master the intricacies of football. That is, there are the rules, certain fundamentals, and the plays and signals which the players must be able to comprehend. This is no simple task. Players have to be able to observe accurately and then react quickly and correctly to suddenly changed situations. Thus, most football coaches are more concerned with the mental ability of their candidates than with their physical prowess (2, pp. 127-132).

Paterno (16) wants his recruits to enjoy the experience of college life while playing the game of football. He sees many things for the players to enjoy besides football, and he is opposed to grouping his players together in a manner that will make it difficult for them to associate with other types of students. Even though football is the players' major interest, it has not resulted in lower academic marks for them in comparison to the rest of the male student body. They have carried a higher academic mark for sixteen straight semesters than the average of the other male students. Paterno says they "want to take you on, head to head, intellectually." Furthermore, when Penn State players get on a plane, they take out their books to study. This is something of which the public is not generally aware, but it does occur among players at Penn State (16, p. 21).

The athlete's lessons have become very sophisticated, and one seldom sees a three-sport man in college today. The

NCAA is confronted with the prospect of putting a limit on the number of football scholarships a college can have as well as the awarding of scholarships only on the basis of need (32, p. 23). When one reviews the number of teams playing college football in 1950 with that of today, the number of teams that have found it financially impractical to continue does not seem so great. In 1950 there were 682 teams playing college football; 617 colleges are still fielding teams (12). Thus, there has been a decline of sixty-five teams, or 9.53 per cent.

The Big Ten Conference does have limitations on scholarships (thirty a year for football). It has eliminated red-shirting and raised its academic standards. The desire is for academics to lead the way and maintain a firm control over sports; yet the Conference does not want to suffer a great loss in athletic prestige (15, p. 19).

Broyles (13), head football coach at Arkansas, points out that all schools do not have an equal chance in finding enough good players to compete at the top level; therefore, they must give scholarships to more boys in order to compete. By limiting scholarships, schools would be forced to be more selective in awarding athletic scholarships than they are presently.

In the black ghettos of New York, only 1 to 3 per cent of the children are ever given the opportunity to go to college, while 60 per cent of the children from middle-class

neighborhoods attend college. In other places, the average is 94 to 97 per cent (29, p. 60). John Niland (14) of the Dallas Cowboys was an orphan who grew up in poverty. Although he played football successfully in high school, he did not expect to attend college because he was not in a financial condition to do so. However, football scholarship offers did provide him the opportunity, and he chose Iowa, for the Hawkeyes could help him the most. He was one of forty freshmen with football scholarships, but only eighteen of them were still playing by his senior year, and of these, only five received degrees. He was not one of them.

Broyles (32, p. 20) says that if you kill or cripple football, there is "the risk of reducing the income which supports the nonremunerative sports." This view is supported by McKay (32, p. 20), University of Southern California coach, by stressing the point that football carries the financial load for college sports in general. McKay (13) also states that "the adjusted gross income formula for establishing need is a complete joke."

Reed (30, p. 65) believes that the grant-in-aid system which dominates the intercollegiate athletic scene today is becoming much improved as "institutions are placing genuine emphasis upon academic purposes and responsibility as a prerequisite to either financial aid or competition."

### The Profile

The importance of considering an individual's profile rather than assessing components separately is consistently emphasized by researchers in personality studies (20, p. 433). Kroll and Petersen (20, pp. 437-438) report "differences between teams may be due to either type of season and/or type of school," and that "the multiple discriminant analysis has demonstrated significant separation of teams when the entire profile was assessed." They also state that profiles are highly relative:

Profile factors may be highly related, and the possibility exists that less than the entire set of significantly different variables is meaningful and/or that other variables, nonsignificant by themselves, may be discriminating variables when viewed as an entire profile rather than individually (21, p. 441).

Research has found definite profiles to be associated with particular societal groups (21, p. 442).

Individual and group analysis is predicated upon an awareness and understanding of the particular interests, abilities, mannerisms, habits, skills, and temperaments which are associated with an individual or group and which can result in a certain act or actions. A knowledge of the motivations, traits, feelings, actions, and attributes of the players is most helpful to the coach. The coach must reckon with the fact that not only do individuals affect a group, but also the group affects the individual. Thus, the effects of reciprocal influences must be considered in order to

better understand the individuals on a football team as well as the over-all performance of that team (22, pp. 182-183).

A serious condition may be created by one who is attempting to use another individual for his own personal recognition. For example, a boy's father may be the driving force behind his son's actions. Consequently, a football coach needs to be able to recognize the various factors and try to analyze correctly the factors which are contributing to the individual reactions. There are various reasons which can be responsible for some players' never realizing their potential (22, pp. 185-187). Whether one examines the individual athlete or the group as a whole and attempts to evaluate potentials, judgments must be accompanied by intellectual knowledge that will avoid as much as possible the guesswork in the evaluation. Differences exist in the readiness to respond as well as in memory and the ability to learn. There is a positive correlation between these factors and the kind of material most readily learned, the time needed for learning, and the rate of forgetting that which had previously been learned (22, pp. 190-191).

#### Computers in Profile Analysis

Computers are now being used in modern professional football to analyze data on prospective college players for drafting into the football leagues. The judgments given by the computers aid the coaches in further evaluation. This

practice has increased enormously in the pro-ranks (24, p. 24).

Tex Schramm of the Dallas Cowboys felt that he had to find an objective method of judging the worth of a football player since the prejudices of coaches lead to inaccurate judgments. The Cowboy's scouting questionnaire is a rather simple form which involves five intangibles: (1) character, (2) quickness and body control, (3) competitiveness, (4) mental alertness, and (5) strength and explosiveness. There are sixteen options, all in the form of statements; and the prospect is graded on a scale of one to nine on each statement (24, pp. 25-26).

In 1964, the Cowboys found that of 100 players rated by the computer, 87 became pros. The Cowboys are now able to obtain at least 50 per cent more information on each player than they could in 1964 (24, p. 33). There are approximately 175 rookies who make the grade each year in the pro-ranks. Schramm (24, p. 33) states that "we want to be able to pinpoint those 175 players and avoid wasting draft choices on the hundreds of others who will be drafted and will not have the ability to play professional football."

In conclusion, football, since it is the most costly intercollegiate sport with the largest number of participants, merits high priority for study. A need exists at each college and university for studies in this area so that coaches and administrators will be aware of the particular characteristics

associated with their teams in order for them to make needed corrections. Such studies would facilitate a reduction of expenditures; aid in advancing a player's scholastic status; demonstrate what combination of factors makes a winning team, thus increasing gate attendance and lowering expenditures; and show what leads to making recruiting easier and more efficient.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barnes, Samuel E., "Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Athletics," 60th Annual Proceedings, College Physical Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1957, 184-193.
2. Bierman, B. W., Winning Football, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1937.
3. Coleman, James S., "The Competition for Adolescent Energies," Phi Delta Kappan, LXII (December, 1960), 231-236.
4. "College Sports Feel Budget Ax," Business Week (August 28, 1971), 38-39.
5. Earl, C. D., "The Academic Achievement of College Athletes and Non-Athletes from Four Ethnic Groups," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968.
6. "Education--Athletic Nonsense: A Proposal for Severing the Connection Between Higher Education and Competitive Sports," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (December, 1963), 487-490.
7. Fall, Charles R., "Amateur College Athletics," Teachers College Record, LIV (October, 1952--May, 1953), 215-222.
8. Harden, Edgar L., "What College Presidents Say About Athletics," The Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXI (March, 1960), 18-19, 76.
9. Hickman, Herman, "Confessions of a Football Recruiter," The Saturday Evening Post (October 30, 1954), 32-33, 137-138.
10. Hilyer, James Carson, "An Analysis of the Academic Status of Southeastern Conference Football Players," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi, 1968.

11. Houston Chronicle, December 6, 1970.
12. Houston Chronicle, January 12, 1971.
13. Houston Chronicle, January 13, 1971.
14. Houston Chronicle, January 17, 1971.
15. Jenkins, Dan, "The Fighting Illini," Sports Illustrated, XXVI (March 6, 1967), 16-19.
16. \_\_\_\_\_, "The Idea is to Have Some Fun--And Who Needs to be No. 1," Sports Illustrated, XXVIX (November 11, 1968), 19-21.
17. \_\_\_\_\_, "Transformed by the Transfer," Sports Illustrated, XXXI (October 27, 1969), 36-39.
18. "Jeremiah of Jock Liberation," Time (May 24, 1971), 88-89.
19. Kirchner, R. J., "Participation in Athletics and Its Effect on Academic Success at Central Michigan University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.
20. Kroll, Walter and Kay H. Petersen, "Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Football Teams," The Research Quarterly, XXXVI (December, 1965), 433-440.
21. \_\_\_\_\_, "Study of Values Test and Collegiate Football Teams," The Research Quarterly, XXXVI (December, 1965), 441-447.
22. Larche, Harry E., Techniques of Football Coaching, New York, A. S. Barnes and Company, 1969.
23. Marco, S. M., "The Place of Athletics in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXI (November, 1960), 422-427.
24. Maule, Tex, "Make No Mistakes About It," Sports Illustrated, XXVIII (January 29, 1968), 24-35.
25. McCormick, John, "Score One for Today's Students," Sports Illustrated, XXVIII (May 20, 1968), 46-48, 53-59.

26. Murphy, Betty Lou, "The Proper Focus of Our Field is the Study of Sport," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XLI (June, 1970), 27, 44.
27. Plant, Marcus L., "The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXII (January, 1961), 1-8.
28. Pollard, James E., Ohio State Athletics, 1879-1959, Columbus, Ohio, Athletic Department, Ohio State University, 1959.
29. Putnam, Pat, "A Man Has Got to Go With What He Believes," Sports Illustrated, XXVIX (October 7, 1968), 60-61.
30. Reed, William R., "Big Time Athletics' Commitment to Education," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXIV (September, 1963), 29-30.
31. Rudy, Michael, "The Football Player Who Changed His Goal," Business Week (January 2, 1971), 6.
32. Ryan, Pat, "A Grim Run to Fiscal Daylight," Sports Illustrated, XXXIV (February 1, 1971), 18-23.
33. Singer, Robert N., "Communicate or Perish," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXVIX (February, 1968), 40-41.
34. Smith, E. B., "Academic Achievement and Athletic Participation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 1965.
35. Steuck, R. H., "A Comparison of the Scholastic Performance of Athletes and Athletic Participants with Non-Athletes at Wisconsin State College at La Crosse," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1963.
36. Stoke, Harold W., "College Athletics, Education or Show Business?" Atlantic Monthly, CXIII (March, 1954), 46-50.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Much material is available on intercollegiate football. The literature includes both praise and condemnation of the sport, but there have been few empirical studies relating to the negative and positive viewpoints on intercollegiate football participation as expressed in Chapter I. When one attempts to analyze the empirical data that has been compiled, the findings are somewhat ambiguous. Thus, more empirical studies are needed to determine the academic achievement of intercollegiate football participants. The following empirical studies comprise most, if not all, of the current research that has been done in this area.

Brown (1), in 1949, made a study of football athletes and track men at North Texas State College between the years 1930 and 1940. During this period, 270 students were reported as football participants. Eighty-one per cent, or 217 of the football players, commenced their eligibility at this university, and 19 per cent, or 53 players, were transfer students. The grades made by football participants during this period were as follows: A's, 354, or 5 per cent; B's, 1,704, or 26 per cent; C's, 2,868, or 43 per cent; D's, 1,109, or 16 per cent; F's, 464, or 7 per cent. The participants, thus, had an

over-all grade point average of 2.90 during this period (1, pp. 16-17).

Based on the data provided by those players, the major areas of study and their rank were as follows: (1) physical education, sixty players; (2) economics, twenty players; (3) government, fourteen players; (4) industrial arts, thirteen players; (5) history, twelve players; (6) business administration, nine players; (7) education, biology, and mathematics, three players each; (8) chemistry and English, one player each (1, p. 19).

Sixty-nine per cent of the football participants did not receive a degree. At this time, it was found that 41 per cent of the football players belonged to college clubs; most of the players were seventeen years old (1, pp. 21, 45-46).

The grades earned by the football participants in Brown's study lead one to wonder why so many failed to obtain a degree since their academic status appeared favorable for doing so. The conditions of the war-time economy at this time probably were influential factors. However, the primary thing to be noted is that their academic standing seems to have been within the college's acceptable limits. This study tends, therefore, to support the positive viewpoint with respect to intercollegiate football participation.

In 1962, a study was conducted by Kirchner (5) covering a five-year period, 1955 to 1960; the purpose of the study was to determine the effect that participation in athletics

at Central Michigan University had on the academic success of the participants. The study involved non-transfer varsity athletes compared with non-transfer non-athletes. The sports involved in the study consisted of football, basketball, track, cross-country, gymnastics, swimming, golf, tennis, and wrestling.

Football athletes at Central Michigan University had a grade point average of 2.16 and a median of 2.19 and were ranked next to the lowest in the ten sports studied. A comparison of mean grade point ratios of football participants and non-athletes showed no statistically significant difference between the groups; in fact, the means were almost the same. Thus, Kirchner did not find athletic participation to be detrimental to the athlete's academic success. However, he did find that pressure sports (football and basketball) did not encourage good scholarship. The scholastic aptitude of the football players proved to be relatively low, whereas participation in non-pressure sports tended to encourage good scholarship. Kirchner also found that freshman participants did not appear to be affected adversely by their athletic participation (5, pp. 35, 43, 55, 61).

Kirchner's study receives support from a study by Stecklein and Dameron (8) conducted in 1965, using varsity athletes at the University of Minnesota. They concluded from their data that athletes' progress toward a degree is

as good as that of non-athletes. This conclusion was based on the following findings; (1) a higher proportion of the athletes earned degrees in a shorter period of time; (2) athletes carried more credit hours during semesters; (3) their grade point averages were slightly higher than non-athletes; (4) academic probation was no more a problem for them than for the non-athletes; and (5) athletes were not suspended as often as non-athletes (4, pp. 26-28).

The scholastic performance of three groups of male students at Wisconsin State College at La Crosse was compared and analyzed by Steuck (9) in 1963. The three categories were (1) athlete group, (2) athletic participant group, and (3) non-athletic group. Ten intercollegiate sports were studied and ranked according to the scholastic performance of the athletes and athletic participants. The sports studied were basketball, golf, tennis, cross-country, gymnastics, track, wrestling, swimming, baseball, and football. The study involved a comparison and analysis of the scholastic performance of athletes, athletic participants, and non-athletes using the factors of personal data, pre-college data, and college data. This information was also used to determine whether differences existed in the profiles of these groups.

When the athlete group and the athletic participant group were combined, there was no difference between the grade point averages of this group and the non-athletic

group; however, there was a slight difference between the grade point average of football participants and the non-athletic group, 2.1 to 2.3, respectively. A slight difference also occurred between the athlete group and the athletic participant group, 2.3 to 2.0, respectively. Furthermore, football players had the lowest grade point average among the ten sports studied (9, pp. iv-vii).

The findings with respect to the profiles of the three groups show that "the percentages and percentile scores differ less than .27 at their greatest spread on all measures for all groups" (9, p. 63).

In view of the slight differences found by Steuch, one should hesitate to make any rash statements concerning the detrimental effects of participating in intercollegiate sports.

Other findings reported by Steuch were (1) that the average age of the athletes was twenty-one years, (2) that one-half of the athletes and athletic participants held part-time jobs, (3) that over one-half of the athletes and athletic participants had been placed on probationary status at some time, (4) that fifteen of the athletes and athletic participants had been suspended from the college, and (5) that athletes participated more in campus organizations and held more offices than either athletic participants or non-athletes (9, pp. 63-68).

Smith (7) was concerned with determining the effect that participation in intercollegiate football at Kent State University had upon academic performance. He investigated accumulative grade point averages of varsity football players and of their non-athletic peers, as well as the number of hours accumulated, since matriculation, between the two groups.

The findings were that varsity football players differed significantly from their non-athlete peers in only the out-of-season grade point average--that "varsity football players had significantly higher out-of-season grade point averages than their non-athlete peers." However, this was not the case with freshman players. No significant differences occurred with respect to "accumulative grade point averages, hours accumulated since matriculation, study habits and attitudes, summer school attendance, and in-season grade point averages" (7, p. 58). Smith concluded that intercollegiate football participation was not detrimental to academic progress over an extended period of time, but that participation appears to have a slightly adverse effect upon scholastic achievement at the immediate time; however, this effect is compensated for during the off-season by the increased academic achievement of the players (7, p. 61).

An attempt was made by Earl (2) to determine whether there were any significant relationships between the academic

achievement of college athletes and non-athletes among four ethnic groups. He found that when the ethnic groups were combined, there was no significant difference in the academic achievement of successful athletes (those who had lettered or would letter) and the academic achievement of non-athletes. On the other hand, when each ethnic group was analyzed separately, significant differences did occur. Among the Anglos, the non-athletes achieved a significantly higher academic level than that of the athletes. This was also true among Negro and Spanish American ethnic groups. The Indian athletes were the only ones to achieve at the same level as their non-athlete ethnic counterparts. It was thought that this similarity may have been a result of the small size of the group. Earl also found that "there was a significant difference in the academic achievement of successful athletes in the four ethnic groups." The data results may have been produced as the ethnic groups were of unequal numbers (2, 67-70, 73-74).

This study dealt with only those athletes who had lettered or would letter, and, thus, all the athletes were not included in the analysis. It seems that an individual, even though he may have failed to letter, still should be considered a participant if he has spent time in practice and the study of plays. The selectivity used in this study certainly reduces its accuracy and reliability.

Hilyer (4) was interested in defining clearly the academic status of college football players as well as in comparing their academic status with that of other students in their respective universities. His study differs from other studies since he compared football athletes enrolled in several universities rather than comparing athletes within a single college or university. The study covered the five-year period from 1962 to 1967.

The results of Hilyer's analysis of the data show no statistically significant difference between the mean score of cumulative grade point averages of football players and that of non-football participants. Neither is there any statistically significant difference between the percentage of football players who earned a bachelor's degree and that of non-football participants. No statistically significant difference exists between the percentage of football players enrolled in each major area of study and that of non-football participants. There was also no statistically significant difference between the percentage of football players who were placed on academic probation and that of non-football participants. In addition, there was no statistically significant difference between the percentage of football players classified as academic failures and that of non-football participants (4, pp. 14-17).

In reviewing the academic records of a group of junior-college transfer football participants at North Texas State

University, Ness found the following:

Originally, each football transfer was unable to enroll in a four year college as a freshman because he could not meet entrance requirements. . . . During his first three or four semesters in junior college, the athlete makes very little progress reducing his academic skill deficiencies. The low vocabulary, reading rates and comprehension . . . in high school change little even though he accrues minimal credit hours and grade points necessary for transfer to a four year college (6).

Ness goes on to say, "Athletes who are poor readers are able to pass enough credit hours for enough grade points to gain NCAA eligibility," but that unless academic skill deficiencies (reading, vocabulary, and study skills) are improved, they will be unable to meet the requirements for enrolling in advanced courses and will not be graduated (6).

Ness proposes further remedies for academic deficiencies:

Through regular class attendance, amiable relationships to instructors, and effort, the poorly reading athlete can pass sufficient courses to satisfy eligibility requirements through his final year of athletic participation. Usually, he is no nearer actual graduation than when he entered NTSU. His consolations are "x" number of hours of college credit, the experience of playing college football, and, in extremely rare cases, a chance to play professional football (6).

Gee was also involved in the above investigation, and he found, after meeting with a group of the students and reviewing their scores on vocabulary and reading comprehension, that a majority of the boys labored under severe reading handicaps (3).

In summary, the studies point to differences among colleges and universities concerning athletic participation

and academic achievement. These differences point to the need for each college and university to conduct a self-study to ascertain the relation of athletic participation and academic achievement. In addition, these studies show that several areas have not been investigated. Such areas are (1) comparisons of the grade point averages of playing and non-playing semesters for each student classification category; (2) comparisons of the grade point averages of junior-college transfer football participants with non-transfer football participants; (3) the racial factor in academic probation and suspension; (4) the racial composition of football teams; (5) the time used to obtain a degree; (6) the number or percentage who get an opportunity to play pro-football; (7) the dropout percentage of freshman football participants; (8) comparisons of the grade point average of academic courses with non-academic courses; (9) the distribution of course curriculum among football participants; and (10) more complete profiles of the players at an institution. Consequently, this study is designed to illuminate some of the above mentioned areas, as well as other areas, with respect to football participants at North Texas State University.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brown, Elmer Arthur, "Personal Study and Comparative Analysis of the Track Men and the Football Men at North Texas State Teachers College for the Period of Ten Years (1930-1940)," unpublished master's thesis, Department of Health and Physical Education, North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas, 1949.
2. Earl, C. D., "The Academic Achievement of College Athletes and Non-Athletes From Four Ethnic Groups," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968.
3. Gee, Thomas, letter, Department of Education, North Texas State University, 1970.
4. Hilyer, James Carson, "An Analysis of the Academic Status of Southeastern Conference Football Players," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi, 1968.
5. Kirchner, R. J., "Participation in Athletics and Its Effect on Academic Success at Central Michigan University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.
6. Ness, Gary, memorandum, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1970.
7. Smith, E. B., "Academic Achievement and Athletic Participation" unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 1965.
8. Stecklein, John E. and Logan Dameron, Intercollegiate Athletics and Academic Progress: A Comparison of Academic Characteristics of Athletes and Non-Athletes at the University of Minnesota, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, Report Series No. 3, 1965, cited in James Carson Hilyer, "An Analysis of the Academic Status of Southeastern Conference Football Players," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi, 1968.

9. Steuck, E. H., "A Comparison of the Scholastic Performance of Athletes and Athletic Participants with Non-Athletes at Wisconsin State College at La Crosse," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1963.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### Description of Subjects

The subjects involved in this study consist of 259 intercollegiate football participants enrolled at North Texas State University between the 1966 and 1971 academic years. The descriptive analysis is based on 234 of the football participants. The profile analysis is based on twenty-five freshmen participants enrolled during the 1971 Fall Semester and another fifty-six subjects who had been and were still enrolled at this university. Thus, the profile analysis is comprised of eighty-one intercollegiate football participants.

#### Procedures for Collecting Data

The Public Information Office at North Texas State University provided football brochures for the years 1966 to 1971. From these, the names of the team members for each year were obtained. Coaches in the Athletic Department then reviewed the list of names to indicate those who were actual participants. Any individual who did not complete the season as a participant for any reason was omitted from the list. In addition, the coaches provided the following information on each participant: scholarship status, marital status, number of years the participant had engaged in intercollegiate

football activities, which included both senior and junior college participation. Fred Graham, of the Public Information Office, provided information regarding the race of each player. The Office of the Registrar provided transcripts on each of the football participants, with the exception of the 1971 freshman participants who are not included in the descriptive analysis.

A questionnaire was designed and administered to the football participants at the end of the football season to determine a current profile of the intercollegiate football participants at this university. The questionnaire was administered to eighty-one participants, and they were assured that their responses were confidential before they were presented with the questionnaires. There was no mark of identification on any of the questionnaires. The subjects were urged to answer all questions and to answer them as truthfully as possible. The participants were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was for use as part of a study to provide administrators and others with a better insight into the lives of football players at this university.

#### Procedures for Analyzing Data

The mean score is used to describe the central tendency of distributions, and the median score is used to describe the location of the middle portion of a distribution. Percentages are used to describe the proportions within categories.

Whether a significant difference occurs between mean scores and between median scores should be viewed on the basis of a grade point average of 2.00, since this is the minimal grade point average acceptable for the awarding of a degree. This median is considered, therefore, to be more important than a statistically significant difference between scores. Both physical and mechanical tabulations were used in the evaluation of data.

Answers for questions posed in the study are determined by the following ways:

Questions One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven, and Twelve concerning the academic status with respect to grade point averages of athletes from 1966 to 1970 are analyzed by using the mean and median scores in the descriptive analysis.

Questions Thirteen, Fourteen, Fifteen, Sixteen, Seventeen, and Eighteen, which are concerned with academic probation and academic suspension, are analyzed by the use of percentages within the various categories.

Questions One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven, Eight, Nine, Ten, Eleven, and Twelve, relating to racial composition, awarding of degrees, and participation in pro-football, are analyzed by the use of percentages within the categories.

Questions One, Two, and Three concerning freshman football participants, are also analyzed by the use of percentages.

Questions One, Two, and Three dealing with the academic status (grade point average) of junior-college transfer players in contrast to non-transfer players are analyzed by use of the mean and median grade point averages for each group.

The profile analysis is based upon percentages. It consists of using the alternative that received the highest percentage of responses for each of the questions on the questionnaire and then consolidating these alternatives to form a profile of the typical player enrolled at North Texas State University during the 1971 Fall Semester.

Additional data presented in the study show either the means of categories or the percentages within categories. Tables LXX, LXXI, LXXII, LXXIII, LXXIV, LXXV, LXXVI, and LXXVII utilize the mean grade point in analyses. Tables LXXVIII and LXXIX utilize percentages in analyses.

#### Description of the Measuring Instrument

A self-report questionnaire was designed to determine a profile of currently-enrolled football participants at this university. A copy of the instrument is presented in the appendix of this study. It is a thirty-six item structured questionnaire. The profile, or the typical player, is based upon the alternative in each question that received the

highest percentage of responses and then these alternatives are consolidated into a composite.

The questionnaire required fifteen to twenty minutes for its administration.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data accumulated on the basis of the questions and procedures described in Chapters I and III were analyzed statistically utilizing three statistical techniques: mean, median, and percentage.

The following tables are used to describe the academic status of intercollegiate football athletes at North Texas State University from 1966 to 1970. Eighteen questions comprise this area.

Question One concerns whether a difference occurs in the grade point average of freshman intercollegiate football

TABLE I

GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF FRESHMAN INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR PLAYING AND NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Semester	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	E 3.84-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Playing Semester (N=138)	5.80%	38.41%	49.28%	6.52%	1.91	1.93
Number	(8)	(53)	(68)	(9)	.....	.....
Non-Playing Semester (N=125)	7.20%	40.00%	45.60%	7.20%	1.93	1.95
Number	(9)	(50)	(57)	(9)	.....	.....

participants during their playing and non-playing semesters. Table I presents the results.

Little difference is shown between the grade point mean (1.91) and median (1.93) of the playing semester and the grade point mean (1.93) and median (1.95) of the non-playing semester. Even the percentages of players in the grade point categories are very similar, with the greatest difference occurring in category D. There is a 3.68 per cent decrease in category D during the non-playing semester from the playing semester.

Question Two concerns whether a difference occurs in the grade point average of sophomore intercollegiate football participants during playing and non-playing semesters. The results are shown in Table II.

TABLE II

GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF SOPHOMORE INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR PLAYING AND NON-PLAYING  
SEMESTERS

Semester	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	E 3.48-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Playing Semester (N=111)	3.60%	28.83%	48.65%	18.92%	1.67	1.71
Number	(4)	(32)	(54)	(21)	.....	.....
Non-Playing Semester (N=115)	4.35%	44.35%	48.69%	2.61%	1.93	1.95
Number	(5)	(51)	(56)	(3)	.....	.....

Sophomore football participants have a higher grade point mean (1.93) and median (1.95) during the non-playing semester than during the playing semester. The mean and median differences between semesters are .26 and .24, respectively. The greatest percentage of change occurs within the grade point categories of C and F. A much higher percentage occurs within category C during the non-playing semester, and a much lower percentage occurs in category F.

Question Three refers to any differences between the grade point means and medians of junior intercollegiate football participants during playing and non-playing semesters. The results are shown in Table III.

TABLE III  
GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF JUNIOR INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR PLAYING AND  
NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Semester	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.44-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Playing Semester (N=102)	7.84%	48.04%	36.28%	7.84%	1.98	2.06
Number	(8)	(49)	(37)	(8)	.....	.....
Non-Playing Semester (N=73)	5.48%	67.12%	23.29%	4.11%	2.21	2.30
Number	(4)	(49)	(17)	(3)	.....	.....

A noticeable difference exists between the grade point mean and median of junior football participants during their non-playing and their playing semesters. A grade point mean of 1.98 and a median grade point of 2.06 exist during the participants' playing semester, whereas a mean of 2.21 and a median of 2.30 exist during non-playing semester. The grade point category C shows a 19 per cent increase, while the other categories show decreases, with category D having the greatest per cent of decrease (16 per cent).

Question Four pertains to differences between the grade point means and medians of senior intercollegiate football participants during playing and non-playing semesters. Table IV shows the results.

TABLE IV

GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF SENIOR INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR PLAYING AND  
NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Semester	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	E 3.80-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Playing Semester (N=68)	16.18%	44.12%	25.00%	14.70%	1.99	2.15
Number	(11)	(30)	(17)	(10)	.....	.....
Non-Playing Semester (N=37)	18.92%	48.65%	24.32%	8.11%	2.18	2.41
Number	(7)	(18)	(9)	(3)	.....	.....

The mean and median grade points are higher for the non-playing semester than for the playing semester of senior football participants. During the non-playing semester, a percentage increase exists in categories B and C and a decrease in categories D and F. However, changes in percentages are rather small, the largest changes being 6.59 per cent in category F and 4.43 per cent in category C.

Question Five pertains to whether a difference occurs between the grade point means and medians of first-string varsity intercollegiate football players and that of other varsity members during playing semesters. Table V presents data on this question.

TABLE V  
PLAYING SEMESTER GRADE POINTS COMPARED BETWEEN FIRST-STRING VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PLAYERS AND OTHER VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL MEMBERS

Category	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.32-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
First-String Varsity Players (N=71)	1.41%	50.70%	47.89%	. . .	2.07	2.07
Number	(1)	(36)	(34)	. . .	. .	. .
Other Varsity Members (N=163)	1.84%	48.47%	45.40%	4.29%	1.98	2.00
Number	(3)	(79)	(74)	(7)	. .	. .

Table V shows a slight increase for the first-string varsity players in both the mean and median, but both groups are very similar in means and medians, as well as in percentages in each grade point category. An exception to this similarity is that there are no first-string players within category F, whereas 4.29 per cent of the other varsity members are within this category.

Question Six concerns whether a difference occurs between the grade point average of white and non-white football participants during the playing semester. Results are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

THE MEAN AND MEDIAN GRADE POINTS OF WHITE AND NON-WHITE INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR PLAYING SEMESTERS

Race	Number of Semesters in which Participants were Enrolled	Mean GPA	Median GPA
Whites	310	1.99	2.03
Non-Whites	109	1.56	1.62

The white participants show a noticeably higher grade point mean and median than that of the non-white participants. Almost one-half a grade point separates the two groups. Whereas the whites are borderline C students, the non-whites have an academic level of D.

Question Seven considers whether a difference exists between white and non-white football participants with respect

to grade point averages during the non-playing semester. Data is presented in Table VII. Both whites and non-whites show improvements in their mean and median grade points during the non-playing semesters. The mean and median grade points are noticeably higher for whites than for non-whites.

TABLE VII

THE MEAN AND MEDIAN GRADE POINTS OF WHITE AND NON-WHITE INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR THE NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Race	Number of Semesters in which Participants were Enrolled	Mean GPA	Median GPA
Whites	260	2.07	2.14
Non-Whites	90	1.85	1.84

Although non-whites have improved their mean and median grade points, these are still within category D. Non-whites do show the greatest amount of improvement.

Wuestion Eight pertains to whether a difference occurs between the cumulative grade point averages of white and non-white football participants. Data is presented in Tabel VIII.

Table VIII shows that white participants have a higher grade point average than non-whites. This is also applicable with the median grade point. There are white participants in all four grade point categories, with the greatest percentage, 55.17, in category C. The non-whites, on the other hand, are

TABLE VIII

THE CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF WHITE AND  
NON-WHITE INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Race	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.64-3.100	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
White Players (N-174)	2.30%	55.17%	38.51%	4.02%	2.05	2.10
Number	(4)	(96)	(67)	(7)	..	..
Non-White Players (N-60)	.. .	31.67%	68.33%	.. .	1.88	1.86
Number	.. .	(19)	(41)	.. .	..	..
Total Per Cent	1.71%	49.15%	46.15%	2.99%	2.01	2.01
Total Number (N-234)	(4)	(115)	(108)	(7)	..	..

in either category C or D, with the greatest percentage, 68.33, in category D.

Question Nine refers to whether there is a difference between the grade point averages of single and married football participants during playing semesters. Data for this question is supplied in Table IX.

The grade point mean and median are only slightly higher for single players than that for married players. A slight difference can be observed in the grade point averages between single and married players during the playing semesters.

TABLE IX

THE GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE AND MARRIED  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS DURING  
PLAYING SEMESTERS

Marital Status	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.80-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Single Players (N-373)*	7.51%	39.68%	42.09%	10.72%	1.89	1.94
Number	(28)	(148)	(157)	(40)	..	..
Married Players (N-36)*	2.78%	38.89%	44.44%	13.89%	1.85	1.88
Number	(1)	(14)	(16)	(5)	..	..

\*Denotes the number of semesters the participants were enrolled.

TABLE X

THE GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE AND MARRIED  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR THE  
NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Marital Status	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.84-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Single Players (N-310)*	6.45%	48.71%	39.68%	5.16%	2.01	2.07
Number	(20)	(151)	(123)	(16)	..	..
Married Players (N-35)*	8.57%	45.72%	37.14%	8.57%	1.95	2.06
Number	(3)	(16)	(13)	(3)	..	..

\*Denotes the number of semesters the participants were enrolled.

Question Ten pertains to whether a difference occurs between the grade point averages of single and married football participants during the non-playing semester. Results are shown in Table X.

Table X shows the two groups to be very similar. However, a slightly higher grade point mean, 2.01, exists among single participants than that which exists among married participants.

Question Eleven considers whether a difference occurs between the cumulative grade point averages of single and married football participants. Table XI presents the results.

TABLE XI

THE CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE AND MARRIED INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Marital Status	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.64-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Single Players (N=212)	1.89%	49.53%	45.28%	3.30%	2.00	2.01
Number	(4)	(105)	(96)	(7)	..	..
Married Players (N=13)	..	30.77%	69.23%	..	1.90	1.96
Number	..	(4)	(9)	..	..	..

The cumulative grade point mean and median are slightly higher for single participants than for married participants.

Most (69.23 per cent) married participants have grade point averages falling in category D. However, there are no married participants in category F, and neither do any fall in category B. There is a slight tendency for single participants to be C students, and a strong tendency for married participants to be D students.

Question Twelve concerns whether a difference occurs during the playing semester between the grade point averages of intercollegiate football participants on football scholarships and those participants not on a football scholarship. Table XII presents data on this question.

TABLE XII

PLAYING SEMESTER GRADE POINT DISTRIBUTION OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WITH A FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP AND THOSE WITH NO FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship Status	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.64-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
On Scholarship (N=215)	1.40%	48.84%	47.44%	2.33%	2.00	2.00
Number	(3)	(105)	(102)	(5)	..	..
Not on Scholarship (N=19)	5.26%	52.63%	31.58%	10.53%	2.08	2.21
Number	(1)	(10)	(6)	(2)	..	..

Football participants without football scholarships have higher academic records than do those participants with

scholarships. Participants without football scholarships have a grade point mean of 2.08 and a median of 2.21, whereas those participants with scholarships have a mean and a median of 2.00.

Questions Thirteen, Fourteen, and Fifteen pertain to the percentage of intercollegiate football participants placed on academic probation and the racial composition of those participants placed on academic probation. Data on these questions are shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII  
ACADEMIC PROBATIONAL STATUS OF WHITE AND NON-WHITE  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Category	Number Placed on Probation	Per Cent
White Players (N=174)	15	8.62
Non-White Players (N=60)	22	36.67
Total Players (N=234)	37	15.81

Table XIII shows that academic probation affected 15.81 per cent of the football participants and that a large percentage difference exists between the white and non-white participants. Fifteen, or 8.62 per cent, of the white players were placed on academic probation compared with twenty-two, or 36.67 per cent, of the non-white players.

Questions Sixteen, Seventeen, and Eighteen pertain to the percentage of players placed on academic suspension and

the racial composition of this group. Table XIV presents the results.

TABLE XIV

THE ACADEMIC SUSPENSORY STATUS OF WHITE AND NON-WHITE  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Category	Number Suspended	Per Cent
White Player (N=174)	36	20.69
Non-White Players (N=60)	22	36.67
Total Players (N=234)	58	24.79

It is shown that the number placed on academic suspension among the 234 football participants was 24.79 per cent and that it affected fifty-eight participants. Among the 174 white participants, 20.69 per cent, or 36 players, were suspended. Among the non-whites, 36.67 per cent, or 22 participants out of a total of 60 participants, were suspended.

The following tables present data for twelve questions pertaining to racial composition, awarding of degrees, and participation in pro-football.

Question One refers to the proportion of whites and non-whites on the football rosters from 1966 to 1971. Table XV contains this information.

Table XV reveals that the percentage of white football participants gradually declined from a high of 83.33 per cent

TABLE XV

THE COMBINED RACIAL COMPOSITION OF FRESHMAN AND  
 VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL  
 PARTICIPANTS FROM 1966-1971

Race	1966 (N=66)	1967 (N=84)	1968 (N=84)	1969 (N=82)	1970 (N=85)	1971 (N=82)
White Players	83.33%	78.57%	72.62%	69.51%	67.06%	73.17%
Number	(55)	(66)	(61)	(57)	(57)	(60)
Non-White Players	16.67%	22.43%	27.38%	30.49%	32.94%	26.83%
Number	(11)	(18)	(23)	(25)	(28)	(22)

in 1966 to a low of 67.06 per cent in 1970, but in 1971 this trend was reversed, and an increase to 73.17 per cent is shown. Thus, non-whites composed a low of 16.67 per cent in 1966 and a high of 32.94 per cent in 1970, but this percentage declined to 26.83 per cent in 1971.

TABLE XVI

THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE FIRST-STRING VARSITY  
 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FROM  
 1966-1971

Race	1966 (N=22)	1967 (N=22)	1968 (N=25)	1969 (N=25)	1970 (N=22)	1971 (N=22)
White Players	68.18%	68.18%	56.00%	56.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Number	(15)	(15)	(14)	(14)	(11)	(11)
Non-White Players	31.82%	31.82%	44.00%	44.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Number	(7)	(7)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)

Question Two concerns the proportion of whites and non-whites on the first-string varsity team. Data on this question are shown in Table XVI.

The per cent of white players on the first-string varsity team has declined from 68.18 per cent in 1966 to 50.00 per cent in 1970 and 1971. The number of non-whites have increased from 31.82 per cent in 1966 to 50.00 per cent in 1970 and 1971.

Question Three pertains to the proportion of scholarships awarded to the white and non-white football participants. Table XVII presents this information.

TABLE XVII

PER CENT OF WHITES AND NON-WHITES RECEIVING FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIPS BETWEEN 1966 AND 1970

Category	Scholarship	No Scholarship
Whites (N=174)	90.23%	9.77%
Number	(157)	(17)
Non-Whites (N=60)	96.67%	3.33%
Number	(58)	(2)
Total Per Cent (N=234)	91.88%	8.12%
Total Number	(215)	(19)

Table XVII discloses that among non-white participants, 96.67 per cent were awarded football scholarships. On the other hand, 90.23 per cent of the white football participants

were awarded football scholarships. Thus, the non-white participants have a slight edge in the percentages of the two groups receiving scholarships. It should also be noted that 91.88 per cent of all football participants were awarded scholarships.

Questions Four, Five, Six, Seven, Eight, and Nine relate to the number of years taken by intercollegiate football participants between the 1966 Fall Semester and the 1971 Fall Semester to obtain a college degree and the racial composition of the group receiving degrees. The results are presented in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

THE YEARS INVOLVED IN OBTAINING A DEGREE AMONG  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
FROM 1966-1971

Race	Four Years	Four Years But Less Than Five Years	Five Years	Five Years But Less Than Six Years	Total
White Players (N=40)	7.50%	37.50%	12.50%	42.50%	100%
Number	(3)	(15)	(5)	(17)	(40)
Non-White Players (N=4)	. . . .	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	100%
Number	. . . .	(2)	(1)	(1)	(4)
Total Per Cent	6.82%	38.64%	13.64%	40.91%	100%
Total Number (N=234)	(3)	(17)	(6)	(18)	(44)

Forty-four intercollegiate football participants were awarded degrees between the 1966 Fall Semester and the end of the 1971 Fall Semester. Those receiving a degree in four years constitute 6.82 per cent of the total participants, or 7.50 per cent among white players. There were none among non-white players.

Participants taking four years, but less than five years, to obtain a degree consisted of 37.50 per cent of the whites and 50.00 per cent of the non-whites. The combined percentages of degrees awarded within this time period was 38.64 per cent. Twelve and one-half per cent of the whites took five years to receive a degree, and 25.00 per cent of the non-whites required the same amount of time. The combined percentage of those taking five years to earn a degree was 13.64.

Football participants spending five years, but less than six years, to obtain a degree were as follows: whites, 42.50 per cent and non-whites, 25.00 per cent; the combined percentage is 40.91.

There were no football participants who remained in college six years or longer and obtained a degree.

Questions Ten, Eleven, and Twelve pertain to the percentage of football participants who have participated in pro-football, the percentage who have participated but did not earn a degree, and the racial composition of those who have participated in pro-football. Table XIX presents the results.

TABLE XIX

THE RACIAL COMPOSITION AND DEGREE STATUS OF THOSE  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS TENDERED  
A PRO-FOOTBALL CONTRACT

Race	Tendered A Pro-Foot- ball Contract	Racial Percentage of Contracts (N=30)	Degree Holder (N=30)	Non-Degree Holder (N=30)
White Players (N=174)	8.05%	46.67%	6.67%	40.00%
Number	(14)	(14)	(2)	(12)
Non-White Players (N=60)	26.67%	53.33%	. . .	53.33%
Number	(16)	(16)	. . .	(16)
Total Per Cent	12.82%	100.00%	6.67%	93.33%
Total Number (N=234)	(30)	(30)	(2)	(28)

From the 1966 Fall Semester through the pro-football spring draft of 1971, there were thirty football players offered pro-football contracts. This is 12.82 per cent of the football participants (234) during this period.

A great difference occurs when considering the degree factor among players offered pro-football contracts. Only two, or 6.67 per cent, of those players offered a contract are degree holders, and both players are white. By the end of the 1971 Fall Semester, none of the other twenty-eight players had completed the requirements for a degree.

When percentage is based upon the number of players in each racial group, the non-whites have a much higher percentage.

The non-whites show a percentage of 26.67, compared with 8.05 per cent for whites. However, when looking at the group offered contracts, there is little difference in the racial composition. Non-whites were offered 53.33 per cent of the pro-football contracts, compared with 46.67 per cent for the whites.

The following tables pertain to three questions concerning freshman football participants. Questions One, Two, and Three refer to the percentage of freshman participants who continue their academic studies. It also refers to the extent that they participate in intercollegiate football until their eligibility expires. Table XX presents this information.

TABLE XX

THE CONTINUATION OF ACADEMIC STUDY AND FOOTBALL PARTICIPATION AMONG FRESHMAN INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FROM 1966-1970

Category	Received A Degree*	Still In School	Football Dropouts**	College Dropouts	Years of Play			
					1	2	3	4
Participants (N=119)	5.88%	37.81%	15.97%	56.30%	45.38%	30.25%	9.24%	15.13%
Number	(7)	(45)	(19)	(67)	(54)	(36)	(11)	(18)

\*Three were also football dropouts

\*\*Nine, or 47.37 per cent, of these became college dropouts.

Table XX shows that only 15.13 per cent of the freshman intercollegiate football participants continue to play football

until their eligibility expires. The data show that 45.38 per cent of the participants drop out of football participation by the end of the first year of play and 30.25 per cent by the end of the second year of play. Thus, 75.63 per cent of the freshman intercollegiate football participants discontinue playing football by the end of their second year of play.

Football dropouts account for 15.97 per cent of the freshman participants. However, 56.30 per cent of the freshman participants become college dropouts.

During the period from 1966 to 1971, 52.63 per cent of the football dropouts continued their academic study at this university, and three of the nineteen dropouts received a degree.

The following tables apply to three questions on the academic status of junior-college transfer football participants. A contrast is then made with non-transfer football participants.

Question One pertains to the beginning academic status of junior-college transfer football participants. Table XXI contains this information.

A very small per cent (6.49) of the junior-college transfer participants enter this university with a grade point average of B. Most junior-college transfer football participants (70.13 per cent) enter with a C average. The grade point mean is 2.24, and the median grade point is 2.17.

TABLE XXI  
 GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF JUNIOR-COLLEGE TRANSFER  
 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
 FROM 1966-1970

Category	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.28-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Junior College GPA (N=77)	6.49%	70.13%	23.38%	. . .	2.24	2.17
Number	(5)	(54)	(18)	. . .	. .	. .
First Year GPA at NTSU (N=77)*	. . .	36.36%	58.44%	5.19%	1.82	1.82
Number	. . .	(28)	(45)	(4)	. .	. .
Second Year GPA at NTSU (N=56)	1.79%	41.07%	55.36%	1.79%	1.96	1.91
Number	(1)	(23)	(31)	(1)	. .	. .

\*By the 1971 Fall semester, thirty-six had become college dropouts and eight had dropped out of football.

Question Two concerns a comparison of the cumulative grade point average at this university of first-year junior-college transfer intercollegiate football participants and the cumulative grade point average of non-transfer intercollegiate football participants who have participated in football one year beyond the freshman level. The results are shown in Table XXII.

The grade point mean of 2.02 for non-transfer football participants is .20 higher than the grade point mean of

TABLE XXII

THE CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE AT NORTH TEXAS STATE  
UNIVERSITY OF FIRST YEAR JUNIOR-COLLEGE TRANSFER  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS COMPARED  
WITH THE CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF  
SIMILAR NON-TRANSFER FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Category	Mean GPA	Median GPA
Transfer Players (N=77)	1.82	1.82
Non-Transfer Players (N=91)*	2.02	1.91

\*Only those players were selected who had participated other than their freshman year.

1.82 for transfer participants. Although the median grade points for the two groups are more similar than their means, the non-transfer group still has a higher median grade point.

Question Three pertains to a comparison of the cumulative grade point average at this university by second year junior college transfer intercollegiate football participants with the cumulative grade point average of non-transfer football participants who have participated in football two years beyond the freshman level. Table XXIII presents the results.

It is shown in Table XXIII that non-transfer football participants have a higher grade point mean and median than do transfer participants. Although the grade point mean of 2.08 for non-transfer participants is slightly higher than the mean of 1.96 for transfer participants, the median grade points, 1.91 and 1.94, of the two groups are very similar.

TABLE XXIII

THE CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE AT THIS UNIVERSITY BY  
SECOND YEAR JUNIOR-COLLEGE TRANSFER INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH THE  
CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF  
SIMILAR NON-TRANSFER FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS

Category	Mean GPA	Median GPA
Transfer Players (N=56)	1.96	1.91
Non-Transfer Players (N=47)	2.08	1.94

The medians of the two groups, thus, indicate that at least half the members of each group fall within the grade point category D.

The following tables are used in describing a current profile of 1971 intercollegiate football athletes at this university. The thirty-six following questions pertain to this profile.

TABLE XXIV

STUDENT CLASSIFICATIONS AND RACIAL COMPOSITION AMONG  
1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Category	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total
White Players	24.69%	17.28%	19.75%	8.64%	70.37%
Number	(20)	(14)	(16)	(7)	(57)
Non-White Players*	6.17%	3.70%	12.35%	7.41%	29.63%
Number	(5)	(3)	(10)	(6)	(24)
Total Per Cent	30.86%	20.99%	32.10%	16.05%	100.00%
Total Number	(25)	(17)	(26)	(13)	(81)

\*All Blacks

Questions One and Six pertain to student classification and racial composition of the athletes. The results are shown in Table XXIV. Student classifications among white football participants consisted of the following: freshmen, 24.69 per cent; sophomores, 17.28 per cent; juniors, 19.75 per cent; and seniors, 8.64 per cent. Among non-white participants, the classifications were as follows: freshmen, 6.17 per cent; sophomores, 3.70 per cent; juniors, 12.35 per cent; and seniors, 7.41 per cent. The overall student classificatory composition of the participants was as follows: freshmen, 30.86 per cent; sophomores, 20.99 per cent; juniors, 32.10 per cent; and seniors, 16.05 per cent. The racial composition of the football participants consisted of 70.37 per cent whites and 29.63 per cent non-whites.

Question Two refers to the major areas of studies among the football participants. The major areas of specialization were reported in the following proportions: physical education, 40.74 per cent; business administration, 25.93 per cent; biology, 5 per cent; recreation, 3.70 per cent; industrial arts, 3.70 per cent; political science, physics, mathematics, sociology, psychology, history, and education, 1.23 per cent for each of these areas.

Only forty-five athletes reported a minor area of study. Biology and physical education were the most prominent areas, and the proportion of participants in these areas were 20.99 and 9.88 per cent, respectively. Table XXV presents the above information.

TABLE XXV  
AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION AMONG THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Major	Number	Per Cent	Minor	Number	Per Cent
Physical Education	33	40.74	Biology	17	20.99
Business	21	25.93	Physical Education	8	9.88
Biology	5	6.17	Chemistry	4	4.94
Recreation	3	3.70	Education	3	3.70
Industrial Arts	3	3.70	English	2	2.47
Political Science	1	1.23	Sociology	2	2.47
Physics	1	1.23	Mathematics	2	2.47
Mathematics	1	1.23	Business	1	1.23
Sociology	1	1.23	Recreation	1	1.23
Psychology	1	1.23	History	1	1.23
History	1	1.23	Industrial Arts	1	1.23
Education	1	1.23	Geography	1	1.23
Not Reporting	9	11.11	Political Science	1	1.23
			Speech	1	1.23
			Not Reporting	36	44.44
Total Number	81	. . .	Total Number	81	. . .

Question Three concerns the average age of the football participants. Results are shown in Table XXVI. The mean age of the 1971 football participants was 19.94 years, and the

TABLE XXVI  
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	Mean	Median
Players (N=81)	38.27%	51.85%	8.64%	1.23%	19.94	20.50
Number	(31)	(42)	(7)	(1)	. . .	. . .

median age was 20.50 years. Only one player was over twenty-four years of age, and none were past the age of twenty-five.

Question Four relates to the marital status of the football participants. Table XXVII presents the results.

TABLE XXVII  
MARITAL STATUS OF THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Single	Legally Married	Living With A Girl Friend
Players (N=81)	83.95%	12.35%	3.70%
Number	(68)	(10)	(3)

Approximately 84 per cent of the participants were single, 12 per cent married, and 4 per cent living with a girl friend.

Question Five pertains to the percentage of players who possess automobiles. Results are shown in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII  
PERCENTAGE OF FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WHO  
POSSESS AUTOMOBILES

	Yes	No
Players (N=81)	72.84%	27.16%
Number	(59)	(22)

Approximately 73 per cent of the participants report the possession of an automobile.

Question Seven pertains to the economic background of the participants and is based upon subjects' estimates of their parents' yearly income. Results are presented in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX  
ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS BASED  
UPON THEIR ESTIMATE OF PARENTS' YEARLY INCOME

	Less Than \$3,000	\$3,000 to 5,999	\$6,000 to 9,999	\$10,000 to 12,999	\$13,000 to 15,999	\$16,000 or More	Mean Income	Median Income
Players (N=78)	11.54%	17.95%	17.95%	26.92%	7.69%	17.95%	9,679	10,285
Number	(9)	(14)	(14)	(21)	(6)	(14)	...	...

It appears that the mean income of parents of football participants at this university is approximately \$9,679, and the median income of the parents is approximately \$10,285. Almost

27 per cent, the highest percentage, of the participants estimate their parents' yearly income to be in the \$10,000 to \$12,999 income category.

Questions Eight and Nine pertain to the percentage of football participants with an older brother or father who participated in intercollegiate football. Table XXX shows data on these questions.

TABLE XXX

PERCENTAGE OF THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WITH AN OLDER BROTHER OR FATHER WHO PARTICIPATED IN INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL

Category	Yes	No
An Older Brother* Who Played Football (N=81)	16.05%	83.95%
Number	(13)	(68)
A Father* Who Played Football (N=80)	7.50%	92.50%
Number	(6)	(74)

\*One player had both a brother and father who played intercollegiate football.

Very few 1971 participants had an older brother or father who participated in intercollegiate football. There were only 16.05 per cent of the participants with an older brother who had participated, and only 7.50 per cent with a father who had participated in intercollegiate football.

Question Ten considers personal factors that were influential in the football participant's decision to play football. Data are presented in Table XXXI.

TABLE XXXI  
PERSONAL FACTORS INFLUENTIAL IN THE  
DECISION TO PLAY FOOTBALL

	Father (N=71)	High School Coach (N=75)	Mother (N=74)	Other Factors* (N=54)	Older Brother (N=53)	Girl Friends (N=68)
Players	85.92%	73.33%	62.16%	57.41%	39.62%	23.53%
Number	(61)	(55)	(46)	(31)	(21)	(16)

\*Players checked this category but failed to indicate what.

Players ranked the order of influence as follows: (1) father, (2) high school coach, (3) mother, (4) other factors, (5) older brother, and (6) girl friends. Several percentage points, however, separate each of the categories. Although the "other factors" were ranked, no explanations were given.

Question Eleven refers to the social factors that influenced the participants to play football. Data are shown in Table XXXII.

Players ranked the order of influence as follows: (1) a desire to play pro-football, (2) a desire to obtain a college education, (3) economic considerations, (4) an ambition to become a coach, (5) prestige, and (6) glamour.

TABLE XXXII  
SOCIAL FACTORS INFLUENTIAL IN THE DECISION  
TO PLAY FOOTBALL

	To Play Pro- Football (N=70)	To Get A College Education (N=73)	Economic Reasons (N=74)	To Be A Coach (N=69)	Prestige (N=74)	Glamour (N=72)
Players	64.29%	63.01%	60.81%	55.07%	35.14%	19.44%
Number	(45)	(46)	(45)	(38)	(26)	(14)

Question Twelve concerns the three most influential factors of the personal and social groups. Data are presented in Table XXXIII.

TABLE XXXIII  
RANK ORDER OF FACTORS MOST INFLUENTIAL IN THE  
DECISION TO PLAY FOOTBALL

Factors	Number (N=80)	Per Cent	Rank Order
Economic	34	42.50	1
Pro-Football	33	41.25	2
Education	29	36.25	3
Father	24	30.00	4
Coaching	21	26.25	5
Own Desire	18	22.50	6
High School Coach	16	20.00	7
Glamour and Prestige	13	16.25	8

TABLE XXXIII--Continued

Factors	Number (N=80)	Per Cent	Rank Order
Mother	8	10.00	9
Older Brother	6	7.50	10
Father and Mother	2	2.50	12
Friends	2	2.50	12
Relatives Outside the Conjugal Family	2	2.50	12
Wife	1	1.25	13.5
Girl Friends	1	1.25	13.5

The three most influential factors are shown to be (1) economic, 42.50 per cent; (2) pro-football, 41.25 per cent; (3) education, 36.25 per cent. However, other important influential factors are the father, 30 per cent; coaching career, 26.25 per cent; own desire, 22.50 per cent; high school coach, 20 per cent; and glamour and prestige, 16.25 per cent.

Question Thirteen refers to the percentage of participants interested in playing pro-football. Responses are shown in Table XXXIV.

The majority, 61.73 per cent, of the football participants are definitely interested in playing pro-football. Another 24.69 per cent of the participants are undecided as yet.

**TABLE XXXIV**  
**PERCENTAGE OF 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL**  
**PARTICIPANTS INTERESTED IN PLAYING**  
**PRO-FOOTBALL**

	Yes	Maybe	No
<b>Players' Interest In Pro-Football (N=81)</b>	61.73%	24.69%	13.58%
<b>Number</b>	(50)	(20)	(11)

A percentage of 13.58 of the participants are not interested in playing pro-football.

Questions Fourteen and Fifteen pertain to the percentage of football participants on scholarships and the likelihood of their continuing to play football without a scholarship. The responses are reported in Table XXXV.

**TABLE XXXV**  
**PERCENTAGE OF THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL**  
**PARTICIPANTS ON SCHOLARSHIPS**

	Yes	No	Maybe
<b>Players on Scholarship (N=81)</b>	96.30%	3.70%	. . .
<b>Number</b>	(78)	(3)	. . .
<b>Players That Would Play Football Without a Scholarship (N=81)</b>	19.75%	48.15%	32.10%
<b>Number</b>	(16)	(39)	(26)

Intercollegiate football participants on scholarships account for 96.30 per cent of the total participants. A substantial per cent, 48.15, of the participants report they would not play without a scholarship. On the other hand, 19.75 per cent of the participants indicate that they would play football without a scholarship, and 32.10 per cent are undecided.

Question Sixteen concerns the players' evaluation of the football scholarship program at this university. Evaluations are presented in Table XXXVI.

TABLE XXXVI

EVALUATION OF THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM BY 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Other
Player's Evaluation (N=81)	8.64%	41.97%	29.63%	17.82%	2.47%
Number	(7)	(34)	(24)	(14)	(2)

Approximately 51 per cent of the participants rate the football scholarship program at this university to be good or very good. However, 49 per cent of the participants consider it to be less than good.

Question Seventeen compares the player's evaluation of his high-school football ability with that of his other high-school teammates. Responses are shown in Table XXXVII.

TABLE XXXVII

**THE FOOTBALL PLAYER'S EVALUATION OF HIS HIGH-SCHOOL  
FOOTBALL ABILITY WITH THAT OF HIS  
HIGH-SCHOOL TEAMMATES**

	The Best	One of the Best	Average
Player's Evaluation (N=81)	13.58%	66.67%	19.75%
Number	(11)	(54)	(16)

Approximately 68 per cent of the participants considered themselves to be one of the best players on their high-school teams, and approximately 14 per cent thought they were the best of players. Only 20 per cent considered themselves to be just average players.

Question Eighteen is concerned with why a player chose to attend this university. Data is furnished in Table XXXVIII.

The following reasons are shown to account for 77 per cent of the responses: (1) liked the school, 21 per cent; (2) not offered a scholarship by a Southwest Conference school, 11 per cent; (3) liked the football program, 10 per cent; (4) close to home, 8 per cent; (5) low college entrance requirements, 7 per cent; (6) not offered a scholarship by another senior college, 6 per cent; (7) for economic reasons when not offered a scholarship by other senior colleges, 6 per cent; (8) liked the coaches, 4 per cent; (9) the best of choices to choose from, 4 per cent. Thus, the response "liked the school" is almost double the percentage of the next highest reason for choosing to attend this university.

TABLE XXXVIII  
 REASONS GIVEN BY THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
 FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FOR CHOOSING  
 TO ATTEND THIS UNIVERSITY

Reasons	Number (N=100)	Per Cent
Liked the school	21	21.00
Not offered a scholarship by a Southwest Conference school	11	11.00
Liked the football program	10	10.00
Close to home	8	8.00
Low entrance requirements	7	7.00
Not offered a scholarship by any senior college	6	6.00
For economic reasons when not offered a scholarship by other senior colleges	6	6.00
Liked the coaches	4	4.00
The best choice to choose from	4	4.00
Because of the business school	2	2.00
Did not want to leave Texas	2	2.00
Older brother	2	2.00
Good pro-background	2	2.00
Wanted to play with a winner	2	2.00
For economic reason when offered no scholarship	2	2.00
Other*	11	11.00

\*Each of these was a separate reason.

Question Nineteen refers to the difficulty a junior-college transfer football participant has in maintaining his junior-college academic status at this university. Responses are recorded in Table XXXIX.

TABLE XXXIX

RESPONSES FROM JUNIOR-COLLEGE TRANSFER FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS AS TO THE DIFFICULTY IN MAINTAINING THEIR JUNIOR-COLLEGE ACADEMIC STATUS AT THIS UNIVERSITY

	Much More Difficult	A Little More Difficult	About The Same
Players' Responses (N=21)	19.05%	57.14%	23.81%
Number	(4)	(12)	(5)

Most, 76.19 per cent, of the junior-college transfer players found the curriculum at this university to be more difficult than their junior-college academic experience. The degrees of difficulty are expressed as follows: (1) much more difficult, 19.05 per cent of the players; (2) a little more difficult, 57.14 per cent of the players; and (3) about the same, 23.81 per cent of the players.

Question Twenty pertains to the utilization of the tutoring service offered at this university by the football participants. Responses are presented in Tables XL and XLI.

Utilization is indicated as follows: (1) very often, 6.17 per cent; (2) sometimes, 6.17 per cent; (3) seldom, 18.52

TABLE XL  
 UTILIZATION OF THE TUTORING SERVICE OFFERED AT THIS  
 UNIVERSITY BY THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
 FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Frequently (Very Much)	Often (Sometimes)	Seldom	Very Seldom	None	Indifferent
Player Responses (N=81)	6.17%	6.17%	18.52%	17.28%	49.38%	2.47%
Number	(5)	(5)	(15)	(14)	(40)	(2)

per cent; (4) very seldom, 17.28 per cent; (5) never, 49.38 per cent; and (6) indifferent to the service, 2.47 per cent.

Table XLI indicates the number of hours per week in which the participants utilize the tutoring service.

TABLE XLI  
 HOURS OF TUTORING SERVICE UTILIZED PER WEEK BY THE  
 FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	None	Less Than One Hour	1 - 3 Hours	3 - 6 Hours	9 - 12 Hours	12-15 Hours
Player Responses (N=79)	69.62%	16.46%	11.39%	1.26%	. . .	1.26%
Number	(55)	(13)	(9)	(1)	. . .	(1)

A very small percentage of the participants use the services of tutors as much as one hour or more per week; in fact,

only 13.91 per cent do so. Thus, 86.08 per cent fail to do so, and furthermore, 69.62 per cent do not use the tutors.

Question Twenty-one concerns the evaluation of the tutoring received by the players. Evaluations are shown in Table XLII.

TABLE XLII  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF THE TUTORING  
RECEIVED AT THIS UNIVERSITY

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Player Evaluation (N=46)	2.17%	19.56%	52.17%	15.22%	10.87%
Number	(1)	(9)	(24)	(7)	(5)

In general, the tutoring received by the football players is given a favorable evaluation. Approximately 74 per cent of the players give it a 'good' or 'better' rating. Only 26 per cent of the players perceive it as 'fair' or 'poor.'

Question Twenty-two is an evaluation of the tutoring program offered by this university. Table XLIII presents the evaluations.

Approximately 71 per cent of the football players give the tutoring program a rating of good or better. Thus, only 29 per cent of the players evaluate the program as being either 'fair' or 'poor.'

TABLE XLIII

EVALUATION OF THE TUTORING PROGRAM AT THIS UNIVERSITY BY  
THE 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Player Responses (N=58)	8.62%	12.07%	50.00%	20.69%	8.62%
Number	(5)	(7)	(29)	(12)	(5)

Question Twenty-three concerns the percentage of football participants who anticipate receiving a degree within four years. Responses are presented in Table XLIV.

TABLE XLIV

PER CENT OF THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WHO EXPECT TO  
RECEIVE A DEGREE IN FOUR YEARS

	Yes	Most Likely	Maybe	No
Player Responses (N=81)	49.38%	18.52%	13.58%	18.52%
Number	(40)	(15)	(11)	(15)

Almost 81 per cent of the participants have hopes or possible expectations of obtaining a degree within four years. Sixty-eight per cent have positive beliefs in this respect, and 49 per cent give a definite response that they expect to receive a degree within four years. Only 19 per cent do not expect to get a degree within this time period.

Question Twenty-four refers to whether a player would encourage his son to play intercollegiate football. Replies are shown in Table XLV.

TABLE XLV

PER CENT OF THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WHO WOULD ENCOURAGE A SON TO PLAY INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL

	Yes	No	Do Not Know
Player Responses (N=81)	67.90%	7.41%	24.69%
Number	(55)	(6)	(20)

Most players have a positive attitude about encouraging their sons to participate in intercollegiate football. Approximately 68 per cent gave a definite answer of "yes" to this question. However, 25 per cent are undecided, and 7 per cent would not encourage their sons to play football. Hence, two out of three players display a positive attitude toward football participation.

Question Twenty-five pertains to the percentage of players who consider their football participation to be necessary for them to receive a college education. Responses are shown in Table XLVI.

A slight majority, 54.43 per cent, of the participants feel that their football participation is necessary

TABLE XLVI

THE PERCENTAGE OF FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS WHO FEEL THAT THEIR PARTICIPATION IS NECESSARY IN ORDER FOR THEM TO OBTAIN A COLLEGE EDUCATION

	Yes	No	Do Not Know
Player Responses (N=79)	54.43%	37.97%	7.60%
Number	(43)	(30)	(6)

for them to gain a college education. However, 38 per cent of the players do not consider it to be necessary, and 8 per cent are undecided.

Question Twenty-six concerns whether football participation tends to isolate the participant from participating in other campus activities. Tables XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, and LI present data on this question.

TABLE XLVII

OPINIONS AMONG THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS AS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF TIME FOR PARTICIPATION IN OTHER CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

	Yes	No	Perhaps, If I Wanted To
Player Responses (N=81)	18.52%	58.02%	23.46%
Number	(15)	(47)	(19)

Table XLVII relates to the availability of time the participant feels he has for participating in other campus activities. Most, 58.02 per cent, players do not feel that they have time to participate in other campus activities. However, 41.98 per cent seem to think that they do have the time to participate.

Table XLVIII concerns the interest the football participants have in taking a part in other campus activities.

TABLE XLVIII

PER CENT OF THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS INTERESTED  
IN PARTICIPATING IN OTHER CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

	Very Much	Of Some Interest	Very Little Interest	No Interest
Player Responses (N=81)	20.99%	49.38%	17.28%	12.35%
Number	(17)	(40)	(14)	(10)

Seventy per cent of the players show a positive attitude toward participating in other campus activities; yet a large percentage, 30 per cent, show little or no interest in other activities.

Table XLIX concerns the number of other campus activities which engage the players.

Approximately 87 per cent of the players participated in no other campus activity, but 9 per cent participated in

**TABLE XLIX**  
**THE NUMBER OF OTHER CAMPUS ACTIVITIES WHICH**  
**ENGAGE THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS**

	None	One	Two	Three
<b>Player Responses (N=80)</b>	87.50%	8.75%	2.50%	1.25%
<b>Number</b>	(70)	(7)	(2)	(1)

one other campus activity, and 4 per cent participate in two or three other activities.

Table L refers to the kind of organizations which engage the players.

**TABLE L**  
**ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS**  
**INDICATE PARTICIPATION**

	Fraternity	Club	Dorm Association
<b>Player Responses (N=14)</b>	71.43%	14.28%	14.28%
<b>Number</b>	(10)	(2)	(2)

Of the organizations in which football players participate, fraternities account for 71 per cent of those participating, while clubs and dorm associations account for the remaining 29 per cent.

Table LI pertains to office positions within campus organizations held by football participants.

TABLE LI  
NUMBER OF OFFICE POSITIONS WITHIN CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS  
HELD BY THE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	None	One	Two
Player Participation (N=80)	96.25%	2.50%	1.25%
Number	(77)	(2)	(1)

Holding an office position is not a trait among the 1971 intercollegiate football participants. In fact, not holding an office is more indicative of the participants since 96 per cent of them do not hold an office position.

Questions Twenty-seven and Twenty-eight pertain to the players' participation in part-time work. Tables LII and LIII show the amount of participation during playing and non-playing semesters.

TABLE LII  
PARTICIPATION IN PART-TIME WORK DURING THE PLAYING SEMESTER  
BY 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Hours of Work Per Week		
	None	3 - 6	12 or More
Player Participation (N=81)	97.54%	1.23%	1.23%
Number	(79)	(1)	(1)

Table LII shows that approximately 98 per cent of the participants do not engage in part-time work during the playing semester.

TABLE LIII

PARTICIPATION IN PART-TIME WORK DURING THE NON-PLAYING SEMESTER BY 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Hours of Work Per Week					
	None	1 - 3	3 - 6	6 - 9	9 - 12	15 or More
Player Participation (N=81)	79.01%	1.23%	1.23%	2.47%	2.47%	13.58%
Number	(64)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(11)

It is shown in Table LIII that 79 per cent of the football participants do not engage in part-time work during the non-playing semester. Of those participants who work, approximately 14 per cent work fifteen or more hours per week.

TABLE LIV

1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF THEIR FOOTBALL ABILITY WITH ABILITY IN OTHER SPORTS

	Football Ability Compared to Ability in Other Sports		
	Better in Other	Equivalent Ability	NOT AS Good In Other
Player Responses (N=67)	1.49%	40.30%	58.21%
Number	(1)	(27)	(39)

Question Twenty-nine refers to whether football participants believe they have equivalent talent in other sports. Tables LIV and LV present data on this question.

Most of the football participants do not consider their talent in other sports to be equivalent to their football ability. Although 58 per cent of the players express this view, 42 per cent believe their talent in other sports to be equal to or better than that in football.

TABLE LV

PARTICIPATION IN OTHER INTERCOLLEGIATE SPORTS AMONG  
1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Number of Other Sports	
	None	One
Player Participation (N=80)	96.25%	3.75%
Number	(77)	(3)*

\*All three were track participants.

Table LV shows that approximately 96 per cent of the football participants do not engage in any other intercollegiate sport. Those who do engage in another intercollegiate sport are all engaged in track.

Question Thirty pertains to the extent that academic probation prevails among football participants. Table LVI shows the prevalence.

TABLE LVI

**PREVALENCE OF ACADEMIC PROBATION AMONG 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS**

	Occurrence		
	None	Once	Twice
Player Responses (N=79)	77.21%	21.52%	1.27%
Number	(61)	(17)	(1)

Seventy-seven per cent of the participants have not been affected by academic probation, but almost 22 per cent have been placed on academic probation one time.

Question Thirty-one considers which semester seems to lead to an occurrence of academic probation. Table LVII shows the subjects' responses.

TABLE LVII

**THE OCCURRENCE OF ACADEMIC PROBATION AT THE END OF A  
PLAYING SEMESTER FOR 1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS**

	Frequency of Occurrence			
	Each Time	Most Often	About the Same	Not Often
Player Responses (N=15)	40.00%	6.67%	20.00%	33.33%
Number	(6)	(1)	(3)	(5)

Among those football participants reporting to have been placed on probation, 47 per cent report it occurring most often at the end of a playing semester. Thirty-three

per cent report that this is not the case with them, and 20 per cent consider it about the same.

Question Thirty-two and Thirty-three pertain to the semester hours generally carried. Data is shown in Tables LVIII and LIX.

TABLE LVIII

SEMESTER HOURS GENERALLY CARRIED BY THE 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
DURING THE PLAYING SEMESTERS

	Semester Hours Carried		
	13-15	16-17	18
Player Responses (N=81)	50.62%	46.91%	2.47%
Number	(41)	(38)	(2)

During the playing semester, approximately 51 per cent of the players generally carry thirteen to fifteen semester hours, but 47 per cent carry sixteen to seventeen hours. The mean hours carried is 15.27.

During the non-playing semesters, 62 per cent of the participants carry sixteen to seventeen semester hours, 30 per cent carry thirteen to fifteen hours, and 8 per cent carry eighteen hours. The players tend to carry only slightly more semester hours during their non-playing semesters than in their playing semesters, and the mean hours are 15.88 for non-playing semesters compared to 15.27 hours during playing semesters.

TABLE LIX

SEMESTER HOURS GENERALLY CARRIED BY THE 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
DURING THE NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

	Semester Hours Carried		
	13-15	16-17	18
Player Responses (N=74)	29.73%	62.16%	8.11%
Number	(22)	(46)	(6)

Questions Thirty-four, Thirty-five, and Thirty-six pertain to the summer school attendance by football players and the number of semester hours generally carried during summer school. Tables LX, LXI, and LXII present the data.

TABLE LX

SUMMER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AMONG 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS

	Attendance		
	Yes	No	Sometimes
Player Responses (N=80)	12.50%	71.25%	16.25%
Number	(10)	(57)	(13)

Only 12.50 per cent of the players generally attend summer school, and 71.25 per cent generally do not attend.

TABLE LXI

ATTENDANCE OF BOTH SUMMER TERMS AMONG 1971  
INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

	Yes	No	Sometimes
Player Responses (N=75)	8.00%	84.00%	8.00%
Number	(6)	(63)	(6)

Eighty-four per cent of the players do not generally attend both summer terms; in fact, only 8 per cent do so.

TABLE LXII

NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS GENERALLY CARRIED BY THE  
1971 INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
DURING THE SUMMER

	3 - 5	6 - 12	13 - 14
Player Responses (N=22)	13.64%	59.09%	27.27%
Number	(3)	(13)	(6)

Fifty-nine per cent of the players generally carry six to twelve semester hours during the summer; 27 per cent generally carry thirteen to fourteen hours; and 14 per cent carry five or less semester hours, with a mean of 9.55 hours.

Additional information is presented on the intercollegiate football participants at this university that does not necessarily pertain to questions previously discussed or included in the research design.

Table XLIII contains data on the educational attainments among intercollegiate football participants between the 1966 Fall Semester and the end of the 1971 Fall Semester.

The table shows almost 19 per cent of the players were awarded degrees during this period. Proportionately, the whites did better than the non-whites, approximately 23 per cent to 7 per cent, respectively.

TABLE LXIII

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS AMONG THE TWO HUNDRED  
THIRTY-FOUR INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS BETWEEN THE 1966 FALL  
SEMESTER AND THE END OF THE  
1971 FALL SEMESTER

Category	Whites (N=174)	Non-Whites (N=60)	Total (N=234)
Players Receiving Degrees Number	22.99% (40)	6.67% (4)	18.80% (44)
Football Dropouts Number	14.37% (25)	18.33% (11)	15.38% (36)
Football Dropout Then College Dropout Number	3.45% (6)	6.67% (4)	4.27% (10)
College Dropouts Number	47.13% (82)	43.33% (26)	46.15% (108)
Players on Suspension Number	4.02% (7)	15.00% (9)	6.84% (16)
Players Still in College Number	25.86% (45)	35.00% (21)	28.20% (66)

Among the football dropouts, 14 per cent were whites, and 18 per cent were non-whites. The combined dropout percentage was 15.38 per cent.

The players who drop out of football and then out of college tend to account for a low percentage of the participants, only 4.27 per cent. There is a greater per cent of non-whites than whites who took this action.

College dropouts among the football participants during this time were quite high; in fact, 46.15 per cent withdrew from college. Little difference is noted with respect to racial percentages.

The per cent (6.84) of players placed on suspension was, as a whole, rather low, but 15 per cent of the non-whites were affected in this matter, whereas 4.02 per cent of the whites were so affected.

Twenty-eight per cent of the players during this period are still enrolled at this university. A higher percentage of non-whites than whites are still enrolled.

Curricular course enrollments among football participants are shown in Table LXIV. Hardly any difference exists between the courses taken during the playing and the non-playing semesters. Courses in business administration, education, and behavioral sciences comprise very small percentages of the courses taken. Of course, a reason for this is that these are not required courses of study for a degree. Table LXIV is shown on the following page.

TABLE LXIV  
CURRICULAR COURSE ENROLLMENTS AMONG INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS FROM 1966-1970

Semester	Health, Physical Education, and Recreation <sup>a</sup>	Humanities <sup>b</sup>	Social Science <sup>c</sup>	Physical Science <sup>d</sup>	Business Administration <sup>e</sup>	Education <sup>f</sup>	Behavioral Sciences <sup>g</sup>
Playing (N=2,721)	39.18%	18.56%	14.66%	14.55%	5.84%	4.96%	2.24%
Number	(1,066)	(505)	(399)	(396)	(159)	(135)	(61)
Non-Playing (N=2,353)	39.18%	17.47%	14.66%	12.75%	7.14%	6.03%	2.76%
Number	(922)	(411)	(345)	(300)	(168)	(142)	(65)

<sup>a</sup>Health, Physical Education, and Recreation--Courses given in this department.

<sup>b</sup>Humanities--Courses in art, English, foreign languages, journalism, philosophy, religion, speech and drama, and music.

<sup>c</sup>Social Science--Economics, geography, history, and political science.

<sup>d</sup>Physical Science--Biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics.

<sup>e</sup>Business Administration--Courses given in the School of Business.

<sup>f</sup>Education--Education courses, plus industrial art courses.

<sup>g</sup>Behavioral Science--Psychology, sociology, and anthropology.

Semesters in which the football participants failed to meet academic requirements and either probation or suspension action was taken against them are shown in Table LXV.

TABLE LXV

SEMESTERS IN WHICH THE INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS FAILED TO MEET ACADEMIC  
REQUIREMENTS AND WERE PLACED ON  
PROBATION OR SUSPENSION

Category	Whites (N=174)	Non-Whites (N=60)	Total (N=234)
Placed on Probation at the end of a playing semester	10.34%	25.00%	14.10%
Number	(18)	(15)	(33)
Placed on Probation at the end of a non-playing semester	4.02%	16.67%	7.26%
Number	(7)	(10)	(17)
Placed on Suspension at the end of a playing semester	11.49%	21.67%	14.10%
Number	(20)	(13)	(33)
Placed on Suspension at the end of a non-playing semester	9.19%	16.67%	11.11%
Number	(16)	(10)	(26)

Table LXV shows that 14 per cent of the players were placed on academic probation at the end of a playing semester. When racial groups are taken into consideration, it is noted that 10 per cent of the whites and 25 per cent of the non-whites were affected by such action.

The percentage of players placed on academic probation at the end of a non-playing semester is almost half that of a playing semester. The difference is 7.26 per cent to 14.10

per cent, respectively. Approximately 17 per cent of the non-whites were so affected, compared with only 4 per cent of the whites.

The percentage of players placed on suspension at the end of a playing semester is equivalent to the percentage placed on probation at such time. However, there is a slight increase among whites and a slight decrease among non-whites in the percentage suspended rather than placed on probation at this time.

The percentage of players suspended is slightly less at the end of a non-playing semester than at the end of a playing semester. With the exception of non-whites, there is a greater per cent suspended at the end of a non-playing semester than the per cent placed on probation at the end of a non-playing semester.

TABLE LXVI

INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS PLACED ON PROBATION  
WITHOUT GETTING SUSPENDED AND THOSE PLACED ON  
SUSPENSION WITHOUT BEING PUT ON PROBATION

Category	Whites (N=174)	Non-Whites (N=60)	Total (N=234)
Placed on probation but not on suspension	10.34%	23.33%	13.67%
Number	(18)	(14)	(32)
Placed on suspension but not on probation	16.09%	23.33%	17.95%
Number	(28)	(14)	(42)

Data concerning football participants who are placed on probation but are not suspended and those who are placed on suspension without having been placed on probation are shown in Table LXVI.

With the exception of non-whites, a greater per cent of the football participants are suspended without having been placed on probation than are placed on probation; these have avoided being placed on suspension.

Data concerning what occurs among football participants who have been placed on academic probation or suspension are shown in Table LXVII.

TABLE LXVII

**DROPOUT ASPECTS OF THOSE INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS PLACED ON PROBATION OR SUSPENSION**

Category	Whites (N=54)	Non-Whites (N=36)	Total (N=90)
Those that became football dropouts	5.56%	11.11%	7.78%
Number	(3)	(4)	(7)
Those that became college dropouts	53.70%	52.78%	53.33%
Number	(29)	(19)	(48)
Those that dropped out of football then college	3.70%	8.33%	5.56%
Number	(2)	(3)	(5)

Almost 8 per cent of the football players placed on academic probation or suspension become football dropouts. This occurs more with the non-whites than with the whites, 11.11 per cent to 5.56 per cent, respectively.

Another observation is that approximately 53 per cent of those players placed on probation or suspension become college dropouts. The percentages of whites and non-whites are very similar. Thus, the white is just as likely to become a college dropout as the non-white.

A very small per cent (5.46) of those who are placed on probation or suspension drop out of football and then withdraw college. However, Table LXVII shows the non-whites to be more likely to do this than the whites, with percentages of 8.33 to 3.70, respectively.

Table LXVIII shows what has occurred to football participants after their dropping out of football.

TABLE LXVIII  
AFTEREFFECTS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS  
WHO DROPPED OUT OF FOOTBALL

	Received A Degree	Continuing College Education	On Suspension	College Dropout
Football Dropouts (N=36)	33.33%	33.33%	5.56%	27.78%
Number	(12)	(12)	(2)	(10)

The following occurred among those players who dropped out of football participation: (1) 33.33 per cent obtained a degree; (2) 33.33 per cent are still enrolled at this university; (3) 5.56 per cent are presently on suspension; and (4) 27.78 per cent became college dropouts.

Table LXIX shows a comparison of cumulative grade point averages between transfer football participants and non-transfer football participants.

TABLE LXIX

A COMPARISON OF CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES BETWEEN TRANSFER FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS AND NON-TRANSFER FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS

Category	Grade Points				Mean GPA	Median GPA
	B 3.64-3.00	C 2.99-2.00	D 1.99-1.00	F .999-.000		
Transfer Players (N=84)	. . .	48.81%	51.19%	. . .	2.04	1.99
Number	. . .	(41)	(43)	. . .	. .	. .
Non-Transfer Players (N=150)	2.67%	49.33%	43.33%	4.67%	1.99	2.02
Number	(4)	(74)	(65)	(7)	. .	. .

The mean cumulative grade point average of transfer football players is only slightly higher than that of non-transfer players, but the median grade point of non-transfer players is slightly higher than that for transfer players.

However, the score advantage should rest with transfer players since none can enter the university with a grade average less than a D. Thus, it is probable that the differentiation shown between the two groups is misleading. On the other hand, one may be interested in knowing whether an advantage that may be gained at another college will continue in effect at this university when compared with the academic work of non-transfer players.

Tables LXX, LXXI, LXXII, LXXIII, LXXIV, LXXV, LXXVI, and LXXVII show comparisons between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses taken by the football participants. The academic courses are defined as those courses taken outside the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, and the School of Home Economics. Thus, the non-academic courses are defined as those courses taken in the above mentioned departments.

Table LXX shows a comparison between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses involving freshman football participants during playing semesters.

There is a marked difference between the mean of academic courses and the mean of non-academic courses, 1.42 to 3.31, respectively. Almost two letter grade points separate these means. While the participants are making D's in their academic courses, they are making B's in their non-academic courses.

TABLE LXX

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC  
AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF FRESHMAN FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS DURING PLAYING SEMESTERS

Playing Semester Courses	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic	140	2,208	1,550	1.42
Non-Academic	139	1,847	558	3.31

A comparison between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses during non-playing semesters of freshman football participants is shown in Table LXXI.

TABLE LXXI

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC  
AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF FRESHMAN FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS DURING NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Non-Playing Semester Courses	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic	127	2,621	1,552	1.69
Non-Academic	125	1,128	361	3.12

Table LXXI also shows that the participants have a higher mean in non-academic courses than in academic courses.

However, a slight improvement is shown in the academic mean, and there is approximately the same amount of decline in the non-academic mean. Nevertheless, the participants are still maintaining D's in their academic courses and B's in their non-academic courses.

The grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of sophomore football participants during playing semesters are compared in Table LXXII. The comparisons are shown below.

TABLE LXXII

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF SOPHOMORE FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS DURING PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean (GPA)
Academic Courses	136	2,054	1,482	1.39
Non-Academic Courses	134	1,474	579	2.55
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	44	363	416	0.87
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	92	1,691	1,066	1.59
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	44	548	258	2.12
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	90	926	321	2.88

The mean grade point of academic courses is more than a letter grade point less than the mean of non-academic courses when all participants are considered. However, this difference is not as great when transfer participants (transfer participants are always junior college transfers) are compared with non-transfer participants. In both academic and non-academic courses, the non-transfer participants have approximately the same higher differences with respect to their counterparts.

Table LXXIII shows comparisons between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of sophomore football participants during non-playing semesters.

TABLE LXXIII

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC  
AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF SOPHOMORE FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS DURING NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean (GPA)
Academic Courses	107	1,888	1,184	1.59
Non-Academic Courses	108	1,480	491	3.01
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	40	438	376	1.16
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	67	1,450	808	1.79
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	41	766	256	2.99
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	67	714	235	3.04

When all sophomore football participants are compared, the mean of the non-academic courses is much higher than the mean of the academic courses, 3.01 and 1.59, respectively.

The same pattern holds when comparisons are made of the means of transfer and non-transfer participants. However, the differences are less pronounced, and the mean difference is only slight when comparing non-academic courses.

Comparisons are shown in Table LXXIV between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of junior football participants during playing semesters.

TABLE LXXIV

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC  
AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF JUNIOR FOOTBALL  
PARTICIPANTS DURING PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic Courses	113	1,868	1,077	1.73
Non-Academic Courses	104	1,450	575	2.52
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	54	752	479	1.57
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	59	1,116	598	1.87
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	51	709	309	2.29
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	53	741	266	2.79

Table LXXIV shows that generally the same patterns hold for junior football participants as that for sophomore participants, but there are less differences among most comparisons. The greatest difference (.79) occurs when all junior participants are compared on academic and non-academic course means. Transfer and non-transfer participants are not only closer in their grade point averages but also are within the same letter grade category with respect to academic and non-academic courses.

The results of comparisons between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of junior football participants during non-playing semesters are shown in Table LXXV.

TABLE LXXV

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF JUNIOR FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS DURING NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic Courses	98	1,733	962	1.80
Non-Academic Courses	93	1,539	579	2.66
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	51	681	439	1.55
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	47	1,052	523	2.01
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	50	946	380	2.49
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	43	593	199	2.98

The same pattern continues in Table LXXV that occurs in Tables LXXIV, LXXIII, and LXXII in that the mean is higher for non-academic courses than for academic courses, and the mean is higher for non-transfer participants in both the academic and non-academic courses than that for transfer participants. The means are, in general, higher in the non-playing semesters than during the playing semesters, but this is not necessarily true when compared with the non-playing semesters of sophomores. This is the first group of participants with an academic course mean above 2.00, and this occurs with the non-transfer participants.

TABLE LXXVI

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF SENIOR FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS DURING PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic Courses	70	1,339	699	1.92
Non-Academic Courses	57	746	291	2.56
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	29	423	248	1.71
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	41	916	451	2.03
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	27	433	165	2.62
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	30	313	126	2.48

Table LXXVI shows the comparisons between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of senior football participants during playing semesters.

The previous pattern continues to hold with respect to the fact that the mean is higher for non-academic courses than for academic courses. However, the mean of academic courses has steadily increased from the beginning of the sophomore year, whereas the mean of non-academic courses has fluctuated. The non-transfer participants continue to maintain better than a 2.00 grade point average for academic courses. Both groups of participants maintain a non-academic mean much above 2.00 but less than 3.00.

TABLE LXXVII

COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC COURSES OF SENIOR FOOTBALL PARTICIPANTS DURING NON-PLAYING SEMESTERS

Categories	Number of Semester Units	Total Grade Points	Total Semester Hours	Mean
Academic Courses	48	1,027	492	2.09
Non-Academic Courses	36	476	187	2.55
Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	20	311	173	1.80
Non-Transfer Participants (Academic Courses)	28	716	319	2.24
Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	17	203	91	2.23
Non-Transfer Participants (Non-Academic Courses)	19	273	96	2.84

Comparisons between the grade point averages of academic and non-academic courses of senior football participants during non-playing semesters are shown in Table LXXVII.

The mean for non-academic courses continues to be higher than the mean for academic courses. This pattern has existed for all semesters, but this is the first semester in which the group as a whole had a mean for academic courses greater than 2.00, although it was only 2.09. This is the third consecutive semester in which non-transfer participants surpassed the 2.00 grade point average in academic courses. Transfer participants never surpassed a mean of 2.00 in academic studies; in fact, the 1.80 mean for this semester was their highest. However, the transfer participants always had a mean above 2.00 in their non-academic courses.

Changes in the racial composition of the varsity intercollegiate football participants from 1966 to 1971 are shown in Table LXXVIII.

TABLE LXXVIII

THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF VARSITY INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL TEAMS FROM 1966-1971

Race	Varsity Players					
	1966 (N=49)	1967 (N=52)	1968 (N=61)	1969 (N=58)	1970 (N=59)	1971 (N=54)
White Players	83.67%	80.77%	70.49%	65.52%	57.63%	66.67%
Number	(41)	(42)	(43)	(38)	(34)	(36)
Non-White Players	16.33%	19.23%	29.51%	34.48%	42.37%	33.33%
Number	(8)	(10)	(18)	(20)	(25)	(18)

The percentage of white players on the varsity teams has steadily declined from 83.67 per cent in 1966 to 57.63 per cent in 1970. However, this trend was reversed in 1971, when the percentage of white players increased to 66.67 per cent. Thus, the percentage of non-whites grew from 16.33 per cent in 1966 to 42.37 per cent in 1970 but at present has dropped to 33.33 per cent.

Data on the racial composition of freshman intercollegiate football teams from 1966 to 1971 are shown in Table LXXIX.

TABLE LXXIX  
THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF FRESHMAN INTERCOLLEGIATE  
FOOTBALL TEAMS FROM 1966-1971

Race	Freshman Players					
	1966 (N=17)	1967 (N=32)	1968 (N=23)	1969 (N=24)	1970 (N=26)	1971 (N=28)
White Players	82.35%	75.00%	78.26%	79.17%	88.46%	85.71%
Number	(14)	(24)	(18)	(19)	(23)	(24)
Non-White Players	17.65%	25.00%	21.74%	20.83%	11.54%	14.29%
Number	(3)	(8)	(5)	(5)	(3)	(4)

No definite racial pattern was established between 1966 and 1971 concerning freshman teams, other than whites were always in a dominant position. The racial composition was, thus, of a fluctuating nature, with the whites always comprising a high percentage of the members.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

This study has a two-fold purpose. The first is to provide a description of the academic status of both white and non-white intercollegiate football participants at this university from the 1966 Fall semester through the 1971 Fall semester. The second is to construct a current 1971 profile of the football participants. This study is not designed for comparative use with other football athlete studies but rather to provide insight into the recent academic and racial status of intercollegiate football participants at North Texas State University. It is designed with the idea in mind that it can be of beneficial use to the coaches and administrators of this university in future football planning. That is, the findings might be useful in such areas as player recruiting, course work counseling, and degree planning.

Four sets of questions were investigated in order to provide the description. The first set of questions (eighteen questions) pertains to the football participants' academic status in the following categories: freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, first-string varsity members, other varsity team members, whites, non-whites, married,

single, scholarship recipients, non-scholarship recipients, academic probation, and academic suspension. The second set of questions (twelve questions) applies to racial composition, awarding of degrees, and participation in pro-football. The third set of questions (three questions) pertains only to freshman football participants. The fourth set of questions (three questions) pertains to the academic status of junior-college transfer players in contrast to the non-transfer players.

A thirty-six-item self-report questionnaire was administered to the football participants at the end of the football season for determining a profile of the 1971 intercollegiate football participants.

The subjects employed were 259 intercollegiate football participants enrolled at North Texas State University between the 1966 and 1971 academic years. The descriptive analysis is based upon 234 of these football participants. The other twenty-five participants were freshmen during the 1971 Fall semester and are used in the profile analysis along with another fifty-six participants who had been and were still enrolled at the university. Thus, the profile composite is based upon eighty-one intercollegiate football participants.

Transcripts, coaches, brochures, and Fred Graham of the Public Information Office of this university provided data for the descriptive analysis of the 234 football participants between 1966 and 1970. The profile composite is derived from

eighty-one football participants answering a self-report questionnaire at the end of the playing season.

Following the collection and tabulation of the data, the results were analyzed by three statistical techniques: mean, median, and percentage. The results are presented in frequency distribution tables.

### Findings

Statistical analysis of the data reveal the following findings.

An examination of the academic status of intercollegiate football participants at North Texas State University from 1966 to 1970 revealed the following:

1. The playing semester of the sophomore year is academically the most difficult period for the football participants. The grade point mean and median are the lowest for this period, falling in the D grade category.
2. The grade point means and medians for freshman and sophomore participants during non-playing semesters are respectively identical, slightly below the C grade level.
3. Junior and senior football participants have very similar grade point means and medians respectively during playing and non-playing semesters. However, non-playing semesters have the higher mean and median grade points.
4. Senior football participants have a high tendency, 54.41 per cent, to drop out of school after their senior

playing semester. Grades probably played some part in this, but other factors must also contribute to the high dropout percentage. Juniors have a higher percentage who make D's and F's than do seniors, yet the junior dropout percentage is only 28.43.

5. It is not until the junior and senior years that the participants' grade point means and medians reach a grade level of C; however, the means for playing semesters are .02 and .01, respectively, below a C level.

6. The grade point mean and median are slightly higher for first-string varsity players than for other varsity team members.

7. White football participants record higher grade point means and medians than do non-white participants; in fact, they are almost .50 higher. While the whites are borderline C students, the non-whites are D students. This applies to both the playing and non-playing semesters, but non-whites increase their grade points more during non-playing semesters than do whites. Thus, it naturally follows that the cumulative grade point mean and median of whites are higher than that of non-whites.

8. Single and married players have very small differences in their grade point means and medians respectively. However, the results may be a consequence of the small number of semester units for married players compared to the

large number of semester units for single players. The same is also probably true with respect to the cumulative grade points of the two groups.

9. Football participants who are non-scholarship recipients have a slightly higher grade point mean and median than do scholarship recipients. Here again, the large difference in the size of the groups makes the findings questionable since only 19 students out of 234 are non-scholarship recipients.

10. Academic probation affects 15.81 per cent of the football participants, with the non-whites being affected the greatest, 36.67 per cent to 8.62 per cent for whites.

11. A higher percentage of participants are suspended than are placed on probation. Among all the players, 24.79 per cent are suspended. The percentage of non-whites placed on probation and suspension is the same. However, there are over twice as many white participants suspended as placed on probation.

Questions referring to racial composition, awarding of degrees, and participation in pro-football of the intercollegiate football participants at this university from 1966 to 1971 reveal the following:

1. Non-white participants constituted 16.67 per cent of the football participants in 1966, but this percentage increased steadily to 32.94 per cent in 1970. However, in 1971 it dropped to 26.83 per cent. The proportion of whites

dropped from a high of 83.33 per cent in 1966 to 73.17 per cent in 1971.

2. Non-whites made up 31.82 per cent of the first-string varsity players in 1966, but the percentage increased to 50 per cent in 1970 and 1971. Thus, in five years the proportion of white players in the first-string varsity team declined from 68.18 per cent in 1966 to 50 per cent in 1970 and 1971.

3. Proportionally, a greater per cent of non-whites are scholarship recipients than are whites (96.67 per cent to 90.23 per cent, respectively).

4. A very small per cent, 6.82, of the football participants are awarded degrees within four years, and all of these are white participants.

5. From the 1966 Fall semester through the 1971 Fall semester there were forty-four degrees awarded to football participants. Forty were awarded to whites and four to non-whites. Seventeen, or 38.64 per cent, required over four, but less than five years, to earn their degrees. Among the whites, fifteen, or 37.50 per cent, took this long, and two, or 50 per cent, of the non-whites took this long.

6. Participants receiving a degree in five years comprise 13.64 per cent of those receiving a degree. There are five whites, or 12.50 per cent of the whites, and one non-white in this group.

7. Seventeen, or 42.50 per cent, of the white participants required over five years, but less than six years, to obtain a degree, and one non-white took a similar amount of time to earn a degree. Thus, eighteen, or 40.91 per cent, of those receiving a degree took over five, but less than six, years to earn a degree.

8. No participant remained in college more than six years.

9. Most players, 93.33 per cent, who were tendered a pro-football contract were non-degree holders. The racial distribution of contracts is very closely divided. Fourteen, or 46.67 per cent, of the contracts were tendered to whites, and sixteen, or 53.33 per cent, were tendered to non-whites.

Questions relating to freshman football participants reveal the following:

1. Most students, 76.63 per cent, who participated in intercollegiate football discontinue the sport by the end of their second year of play. Only 15.13 per cent of the freshman participants continue to participate in football until their eligibility terminated.

2. The percentage of freshman participants who dropped out of football is 15.97 per cent.

3. During the period from 1966 to 1971, ten, or 52.63 per cent, of the football dropouts continued their academic study at this university.

Questions pertaining to the academic status of junior-college transfer football participants revealed the following:

1. Most junior-college transfer participants, 70.13 per cent, entered this university with a C grade point average. Almost 94 per cent of the junior-college transfer participants entered this university with either a C or D grade level.

2. After one year of study at this university, the junior-college transfer participants earned a North Texas State University cumulative grade point mean and median slightly lower than that for non-transfer participants.

3. After the junior-college transfer participants had completed two years of study at this university, the difference between their cumulative grade point mean and median at this university and that of non-transfer participants had been reduced by one-half or more from what it was at the end of the first year.

Questions pertaining to the current 1971 profile of intercollegiate football athletes at this university revealed the following to be most typical of a football participant at this university:

He was white, single, and a junior between 20-21 years of age majoring in physical education with a minor in biology. His family's annual income was from \$10,000 to \$12,999, and he possessed an automobile. He had neither an older brother

or father who had participated in intercollegiate football; however, his father was the most influential person in his decision to play football. The most important social factors that influenced him to play football were a desire to play pro-football and a desire to receive a college education; too, economic considerations influenced his decision to play college football. The three most important factors in his decision to play football were economic considerations, a desire to play pro-football, and a desire to obtain a higher education. He was a scholarship recipient, and there was almost a 50 per cent chance that he would not play football without a scholarship. There was a 50 per cent chance that he regarded favorably the scholarship program at this university. He had a high opinion of his high-school football ability. There was one chance in five that he chose to attend this university because he liked the school; this was the most prevalent reason given by the participants. He was not a junior-college transfer student; however, junior-college transfer participants did feel that this university was more difficult academically than their respective junior colleges. Although he had a favorable opinion of the tutoring service provided by the university, as well as the tutors' abilities, he was not disposed to use this service. He expected to receive a degree in four years. He would encourage a son to play collegiate football. There was a 50 per cent chance that he thought that his participation in

football was necessary for him to be able to obtain a college education. But he felt that participation in football prevented him from having the time to participate in other campus activities in which he was interested. However, 42 per cent of the participants did not feel that football really prevented their participation in other campus activities. Although generally he expressed a desire to participate in other campus activities, he did not do so. He did not engage in part-time work during either the playing or non-playing semesters. He did not believe his ability in other sports to be equivalent to his ability in football, and he did not participate in other intercollegiate athletics. It is unlikely that he was ever placed on probation; yet his chances of being placed on probation were increased at the end of a playing semester. Seventy per cent of the participants reported never having been placed on probation. Generally, he carried from 13-17 semester hours during the playing semester and from 16-17 hours during the non-playing semester. He generally did not attend summer school. If, however, he attended one session, it is unlikely that he would attend both sessions. A player who attended summer school tended to carry six or more semester hours.

Other information derived from the collected data provides additional insight into the academic status of the football participants. The additional information is as follows:

1. Between the 1966 Fall semester and the end of the 1971 Fall semester, almost 19 per cent of the participants were awarded degrees, and 28 per cent were still in school. On the other hand, 53 per cent were no longer enrolled at this university.

2. Few football athletes enroll in business administration, education, and behavioral science courses. This is probably a result of the great number of football athletes who drop out of football at the end of their second playing semester and who concentrate on required basic courses and physical education courses.

3. The playing semester evidently presents an academic problem for the athletes since it is at the end of this semester that most probations occur.

4. Among those football athletes placed on probation or suspension, 53.33 per cent became college dropouts.

5. Only 27.78 per cent of the football dropouts became college dropouts.

6. The cumulative grade point mean of transfer participants is only slightly higher than that for non-transfer participants, but the median of non-transfers is higher than that for the transfers. The advantage should rest with the transfer group since none can be admitted with a grade average below D, whereas a few of the non-transfer group are in this category.

7. Freshman participants during playing semesters have a much higher grade point mean in non-academic courses than in academic courses, 3.31 to 1.42, respectively. The same pattern holds during the non-playing semesters, 3.12 to 1.69, respectively.

8. Sophomore participants, during playing semesters, have a higher grade point mean in non-academic courses than in academic courses, 2.55 to 1.39, respectively. The same pattern continues during non-playing semesters, 3.01 to 1.59, respectively. Transfer participants have a lower mean in each category than do non-transfer participants.

9. The above pattern continues to exist for the junior football participants. Although the academic mean has begun to increase, it is still below a C grade level.

10. The same pattern continues to prevail among the senior football participants. The academic mean continues to increase but does not reach the C grade level until the non-playing semester.

Findings seven, eight, nine, and ten above indicate that the football participants are only able to meet school standards by relying heavily upon the non-academic courses to make up for their deficiencies in academic courses.

11. The proportion of white varsity players declined from 83.67 per cent in 1966 to 66.67 per cent in 1971. The lowest percentage occurred in 1970, when it dropped to 57.63 per cent. The non-white percentage of 16.33 in 1966 increased

to 42.37 per cent by 1970, and then it declined to 33.33 per cent in 1971.

12. Freshman football teams from the fall of 1966 through the fall of 1971 consistently included a high proportion of whites. The proportion varied from a low of 75 per cent in 1967 to a high of 88.46 per cent in 1970. Thus, few non-whites were ever members of the freshman teams during this period.

#### Recommendations

Based upon the investigation and findings of the present study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Athletic Department should maintain complete academic records on each person who tries out for the team. Other information regarding race, marital status, campus or off-campus residence, scholarship status, previous college experience, part-time work, financial background, major and minor areas of study, and tutorial assistance should also be included in the records. Such data would provide information for the forming of profiles to be used in recruiting and would help improve the selection of football prospects. The records of a participant should be maintained for at least ten years before their removal from the files. Even after the person has departed, attempts should be made to keep the records as nearly up-to-date as possible with respect to occupation. Continuous studies based upon such

data could be of immense value to the coaches in the areas of recruiting, counseling, and degree planning.

2. A study should be undertaken to determine what occupational positions are being held by players who have received degrees and to what extent football played a part in their being in the occupation.

3. Research should be conducted to discover whether a significant difference exists between football athletes and non-athletes in academic courses.

4. Research should be conducted to determine whether a low academic achieving athlete or a high academic achieving athlete will perform the best athletically.

5. Research should be undertaken to determine the feasibility of accepting low academic achieving junior-college football prospects.

6. Research should be carried out to determine the academic image of the football participants at this university among the students, administrators, and alumni of this university.

7. A study should be initiated to determine which factors contribute to senior football participants' withdrawing from school after their senior playing semester.

8. Research should be done to determine which factors significantly contribute to football participants' tendency to discontinue playing football after one, two, and three years of participation.

APPENDIX

AN INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL PLAYER'S

SELF-ANALYSIS INVENTORY

The items on this questionnaire are designed to provide a current profile of the football participants at North Texas State University. Its purpose is to provide for a better understanding of the players. Please answer all questions.

1. What is your student classification?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Freshman                      (d) \_\_\_\_\_ Junior  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore                    (e) \_\_\_\_\_ Senior

2. What are your major and minor fields of study?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Major  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ Minor  
(c) \_\_\_\_\_ Undecided

3. What is your age?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ 18-19                      (d) \_\_\_\_\_ 24-25  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ 20-21                      (e) \_\_\_\_\_ 26 or over  
(c) \_\_\_\_\_ 22-23

4. What is your marital status?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Single  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ Legally married  
(c) \_\_\_\_\_ Living with a girl friend  
(d) \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced

5. Do you possess a car?            (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes    (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No

6. What is your race?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ White                      (d) \_\_\_\_\_ Indian  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ Black                      (e) \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)  
(c) \_\_\_\_\_ Mexican-American  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Based on what you think your father's and/or mother's annual income to be, what is your economic background?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Less than \$3,000            (d) \_\_\_\_\_ \$10,000 to 12,999  
(b) \_\_\_\_\_ \$3,000 to 5,999            (e) \_\_\_\_\_ \$13,000 to 15,999  
(c) \_\_\_\_\_ \$6,000 to 9,999            (f) \_\_\_\_\_ \$16,000 or more

8. Have you had an older brother who participated in intercollegiate football?  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No
9. Did your father participate in intercollegiate football?  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No
10. Mark in order (for example, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) what you consider to have been most influential in your choosing to play intercollegiate football.  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Father (e) \_\_\_\_\_ Girl friends  
 (b) \_\_\_\_\_ Mother (f) \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)  
 (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Older brother  
 (d) \_\_\_\_\_ High school coach \_\_\_\_\_
11. Mark in order (for example, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) what you consider to have been most influential in your choosing to play intercollegiate football.  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Prestige  
 (b) \_\_\_\_\_ Glamour  
 (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Economic reasons  
 (d) \_\_\_\_\_ The only means available to get a college education  
 (e) \_\_\_\_\_ The desire for a coaching career  
 (f) \_\_\_\_\_ In order to get a chance to play pro-football  
 (g) \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)  
 \_\_\_\_\_
12. Of the two questions above (10 and 11), list in order of influence the three most important factors for you.  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (b) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (c) \_\_\_\_\_
13. Are you interested in playing pro-football?  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Maybe
14. Do you have a scholarship? (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No
15. Would you participate in intercollegiate football without being awarded a scholarship?  
 (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
 (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
 (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know



21. How many hours of tutoring do you estimate you receive each week?
- |                            |                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| (a) _____ None             | (f) _____ 9 to 12 hours    |
| (b) _____ Less than 1 hour | (g) _____ 12 to 15 hours   |
| (c) _____ 1 to 3 hours     | (h) _____ 15 hours or more |
| (d) _____ 3 to 6 hours     |                            |
| (e) _____ 6 to 9 hours     |                            |
22. How do you evaluate the tutoring you receive?
- |                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| (a) _____ Excellent | (d) _____ Fair |
| (b) _____ Very good | (e) _____ Poor |
| (c) _____ Good      |                |
23. How would you evaluate the tutoring service offered by this university?
- |                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| (a) _____ Excellent | (d) _____ Fair |
| (b) _____ Very good | (e) _____ Poor |
| (c) _____ Good      |                |
24. Do you anticipate getting a college degree at the end of four years of college?
- |               |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| (a) _____ Yes | (c) _____ Most likely |
| (b) _____ No  | (d) _____ Maybe       |
25. If you had a son who was capable of playing football, would you encourage him to play intercollegiate football?
- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes    (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No    (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know
26. Do you consider the participation in intercollegiate football a necessity for your education?
- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes    (b) \_\_\_\_\_ No    (c) \_\_\_\_\_ Undecided
27. Are you interested in participating in other campus activities?
- |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|
| (a) _____ Very much so            |
| (b) _____ Of some interest        |
| (c) _____ Of very little interest |
| (d) _____ No interest             |
28. During the football playing season, do you feel that you have sufficient time to participate in other campus activities?
- |               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| (a) _____ Yes | (c) _____ Perhaps, if I wanted to |
| (b) _____ No  |                                   |

29. Other than football, are you an active participant in campus organizations? (For example, hold an office, attend meetings regularly, take an active part in its various activities, etc.)

- |                |                        |
|----------------|------------------------|
| (a) _____ None | (d) _____ Three        |
| (b) _____ One  | (e) _____ Four         |
| (c) _____ Two  | (f) _____ Five or more |

30. Please list the campus organizations in which you are an active participant.

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) \_\_\_\_\_
- (c) \_\_\_\_\_
- (d) \_\_\_\_\_
- (e) \_\_\_\_\_
- (f) \_\_\_\_\_
- (g) \_\_\_\_\_

31. Other than football, do you hold an office position in any campus organizations?

- |                |                        |
|----------------|------------------------|
| (a) _____ None | (d) _____ Three        |
| (b) _____ One  | (e) _____ Four         |
| (c) _____ Two  | (f) _____ Five or more |

32. During the playing season, do you engage in any part-time work?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (b) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 to 3 hours per week
- (c) \_\_\_\_\_ 3 to 6 hours per week
- (d) \_\_\_\_\_ 6 to 9 hours per week
- (e) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 to 12 hours per week
- (f) \_\_\_\_\_ 12 hours or more per week

33. During the non-playing season, do you engage in any part-time work?

- (a) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (b) \_\_\_\_\_ 1 to 3 hours per week
- (c) \_\_\_\_\_ 3 to 6 hours per week
- (d) \_\_\_\_\_ 6 to 9 hours per week
- (e) \_\_\_\_\_ 9 to 12 hours per week
- (f) \_\_\_\_\_ 12 to 15 hours per week
- (g) \_\_\_\_\_ 15 hours or more per week

34. Do you participate in other intercollegiate sports?

- |                |                        |
|----------------|------------------------|
| (a) _____ None | (d) _____ Three        |
| (b) _____ One  | (e) _____ Four or more |
| (c) _____ Two  |                        |



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Bierman, B. W., Winning Football, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1937.
- Larche, Harry E., Techniques of Football Coaching, New York, A. S. Barnes and Company, 1969.
- Pollard, James E., Ohio State Athletics, 1879-1959, Columbus, Ohio, Athletic Department, Ohio State University, 1959.
- Stecklein, John E. and Logan Dameron, Intercollegiate Athletics and Academic Progress: A Comparison of Academic Characteristics of Athletes and Non-Athletes at the University of Minnesota, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, Report Series No. 3, 1965, cited in James Carson Hilyer, "An Analysis of the Academic Status of Southeastern Conference Football Players," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi, 1968.

### Articles

- Barnes, Samuel E., "Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Athletics," 60th Annual Proceedings, College Physical Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1957, 184-193.
- Coleman, James S., "The Competition for Adolescent Energies," Phi Delta Kappan, LXII (December, 1960), 231-236.
- "College Sports Feel Budget Ax," Business Week (August 28, 1971), 38-39.
- "Education--Athletic Nonsense: A Proposal for Severing the Connection Between Higher Education and Competitive Sports," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (December, 1963), 487-490.
- Fall, Charles R., "Amateur College Athletics," Teachers College Record, LIV (October, 1952--May, 1953), 215-222.

- Harden, Edgar L., "What College Presidents Say About Athletics," The Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, XXXI (March, 1960), 18-19, 76.
- Hickman, Herman, "Confessions of a Football Recruiter," The Saturday Evening Post, (October 30, 1954), 32-33, 137-138.
- Jenkins, Dan, "The Fighting Illini," Sports Illustrated, XXVI (March 6, 1967), 16-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Idea is to Have Some Fun--And Who Needs to be No. 1," Sports Illustrated, XXVIX (November 11, 1968), 19-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Transformed by the Transfer," Sports Illustrated, XXXI (October 27, 1969), 36-39.
- "Jeremiah of Jock Liberation," Time, (May 24, 1971), 88-89.
- Kroll, Walter and Kay H. Petersen, "Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Football Teams," The Research Quarterly, XXXVI (December, 1965), 433-440.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Study of Values Test and Collegiate Football Teams," The Research Quarterly, XXXVI (December, 1965), 441-447.
- Marco, S. M., "The Place of Athletics in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXI (November, 1960), 422-427.
- Maule, Tex, "Make No Mistakes About It," Sports Illustrated, XXVIII (January 29, 1968), 24-35.
- McCormick, John, "Score One for Today's Students," Sports Illustrated, XXVIII (May 20, 1968), 46-48, 53-59.
- Murphy, Betty Lou, "The Proper Focus of Our Field is the Study of Sport," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, XLI (June, 1970), 27, 44.
- Plant, Marcus L., "The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXII (January, 1961), 1-8.
- Putnam, Pat, "A Man Has Got to Go With What He Believes," Sports Illustrated, XXVIX (October 7, 1968), 60-61.
- Reed, William R., "Big Time Athletics' Commitment to Education," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, XXXIV (September, 1963), 29-30.

- Ruby, Michael, "The Football Player Who Changed His Goal," Business Week, (January 2, 1971), 6.
- Ryan, Pat, "A Grim Run to Fiscal Daylight," Sports Illustrated, XXXIV (February 1, 1971), 18-23.
- Singer, Robert N., "Communicate or Perish," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, XXXVIX (February, 1968), 40-41.
- Stoke, Harold W., "College Athletics, Education or Show Business?" Atlantic Monthly, CXIII (March, 1954), 46-50.

#### Unpublished Materials

- Brown, Elmer Arthur, "Personal Study and Comparative Analysis of the Track Men and the Football Men at North Texas State Teachers College for the Period of Ten Years (1930-1940)," unpublished master's thesis, Department of Health and Physical Education, North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas, 1949.
- Earl, C. D., "The Academic Achievement of College Athletes and Non-Athletes From Four Ethnic Groups," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968.
- Gee, Thomas, letter, Department of Education, North Texas State University, 1970.
- Hilyer, James Carson, "An Analysis of the Academic Status of Southeastern Conference Football Players," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi, 1968.
- Kirchner, R. J., "Participation in Athletics and Its Effect on Academic Success at Central Michigan University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.
- Ness, Gary, memorandum, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1970.
- Smith, E. B., "Academic Achievement and Athletic Participation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 1965.

Steuck, R. H., "A Comparison of the Scholastic Performance of Athletes and Athletic Participants with Non-Athletes at Wisconsin State College at La Crosse," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1963.

Newspapers

Houston Chronicle, December 6, 1970.

Houston Chronicle, January 12, 1971.

Houston Chronicle, January 13, 1971.

Houston Chronicle, January 17, 1971.