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The purpose of this study was to examine the knowledge, attitude, and appreciation of high school student-athletes toward National Collegiate Athletics Association bylaw 14.3, commonly known as Proposition 48. The subjects completed a questionnaire inquiring about their knowledge of Proposition 48 as well as knowledge of its qualifying criteria. Those subjects that acknowledged having heard of the bylaw were then asked questions pertaining to their attitude towards Proposition 48 as a standard for intercollegiate athletics eligibility and the effect of their knowledge of Proposition 48 on their study habits in preparing for the pressures of being an intercollegiate athlete.

The results of the questionnaire provided a small sample of predominately white, female high school basketball and volleyball student-athletes with little or no knowledge of Proposition 48. A majority of those with knowledge supported the requirements of Proposition 48 and felt that their knowledge of the bylaw had no effect on their study habits.

The results of this study indicate that the majority (59.4%) support Proposition 48's requirements, including the use of minimum standards for athletics eligibility.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The French social philosopher Auguste Comte published a series of treaties during the 19th century in which he proposed a new science of society which he named sociology. He defined sociology as the study of why societies are orderly and why they change (Curry & Jiobu, 1984). Writings on the subject of sport and leisure and their relationship to the functions of society date back to the late 1800s, however, only within the last two or three decades has serious effort been made in the study of sport as a social phenomenon.

Loy, Kenyon, and McPerson (1981) state that

if sociology is the study of social order - the underlying regularity of human social behavior - including efforts to attain it and departures from it, the sociology of sport becomes the study of regularity, and departures from it, of human social behavior in a sports context. (p. 5)

Sport has been institutionalized in American society. It is viewed as necessary and functional for the continuation of society as we know it. Wilson (1994) writes, "Sports encode national identities. Through sports, Americans construct a coherent vision of what it means to be truly American" (p. 266). All forms of the media are inundated with sport activities. Sports talk radio shows, all sports television networks, and entire sections of daily newspapers, both local and national, are dedicated to sport coverage on a daily basis.
Sport also permeates the political arena. Politicians are often seen throwing out the first pitch at season-opening games in baseball and presenting awards to championship teams, both at the state and national level. Various past Presidents of the United States have asked National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) championship teams, Olympic medal winners, and professional teams to the White House for receptions after their successful athletic endeavors. In fact, President Theodore Roosevelt "...helped prod the colleges into forming the NCAA in order to make football safer and protect the amateur ideal" (Wilson, 1994, p. 270).

It is widely held belief that there are numerous benefits to athletic participation for both males and females. Such benefits include learning the values of cooperation and teamwork, improving self-confidence, improved social skills, a better understanding of hard work, self-discipline, and determination, and the value of setting goals and striving to achieve them. It has also been noted that athletic participation by high school aged students has been beneficial to them in the classroom, including less behavior problems, less absenteeism, and better grades (Burnette, 1996; Warfield, 1983).

Many sociologists agree that sport is a great socializing agent in teaching proper behavior as well as society's norms and expectations. But when taking the deviant behaviors of athletes into consideration, one can see how sport mirrors the society in which it exists. Most problems that plague society in general
(sexism, racism, corruption, violence, cheating, crime and drugs) can also be found in the world of sport. Therefore, by studying sport one can gain insight into the problems of society and hopefully look for solutions to benefit both sport and society as a whole.

Considering the number of sport participants and the low number of those breaking the law, an overwhelming majority must be learning the lessons of appropriate behavior and society’s expectations of them. Just consider the number of politicians, business executives, judges, lawyers, and community leaders who are former intercollegiate athletes who have gone on to become successful and productive members of society both during and after their athletic careers ended (i.e., Donna Lopiano, Bill Bradley, Robin Roberts, Steve Largent, Gerald R. Ford, Allen Page, Billie Jean King, and Arthur Ashe.)

Participation in sport is considered to have a positive impact on youths and adults alike. Athletes learn society’s expectations of appropriate behavior. They learn how to cooperate and work with others towards achieving a goal. Thus the benefits of athletics participation appear to outweigh potential negative outcomes. The impact of the NCAA on the life of the student-athlete is enormous. No matter how hard a student practices and trains to compete, the NCAA is the organization that determines whether he or she will be able to participate or not, according to preset rules and standards of which the student may not even be aware of.
Problem Statement

One of the functions of the NCAA is to regulate the academic and athletic eligibility of prospective and continuing student-athletes at Division I, II, and III institutions. NCAA Bylaw 14.3, better known as Proposition 48, was formulated by a group of chief executive officers from Division I and II member institutions. It was created as a method of standardizing initial eligibility determinations for graduating high school students who wished to participate in intercollegiate athletics at Division I and II institutions during their first year of full-time enrollment. According to the NCAA, Proposition 48 was designed as an effort to push high schools to do a better job of preparing their student-athletes for college level work (Holden, 1989).

The problem with this approach was that the NCAA never proposed a plan for how to better prepare the future collegiate student-athletes. The method for preparing the student-athletes appeared to remain with the individual high schools. Another problem was the decision to use standardized test score results as a determining factor of initial eligibility. Several authors have suggested that use of standardized test results creates a bias against blacks and females (Crouse & Trusheim, 1988; Owen & Doerr, 1999; Hanford, 1991) and that they are not necessarily predictors of future academic success. Therefore, lack of information and use of standardized tests ultimately deny certain groups equal access to the benefits of higher education provided through athletic participation.
Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the knowledge of, attitude towards and appreciation of (application of knowledge on behavior) the NCAA initial eligibility standards established by Proposition 48 in specific groups of high school age student-athletes.

Position Statement

The issues to be investigated here are tri-fold. The primary issue is whether the population that could be affected by Proposition 48 was informed of the rule and its requirements. The second issue is to assess how those student-athletes feel about the standards set by Proposition 48. The final issue is whether those student athletes are applying their knowledge of the bylaw to their academic preparation for intercollegiate athletics participation.

It is the writer's position that at the time of this study, student-athletes were not receiving the necessary information about the eligibility standards and how they could be affected until it was too late. The writer also takes the position that student-athletes of certain minority groups (including females and ethnic minorities) will agree with the critics who argue that standardized tests are an unfair tool to assess the academic readiness of students. Finally, it is the writer's position that notification of the bylaw would help student-athletes to prepare to meet the requirements prior to their high school graduation.
Proposition 48 may have been designed to restore some of the academic integrity to intercollegiate athletics that appeared to have declined in the quest for athletic dominance, but it has been the student-athletes who have had to pay the price. The price they had to pay was the loss of eligibility for athletic participation. Their athletic ineligibility also caused them to be ineligible for athletic scholarship money that would help to offset the increasing costs of higher education.

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that the majority of the high school student-athletes surveyed will have little or no knowledge of the NCAA initial eligibility bylaw Proposition 48 or its qualifying criteria. The second hypothesis is that those female and minority students with knowledge of this bylaw will not be in support of it as a standard for initial eligibility for athletics participation. Finally, it is also hypothesized that the student-athletes' knowledge of the standards of Proposition 48 will have a positive affect on their study habits.

Significance of Study

The information to be gained from this study can be significant in that it could show the NCAA that student-athletes are not being informed of the standards for initial eligibility for athletics participation. It could also show that, just as certain
groups of individuals felt that the use of standardized test results as a factor of eligibility was unfair to certain groups of student-athletes, those groups would feel the same way and view Proposition 48 as unfair or biased. Lastly, the results of this study could be significant in showing that those students who were informed of the standards of Proposition 48 took appropriate steps to assure that they would not be a victim of the rule by making better use of their study time. This would be significant because that was the primary objective of the creators of Proposition 48, a more prepared student-athlete.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief historical background of the NCAA as an organization and the various freshman eligibility requirements that the NCAA has imposed over the years, up-to and including Propositions 16, 42, and 48. The pros and cons of standardized tests will also be discussed as will the topic of minorities in sport, including both women and ethnic minorities. Finally, a discussion of two theoretical frameworks to analyze and interpret the data will be presented. This information should provide background to the rationale for why this study was done and why it is important.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Early intercollegiate football was very physical and competitions often resulted in numerous injuries and deaths. In early December 1905, under the urging of President Theodore Roosevelt, athletics leaders from 13 institutions that participated in intercollegiate athletics banned together to form the National Intercollegiate Football Conference. The primary purpose of this conference was changing the rules of intercollegiate football to address the safety issue. At a meeting of representatives from 62 institutions of higher education later that month, the conference
was renamed the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) with those schools as charter members (Edwards, 1973). In 1910, the IAAUS changed the name to what it is currently known as, the National Collegiate Athletic Association and soon became known as the "voice of college sports" (Falla, 1981, p. 15).

The NCAA now boasts 972 member institutions across three divisions. There are over 330,000 student-athletes participating in these divisions (based on 1996-97 participation figures). The original purpose of the NCAA was to address the physical and educational abuses of the student-athlete. Due in part to the growing popularity of intercollegiate athletics and the increased revenue opportunities, the NCAA has evolved to become more of an enforcement or social control agency designed to ensure that the many rules regarding amateurism and eligibility are followed appropriately.

Freshman Eligibility

The history of freshman eligibility dates back almost to the beginning of intercollegiate athletics in the late 19th century. The debate over freshman eligibility has centered on three important issues: (1) competitive equity, (2) financial considerations, and (3) academic integrity (NCAA, 1989). One of the strongest arguments against freshman competing in varsity athletics was the issue of academic integrity. It was believed that freshmen needed one year to adjust to the collegiate lifestyle. They needed to learn to be students first and athletes second. This remains an important issue
in the debate regarding freshman eligibility today. The issue of academic integrity is also why in the majority of big time athletics programs (i.e. high profile Division I institutions), academic centers for athletes have been developed. They help make the transition from high school senior to college freshman easier and help manage the difficulty of juggling a demanding schedule of athletics and academics.

It was first suggested in 1889 by then Harvard University president Charles Eliot that freshmen not be allowed to participate in varsity intercollegiate athletics. At that time, he wasn't able to convince his peers at his own institution, much less across the nation. Some colleges and universities decided to allow freshmen to participate while others chose not to. Then, in 1903, Harvard's administration agreed to deny athletic eligibility for freshman and soon, many other schools followed suit. However, there was no unified national policy on freshman athletic eligibility.

The NCAA was designed as an advisory organization. It did not have the numerous rules that are found today. In order to feel like there was competitive equity amongst competing institutions, colleges and universities would align themselves with others that had similar policies to their own. Historically, many conferences were formed based on where institutions stood on the issue of freshman eligibility. For example, a number of the East Coast schools which were considered "scholarly" institutions aligned together to form small school conferences while larger state schools which were
more attractive to the average student joined together to form conferences like the Big 10 and the Pac West.

Until the late 1960s, most of the larger colleges and universities banned freshman student-athletes from participation on varsity athletics teams, except during the two World Wars and the Korean War when many young men were serving in the armed forces (NCAA, 1989). Many of the schools which did not allow freshman to compete on the varsity teams were forced to establish freshman programs. They did this so that they would not lose recruits to small institutions that allowed freshman eligibility and promised them competition in their first year of enrollment. High school stars did not want to quit playing for a year so they often opted to go to smaller schools where they could participate immediately. The freshman programs offered the opportunity for participation without the excessive time demands of the varsity program. During this time they could learn to become a student as well as an athlete.

These programs, however, proved to be expensive both in terms of additional equipment and facility usage as well as the addition of athletic grants-in-aid that were soon implemented. Schools could no longer afford to support freshman teams financially. It soon became evident to these institutions that a national policy on freshman eligibility was needed in order to remain competitive athletically.
1.6 Rule

In 1964 the NCAA passed a nationally binding rule dealing with freshman eligibility during their playing season. This was known as the 1.6 rule. It stated that for a freshman to be eligible for participation and receive an athletics grant-in-aid, he would have to predict a 1.6 grade point average in college (NCAA, 1989). This prediction was based on a set of tables that factored in class rank or high school grade point average (GPA) and standardized test scores. This rule was actually more stringent than today's Proposition 48. Under 1.6 rule guidelines, someone who scored the Proposition 48 standard of 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) would have needed better than a 3.0 high school GPA to predict a 1.6 in college (NCAA, 1989).

Like Proposition 48, the 1.6 rule was met with much criticism and controversy, especially from minority organizations. The minority groups criticized the 1.6 rule, as they do Proposition 48, for its use of standardized test scores and asserted that such tests were blatantly discriminatory. Other groups, including the Ivy League, criticized the 1.6 rule as well. Their criticism focused on the belief that the NCAA should have no power over the institution in deciding who should receive financial aid of any kind.

After eight years of existence, in 1972 the 1.6 rule was voted out by NCAA member institutions. Smaller colleges and universities felt that the talent pool available to them was too small because of the rule. In 1973, in order to be eligible as a freshman and re-
ceive athletic grants-in-aid, the minimum academic standard became a 2.0 high school GPA regardless of what courses were taken (NCAA, 1989). Between 1972 and 1982, the academic standards for freshman eligibility were significantly lower and the criticisms of the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics as a lucrative business, not as institutions of higher learning, resumed.

Then, in an effort to diminish the business image and reassert the student-athlete ideal into intercollegiate athletics, a group of institutional presidents collaborated in the creation of a new policy-making organization, The American Council on Education (ACE) and crafted what became known at the 1983 NCAA Convention as Proposition 48.

**Proposition 48**

During the time of the creation and implementation of Proposition 48, it was a widely held belief in society that student-athletes, especially minorities, were enrolled in soft or easy courses so that they would maintain their athletic eligibility. Colleges and universities were being accused of using their student-athletes for publicity and revenues during their four years of eligibility then dropping them, very often without the benefit of an education or a degree. Intercollegiate athletics was consistently under attack by the media for exploiting student-athletes, particularly African American student-athletes. John Underwood, in a 1982 article in *Sports Illustrated*, summed up this notion by stating the stu-
dent-athletes were majoring in eligibility. Certain NCAA member institutions wanted to change or dispel that belief. Proposition 48 was developed in an effort for colleges and universities to regain credibility as institutions of higher learning.

Proposition 48 was brought before the membership of the 1983 NCAA Convention in San Diego, California. It is a NCAA by-law that mandates those student-athletes wishing to compete in intercollegiate athletics in Division I or II institutions during their first year in college must meet a set of universal standards composed of high school curriculum grade point average and standardized test scores. The following is a list of the initial eligibility requirements at the time of Proposition 48's enactment (a core course is defined as a recognized academic course designed to prepare a student for college level work) (NCAA, 1986):

1. Graduate from high school.

2. Attain a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a 4.000 scale) in a successfully completed core-curriculum of at least 11 academic courses.

3. Core-curriculum: 3 years in English, 2 in mathematics, 2 in social science and 2 in natural or physical science.

4. Achieve a minimum 700-combined score on the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) or 15 composite score on the ACT (American College Test).

Any prospective student-athlete who graduated from high school but did not meet both the minimum GPA and the minimum test score
requirement would be deemed a non-qualifier. Non-qualifiers were not eligible for athletic participation during their first year of full-time enrollment and could not receive any athletically related financial aid from Division I institutions.

A prospective student-athlete who graduated from high school and met either the GPA requirement or the test score requirement would be deemed a partial qualifier. Partial qualifiers were not eligible for practice or competition during their first year of full-time attendance but were eligible for athletically related financial aid. If they received athletic aid that first year, they would lose one year of athletic eligibility in Division I.

A qualifier, by Proposition 48 standards, was anyone who met both the core GPA requirement and the minimum test score requirement while graduating from high school. Qualifiers were eligible for both practice and competition and were also eligible to receive athletically related financial aid in their first year of full-time enrollment at a NCAA Division I institution.

Many of the proposals before the convention on the issue of initial eligibility suggested a minimum high school GPA in a core curriculum, as did the ACE group's proposal. However, their proposal was different with regard to the composition of the core curriculum and the use of minimum standardized test scores as part of the requirement. It was felt that because the quality of a 2.0 GPA could vary widely from high school to high school, a minimum standardized test score was the best available national measure of high school
performance.

Proposition 48 was initially criticized by many minority organizations for its use of standardized test scores as part of the eligibility requirement. As was stated earlier, standardized tests such as the SAT and the ACT have been accused of being biased against females and minorities. Blacks have historically scored lower on standardized tests than whites (Crouse & Trusheim, 1988). Such tests' use as a determining factor for eligibility was viewed as another way to deny black students access to the benefits of higher education. The issue of the use of standardized tests as a determining predictor of future academic success will be discussed later in this chapter.

One of the most vocal groups against the adoption of Proposition 48 came from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). According to a paper presented by Frederick S. Humphries (1983), there were several reasons for HBCUs to oppose Proposition 48, including that Proposition 48 blames the victim. He states that, "The academic preparation of athletes is but a microcosm of the education problem in our nation" (p. 4). He goes on to suggest that grades are relative to the educational experience of the student and the many factors that shape that experience. That those persons with limited access to adequate resources that would aid in developing their potential to learn are left at an unfair advantage against those students who do have access to those same resources. Such resources could include computers in the classrooms, smaller class
size, and more teachers to lower the student to teacher ratio.

While there were many people and organizations who spoke out against Proposition 48, many others were in favor of the legislation. The main argument in support of the provisions of Proposition 48 was the issue of academic integrity. No one could disagree that if freshman were going to be eligible for competition in their first year of enrollment, colleges needed to be assured that the student-athletes were prepared for the demands of college curricula. This legislation was viewed as a way of forcing the high schools to evaluate their courses and encouraging academic preparation at the secondary school level.

According to Sellers (1992), supporters of Proposition 48 also hoped to, "filter out those whose educational background provided them with little chance of succeeding in college, by eliminating a year of their athletic eligibility" (p. 48). He goes on to suggest that most colleges and universities would be less likely to recruit a student with three years of eligibility than one with all four years available. This suggestion reveals support for the unintended function of Proposition 48 that will be discussed in the theory portion of this chapter.

Although the creation and implementation of Proposition 48 created a standard of eligibility, it did not take the transcript evaluation process out of the hands of individual institutions. On January 16, 1993, the NCAA adopted a proposal that created the Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse (NCAA News, January 1993).
Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse

The NCAA Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse is an organization created in an effort to establish uniformity in freshman eligibility decisions and take the onus of initial eligibility determinations from the institutions. With the creation of the Clearinghouse, institutional variations in assessment of academic records were eliminated.

Every high school in the United States is required to submit course content and syllabi for each course that they wish to consider a core course. The Clearinghouse staff reviews the information submitted and determines if the course meets the definition of a NCAA core course. These courses are then listed on a form called 48H which lists the courses that high school offers which fit the definition of a core course.

With the implementation of the 48H form, this administrative process also resolved the concern of many university administrators that the quality of a 2.000 GPA could vary widely from high school to high school. That variation is one of the initial reasons for instituting the use of standardized test scores in the first place. Because the definition of a core course was now the same across the country, the administrators could be confident that students completing those courses were being taught the same type of information in preparing them for the rigors of university scholarship.

Any prospective student-athlete who wished to participate in a NCAA Division I (or II) institution must pay a fee and register with
the Clearinghouse. Each student-athlete must then submit all stan-
dardized test results and transcripts from each high school he or
she attended for verification of the academic courses taken and
grades received. It is important for prospective student-athletes
to register during or by the end of their junior year in high
school. The reason this is important is because once registered,
each student-athlete will receive a preliminary report from the
Clearinghouse detailing which courses were accepted from their
transcript, and in what areas they may be lacking according to the
core requirement. This way they have ample time to adjust their
course schedule to complete the required core classes for athletics
eligibility.

The colleges or universities must then request information on
their prospective student-athletes from the Clearinghouse on an In-
stitution Request List. The Clearinghouse notifies the institution
of the students' initial eligibility standing and areas where the
students may be deficient according to the current initial eligi-
bility requirements. The Clearinghouse also requires proof of gra-
duation from high schools before it will make a final certification
decision.

The initial problems that surrounded the enactment and appli-
cation of the Clearinghouse were similar to those problems found
when Proposition 48 was applied to its first incoming class. There
seemed to be an overwhelming number of prospective student-athletes
who were unaware of the Clearinghouse. This was also true for high
school counselors and administrators. This lack of knowledge often delayed the opportunity for participation for many first-year student-athletes. It is not known whether the students' lack of knowledge of the new initial eligibility certification process and the requirements of the process was due to a lack of communication and/or follow through on the part of the NCAA.

Proposition 42

Proposition 42, proposed and adopted at the 1989 NCAA Convention, was an amendment to the financial aid provision of Proposition 48. This proposal denied any institutional financial aid, including athletic scholarship, to entering freshman student-athletes who were not full qualifiers according to Proposition 48 standards.

Again, HBCUs, members of the black community, and civil rights leaders charged that this rule was blatantly discriminatory. Joseph Johnson, president of Grambling State University (a HBCU) and chairman of the National Association for Equal Opportunities in Higher Education, spoke out against Proposition 42. He argued that the majority of black student-athletes would be unable to attend college without financial aid, much less an athletic scholarship (Sailes, 1994). Gary Sailes (1994) goes on to state that the American Council on Education report from 1989 reported that, "87% of African-Americans attending college require financial aid" (p. 97).

The NCAA, under public pressure from academic institutions
across the country, not just HBCUs, amended Proposition 42 to just disqualify athletic scholarship to non and partial qualifiers while they could receive institutional financial aid that was awarded on a non-athletic basis.

**Proposition 16**

In 1995, the NCAA membership decided to change the initial eligibility requirements for Division I student-athletes with the adoption of Proposition 16, an amendment to Proposition 48. It asserted that, effective August 1, 1996, for those student-athletes first entering collegiate institutions on or after that date, to be eligible for practice, competition, and athletically related financial aid during his/her first year of residence, a Division I qualifier must meet the following requirements (NCAA, 1996):

1. Graduate from high school.

2. Present a minimum core course GPA and standardized test score according to an initial eligibility index where the minimum GPA is 2.000 in combination with a minimum SAT score of 900 (recentered) or ACT sum score of 86. A minimum SAT score of 820 (recentered) or ACT sum score of 68 would require a 2.500 minimum GPA.

3. Successfully complete a core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses as follows: 4 years in English, 2 in mathematics (1 year of algebra and 1 year of geometry or a higher level math course), 2 in social science, 2 in natural or physical science (including at least 1 year of a laboratory class), 1 additional year
in English, math or natural or physical science, and 2 additional academic courses (including anything from the above categories as well as foreign language, computer science, philosophy).

Proposition 16 was also viewed as controversial because it increased the already stiff requirements for participation in Division I institutions, the athletic programs with the most visibility where participating student-athletes could receive national recognition and the opportunity to extend their career into the professional leagues.

**Standardized Tests**

Since Proposition 48's enactment, much of the surrounding controversy has focused on the use of SAT and ACT scores as criteria of eligibility. The Education Testing Service (ETS), which created the tests, claims that the SAT and ACT predict how well a student will perform in their freshman year in college (Robinson, 1981).

Many critics have questioned whether SAT and ACT results measure an individual's existing or potential ability to do academic work? Sellers (1992) lists several authors (Baumann & Henschen, 1986; Ervin, Saunders, Gillis, & Hogrebe, 1985; Lange, Dunham, & Alpert, 1988; Purdy, Eitze, & Hufnagel, 1982; Walter, Smith, Hoey, & Wilhelm, 1987) of studies that have found that high school GPA has been a successful predictor of college GPA. He argues further that studies have demonstrated an inconclusive relationship between standardized test scores and college GPAs. In 1989, Sellers con-
ducted an investigation into the predictors of academic success for a major college football program. In his analysis of only black student-athletes, "high school GPA was the only significant predictor of college GPA" (p. 51). These results challenge the assertion that standardized tests are accurate predictors of future academic success.

Jencks and Crouse (1982) state that, "...individual's 'aptitude' for higher education could depend on the quality of their secondary education" (p. 23). Those persons with limited access to adequate resources that would aid in developing their potential to learn are left at an unfair advantage against those students who have access to the same resources. Adequate resources could include computers in the classroom, smaller class size, and more teachers to lower the student-to-teacher ratio. It follows that student-athletes from lower income areas where the above resources are not available, regardless of race, are at a disadvantage when it comes to standardized tests.

In referring to the SAT and its predictability of future academic success, it has been documented that the average scores of women, minorities, and people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are lower than those of men, the white majority, and wealthier people respectfully (Holden, 1989; Crouse & Trusheim, 1988). Therefore, use of these test scores as a major criteria for determining athletic eligibility seem to be an unfair predictor of future academic achievement.
Some feminists have blamed the discrepancy between male and female test scores on social conditioning which discourages girls from taking science and mathematics at younger ages. Females generally score about 60 points lower than males (Holden, 1989). The ETS claimed, however, that the discrepancy is due to the fact that the “group of girls who take the SAT have somewhat different educational and socioeconomic backgrounds than [the] boys” (Holden, 1989, p. 885). This argument doesn’t make sense in terms of their claim that the girls have a different background than the boys when boys and girls from the same high schools across the country are taking the test at the same time.

As stated earlier in this chapter, Blacks have historically scored lower on standardized test scores than whites. The National Center for Fair and Open Testing (FairTest) asserted that the ETS uses words that are not part of the black experience such as regatta, pirouette, timpanist, and melodeon. Using these words creates a bias against minorities. Generally, blacks score about 200 points lower than whites (Crouse & Trusheim, 1988). The ETS states that the SAT and ACT are carefully combed for possible bias but agree that the discrepancy between white students and minorities is due to unequal educational opportunities (Leo, 1989).

In summary, there are other factors that need to be considered when evaluating a student’s potential for success in post-secondary education. According to Schurr (1988), personality variables could explain 21% of the verbal score variance and 8% of the mathematics
score variance. Some other factors that have not been considered when evaluating differences in test scores are a student’s creativity, motivation, research ability, and character (Schurr, 1988). Whether the test score discrepancies are the result of using a biased testing instrument or the unequal educational opportunities available to lower-class students, it is clear that the tests are not objective and therefore questionable as the basis for determining athletics eligibility requirements. Either way, using such an instrument for initial eligibility can be viewed as another way of blaming the victim.

Two of the groups who were discussed as being victims of standardized tests are women and ethnic minorities. The consequences of these two groups' minority status in sport will be discussed next.

Minorities and Sport

Women and Sport

Women are a minority when it comes to athletics participation. Like males, females have participated and competed in various athletic activities for many years. The NCAA, however, only sponsored intercollegiate athletics at the varsity level for men until October 24, 1967, when the NCAA Council appointed a committee "to study the feasibility of establishing appropriate machinery to provide for the control and supervision of women's intercollegiate athletics" (Falla, 1981, p. 161). This committee emerged because some Association
members began to feel that not allowing varsity competition for women violated several of the NCAA's founding principles, "to supervise and promote all forms of intercollegiate athletics among its members," which included women (Falla, 1981, p. 161). During the 1966-67 academic year, sixty-two NCAA member institutions offered five or more intercollegiate sports for women. By 1971-72, those numbers jumped to 186 schools with 26 of these offering ten or more sports for women (Falla, 1981).

Then in 1971, female physical educators representing 278 colleges and universities founded the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The AIAW was developed in order to challenge the male dominated NCAA (Guttmann, 1978). Women college sports leaders did not want the NCAA to involve itself in varsity athletics for women for fear of women's sports becoming plagued with some of the problems associated with male sports, including violence, cheating, and decreased focus on the merits of higher education.

Initially, the AIAW was opposed to national championships and athletic scholarships for several reasons including, the competition associated with off-campus recruiting and the cost of such recruiting. However, in 1973 their membership voted to allow athletic scholarships. By 1975 the AIAW had national championships in 19 varsity sports for women (as compared to 13 offered by the NCAA) (Guttmann, 1978). Soon the same controversies that plagued men's sports became apparent in the AIAW. Coaches were accusing each
other of recruiting violations and they soon felt that personal off-campus recruiting, although against the rules, was now indispensable if they wanted to be competitive.

In 1972 the United States Congress passed the Education Amendment Act. Title IX of this amendment states that, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." *(Achieving Gender Equity, I-1)*. In order for a college or university to be in compliance with Title IX, it must meet at least one of three criteria established by this amendment. The three criteria are:

1. Proportionality - Are the total number of athletes, male and female, proportional to their total enrollment at that institution?

2. Historical Effort: Does the institution have a continuing history of expanding athletics opportunities for women on their campus?

3. Interests and abilities: Does the institution demonstrate success in meeting the interests and abilities of the females on its campus?

Again, the college or university must only meet one of the three criteria to be in compliance with this federal law.

The adoption of Title IX produced many benefits to female student-athletes and facilitated increased growth in participation in
women's athletics during the 1970's. "By 1978, the number of female high school student-athletes had grown from 300,000 to more than two million while female intercollegiate athletics participation grew from 32,000 to more than 64,000" (Achieving Gender Equity, I-1).

Because of Title IX, the NCAA began to gradually expand the number of championships that were offered for women. The benefits of NCAA membership (public exposure and potential income) outweighed those of the AIAW for female athletes and institutions sponsoring women's sports. The possibility of such benefits brought about the downfall of the AIAW. The group finally dissolved in 1981 and the NCAA became the only sponsor of intercollegiate championships for women. According to 1997-98 NCAA participation rates for women, there are more than 135,110 females participating in athletics at the intercollegiate level (NCAA website).

The popularity of athletics for girls and women exploded after the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta, Georgia, where the USA women's teams won gold medals in basketball, softball, soccer, gymnastics and ice hockey. Such successes spawned two professional basketball leagues in the United States as well as increased participation in girls' ice hockey and soccer. Previously, if women wanted to continue in athletics after their intercollegiate eligibility was exhausted, they had to go to Europe and Asia and participate in the international leagues overseas. Another benefit of the success of 1996 Olympics was increased visibility for female athletes in all sports providing them increased opportunities in areas of economic
marketability. Sheryl Swoops (of the WNBA) was the first female to have an athletic shoe named after her. Mia Hamm (of the Olympic women's soccer team) can now be seen in many commercials including one in which she competes in various sports against Michael Jordan with the slogan "I can do anything better than you" (Gatorade commercial). Previously such rewards were only available to male athletes.

Although women's athletics have come along way since the passing of Title IX, they still fall short in many areas when compared to men's athletics teams at NCAA institutions. Operating, scholarship, and recruiting budgets for women's sports still are much lower than those of male sports at the majority of NCAA schools (Brady, 1997). Unfortunately, many institutions are dropping men's sports and blaming Title IX for this decision.

Ethnic Minorities and Sport

Another minority group whose presence in intercollegiate athletics grew tremendously during the 1970's was the black athletes. Blacks had not been included in either professional or intercollegiate athletics for many years due to long standing racial practices and prejudices. Until Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in baseball, blacks had been segregated from that sport as well as many others. Colleges and universities were forced to desegregate during the 1960's thereby allowing blacks to attend previously all-white institutions. This led to desegregation of athletic teams as well
and blacks soon found their way into colleges and universities through the opportunity that athletics participation provided.

Sports have had a major impact and influence in the black community, especially among black male youths. Many poor black youths grow up believing that the best way to get out of poverty is through participation in sports. They often admire professional athletes and hope to become the next Michael Jordan of basketball or Barry Sanders of football. However, this is rarely the case. Only certain, exceptional athletes make it to the professional ranks and their careers generally last an average of 4-5 years.

Many people believe that Proposition 48 was created to curb the budding black dominance in collegiate sports, especially high profile, high revenue sports such as football and basketball. According to Kroll (1989), 88% of the black Division I student-athletes were attending school on athletic scholarships. Also, blacks represented 52% of the men's basketball players and 36% of the football players in Division I institutions (Kroll, 1989).

Black males were the group hardest hit by the standards set by Proposition 48. As reported in the NCAA News (1988), "of the 297 partial qualifiers in Division I that year, 65% were black, including 213 who failed to achieve the minimum test score and 32 who did not achieve the minimum grade point average" (p. 1). The NCAA News (1993) reported that the number of black athletes that enrolled in college immediately following Proposition 48's implementation declined by slightly more than 2%. According to a 1991 NCAA report on
partial qualifiers, blacks averaged 65.8% of the total partial qualifiers between 1987 and 1991 with an average of 80.6% of those not meeting the test score requirement.

The results of that NCAA study tend to support the belief of many of the bylaws opponents; that Proposition 48 was created in an effort to prevent black athletes from benefits available through intercollegiate athletics competition. A theoretical explanation for the creation of Proposition 48 can be found in the propositions of Structural Functionalism and Conflict Theory.

Structural Functionalism

Structural Functionalists study social systems as a whole and the impact of the various parts on the functioning of the whole. Three sociologists with an important influence on contemporary structural functionalism are Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons and Robert K. Merton. Each theorist’s views were similar in their study of society’s structures and the outcome function that their interaction produced.

Structural Functionalists believe, “Sport exists because it satisfies a biological or cultural need to play or disport” (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 25). According to this theory, “the institution of sport is integral to society, providing both socialization and a means for upward socioeconomic mobility for those who invest what it takes to achieve” (Figler & Whitaker, 1991, p. 42).

Emile Durkheim believed that social order was maintained be-
cause of cultural consensus, meaning everyone in a particular so-
ciety agreed on the "fundamental beliefs, creeds, and ideologies of
their culture" (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 79). Some dominant values
of American general culture (equality, success, and determination)
are also dominant values that can be learned and developed through
participation in sport.

Durkheim studied society's structures, functions, and their
relationship to the needs of society as a whole. His focus was on
the relationship between social causes and social functions. Ac­
according to Ritzer (1988),

the study of social causes is concerned with why a given
structure exists as well as why it takes a certain form. In
contrast, the study of social functions is concerned with the
needs of the larger system met by a given structure. (p. 82)

As it relates to this study, Durkheim would be concerned with the
relationship between the NCAA and the student-athletes. He would
study the extent to which the NCAA has or has not met the student-
athletes' needs and how the adoption of bylaws such as Proposition
48 did or did not contribute to its ability to meet those needs.

The writings of Durkheim had an influence on the work of Tal-
cott Parsons who was concerned with how order was maintained and how
the structures or systems controlled the actors of the society (Rit-
zer, 1988). On the subject of the NCAA and Proposition 48, Parsons
may question whether the NCAA, through adoption of bylaws such as
Proposition 48, was actually maintaining order or creating inst-
ability in the organization or in society as a whole.

Robert K. Merton, a student of Talcott Parsons, believed,
"The focus of the structural functionalist should be on social functions rather than on individual motives" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 97). He also introduced the concepts of manifest and latent functions where, according to Ritzer (1988), "manifest functions are those that are intended, whereas latent functions are unintended" (pp. 100).

These different types of functions can be used to explain the NCAA bylaw Proposition 48. As was stated earlier in this chapter, Proposition 48 has disproportionately affected minority males. Whether this was caused through lack of awareness of the bylaw or through an educational disadvantage, the lack of awareness in minority groups of the standards of Proposition 48 could be viewed as either a manifest (intended) or latent (unintended) function. The manifest function of Proposition 48 was to increase the academic preparation of intercollegiate athletes and therefore return some academic integrity to intercollegiate athletics in general. The latent function, or unintended consequence, was the decrease in enrollment of minority student-athletes due to their partial or non-qualifier status and subsequent ineligibility for athletics grants-in-aid.

Structural Functionalists view change as occurring gradually over time. The current organizational structure of the NCAA and the adoption of Proposition 48 can be analyzed using this perspective. The recent restructuring of the NCAA has shown that, over time, the NCAA's role or function is no longer that of an advisory agency. As we approach the new millennium, its role has become more of an
enforcement agency used to monitor the implementation of the many rules that have been adopted to control intercollegiate amateur athletics.

In contrast to that ideal, that change occurs gradually, the old adage, the more things change, the more they remain the same, comes to mind. In a racist society, the adoption of Proposition 48 seemed inevitable as the visibility and marquee value of the student-athlete grew over time. With the increased amount of publicity devoted to intercollegiate athletics, and the increasing number of minority athletes in the “high profile” sports, the adoption of Proposition 48 could be viewed as a way to curb the budding black dominance and return intercollegiate athletics to the white majority.

The power of the NCAA has grown substantially over the years because of the role it plays in the future of intercollegiate athletics. With the change in the organizational structure of the NCAA at the 1997 Convention, there is no longer a system where each institution has a vote on the rules changes that will have an effect on all members. The decisions are now made by a small group of institutional presidents and chief executive officers, not by athletics administrators. With this process, are the needs of the many (the student-athletes) or the needs of the few (the decision-making institutions) being considered when new legislation comes up for a vote?

It is obvious that the NCAA and the student-athletes need each
other to continue to grow and prosper as each has in recent years. Because the NCAA is there to regulate the recruitment and eligibility of potential and returning student-athletes, it is viewed as leveling the playing field amongst institutions. Every institution is given the opportunity to recruit the best players (as opposed to having different standards in place depending on the institution) and therefore allowing each institution an opportunity to be successful. The playing field, however, was not level because the information was not made available to all high school student-athletes equally, thus the NCAA is not meeting its responsibility.

Structural Functionalism may not be the best sociological theory to use in describing the NCAA and its role in the preparation of high school student-athletes for intercollegiate athletics. This appears to be an instance where the NCAA is contributing to a dysfunctional dimension of society in the United States through the perpetuation of racist practices, attitudes, and policies embedded in certain bylaws such as Proposition 48.

Conflict Theory

Conflict Theory is viewed as a theory that came about, in part, as a reaction to Structural Functionalism. Structural Functionalists were criticized for theorizing on "abstract social systems instead of real societies" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 103). According to Figler and Whitaker (1991), conflict theory makes society's members are forced through coercion to participate in a society that does not treat them fairly, while
their desire for bringing about social change is blunted through system-fostered opiates such as religion and sport. (pp. 42)

As stated earlier, a functional explanation of sport would be that sport exists, “because humans have an urge or need for recreation” (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 25). A Marxian explanation would be that sport exists, “because sport is profitable; because the ‘masses’ can be duped into liking it; because sport diverts the ‘masses’ from thinking about their plight” (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 25). Philosopher Paul Hoch was first to state that "sport was developed as “an opiate of the masses” (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 26). This means it is used as a broadly effective socializing institution that creates ways for people to find common bonds and conform to the acceptable ways of society, ignoring the reality of oppression and maintaining false hopes of upward social mobility.

Ritzer (1988), states that, “...conflict theories emphasize the dominance of some social groups, see social order based on manipulation and control by dominant groups...” (p. 78). This explains why the adoption of Proposition 48 outraged many black coaches and minority organizations. Using this theory, Proposition 48 could be viewed as another way for the white majority to dominate and control access to the educational and economic opportunities for certain athletically gifted minority groups.

A significant body of writing on the Conflict Theory has come from Karl Marx, Ralf Dahrendorf, and Randall Collins. The concern of Conflict Theorists was to show Structural Functionalists that so-
ciety was being held together by organized coercion or enforced con-
traint, not by voluntary consensus (Ritzer, 1988).

Ralf Dahrendorf focused on the larger social structures of
society and the idea that various positions within society have
different amounts of authority. His belief was that positions held
authority, not individuals. With this authority lies the assumption
of dominance over other positions. Therefore those in positions of
authority seek to maintain the system as it is, while those without
power or authority seek change, thus conflicts arise. Describing
the relationship of Conflict Theory to the adoption of Proposition
48, member institutions adopted Proposition 48 in an effort to main-
tain the ideals of the higher educational system represented in the
concept of the student-athlete. But by doing so they effectively
took control of the access to this system from certain student-ath-
letes therefore causing conflict within the NCAA membership.

Marx was very influential on the thinking of Randall Collins.
According to Collins (1985), inherent in humans is the desire to
dominate while at the same time to not be dominated, therefore con-
licts are bound to arise. Every social organization has various
levels of power and authority where occupants of certain positions
have a "right to exercise control over other positions..." (Collins,
1985, p. 62). Such differentiation in the distribution of power and
authority invariably causes conflicts to occur between groups.

In this case there was conflict within the NCAA membership.
Although the rules of the NCAA are voted upon and approved by the
membership, at the time of this bylaw's adoption, there was a one school, one vote policy. Use of standardized test scores as a determining factor of eligibility, a test where minorities and economically disadvantaged persons score lower than their white and more prosperous counterparts respectively, destined HBCUs to be the most effected by the new bylaw. There was little that could be done by that group because they are so small in number, therefore conflicts arose between the NCAA and minority organizations such as HBCUs. Members of the HBCUs argued that the issue of test score minimums prevented them from continuing to do what they have done well as higher educational institutions for many years. What they have done is take the undereducated, underprivileged minority student and helped them to succeed in the classroom and have graduated them to become productive members of society.

Collins' views differed from those of other conflict theorists. He viewed "social structures as inseparable from the actors who construct them and whose interaction patterns are their essence" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 113). He did agree, however, that those with power and authority are likely to attempt to maintain their position, while unintentionally (or intentionally) exploiting those without power and authority. This view on power and authority is similar to Merton's manifest and latent functions and can be used to explain the adoption of Proposition 48 as necessary to the ideals of the NCAA while ignoring or downplaying the fact that it disproportionately effected minority student-athletes and the mission of minority
Another reason many member institutions were upset at the passing of Proposition 48 was that it held student-athletes to a higher admissions standard than the traditional student at many member institutions. This was an example of certain groups having power and authority over numerous individuals who had no choice other than to comply with higher standards. Establishing higher test score standards was argued by several coaches within the NCAA as a way of lowering the black presence in predominantly white educational institutions and ultimately blocking their access to higher income positions or lucrative professional careers.

Conflict Theory appears to more appropriately describe the relationship between the NCAA and the student-athletes. The institution of intercollegiate athletics seems to be held together through coercion, not consensus, with the adoption of bylaws such as Proposition 48. The lack of knowledge on the part of the student-athlete can be attributed to the desire of those in power to change the image of the NCAA, under the guise of returning some of the integrity to athletics in the higher education arena.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study was to determine high school age student-athletes' knowledge of, attitude towards, and appreciation (behavioral response) of the current NCAA standards of initial eligibility for athletics participation during the freshman year in college. The purpose of this chapter is to provide information on the instrumentation used in this study, the subject selection process, definition and description of the dependent and independent variables, and the method of analysis that will be used.

Instrumentation

Questionnaires (see Appendix D) were chosen as the best method of gathering data for this study because the number of respondents to be used was large and to use in-depth, open-ended interviews, for example, would be impractical. Each questionnaire consisted of demographic questions to solicit background characteristics of the subjects. Information solicited includes sex, race, grade, GPA, SAT and ACT results, and main sport participation. Additional questions were asked to determine their weekly study habits, hours of weekly athletics participation, intent to go to college, intent to participate in varsity athletics in college, and the importance of receiving an athletics scholarship.
The subjects' responses to the three main issues of this study will be determined using several different questions. Their knowledge of Proposition 48 will be assessed in two different ways. First, they will be asked if they had ever heard of Proposition 48. Second, those respondents who answered "yes" will then be asked a series of "true" or "false" questions that contain defining statements on the rule requirements of Proposition 48.

Those respondents who admitted being aware of Proposition 48 will be asked two questions to determine their attitude toward Proposition 48 and academic standards for high school student-athletes. These responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. In reference to the final issue, their appreciation of Proposition 48, the subjects will then be asked if knowledge of the requirements of the bylaw on their eligibility for intercollegiate athletics participation had affected their study habits or their overall academic performance.

Subject Selection

Initially, the study population was to come from the two public high schools in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Those two schools are Kalamazoo Central and Loy Norrix. Both schools are co-educational, non-denominational, and have a racially mixed population as well as students from varying economic backgrounds, therefore offering a well-balanced sample population for the purposes of this study. Only those student-athletes who were currently in high school during the
1992-93 academic year were used. Male and female student-athletes from all four grades, ninth through twelfth, were asked to participate in the study.

In attempting to reach the student-athletes from those two schools, assistance was obtained from the Assistant Superintendent of Kalamazoo Public Schools. During the spring of 1993, address label listings for both of the high schools were compiled. Questionnaires were then mailed to each of the 610 student-athletes who participated in at least one sport at either of the schools during the 1992-93 academic year.

Unfortunately, the rate of return was low (5%). Due to financial constraints, the investigator was unable to conduct a follow-up mailing requesting returns from those student-athletes who had not responded to the original questionnaire. Therefore, the investigator was forced to adopt another research strategy. The investigator decided to pursue additional subjects through the use of upcoming summer camps.

The investigator made contact with a director of a summer girl’s basketball camp in Michigan and a decision was soon made to distribute 150 questionnaires to the camp attendees. To get additional subjects for the study, a director of a summer volleyball camp in Connecticut was contacted and 150 questionnaires were distributed to those camp attendees as well.

With the use of the two summer camps, the sex of the study population was overwhelmingly female. Although, the investigator
was forced to focus on females to test the hypotheses, the data from the males who returned the questionnaires from the initial high school mailing will be evaluated to see what, if any, differences can be found and what insights may be gained from their input.

Variables

There were three dependent variables used in this study. These were (1) the student-athletes knowledge of Proposition 48, (2) their attitude toward it, and (3) their appreciation of it. Those were chosen as dependent variables to determine if the subjects' responses to the corresponding questions were determined by their race, sex or main sport participation. The statistical analysis section that follows will describe the tests that were run to determine if, in fact, the subjects' sex, race or main sport participation made a significant difference in their responses. The independent variables of this study were sex, race, and main sport participation.

Statistical Analysis

The Pearson Chi-Square test of significance was used as the method of statistical analysis. Significance was determined at the .05 level (p<.05). Crosstabulations were run to determine if there was a significant difference between the two variables being compared. Comparisons were made using sex, race, and main sport participation against the student-athletes' response to having heard of
Proposition 48. Crosstabulations were also run using sex, race and main sport participation against their responses to the questions that assessed their actual knowledge of the provisions of the initial eligibility bylaw. Of those that have heard of Proposition 48, the Chi-Square was also used to determine if there was a significant difference in responses to the attitude and appreciation questions according to sex, race and main sport participation.

The results of the study provided two groups to analyze. As stated above, the majority of the analyses were done using the group that responded that they had heard of Proposition 48. The second group that was analyzed came from the responses of those who had not heard of Proposition 48. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe their responses. Both the descriptive and statistical analyses were performed using SPSS for Windows, v. 9.0.
Again, the purpose of this study was to determine high school age student-athletes' knowledge of, attitude towards, and appreciation (application of knowledge on behavior) of the current NCAA standards of initial eligibility for athletics participation during the freshman year in college. This chapter will present descriptive statistics used to describe the sample population of this study. There will also be a statistical analysis of the results of the student-athletes' responses to the questions used to gauge their reaction to each of the three hypotheses. Descriptive statistics will also be presented for those respondents that had never heard of Proposition 48.

Data Analysis

Table 1 reveals that females constituted the overwhelming majority of the subjects in this study. Specifically, there were 247 (92.2%) females and 21 (7.8%) males who answered the questionnaire. Regarding race, of the 268 respondents, 214 (79.9%) were Caucasians, 32 (11.9%) African Americans, and 22 (8.2%) Others. That females outnumbered males in this study does not come as a surprise because, as noted in the methods chapters, we employed the use of the participants of two summer camps in basketball and volleyball that
mainly involved young girls.

Table 1
Sex and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the majority of this study's subjects are female. Again, this is attributed to the use of the two girls summer sport camps. Table 2 displays the number of subjects obtained through the various methods of distributing the questionnaires as described in the methods chapter. Thirty-one (5%) of the 610 questionnaires that were mailed to the student-athletes from the two public high schools were returned for use in this study. Additionally, of the 150 that were distributed at each of the summer camps, 112 (74.7%) were returned from the basketball camp participants while 125 (83.3%) were returned from the volleyball camp partici-
pants. Table 2 also reveals that the subjects were rather evenly distributed with respect to the three grade levels considered: 91 (34.0%) were in the 12th grade, 92 (34.3%) in the 11th grade, and 85 (31.7%) in the 9th and 10th grades combined.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Distribution Methods and Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Mailing (610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Camp (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Camp (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th &amp; 10th Grades</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that we have ACT and/or SAT information for only a negligible number of the students. Most of the students did not report a SAT or ACT score and there was no way for us to determine if they had actually taken the tests or not. A possible explanation for this could be ascertained from the information provided in
the lower portion of Table 2. With 66% of the sample having not yet begun the 12th grade, this could possibly be the reason that so few reported test score results. Most students do not take the SAT or ACT until the summer prior to their senior year in high school. Also, if some did take the test but the scores were low — by NCAA standards or their own — were they too embarrassed to report it?

Table 3
ACT and SAT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT/SAT Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and higher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAT Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-900</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-1000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010 or higher</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74**</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were no ACT scores reported for 87.3% (234) of the subjects.
**There were no SAT scores reported for 72.4% (194) of the subjects.

Perhaps the best way to summarize the information in the ACT portion of Table 3 is to point out that of the 268 students, we have
information on only 34 (12.7%) of them. Of the 34 students, 26.5% had ACT scores between 21 and 24, and 44.1% had a score of 25 or higher. Thus, approximately 70% of the students had ACTs that were in the 21 or higher range. Another 20.6% had ACT scores between 17 and 21, with 8.8% scoring less than 17 on The American College Test. Because we have missing information on 87.3% (234) of the students, the above information must be interpreted cautiously.

The same cautionary note should be applied to the SAT scores where there is only a slightly higher percentage of information reported. Table 3 indicates that we have information for 27.6% (74) of the students. It shows that of the 74 students, 50% of them scored 1010 or higher on the SAT. Thirty-one percent scored between 910 and 1000, and another 17.6% placed between 700 and 900. Only 1.4% reported a score less than 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. On the other hand, we did not have any information for 72.4% (194) of the students and it is therefore difficult, if not impossible, to generalize from the information contained in Table 3.

While the data in Table 3 are rather scanty, the information in the next table is complete for all except for five students. Table 4 reveals the grade point average for 98.1% of the students and there it is seen that, of the top students, 31.7% had a GPA between 3.0 and 3.49, and 42.9% had acquired a GPA of 3.5 or better. The table also shows that less than 1.9% had a GPA less than 2.0, while 21.6% had a GPA that ranged between 2.0 and 2.99. We seriously doubt whether these figures are representative of student-athletes
in any public high school system in the country. We say this because the majority of the students in this study are females and studies show that girls' GPAs are usually higher than boys'. So, the fact that 74.6% of the students, again 92.2% female, in this study had a 3.0 plus GPA could be a reflection of the fact that girls achieve higher grades in school than boys.

Table 4
Students' Grade Point Average (GPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.49</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 and above</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the fact that 88.4% (237) of the student-athletes in this study coming from the two summer camps, it is not surprising that 101 (37.7%) reported their main sport as basketball while 109 (40.7%) indicated their main sport as volleyball. The remaining 58 (21.6%) list their main sport as one other than basketball or volleyball. These results are displayed in Table 5 along with information regarding the subjects' other sport participation. Whether the subjects participated in more than one sport was solicited because
that information could be valuable when considering the number of those who affirm or deny having heard of Proposition 48. Logically, one would expect that the more sports that a high school student participates in, the greater chances and likelihood that he/she would have heard from one of the various coaches about Proposition 48 and its qualifying criteria.

Table 5
Main Sport and Other Sport Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Sport</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Other</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Others</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Others</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 provides information on subjects' desire to participate in athletics while in college and the level at which they would like to play. Two hundred-three (75.7%) indicated that they would like to play a sport in college while 49 (18.3%) answered that they did not want to participate.
Table 6

Play in College and Level of Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Play in College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Play</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Division I</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Division II</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Level</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 16 (6.0%) of the subjects did not respond to this question. Of the 203 that intended to participate in a sport in college, 45 (22.2%) expressed an interest in playing at the NCAA Division I level while another 19 (9.4%) wanted to play at the NCAA Division II level. Those are the divisions that are affected by the provisions of Proposition 48. Sixty-three point five percent (129) indicated desire to play at a level other than Division I or II.
Knowledge of Proposition 48

One of the issues under investigation by this study was high school student-athlete’s knowledge of NCAA bylaw Proposition 48 and its standards for initial eligibility. We are hypothesizing that the majority of the students surveyed in this study will be both: (a) unaware of the proposition and (b) its qualifying criteria.

Regarding the first part of the hypothesis, we asked the students: “Have you ever heard of Proposition 48?,” and 32 (11.9%) said “yes”, while 235 (87.7%) answered “no.” The ratio for those who said “yes” to those answering “no” is 1 to 7.34. Hence, these figures confirm that aspect of the hypothesis that states that the majority of the students will have little or no knowledge of the proposition.

Concerning the second part of the hypothesis, we tested the students’ knowledge of the qualifying criteria by asking the students to respond “true” or “false” to four pertinent statements. Table 7 (N=32) provides their responses. Anyone who is knowledgeable about Proposition 48’s qualifying criteria would respond “false” to statements 1, 2, and 3 and “true” to the fourth statement. The statements were:

1. To not be considered a Proposition 48 athlete, a high school athlete must score at least a 700 on the SAT or at least 18 on the ACT.

2. Proposition 48 requires an overall GPA of 3.0 or better in
all high school courses.

3. If a high school athlete does not meet the minimum GPA and SAT or ACT requirements, then all colleges and universities must consider that athlete to be in the Proposition 48 category.

4. An athlete can receive an athletic scholarship if he/she only meets part of the requirements under Proposition 48.

Table 7
Questions Regarding Qualifying Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N T</td>
<td>N T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Row totals do not equal N-32 and 100% due to missing data.

There appears to be confusion or lack of accurate information about the specific qualifying criteria. Specifically, of the 32 students who affirmed that they had heard of Proposition 48, 68.8% and 56.3%, respectively, did not have accurate information regarding questions 1 and 3. Question 1 dealt with standardized test score minimums and question 3 asked whether a high school athlete, not meeting the minimums, must be considered a Proposition 48 by all colleges. On the other hand, most of these students responded accurately to questions 2 and 4, which dealt with the overall GPA
and the financial aid provision of the proposition.

In trying to determine if the sex, race or main sport of participation of the subjects produced a significant difference in responses at the assumed level (p>.05) with regard to having heard of Proposition 48, the Pearson Chi-Square test of significance was run for each variable. Table 8 shows the results of the crosstabulations for the question, "Have you ever heard of Proposition 48?" and sex. This calculated to a .007 Pearson Chi-Square which is significant at the assumed level which allows one to conclude that there is a significant difference in responses of males and females with regard to having heard of Proposition 48 that could not be achieved simply by sampling error.

Table 8
Heard of Proposition 48 by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>&quot;Yes&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>&quot;No&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = .007 level of significance

The results of the crosstabulations between those who had heard of Proposition 48 and race also yielded a .007 Pearson Chi-Square. Table 9 shows that 26 (21.1%), 4 (12.5%) and 2 (9.1%) of the Caucasians, African Americans and Other Minorities respectively
reported having heard of the bylaw while 187 (87.4%), 28 (87.5%) and 20 (90.9%) answered that they had not heard of Proposition 48. The conclusion can be made that there is a significant difference in responses to the question "Have you heard of Proposition 48?" when compared by race that could not have occurred through sampling error.

Table 9
Heard of Proposition 48 by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>&quot;Yes&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>&quot;No&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = .007 level of significance.
*Row total does not equal N=268 due to missing data.

A significant difference at the assumed level (p<.05) was found when comparing the responses of the main sport of participation of the subjects to the same question. Table 10 reveals a .002 level of significance as calculated by the Pearson Chi-Square.

Twenty (19.8%) of the subjects who listed basketball as their main sport reported having heard of Proposition 48 while only 3 (2.8%) of the volleyball players and 9 (15.5%) of those participating in another sport had heard of the bylaw. An explanation for the significance of these data can be made because the subjects were rather
evenly distributed across the three categories of main sport participation, which was described earlier in this chapter.

Table 10
Heard of Proposition 48 by Main Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Sport</th>
<th>&quot;Yes&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>&quot;No&quot; Heard of</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = .002 level of significance.

Crosstabulations were also run in correlation to the Pearson Chi-Square to determine whether there was a significant difference to the subjects' responses to the knowledge questions according sex, race or main sport participation. While the test of significance was run for each question individually, the results in Table 11 show the total number of correct responses given for each of the four knowledge questions according to the sex of the subjects. There proved to be no significant difference when comparing either the main sport participation of the subjects or their sex to the responses to the knowledge questions according to the assumed value.
Table 11
Correct Answer to Knowledge Questions by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Answered Question Correct</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males (N = 7)</td>
<td>Females (N = 25)</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = .002 level of significance.

However, there did prove to be a significant difference in responses to each of the four questions when compared by race. Table 12 provides an illustration of these results. Questions 1, which addressed the standardized test score minimums, produced a significance level of .003 while questions 3 and 4, regarding the NCAA Divisions that the bylaw applied to and the financial aid provisions respectively, each had a .001 level of significance. Regarding the GPA requirement of Proposition 48, question 2 had a Chi-Square significance level of .033. Although significant according to the Pearson Chi-Square at p>.05, these differences do not mean that one race had any more of less knowledge of the qualifying criteria, only that there was a significant difference in the subjects' responses according to race.
Table 12
Correct Answer to Knowledge Questions by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Other Minority</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum the data tend to support the first hypothesis that the majority of the high school student-athletes surveyed will have little or no knowledge of the NCAA bylaw Proposition 48 or the associated initial eligibility criteria.

Attitude Towards Initial Eligibility Standards

The second issue to be examined by this study was the subjects' attitude towards Proposition 48 as a rule determining initial eligibility for athletics for freshman student-athletes. It was hypothesized that those female and minority students that acknowledged having heard of Proposition 48 will disagree with the bylaw.

There were two questions asked to determine the subjects' response to the hypothesis. The questionnaire item designed to determine the subjects' response to the hypothesis was formed as a statement in which they were asked to choose their response using a
5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The statement read, "I support the NCAA Proposition 48 requirements." Table 13 illustrates that of the 32 who affirmed that they had heard of the bylaw, 19 (59.4%) responded that they either strongly agreed or agreed with that statement. Four (12.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement while 9 (28.1%) were undecided as to whether they agreed with Proposition 48 or not.

Table 13
Support Proposition 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Support Proposition 48</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing the responses to that same statement according to sex, race, and main sport individually, there proved to be no significant difference at the assumed level between the variables. The hypothesis that females and minorities would not support this bylaw, 16 (64.0%) of the 25 females in this study either strongly agreed or agreed with Proposition 48 while only 2 (33.3%) of the 6 minorities felt the same way. To summarize, these data do not support the hypothesis that those female and minority students that acknowledged having heard of Proposition 48 will disagree with the
bylaw. The lack of diversity, both in sex and race, of the subjects of this study could again attribute to the lack of statistically significant differences in responses.

Appreciation of Knowledge

The final issue to be investigated by this study is what affect, if any, did the subjects' knowledge of the existence of Proposition 48 have on their study habits. Specifically, it was hypothesized that the student-athletes' knowledge of Proposition 48 will have a positive affect on their study habits.

Table 14 shows the subjects' responses to the statement, "Knowing about Proposition 48 has influenced my study habits ___" in which they chose to fill in the blank from one of the following responses: (a) greatly, (b) slightly, (c) undecided, (d) very little, or (d) not at all.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence on Study Habits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly-Slightly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little-Not at All</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was only asked of those 32 who admit having heard of
the bylaw. The majority (65.6%) of the subjects reported that their knowledge of Proposition 48 had "very little" or "no" influence on their study habits while only 21.9% acknowledged a "slight" or "great" influence.

These data show there to be no significant difference to this question by either sex, race or main sport participation. This could again be attributed to a lack of diversity within the study population.

In review, an overwhelming majority (65.6%) indicated their knowledge of Proposition 48 had little to no affect at all on their study habits. This leads the investigator to summarize that the data do not support the hypothesis that the student-athletes' knowledge of the standards of Proposition 48 will have a positive affect on their study habits.

Results of Those Who Had Not Heard of Proposition 48

As was stated earlier in this chapter, 235 of the study respondents had never heard of the NCAA bylaw known as Proposition 48. This represented an overwhelming majority (87.7%) of this study's population. Because the support or defeat of the hypotheses could only be ascertained from the responses of those who admitted having heard of Proposition 48, the information provided by this group was not a part of the earlier analyses. The following analysis pertains only to those who had never heard of Proposition 48.

It is important to note that 53 (22.5%) of the subjects in
this group indicated that they wanted to participate at the Division I or II level. The data for this group also show that 7 students admit to having been declared ineligible at least once for athletics participation due to their GPA falling below the minimum requirement at their high school. Additionally, of those 7 who had been declared ineligible, 3 (42.9%) indicated their desire to participate in intercollegiate athletics at the Division I or II level. With Proposition 48 applying only to prospective Division I or II student-athletes, the 53 mentioned above, and more specifically the 7 who have already demonstrated their vulnerability to academic requirements for athletes, are potential victims of a rule of which they have no knowledge.

The provisions of Proposition 48 not only determine a prospective student-athletes' eligibility for athletics participation, they also determine the athletes' eligibility for athletics scholarships. The subjects of this study were asked to list the importance of receiving an athletics scholarship by choosing from one of the following responses: (a) very, (b) moderately, (c) not important, and (d) can't go to college without one.

While there proved to be no significant difference in responses to that question by race, Table 15 reveals that there was a significant difference by sex. Four (28.6%) of the 14 males in the study indicated either they would not be able to attend college without an athletics scholarship or that a scholarship was very important to them. This was true of only 18.5% (41) of the fe-
males in the study.

Table 15
Importance of Athletics Scholarships by Sex (N=236)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Importance</th>
<th>Males Frequency</th>
<th>Males Percent</th>
<th>Females Frequency</th>
<th>Females Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can't go Without one 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important At All</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = .005 level of significance.

This difference in response was significant at .005 indicating that the difference between males and females in response to the importance of an athletics scholarship did not occur through sampling error thus concluding that males place more of an importance on receiving an athletics scholarship than females. The reasons for the importance of receiving an athletics scholarship, however, are not clear. This issue is to be discussed in the limitations portion of the following chapter.

While the majority of both groups of subjects (those having
heard of the bylaw and those that had not) had GPAs greater than 2.0, all of those who responded that they had, at one point, been declared academically ineligible came from the group that had no knowledge of this rule. In summary, although the majority of the analysis of the data was conducted only for those who acknowledged having heard of Proposition 48 there was a great deal to learn from the data provided by the subjects who had not heard of this bylaw.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the knowledge of, attitude towards and appreciation of (application of knowledge on behavior) the NCAA initial eligibility standards established by Proposition 48 in specific groups of high school age student-athletes. Three hypotheses were constructed prior to the data collection. First, it was hypothesized that the majority of the high school student-athletes surveyed would have little or no knowledge of the NCAA initial eligibility bylaw Proposition 48 or its qualifying criteria. The second hypothesis was that those female and minority students with knowledge of this bylaw would not be in support of it as a standard for initial eligibility for athletics participation. Finally, it was hypothesized that the student-athletes' knowledge of the standards of Proposition 48 would have a positive affect on their study habits.

With an overwhelming majority (87.7%) of the subjects responding that they had not heard of the NCAA bylaw Proposition 48, the analysis of the data showed support for the first hypothesis, that the subjects would have little to no knowledge of the bylaw. This support was statistically significant when a comparison was made based on sex (p<.007) and main sport participation (p<.002).
The data failed to support the second hypothesis which focused on the female and minority subjects' attitude towards Proposition 48. When asked whether they supported NCAA bylaw Proposition 48, 64.0% of the females in the study either strongly agreed or agreed with Proposition 48 while 33.3% of the minorities felt the same way. There proved to be no significant differences between the responses of the males and females or between the minorities and non-minorities.

There also proved to be no support for the third hypothesis, that the student-athletes' knowledge of the bylaw would have a positive affect on their study habits. The majority (65.6%) of the subjects reported that their knowledge of Proposition 48 had "very little" or "no" influence on their study habits while only 21.9% acknowledged a "slight" or "great" influence. There were no significant differences at the assumed level when comparing their responses to the statement, "Knowing about Proposition 48 has influenced my study habits ____" according to sex, race, or main sport participation.

Conclusion

As was stated earlier, Proposition 48 was designed as an effort to push high schools to do a better job of preparing their student-athletes for college level academic work. An overwhelming majority (87.7%) of this study had never heard of Proposition 48, yet 74.6% had a GPA of 3.0 or higher, with 70.6% scoring 21 or higher on
the ACT and 81% scoring 910 or above on the SAT. Therefore, the data produced by this study reveal that knowledge of Proposition 48 was not necessary. These students seemed to be already prepared for college level work.

In finding that the white females in this population were not informed of the requirements of Proposition 48 but were already prepared to meet them, it would follow that black males would be more likely to neither know of Proposition 48 nor be prepared to meet the requirements. This would support the criticism of and opposition to the creation of Proposition 48 because it denies blacks access to the benefits of higher education through athletic participation.

Based on the findings of this study, I conclude that the NCAA appears to have made a theoretical shift in its role in the governing of intercollegiate athletics. The Theory section of the Review of Literature chapter showed that the early NCAA would be better described through the Structural Functionalist perspective with athletic participation as a normative function of society, teaching appropriate behavior and the benefits of cooperation. The image of the student-athlete was a positive one reinforcing the assumptions that athletics plays in creating an ideal student and future citizen.

The advent of television and the growing role television revenues and other athletically related income had on intercollegiate institutions created a conflict of ideals--education versus business--causing the NCAA to shift its role from a monitoring group to
a policy making and enforcement group. Competition for media coverage and for a larger slice of the athletically related income pie generate processes better explained by Conflict Theory as the appropriate framework to describe the NCAA and its impact on intercollegiate athletes. With the implementation of rules like Proposition 48 the NCAA appears to be trying to reverse its high business image and restore the ideals of the student-athlete as a positive role in society.

Limitations

The sample size limited the results of this study with respect to determining if there were significant differences among the subjects in comparing their responses to the dependent variables of knowledge, attitude, and appreciation of the NCAA bylaw Proposition 48. The main limitation is the lack of diversity of the study population with respect to sex, race, and main sport participation. The lack of diversity in the study is due in large part to the use of summer camp attendees.

As stated in the Review of Literature chapter, Proposition 48 disproportionately affects males more than females and minorities more than non-minorities. Table 1 portrayed both the sex and race of the subjects of this study. As this table revealed, the overwhelming majority of this study was Caucasian females thus making it difficult, if not impossible, to determine if males and minorities were more likely to be affected by Proposition 48 due to a lack of
knowledge of the bylaw or its qualifying criteria.

Another strong argument made against the use of standardized test scores as a measure of academic potential was made from the economic side. As was stated in the review of the literature chapter, poorer students score lower on standardized test, regardless of race or sex. This study was unable to explore the issue of economics with regard to the dependent variables because there were no questions asked to determine the subjects' socioeconomic standing. There was a vague attempt to ascertain information on this issue with the question of the importance of an athletic scholarship, but the importance of a scholarship could be related to reasons other than economics (i.e., desirability, prestige, wanting to go out-of-state which is more expensive than in-state). A better way to determine the student-athletes' economic background would have been to have household income ranges for them to select. The economic background of the respondents could have told the investigator whether those students from lower economic backgrounds were being informed of the bylaw as much as those from middle to upper class backgrounds. Also, with the high cost of attending a summer camp, one could speculate that the majority of the participants came from a middle class background or higher in terms of their families' socioeconomic status.

Proposition 48 is a NCAA rule that effects student-athletes with low GPAs and/or standardized test scores. As was shown in Tables 3 and 4, the subjects of this study had GPAs and test scores
that were well above the minimum requirements of Proposition 48. The overwhelming majority was not likely to become victims of this bylaw.

One of the purposes of this study was to determine the attitude that these student-athletes had towards academic standards for athletics eligibility as well as the standards of Proposition 48 in particular. However, the attitude questions were only asked of those who answered that they had heard of Proposition 48. Therefore, the attitudes toward such standards could not be determined for approximately 88% of the study population.

Another limitation of the study was not assessing the issue of Proposition 48 in a variety of ways. At the time of this study Proposition 48 was a relatively new, albeit important, topic. More survey respondents may have heard of or known about the bylaw's initial eligibility standards but may not have known them under the term Proposition 48. Were the questions asked without using the term "Proposition 48", the responses may have been different. For example, instead of asking, "Have you ever heard of Proposition 48?" the question could have been phrased, "Have you ever heard of the NCAA's requirements for athletics participation for freshman?"

Recommendations

Although it made a slow start, the NCAA has increased the available printed forms regarding the initial eligibility regulations for both Division I and II institutions. They publish the NCAA
Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete and the NCAA Core Course Review Playbook. Information on initial eligibility standards can also be accessed via the NCAA website. The NCAA now produces commercials which are presented during televised NCAA Championship events. They also sponsor an annual High School Videoconference for high school administrators, parents and students. All of these represent an increased effort to inform freshmen athletes. However, more could be done.

One recommendation suggested by this research would be to conduct a follow-up study concerning the same issues that were brought forth here. Considering the amount of information that is now available and the fact that this study was performed more than five years ago, a study today is likely to produce different results. An attempt to determine if the NCAA’s increased efforts in making initial eligibility information available has made a difference in student-athletes’ knowledge of the standards should be made through a comprehensive study of high school student-athletes across a more diverse population. Additionally, a longitudinal study on the extent to which the NCAA has been successful in restoring the ideal of the student-athlete that was intended through enacting legislation such as Proposition 48 is vitally needed.

Finally, coaches generally have the most direct contact with the student-athletes and, in many cases, are looked to for guidance in choosing the right place to pursue their future academic and athletic careers. The results of this study indicated that of those
who affirmed that they had heard of Proposition 48, the majority listed their coach as the main source of information. This points to the need for a study on the knowledge of initial eligibility regulations among coaches of high school age student-athletes, including the growing number of coaches of youth sport organizations that now practice and compete almost year round. This study would be important because it would provide information on what the coaches are doing with their knowledge of this proposition. For example, have they established minimum grade requirements for playing or instituted study tables during their playing seasons? In other words, it would reveal to NCAA the ways in which they are preparing their student athletes for the rigors of being an intercollegiate athlete.
Appendix A

Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: May 12, 1993
To: Robin Salters
From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair
Re: HSI RB Project Number 93-04-13

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Proposition 48 and its effects on perceptions of academic success in high school athletes" has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 12, 1994

xc: Davidson, SOC
Appendix B

Parent Information Letter
Dear Parent/Guardian of Student Athlete:

My name is Robin Salters. I am a graduate student at Western Michigan University and am completing my Master's degree in sociology.

My Master's thesis concerns the issue of the NCAA's Proposition 48. I am conducting the study with current high school student athletes to examine whether or not they are informed about the proposition and if it has influenced their perceptions of academic success. Your son/daughter's participation will involve answering a 21 item questionnaire concerning his/her knowledge and attitude about Proposition 48. The questionnaire should take about 15 minutes to complete.

Dr. Stan Olson, Assistant Superintendent of Kalamazoo Public Schools, has reviewed the project and agreed that students' knowledge of and attitude toward Proposition 48 are an important issue. I have also obtained approval from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University in order to do the research.

All information will be kept confidential. Your child's name will not be used in any writing about this study. He/she can withdraw from the study at any time without any negative effect on his/her status or participation as an athlete. If you have any questions please feel free to call (616) 345-2339 and ask for Robin Salters.

If you agree to allow your child to participate, please have him/her sign and date the enclosed assent form and complete the questionnaire alone and return them both to a drop box that can be found either in their high school office or in the KPS Administration building by Friday, June 18, 1993.

Thank you, in advance, for your participation.

Robin Salters
Department of Sociology
Western Michigan University

Dr. Stan Olson
Assistant Superintendent, Kalamazoo Public Schools
Appendix C

Student-Athlete Assent Form
ASSENT FORM

My name is Robin Salters. I am a graduate student in sociology at Western Michigan University. For my Master's Thesis, I am studying NCAA's Proposition 48 to examine if the bylaw has influenced the perceptions of academic success in high school athletes. I hope the results will be used to improve communications between the NCAA and secondary schools on academic and athletically related policies.

You will be asked to fill out a 21 item questionnaire with a code number on it so no names will be used. The questionnaire should take about 15 minutes to complete. There are no known risks or discomforts connected with this research. I believe your participation will help in creating better prepared student athletes.

All information will be kept confidential. Your name will not be used in any writing about this study. You can withdraw from the study at any time without any negative effect on your status or participation as an athlete. If you have any questions please feel free to call (616) 345-2339 and ask for Robin Salters.

I, __________________________________________ have read the above statement and have had all of my questions answered.

Date: __________________________________________
Signature: __________________________________________
Appendix D

Student-Athlete Questionnaire
My name is Robin Salters and I am a graduate student at WMU. This questionnaire is part of my thesis project concerning what student-athletes know and how they feel about Proposition 48. The answers you give are important and may be used to improve communications between the NCAA and secondary schools on academic and athletically related issues. Please respond honestly and circle the response that applies best to you or fill in your response where asked. Thank you in advance for your participation.

1. Are you male or female?
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. What ethnic group do you consider yourself?
   1. Caucasian
   2. African-American
   3. Hispanic
   4. Asian
   5. Other

3. What grade are you in now?
   1. 9th grade
   2. 10th grade
   3. 11th grade
   4. 12th grade

4. In what state do you attend high school?
   1. Midwest
   2. East Coast

5. In what range is your overall grade point average (GPA)?
   1. below 1.0
   2. 1.00 to 1.49
   3. 1.50 to 1.99
   4. 2.00 to 2.49
   5. 2.50 to 2.99
   6. 3.00 to 3.49
   7. 3.50 and higher

6. What were your ACT and SAT scores?
   1. ACT
   2. SAT

7. What sport(s) do you play for your high school?
   1. main sport_______________________________
   2. other sport(s)_____________________________
8. During your main sport season, how many hours do you spend studying per week?
   1. 0 hours
   2. 1-3 hours
   3. 4-6 hours
   4. 7-10 hours
   5. 11-13 hours
   6. 14-16 hours
   7. more than 16 hours

9. During your main sport season, how many hours are you tutored per week?
   1. 0 hours
   2. 1-3 hours
   3. 4-6 hours
   4. 7-10 hours
   5. more than 10 hours

10. During your main sport season, how many hours do you spend practicing/competing per week?
    1. 0 hours
    2. 1-5 hours
    3. 6-10 hours
    4. 11-15 hours
    5. 16-20 hours
    6. more than 20 hours

11. Have you ever been athletically ineligible because your grades were below your school’s minimum GPA standard?
    1. yes
    2. no

12. Do you plan to go to college?
    1. yes
    2. no

12a. If yes, do you plan to play a sport in college?
     1. yes
     2. no

12b. If yes, at what level are you looking to play?
     1. Division I
     2. Division II
     3. Division III
     4. NAIA
     5. Junior College
     6. It doesn’t matter
13. Do you think you will get an athletic scholarship?
   1. yes
   2. no
   3. don't know

14. How important is it to you to get an athletic scholarship?
   1. very important
   2. moderately important
   3. not important
   4. I can't go to college without one

15. Have you ever heard of Proposition 48?
   1. yes
   2. no

15a. If you answered "no" to question 15, would you like to learn about Proposition 48 and how it could effect you?
   1. yes
   2. no

If you answered "no" to question 15 you are done with the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation. If you answered "yes" to question 15, please continue.

16. Where did you learn about Proposition 48?
   1. coach(es)
   2. parent(s)
   3. media
   4. counselor
   5. friend
   6. other

17. When did you learn about Proposition 48?
   1. less than one year ago
   2. 1-2 years ago
   3. 2-3 years ago
   4. 3-4 years ago
   5. 4-5 years ago
   6. 5-6 years ago
   7. more than 6 years ago

Please answer True or False to each of the following questions.

18a. To not be considered a Proposition 48 athlete, a high school athlete must score at least 700 on the SAT or at least 18 on the ACT.
   1. true
   2. false
18b. Proposition 48 requires an overall GPA of 3.0 or better in all high school courses.
   1. true
   2. false

18c. If a high school athlete does not meet the minimum GPA and SAT or ACT requirements, then all colleges and universities must consider that athlete to be in the Proposition 48 category.
   1. true
   2. false

18d. An athlete can receive an athletic scholarship if he/she only meets part of the requirements under Proposition 48.
   1. true
   2. false

Choose one of the following answers to fill in the blank in the statement below.

19. Knowing about Proposition 48 has influenced my study habits
   1. greatly
   2. slightly
   3. undecided
   4. very little
   5. not at all

20. Knowing about Proposition 48 stresses me out
   1. most of the time
   2. some of the time
   3. undecided
   4. seldom
   5. never

21. Please circle whether you SA (strongly agree), A (agree), U (undecided), D (disagree) or SD (strongly disagree) with the following statements:

   I support the NCAA’s Proposition 48 requirements.
   SA   A   U   D   SD

   I think athletes have it too easy in high school.
   SA   A   U   D   SD

   I disagree with academic standards for high school athletes.
   SA   A   U   D   SD

   I think instructors should be more lenient with high school athletes.
   SA   A   U   D   SD
Knowing about Proposition 48 has improved my academic performance.

My parents think Proposition 48 is a good rule.

My coach(es) think Proposition 48 is a good rule.

My teachers think Proposition 48 is a good rule.

My friends think Proposition 48 is a good rule.

Other student-athletes at my school think Proposition 48 is a good rule.
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