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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the United States the composite institution called a university is doubtless still an intellectual agency. But it is also a social, a commercial and an athletic agency, and these activities have in recent years appreciably overshadowed the intellectual life for which the university is assumed to exist (Savage, et al., 1929, p. viii).


Background

In January 1983, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) voted to tighten academic standards for students participating in collegiate athletics. The new rule, NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as Rule 48, Proposition 48, and Proposal 48, became effective August 1, 1986 and now states that freshmen athletes at Division I and Division II institutions will be eligible to play only if they achieve:

1. A high school cumulative Grade Point Average of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale;

2. A 2.0 Grade Point Average in a specified high school curriculum consisting of eleven academic courses, including at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science, and two in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class if available at the school);
3. A combined score of at least 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or 15 on the American College Test (ACT).

Students who fail to attain one or a combination of the above standards will be unable to participate in athletics during their freshman year of college. However, these students are able to receive grant-in-aid for their initial year of college (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1986).

For years, high school student-athletes have been recruited by colleges and universities which offer scholarships to participate in athletics. These institutions have allowed these student-athletes to participate in their athletic programs with little regard to the students' academic achievements before, during, and after enrollment. Underwood (1980), states in regards to this situation:

...academic standards have been eroded to the point where more undereducated student-athletes than ever are getting into colleges today. Not just underprivileged young men who need a chance, but young men who have no chance, not in the classroom (p. 41).

Too often students have been accepted into institutions because of athletic abilities and once in the college and university setting they make little progress toward a degree and at times fail to graduate. To combat this problem, the NCAA's Bylaw was instituted to end the controversial aspects which surround the deficiencies of student-athletes and the questionable academic practices of institutions of higher learning, and to enhance the integrity of the NCAA itself.

Bylaw 5-1-(j) was proposed by the NCAA and two proponents of eligibility change, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Ad HOC Committee on the Problems of Major Intercollegiate Athletic Programs. The contention
presented by these parties was that high schools graduated athletes unprepared for college academics, while colleges restructured their curricula to keep athletes eligible. These abuses had in turn led to an intolerable degree of illiteracy among college athletes, many whom never graduated from college. The backers of Proposal 48 (Bylaw 5-1-(j)) viewed the vote as a referendum on the integrity of both the NCAA and higher education generally (Yasser, 1983/84). Bylaw 5-1-(j) would assure that student-athletes would not be counseled primarily into courses designed to safeguard their eligibility with little or no concern for their progress toward graduation (Greene, 1984).

Many freshmen student-athletes at Division I and Division II institutions begin their college years already lagging behind in academics. Some high school athletes may have had fewer restrictions or some have been passed by their teachers and school administrators and coddled by their coaches and schools who allow them to participate. Upon entering college, these same students, now lagging behind academically, must spend considerable time and energy with their sport, therefore taking them away from their studies. The NCAA hoped that by imposing these new standards on entering freshmen they could eliminate the recruitment of poor students such as several of the athletes of the University of Georgia who were granted four opportunities to pass developmental studies courses without having to face true college level courses (Neff and Sullivan, 1986). Football players at Southern Methodist University also evidenced the lack of academic integrity when of the 114 football players Southern Methodist admitted between 1980 and 1984, 42% had test scores below the standards adopted in 1986 at the NCAA convention in New Orleans (The Columbus Dispatch, 1986).
The controversies surrounding the eligibility of freshmen student-athletes are not new. A study of the origin of eligibility requirements dates back almost to the beginning of intercollegiate athletics in the late nineteenth century (Petr and Walsh, 1987). This same issue was also a critical concern at the First Annual Meeting of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States which formed in 1905, and which later became the NCAA in 1906 (Browning, 1986). Bylaw 5-1-(j) is based upon a long history of insistence that the student-athlete meet certain academic standards in order to participate in intercollegiate athletics and to assure satisfactory progress toward the completion of a degree.

A view of the formation of intercollegiate athletics reveals that in its earliest years, intercollegiate sports were unorganized, spontaneous events played for enjoyment. The activities were player-centered, and the little organizing that was necessary was done by the students. During this time, a win-at-all cost attitude had not yet pervaded athletic contests. For a host of reasons in the late nineteenth century, intercollegiate athletics, especially football, became heavily influenced by an emphasis on winning, what opponents of athletics termed winning-at-all costs (Lucas and Smith, 1978). This emphasis on winning led to inducing promising high school athletes to matriculate at a particular college. Recruited players were often graduate students, students not enrolled in school, or players who had played for several years at other schools. Recruiting habits were problems created by the rapid change and transformation in athletics.

The advent of competitive intercollegiate athletics was accompanied by support from alumni and students (Leslie, 1976). Games began to attract large crowds and teams began to receive revenue from gate receipts. In
order to secure this revenue, along with alumni giving and student and business donations, it was imperative that schools win. Pressure was placed on institutions to obtain skilled performers, whether-or-not they could perform as well in the classroom was not the issue. Initially there were no attempts to restrict participation to those students who met certain prescribed standards.

The transformation of intercollegiate athletics to a faculty and association controlled activity brought about attempts to establish uniform regulations. From the inception of intercollegiate athletics as competitive, institutionally controlled activities, until the mid-1960’s, there was no unified policy for colleges and universities concerned with freshmen eligibility. One reason for this was in the early years of the NCAA, the NCAA acted strictly in an advisory capacity to the colleges (Petr and Walsh, 1987; Scott, 1951). Because the NCAA could only act in an advisory capacity, many institutions did not follow the advice of the NCAA to bar freshmen eligibility. This lack of unity led to some conferences allowing freshmen to participate, while others did not allow freshmen participation. Until the NCAA received enforcement powers, controversies persisted.

In 1939, the NCAA published its first eligibility rulebook for NCAA championships, and was forced to make a decision about freshmen eligibility. The NCAA decided to exert more influence than it had previously shown by excluding freshmen from any of its championships. However, NCAA member schools that wished, were permitted to keep freshmen eligible for any contest except NCAA championship events (Petr and Walsh, 1987). In 1952, through a variety of occurrences, the NCAA was able to receive enforcement powers, however it was not until 1964 that the NCAA passed a nationally
binding rule dealing with freshmen eligibility in seasons of competition (Petr and Walsh, 1987). This initial rule was known as the 1.600 Rule and became effective January 1, 1966 (NCAA, 1965).

The 1.600 Rule was based on a set of standards which factored in class rank or high school GPA and standardized test scores. This rule was actually more stringent than Bylaw 5-1-(j). In 1971 the 1.600 Rule was expanded, and in 1972 it was voted out (Strome, 1972). In 1973 the minimum standards for freshmen eligibility became simply a 2.0 GPA in high school and took all the obligation off the colleges and placed it on the high schools (Michener, 1976). The 2.0 GPA rule stood as the requirement for freshmen eligibility until discussion, formation, and implementation of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) in the early and mid-1980’s.

The new standard is designed to decrease criticism of the academic achievements of many student-athletes in high school and college. It is hoped that by implementing these new standards, high school students will strive to meet these requirements and take academics much more seriously. Students now are aware that, in order to participate in Division I and Division II intercollegiate athletics as freshmen, they will have to meet established academic standards. The NCAA additionally hopes that ineligible student-athletes will use their freshman year to acclimate themselves to college and raise their grades.

The secondary school community has been one of the most severe critics of the Bylaw because they were not involved with its formation and implementation. In spite of these ill feelings, they now are responsible for determining not only the academic accomplishments of students, but also for the success of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), the latest attempt by the NCAA to improve student-athlete academic achievements.
Statement of the Problem

In order for NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) to be successful and supported by high school personnel, they must be aware of the rule, perceive it as fair and satisfactory, and respond positively to it. Without the support of these professionals, it is possible that Bylaw 5-1-(j) will not be as successful as hoped for by the NCAA.

Problems within this investigation include describing the awareness of Bylaw 5-1-(j), the attitudes and perceptions of the fairness of Bylaw 5-1-(j), changes and modifications to the Bylaw, the impact of Bylaw 5-1-(j), the responses to Bylaw 5-1-(j) in various high school types, and to determine if there are differences between principals, guidance counselors, and head coaches within urban, rural, suburban, and private high schools, and if there are differences between high school types.

Definition of Terms

1. **Bylaw 5-1-(j)** - [also referred to as Proposal 48, Proposition 48, Rule 48, or the "2.0 rule"] This NCAA Bylaw defines the requirements that must be met to participate in intercollegiate athletics and receive athletically related financial aid as a freshman. The Bylaw reads:

   A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school presented an accumulative minimum grade-point-average of 2.000 (based on a minimum of 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least eleven academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a (minimum) 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a (minimum) 15 composite score on the ACT (NCAA, 1986, p. 96).
2. **Satisfaction** - acceptance of Bylaw 5-1-(j) as presently written.

3. **Qualifier** - an individual who meets the requirements of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j).

4. **Test-score requirements** - The minimum required SAT or ACT must be achieved no later than July 1 immediately preceding the individuals first full-time enrollment in a collegiate institution and must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e. no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates].

   a. **Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)** - For students utilizing the SAT examination, the highest scores achieved on the verbal and mathematics sections of the SAT from two different national testing dates may be combined in determining whether the student has met the minimum test-score requirement. The maximum score an individual may achieve on the SAT is 1600.

   b. **American College Test (ACT)** - For students utilizing the ACT examination, the highest scores achieved on the individual subtests of the ACT from more than one national testing date may be combined in determining whether the student's composite score has met the minimum test-score requirement. The maximum score a student may achieve on the ACT is 36.

5. **Grade-Point-Average** - The grade values listed below are to be used in determining a student's grade-point-average in the core courses:

   - A= 4 quality points
   - B= 3 quality points
   - C= 2 quality points
   - D= 1 quality point
   - F= 0 quality points

   **Grade-point-average** =

   \[
   \text{sum of quality points} \times \text{credits for course} \\
   \text{Total credits completed}
   \]
Pluses or minuses within a grade level shall not receive greater or lesser quality points. Grades earned in courses taught at the advanced-placement level and awarded additional quality points by the high school, however, shall receive one additional quality point per grade level.

6. Core Course - For the purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement, a "core-course" is defined as a recognized academic course (as opposed to a vocational or personal-service course) that offers fundamental instructional components in a specified area of study. Courses that are taught at a level below the high school's regular academic instruction level (e.g., remedial, special education or compensatory) shall not be considered as core courses regardless of course content.

   English - Core courses in English shall contain instructional elements in the following areas: grammar, vocabulary development, composition, literature, analytical reading or oral communication. Ohio requires 3 English courses.

   Mathematics - Core courses in mathematics must be designed to develop a student's basic ability to formulate and solve mathematical problems in courses such as: mathematics, geometry, algebra, trigonometry, statistics or calculus. Ohio requires 2 math courses.

   Social Science - Core courses in social science shall include offerings in history, social studies, economics, geography, psychology, sociology, government, political science or anthropology. Ohio requires 3 courses.

   Natural or Physical Science - Core courses in natural or physical science shall include biology, chemistry, physics, environmental science, botany or geology. In addition, students must complete at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school. Ohio requires 2 science courses.

   Additional Core Courses - The two remaining years of additional academic credit must be from courses attempted in English, mathematics, social
science, or natural or physical science, foreign language, computer science, speech, religion, or philosophy (Toner, 1983).

7. **Awareness** - Demonstrating knowledge of and complete understanding of Bylaw 5-1-(j) and its effects on high school student-athletes.

8. **Secondary school** (high school) - A school with a grade designation of 7-12, 8-12, 9-12, or 10-12.

9. **Eligibility** - Being legally qualified to participate in intercollegiate athletics at a Division I or Division II collegiate institution as a freshman.

10. **Grant-in-aid** - (athletic scholarship). Financial aid awarded by an institution to practice and/or compete on an intercollegiate team.

11. **Division I** - Institutions which grant full number of athletic scholarships. Division I institutions must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports.

12. **Division II** - Offer a limited number of athletically-related scholarships. Division II institutions must sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports.

13. **Division III** - Offer no financial aid to any student-athlete except upon evidence of financial need of the recipient. Division III institutions must sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports.

14. **High School Types** - Designated as urban, rural, suburban, or private high schools;

   a. **urban** - the fifteen secondary schools which compete in the Columbus City League (North and South Divisions), excluding Mifflin High School. These schools have a higher minority enrollment than rural and suburban schools.

   b. **suburban** - the twenty secondary schools which compete in the Ohio Capital Conference and the Central Buckeye League, excluding Academy High School.
c. rural - the twelve secondary schools which compete in the Mid-State League, excluding Fairfield Union High School, and Fisher Catholic High School.

d. private - members of the Ohio Catholic League.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1. Response to the questionnaire, statistical analysis, and results are limited to head coaches, guidance counselors, and principals at the high schools in the 49 secondary schools in the state of Ohio used in the study and may not be applicable to other secondary schools in the state of Ohio, the nation, or other secondary school personnel.

2. Two private secondary schools, Academy High School and Fisher Catholic High School are excluded from the study because they are not members of the Ohio Catholic League, but rather are in conferences which include all public high schools. Mifflin High School and Fairfield Union High School chose not to take part in the research.

3. Only head coaches at the secondary schools who coach a sport which is a Division I or Division II collegiate sport will be queried.

4. This investigation is concerned with Division I and Division II collegiate athletics. This investigation is not concerned with Division III, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

5. Because of confidential measures requested by participating secondary schools, and additional requests that the researcher not follow-up with non-respondents because of the additional time burden placed on high school personnel, the researcher is unable to follow-up with non-respondents. Other measures will be taken by the researcher to assure a high response rate.
Basic Assumptions

1. Return of the questionnaire from principals, guidance counselors, and head coaches reflects accurate completion of the instrument.
2. Response to the questionnaire was voluntary. Dates to respond and complete the questionnaire were arranged with each secondary school's principal.
3. Secondary schools investigated varied in number of guidance counselors and head coaches who responded. This was dependent on how many each these schools employ.

Objectives of the Study/Research Questions

1. To describe the following variables among Columbus, Ohio area high school principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches:
   a. type of high school (suburban, urban, rural, or private)
   b. job title (principal, guidance counselor, or head athletic coach)
   c. gender
   d. age
   e. race
   f. years employed at respective profession (principal, guidance counselor, head athletic coach)
   g. awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   h. source of initial awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   i. additional information needed regarding NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   j. perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   k. perceived changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   l. impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)
   m. number of student-athletes affected by NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

2. To determine the nature and strength of the relationships (and differences) between selected variables:
a. What is the relationship between type of high school and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
b. What is the relationship between job title and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
c. What is the relationship between gender and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
d. What is the relationship between race and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
e. What is the relationship between age and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
f. What is the relationship between number of years employed and awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
g. What is the relationship between job title and source of initial awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
h. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and type of school?
i. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and job title?
j. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and age?
k. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and gender?
l. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and race?
m. What is the relationship between perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and years employed at respective profession?
n. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and type of school?
o. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and job title?
p. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and age?
q. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and gender?
r. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and race?
s. What is the relationship between proposed changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and years employed at respective profession?

t. What is the relationship between principals at the four high school types and the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?

u. What is the relationship between guidance counselors at the four high school types and the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?

v. What is the relationship between head athletic coaches at the four high school types and the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?

w. What is the relationship between type of high school and number of players ineligible for college athletics because of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?

Significance of the Study

As a result of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), high school educators must adequately prepare college bound Division I and Division II scholarship athletes for expectations and requirements they will face. Bylaw 5-1-(j) is part of the NCAA’s movement to quell the mounting controversies surrounding the deficiencies of scholarship athletes and the questionable academic practices of big-time college athletic powers (Ervin, Saunders, & Gillis, 1984). The drafting of the Bylaw was a response to a string of scandals which involved illegal recruiting and charges that educators used athletes to fill arenas and stadiums so as to give their schools national publicity; therefore throwing the athletes out into the world with no useable education (Williams, 1983). The NCAA felt that Bylaw 5-1-(j) would increase the integrity of the NCAA in addition to reinforcing the emphasis of education on athletics. High school students are now expected to be motivated to study more and improve their chances of meeting the Bylaw’s requirements. Those senior high school students who are not made aware of the rule soon enough, or do not take the
rule seriously, may suffer the consequences by sitting out their freshman year of eligibility.

There is now a great responsibility placed in the hands of high school personnel in making sure student-athletes meet the Bylaw's requirements. Their attitudes and responses will have a great impact on the implementation of Bylaw 5-1-(j). The extent to which the Bylaw is successful is heavily dependent upon principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches. The objective of Bylaw 5-1-(j) is to tighten academic standards for students competing in collegiate athletics at the Division I and Division II level. If this objective is to be met, principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches must support the Bylaw. An awareness of how these secondary school personnel are affected and are impacted will expose to what extent the Bylaw is supported.

While the NCAA has attempted to remediate the problems that have occurred with student-athletes with their adoption of the Bylaw, there are those who bitterly oppose this legislation. The Bylaw was opposed by black leaders, educators, and colleges as racist and discriminatory. These groups believe that the Bylaw is aimed at reducing the number of blacks on teams of institutions with major sports teams (Crowl, 1983). The black leaders' protests rest on several claims. First, the cutoff point for determining eligibility is racially biased because it affects a higher proportion of black athletes than white. Secondly, blacks protest the Bylaw because black college presidents and representatives of the NCAA were excluded from membership on the committee that drew-up the proposal, and therefore excluded from the decisions which critically affect the black athlete (Warfield, 1984). Finally, blacks oppose the Bylaw because they believe
athletic programs at historically black colleges, seventeen in number, will lose more money than their white counterparts.

Additional critics protest the Bylaw because the rule requires something of athletes that is not expected of other students. In addition, secondary schools are vociferous in their protests because the Bylaw was adopted and implemented without their input.

At the time of this investigation, there were not any research studies concerned with the support of Bylaw 5-1-(j) from principals, guidance counselors, and head coaches in a variety of community types after the implementation of the Bylaw. There has been only one study of principals' awareness and response to Bylaw 5-1-(j) (Jenkins, Walker, White, & Woodson, 1984), but was completed before the Bylaw was actually implemented. This study found that the size of the secondary school, and whether or not the school was urban or rural, played a role in determining whether or not a student-athlete met the requirements of the Bylaw. The authors also discovered that 25 percent of the principals responding to the survey were at the time, unaware of the Bylaw. There have been no studies conducted concerning guidance counselors and head coaches' roles in the secondary schools either before implementation of the Bylaw, or after its implementation. While the success of the Bylaw depends on rural, suburban, urban, and private secondary schools, to the author's knowledge, few studies have addressed the impact on these communities, their level of awareness, and satisfaction with the Bylaw. Colleges, secondary schools, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association can all benefit from the data obtained in this study to determine support for Bylaw 5-1-(j) and to make future recommendations for the Bylaw in order to achieve success in the NCAA's latest attempt to achieve academic integrity of student-athletes.
CHAPTER 11

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Intercollegiate athletics were introduced in the United States in 1852 with a rowing match between Harvard and Yale (Rader, 1983). Since the beginning of intercollegiate events, there has been a considerable amount of information concerned with the formation, growth, and control of athletics, as well as on eligibility requirements and standards. Published information also exists examining NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Much of this research deals with the controversies surrounding the Bylaw, the criticism and opposition to the Bylaw, and a history of eligibility requirements and standards which have been in place prior to Bylaw 5-1-(j). Unfortunately, while there is information and data now published concerned with Bylaw 5-1-(j) and eligibility requirements in general, relatively little information exists which deals with high school personnel, their support for the Bylaw, and the impact the Bylaw will have on secondary schools. Only one study was uncovered which investigated the changes occurring, and the changes planned, at the secondary level as a result of the Bylaw (Jenkins, et al., 1984). However, this study was completed before implementation of Bylaw 5-1-(j). There has since been considerable conjecture on the effects of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on the feeder high schools and the potential high school student-athlete graduate,
however little has been done to determine what those effects will be (Jenkins, et al., 1984).

Jenkins' et al. study (1984) revealed the awareness, impact, and responses of secondary school principals to the Bylaw. This study did not include coaches or guidance counselors. It has been contended by others that the success of Bylaw 5-1-(j) will be determined largely from the support of secondary school personnel (McDonald, 1986; Cohen, 1983).

The topics to be included and covered in the Review of Literature have been divided into several major sections as follows:

1. Origin and Control of Intercollegiate Athletics
2. History of Eligibility Requirements and Standards
3. Opposition to Bylaw 5-1-(j)
4. Proposed and Accepted Modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j)
5. The Role of Secondary School Personnel

**Origin and Control of Intercollegiate Athletics**

A review of literature reveals that intercollegiate athletics were first introduced into colleges and universities by students (Lucas and Smith, 1978). Faculty members knew of the existence of these extracurricular activities but preferred to ignore them. According to Scott (1951), athletics were an important part of the student body life, but without support of educational authorities.

Various authors offer numerous reasons for the origin of intercollegiate contests in the United States. Some contend that intercollegiate athletics were introduced primarily because student life was dull, Spartan, well-regulated, and academically rigorous. Austere faculty members, usually former clergymen, exercised complete control over every aspect of the lives of their charges (Lewis, 1979). Neither winning, creating revenue, or
entertaining spectators motivated these early participants. Bored with their academic curriculum and days regulated and supervised by faculty members who insisted the students spend most of their class time in study or chapel, the students created the extracurriculum (Lewis, 1972). Early events were played by the students for their own enjoyment, were organized by the students, and for much of the 1800's, college officials generally had no policy toward the extracurricular activities, did little to control or impede athletic contests, and only in times of crisis did they act (Lucas and Smith, 1978). The initial growth of athletics on campuses was more of a social experience, rather than an intellectual one.

Other reasons are offered for the origin and quick rise to prominence of intercollegiate athletics. Sport was only one of many activities which were organized by students in the second half of the nineteenth century, and the development coincided with the changes in the nature of the student body and purpose of the college. Lewis (1979) states:

The new type of student was gregarious and organizations provided him with an opportunity to identify with a group. Thus, students came to accept participation in extracurricular activities as an extremely important part of their educational experience. (p. 22)

The English played a role in the development of a new attitude toward sport in America, which intensified the interest of American collegians in sport (Rader, 1983). In the mid-nineteenth century in England, religion began a shift to the secular, partly in response to Muscular Christianity. The ideas of Muscular Christianity took off with the publishing of Tom Brown's Schooldays, authored by Hughes, and Kingsley's, Westward Hol (Redmond, 1978). With Muscular Christianity, the cult of athleticism developed, along
with new views of manliness. This Muscular Christian gospel excited American students and held that physical activity and sports, especially team games like football and cricket, contributed significantly to the development of moral character, fostered desirable patriotism, and the virtues received from participation were transferable to other situations (Redmond, 1978).

The faculty and presidents of many universities in the early to mid 1800's maintained a laissez faire attitude toward campus athletic activities. However, during this time there were no records of sporting activities between institutions of higher learning. In the year 1850, the place of sport on campuses was minimal and nowhere did intercollegiate sport exist. However, in the next half century it became the most important social function of private and public colleges across the land (Lucas and Smith, 1978).

The first intercollegiate contest in the United States resulted from a promotional venture of a small New England railroad. The railroad persuaded Harvard and Yale to send crews to race at Lake Winnepesaukee, New Hampshire (Rader, 1983). The crews of the two schools were organized and controlled by the students, like most intercollegiate squads were in the 1850's. Students organized the teams, scheduled all of their games, and were responsible for the financing of the teams.

Student operated and managed athletics did not remain free from faculty criticism. Faculty members and administrators of the schools became concerned with the integrity and reputation of their schools and began to assert control of athletics, and as athletics grew in importance and size there occurred a transformation from student to faculty control of athletics.
What was responsible for the transformation from student to faculty and institutional control? Several reasons are offered. Students could no longer control the growth of athletics (Lucas and Smith, 1978). As well, students, student captains, and student associations, responsible for the operation of their teams, were guilty of playing to win-at-all-costs, of recruiting and eligibility violations, sportsmanship abuses, and the adoption of professionalism, rationalism, and commercialism (Lucas and Smith, 1978; Sack, 1973; Westby and Sack, 1976). One of the greatest abuses was the use of tramp athletes and ringers. The colleges often recruited athletes rather than use the best available from the student body population (Smith and Helman, 1987). They state:

Tramp athletes and ringers gave credence to the criticisms of the college game as professional, unrepresentative of the student body, and at cross purposes with the goals of higher education. (pp. 1-2)

The desire to win led to the hiring of professional coaches and trainers to organize and control teams, and this desire to outdo the opposition demanded more travel, costly equipment, first-class travel accommodations, and scouting. To pay for these expenses, the alumni of the alma mater's were asked to lend financial support, and gate receipts, the eventual primary financial source, came into being (Lucas and Smith, 1978). In addition, college presidents and faculty witnessed the attention a winning football team could bring to the campus. They began to show more interest in the athletic programs, and began to seek control. College presidents were very aware of the fact that the appeal of higher education was related in a very real way to campus life, and they used athletics in hopes of attracting
students. After 1875, higher education was becoming a more popular institution and college presidents hoped to use intercollegiate athletics to draw students (Lawson and Ingham, 1980).

Because of the many controversies which surrounded intercollegiate athletics in its early years, it was opposed and criticized by many educators. Scott (1951) believes that athletics were set apart from the educational structure which operated outside the educational framework of the university. While educators and the faculty originally attempted to ignore intercollegiate athletics, they found with its growth, they could no longer do so, realizing in order to curb the abuses, they would have to step in and attempt to bring athletics under the guise of educational programs. By the 1900's, students, who had been responsible for the beginnings of intercollegiate athletics, were to forfeit their control partly because they were unable to harness its growth and partly because there were others who wanted control of it.

Several means of administration and control developed as a result of the abuses and criticisms of intercollegiate sport, two of the most influential controls being the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the formation of conferences.

In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt, angered by problems and criticisms of professionalism, sportsmanship, brutality, and questionable recruiting habits, especially in football, called for a study of these abuses in intercollegiate athletics (Lewis, 1969; Smith, 1981). This action was the impetus for the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (1905) which later became the NCAA in 1906. From the inception of the NCAA until 1952, the NCAA could only act in an advisory
capacity with institutions responsible for their own actions and practices (Scott, 1951). While the NCAA would issue statements condemning such abuses as athletic subsidies and unseemly recruiting, the NCAA could only resort to persuasion to enforce its principles (Rader, 1983). In 1952, through a variety of occurrences, the NCAA was able to receive enforcement power. The NCAA is now an enforcing body, formed into an accrediting association which forces compliance with the rules of the organization under pain of expulsion and punishment. The NCAA now enforces the rules with committees and investigates and is able to punish any infraction which comes to its attention.

Also developing in the late 1800's and early 1900's in terms of faculty control was the formation of intercollegiate athletic conferences to prescribe and control conditions under which members competed (Scott, 1951). Membership in these conferences was voluntary and often grouped institutions with similar philosophies, objectives, and missions. Two of the earliest conferences to form were the Ivy League, and the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (1895) which later became the Western Athletic Conference, and later the Big 10 (Scott, 1951). The athletic conference represents the extension of the principle of faculty control of athletics.

Prior to the NCAA receiving enforcement powers, conferences were the means by which colleges and universities dealt with common issues. Savage (1929) stated that in the absence of any control agency to deal with the relationships between college and school, interest in common problems on the part of administrators led first to the formation of associations to deal with or at least discuss such matters, and later to a recognition of the value
of discussion of other phases of mutual concern, including athletic competition.

Conferences are still an active means of control, and each conference member is obliged to follow conference policies as long as they are in force. Although the conference is in complete control of all matters pertaining to the athletics of a particular group of colleges, there are no attempts by conferences to usurp the right of an institution to control its own program of intercollegiate athletics.

In the past, many individuals and groups believed that institutional, rather than faculty control was the answer to ending the abuses in intercollegiate athletics. Harry A. Scott (1951), was one who called for institutional control, stating that both the National Collegiate Athletic Association and local intercollegiate athletic conferences, both extensions of faculty control, have effectively curbed athletics, but have accomplished little by way of eliminating the causes underlying the problems growing out of competitive sports. Today, many other people concerned with the state of intercollegiate athletics, are calling for institutions to bring about the reforms necessary to end the evils and controversies (Farrell, 1987; Scott, 1951).

Today the NCAA dominates intercollegiate athletics (Stern, 1979). In 1952 the decision was made by NCAA-member colleges and universities to grant the association the right to control athletic programs through rule-making and sanctions. This decision, termed the "enforcement decision," marked the completed transformation of the NCAA from a loose confederation designed for mutual support and dissemination of rules into a powerful control agent capable of inflicting serious financial loss on member schools caught violating its rules (Stern, 1979). The recent case at Southern Methodist University
(SMU) is an example of a school most severely penalized by the NCAA, having received the so-called "death-penalty" in 1987 (Sullivan and Neff, 1987).

The NCAA Division I and II institutions are now charged with the responsibility for their actions and their primary purposes are stated in Article Two of the "Constitution and Interpretations of the NCAA" contained in the NCAA Manual (1986-87):

a. To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletic excellence;

b. To uphold the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for all intercollegiate sports in conformity with the constitution and Bylaws of the Association;

c. To encourage its members to adopt eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, sportsmanship and amateurism;

d. To formulate, copyright and publish rules of play governing intercollegiate sports;

e. To preserve intercollegiate athletics records;

f. To supervise the conduct of, and to establish eligibility standards for, regional and national athletics events under the auspices of this Association;

g. To cooperate with other amateur athletics organizations in promoting and conducting national and international athletics events;

h. To legislate, through bylaws or by resolution of a Convention, upon any subject of general concern to the members of the administration of intercollegiate athletics, and
i. To study in general all phases of competitive intercollegiate athletics and establish standards whereby the colleges and universities of the United States can maintain their athletic activities on a high level.

The NCAA has the responsibility as well, of recommending and implementing eligibility standards and requirements to all member institutions. Each institution may not set its own eligibility standards if it plans to remain in the association unless they adopt specific standards more stringent than those of the NCAA. In 1964 the NCAA passed a nationally binding rule dealing with freshmen eligibility in season, and since then the NCAA has operated under several different eligibility plans (Browning, 1986; Petr and Walsh, 1987; Strome, 1972), the latest being NCAA Bylaw 5-1-1-(j), presently in operation. A participant in the National Collegiate Athletic Association must satisfy all of the NCAA eligibility requirements, and cannot permit student-athletes to represent their schools in intercollegiate athletic competition unless the student-athlete meets the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-1-(j).

History of Eligibility Requirements and Standards

The issue and controversy of whether or not collegiate student athletes should be required to meet certain academic eligibility standards and requirements is not new to the college venue, concerns regarding eligibility date back as early as the mid to late 1800's when the ideas of winning and generating profits and revenue to support teams were developing. This desire to win led to numerous scandals and controversies, many of which involved the use of players deemed ineligible to participate. Student-athletes were being recruited from high schools to play for various collegiate
institutions. The issue of eligibility was also present at the First Annual Meeting of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States in 1906 when the delegates to the meeting stated:

Definite rules of eligibility made mandatory upon all members of the Association were judged impractical at the present time, by reason of the widely diverse conditions prevailing in different parts of the country. (Browning, 1986, p.41)

Bylaw 5-1-(j), the eligibility standard presently operating in intercollegiate athletics is based on a long history of insistence that the student-athlete meet certain academic standards, and makes satisfactory progress toward the completion of a degree in order to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

The essence of the debate over freshmen eligibility and academic standards has focused on three major areas according to Smith and Helman (1987):

1. The desire for competitive equity or fairness among competing institutions;

2. The need to maintain financial solvency in intercollegiate athletics, and

3. The pressure to preserve academic integrity within higher education. (p. i)

Smith and Helman also claim that two other factors have been important in determining freshmen eligibility, but have become historically insignificant through the twentieth century. These were:

1. The lack of students resulting from American participation in wars, and
2. The recruitment of virile men to colleges, which were perceived to be effeminate institutions. (p. i)

Concern for academic integrity of institutions was one of the earliest rationales for creating freshmen eligibility rules. For students to be academically successful in college, they needed their first year to become acclimated to the rigors of college academics. This argument was made by Harvard President Charles Eliot in 1889 when he suggested that freshmen athletes not be permitted to participate in athletics. While Harvard's student body did not agree with Eliot, the Big 10 Conference did, and they established themselves in 1895 as a conference that would not allow freshmen eligibility (Petr and Walsh, 1987).

From the beginning, intercollegiate athletics were not foremost in the mind of educators, and they were not developed for educational purposes. They began as extracurricular activities, organized and conducted by students outside of faculty or administrative control. Faculties then took restrictive actions regarding intercollegiate athletic, not in an attempt to infuse athletics with educational values, but to prevent the disintegration of perceived collegiate educational values by the increasing attention given to athletics (Smith and Helman, 1987).

In 1903, Harvard became the first "big-time" school not to allow freshmen to participate and many other schools followed suit. From 1903 to 1964 when the NCAA passed the nationally binding 1.6 Rule, most schools had their own rules to bar freshmen from competing, using the argument that the academic integrity of the universities would be compromised if freshmen were eligible to participate (Petr and Walsh, 1987). Today, the conditions of scholastic achievement required by Bylaw 5-1-(j) for first year participation
are an indication that perhaps maybe a movement toward athletic eligibility standards are based upon academic concern for the student-athlete (Smith and Helman, 1987). The concern and desire for competitive equity has also been cast as a reason for eligibility standards. It was argued that without the freshmen eligibility rule, schools would bring in "ringers" as freshmen who would not have to prove themselves academically for a year before being able to participate on the playing fields (Petr and Walsh, 1987). In 1905, Henry Beach Neadham, author for _McClure's_, charged that the Ivy League frequently raided prep schools in search of talent. Many of the "drafted" students were actually semipros who played for several teams (Moore, 1967). By disallowing freshmen to participate, hopefully competition would be more equal. An example of an instance where the eligibility debate centered on equality of competition, was in 1913, when the Southern Association considered dropping freshmen eligibility for all of its members. They eventually agreed to allow all the institutions within the district that had less than four hundred or more students, to utilize freshmen athletes with the provision that these freshmen, in order to be eligible should be completely free of any entrance requirements. This distinction between institutions based upon the size of their student bodies and by extension the size of their athletic programs or at least commitment to such programs is first experienced here. Clearly, the fundamental issue of equality was the concern (Browning, 1986).

From the inception of intercollegiate athletic competition in the mid-nineteenth century until the mid-1960's, there was no unified policy for colleges and universities on academic standards and requirements for eligibility. The 38 founding schools that formed the NCAA made rather
tenuous commitments. They could not agree on a strict eligibility code, or enforcement procedures, and each of the 38 schools insisted that its program be controlled by its own school faculty (Stern, 1979). This lack of national policy resulted in diverse regional policies and had two important effects. Some conferences allowed freshmen eligibility and others did not. Institutions aligned themselves with other institutions that had similar regulations concerning freshmen eligibility (Petir and Walsh, 1987).

Without strict controls or policies regarding standards and requirements for eligibility, schools continued to recruit academically unprepared students. In order to regulate and bring uniformity to situations like these, university leaders began to move toward inter-institutional agreements regarding eligibility (Smith, 1983). Browning (1986) claims that the creation of conferences resulted in greater homogeneity of standards and moderately higher standards of athletic practice across the country. Enforcement of rules within conferences provided members with the assurance that their competitive peers were not gaining an unfair advantage and so encouraged observance of established conventions. As legislated athletic practices within conferences became more accepted, it became more comfortable and possible for the NCAA to enforce standard guidelines.

However, while there developed more interest and policing throughout the United States concerning requirements and standards, controversies would continue until the NCAA received its enforcement powers. A mid-1920's national study on intercollegiate athletics by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching described the situation of academic freshmen eligibility prior to 1952:
In short, high though the academic standards of participation maintained at certain institutions may be, they represent no universal condition. Faculties, trustees, and even college and university presidents are not yet unified as respects the maintenance of strict requirements in the face of the supposed benefits that can be wrung from winning teams. (Savage, et al., 1929, p. 119)

It should be concluded then, that in its earliest years, the concern for competitive equity and academic integrity were the major considerations for freshmen rule legislation, however there was no uniform national policy.

Prior to 1939, the NCAA remained adament in following a "home-rule" policy in terms of dealing with athletic issues. Home-rule meant the NCAA allowed its member institutions to formulate their own policies in respect to key problems. In 1939, the NCAA published its first set of rules concerned with freshmen eligibility in NCAA championship events only thereby forcing itself to make a decision about the eligibility of freshmen in these events. But in keeping with its policy of home-rule, the NCAA allowed member schools to make their own decisions while in-season (Petr and Walsh, 1987).

In 1952, the NCAA finally secured dominance over intercollegiate athletics. Several factors led to this, including; 1) collegiate athletics were being accused of losing sight of educational ideals, 2) corruption by alumni, and 3) the victimizing of student athletes (Stern, 1979). These revelations led to a group of institutional presidents to meet under the auspices of the American Council on Education to recommend changes deemphasizing athletics in college curricula. New regulations drafted permitted limited scholarships and forced all schools in affiliated conferences to join the NCAA. The enforcement procedures granted the NCAA, plus members dependence
on NCAA-controlled services secured dominance for the NCAA (Stern, 1979).

From 1952 to 1964, the NCAA did not operate with a nationally binding rule dealing with freshmen eligibility in season (Petr and Walsh, 1987). It would not be until 1966 when the NCAA would do so. In 1965, at the 59th Annual Convention held in Chicago, Illinois, the NCAA adopted Article 4, Section 6-(b) [NCAA, 1965]. This legislation, also known as the 1.600 Rule was passed as an effort to increase the academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics. It was felt that since the advent of athletic grant-in-aid, colleges and universities were accepting student-athletes who were not qualified students and would have very little chance of succeeding academically while in school. The Rule, implemented January 1, 1966, was an effort by the NCAA to regain integrity. However, according to Petr and Walsh (1987):

This would be the last time for 20 years that academic integrity would be the dominant factor in deciding questions of eligibility (pp. 3-4).

Specifically, the 1.600 Rule stated that:

A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored event, unless the institution:

1. Limits its scholarships or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient’s athletic ability is considered in any degree) to incoming student-athletes who have predicted minimum grade-point-average of 1.600 (based on a maximum 4.000) as demonstrated by demonstrable institutional, conference, or national experience tables; and

2. Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards and eligibility for participation to student athletes who have a grade-point-average, either accumulative or
for the previous academic year of at least 1.600. (NCAA, 1965, p. 1)

The 1.600 Rule was based on factors which included the student-athlete's rank in high school and SAT or ACT scores and was intended to provide information from which a reasonable prediction of a student's ability to do college work could be made. The 1.600 was actually much more stringent than Bylaw 5-1-(j), because under the 1.600 Rule, a student scoring 700 on the SAT, would be required to have better than a 3.0 GPA to predict a 1.6 in college (Petr and Walsh, 1987). In 1971, as problems with interpretation of the 1.600 rule developed, the rule was expanded (Browning, 1986; Strome, 1972).

According to Smith and Helman (1987), since the 1960's, the major argument to allow freshmen to compete in varsity athletics has been determined first, and foremost, on financial grounds. Because football and basketball have been the two principal revenue producing sports in colleges since World War II, it has been only natural that the financial aspect of eligibility rules have been directed at the two leading men's sports. Whereas there was a time that concern for competitive equity and academic integrity were the major considerations for freshmen rule legislation, finances became the third in that important triad.

The next eligibility decision was based on financial consideration. In 1968 freshmen were declared ineligible to participate in football and basketball, but eligible in all other sports. The NCAA hoped that this would decrease finances of colleges and universities by reducing the number of scholarships given out in these two sports, and save money. Apparently though, the NCAA schools did not save enough money because in 1972, the NCAA enacted
legislation that made all freshmen eligible to participate (Petr and Walsh, 1987). During years when freshmen were eligible to participate in football and basketball, many schools fielded freshmen teams in these sports. Clearly, one of the major reasons in 1972 that freshmen regained eligibility in all sports was because of the high cost of maintaining freshmen teams (Smith and Helman, 1979). In 1972, the 1.600 Rule was voted out by the NCAA, after years of controversy in which opponents argued that the rule was a direct and serious violation of the long standing principle of institutional autonomy. The rule was extremely complicated, and the rule applied only to athletes (Browning, 1986).

In 1972, the NCAA adopted new standards and requirements for athletic participation. This time, the NCAA set the standard as simply a 2.0 GPA in high school. This 2.0 rule placed the burden on high schools to make students eligible to play in their freshmen years. However, this new standard was highly controversial and lasted only until Bylaw 5-1-(j). Most responsible for the failure of the 2.0 rule were the concerns and criticisms that schools were unable to compute grade-point-averages, and that college and university registrars could easily doctor transcripts (Browning, 1986). According to Atwell (1983), the 2.0 GPA was a travesty because:

Something like 90 percent of the people graduating from American high schools exceed the standard. There are many examples of marginal high school students who are gifted athletes being counseled into easy courses to assure eligibility. Furthermore, the quality of American high schools, not to mention colleges, differs widely so that a 2.0 in a good suburban high school means something very different from a 2.0 in a financially starved inner-city high school. Sadly enough, many gifted athletes graduate from bad high schools with a 3.0 or higher GPA and have a combined SAT score of 550. (p. 16)
James Michener (1976) best stated the reason why the rule did not continue:

The chicanery that such a rule encourages is scandalous. Not only do many high schools grant a 2.0 average if a warm body appears in class without slugging the teacher, but those (high schools) who do not try to maintain standards will now be under extra pressure to grant any promising athlete any grade he requires to bring up his average to 2.0 whether he attends class or not. (p. 248)

The 2.0 GPA stood as the requirement for freshmen eligibility until the discussion, formation, and implementation of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) in the mid-1980's (Crowl, 1983). In 1986, NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) was instituted to end the controversies attributed to academic deficiencies of student-athletes and the questionable academic acts of colleges and universities (Toner, 1984). The principal argument for Bylaw 5-1-(j) was that high schools were failing to prepare student-athletes for college-level work, requiring them to take less than rigorous high school courses (Crowl, 1983; Lapchick, 1987). A study conducted by The Washington Post in 1985 revealed that many athletes took such courses as independent living, personal typing, and physical education to attain GPA's high enough to be admitted into college (Lapchick, 1987).

Bylaw 5-1-(j) requires any student, who wishes to participate at the Division I or Division II level as a freshman, to not only achieve a certain minimum GPA, but must also achieve a minimum score on a Standardized Test, and to have taken a minimum number of "core" courses while in high school. The implementation of the Bylaw calls for freshmen participation only if they can achieve a scholastic standard indicative of minimum ability to do college work (Smith and Helman, 1987).
In review of the history of eligibility standards for participation in intercollegiate athletics, it is clear that the NCAA has not always been successful, nor implemented standards and requirements entirely for academic reasons. A natural conflict exists between the regard for the academics of individual athletes and the concern of the institutions for financing athletics and for creating a climate for competitive equity. This conflict continues to be a driving force in creating legislation and will likely do so in the future. Because of the drive to win by collegiate institutions, the financial concerns and the need to compete on an equal basis athletically with other institutions has often overshadowed the issue of academic integrity and the academic needs of student-athletes (Smith and Helman, 1987). From 1972-1982 the academic integrity part of the important triad that rules the debate regarding the academic standards as well as freshman eligibility had been neglected. With Bylaw 5-1-(j), it appears that academic integrity, rather than competitive equity and financial concerns is the major issue. Donald Shields, president of Southern Methodist University addressed this concern when he spoke in favor of the Bylaw:

It seems clear to many of us that in these days of increasing national concern about inadequate academic standards in our secondary schools and colleges that this legislation is not only appropriate but indeed is necessary to preserve the organizational integrity of the NCAA as well as the institutional integrity of our member institutions. (Petr and Walsh, 1987, p. 5)

Opposition to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

While the latest attempt to impose eligibility standards on incoming collegiate student-athletes is based on a strong desire to achieve academic
integrity in college sport, the Bylaw was met not only with praise and publicity, but scorn as well (Greene, 1984). Opposition to the Bylaw came from several areas; blacks, historically black colleges, the nation's secondary schools, the legal system, and from those who claim that standardized tests are not accurate predictors of collegiate academic success.

The historically black colleges protests rested on several claims. The first was that black college presidents and black representatives to the NCAA were excluded from membership on the committee that drew up the proposal, and therefore were excluded from the decision which so critically affects the black athlete (Warfield, 1984). Warfield believes that the exclusion of black representatives from the development of Bylaw 5-1-(j) was totally unacceptable. Such a proposal should have been understood as highly relevant to the black community, and appropriate members should have been included in the committee process. For the black leadership, the exclusion seems racist, guaranteeing a biased outcome (1984). Grambling State University President Joseph B. Johnson accused the American Council on Education (ACE) and the NCAA of a lack of sensitivity in failing to include representatives of black colleges in the early deliberations (Crowl, 1983). Luna I. Mishoe, President of predominately black Delaware State University was the sole black member of the ACE's Ad HOC Committee on Athletics, but was appointed only one week before the 1983 convention. The ACE and the NCAA denied any intentional exclusion of blacks from the committee. Jack Peltason, at the time president of the ACE, defended his association's procedures. He noted that he had first asked all presidents of Division I-A universities to gather and develop an agenda of problems, however none of the seventeen predominately black colleges were Division I-A members.
When the question of academic standards was given top priority, Peltason began to expand the number of committee members and attempted to enlist the presidents of black colleges. Peltason claimed that several of these presidents balked, asserting they should have been involved from the inception (Crowl, 1983). Several efforts then transpired which accommodated the concern voiced by the black colleges, and Dr. Johnson of Grambling University was selected to the NCAA committee (Warfield, 1984).

Much of the controversy stemming from Bylaw 5-1-(j) and the black colleges in Division I and Division II derives from financial implications. Athletic programs at historically black colleges and universities will lose considerably more revenue than their white counterparts if a disproportionate number of blacks fail to meet the Bylaw's standards and requirements. The black Division I and Division II schools that do not have large budgets or television contracts will not be able to provide ample financial support if black players cannot compete in their freshmen year. Football and basketball at these schools will lose financial support if the players are unable to play immediately upon registration (Edwards, 1984a). Because predominately black colleges have more modest athletic budgets than traditionally white schools, the black schools are not able to provide financial support for a roster of inactive athletes and for a long roster of newly recruited athletes ineligible under NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j).

One of the most serious charges leveled at the ACE and the NCAA was that the Bylaw as proposed and adopted was motivated in whole or part by racism. The new Bylaw was and is now seen by many blacks and whites, as a response to the domination of college sports by black athletes. As such, the academic integrity justification is thought merely to be a subterfuge for
another goal, the exclusion of black athletes from collegiate sports (Greene, 1984). Blacks oppose the rule because they feel it was aimed at reducing the number of black athletes on teams of institutions with major sports teams (Crowl, 1983). They claim that by using a cutoff point for determining eligibility, a higher number of black athletes will be affected. The Reverend Jesse Jackson, at the time President of Operation PUSH (People United to Save Humanity), claimed that the NCAA acted as a:

trojan horse to protect the interests of major white universities who have violated the contract of educating these people. (Farrell, 1983a, p. 1)

And, according to Jesse N. Stone, President of Southern University:

The end result of all this (Bylaw 5-1-j) is that the black athlete has been too good. If it is followed to its logical conclusion, we say to our youngsters, 'Let the white boy win once in a while.' This has set the black athlete back twenty-five or thirty years. The message is that the white schools no longer want black athletes. (Edwards, 1984a, p. 15)

The standardized test score requirement (SAT and ACT) is a reason for many, especially black educators challenging the Bylaw. They feel that the test scores have not proven to be reliable predictors of success in colleges and may be culturally biased (Cook and Mottley, 1984). Usage of an absolute cutoff score that less than fifty percent of all black students attain has the potential effect of seriously limiting the pool of black students in higher education. Many claim that it is unfair to suddenly expect blacks to score at the same level of whites when their educational backgrounds have been grossly different (Williams, 1983). According to Gregory R. Anrig (1985), President of the Educational Testing Service (ETS) the standards
established by the Bylaw have an impact that is especially adverse to black students, that results in a significant portion of students being ineligible for freshmen athletics who otherwise would succeed academically. And according to Robert Atwell (1983), executive vice-president of the ACE, half the blacks taking the SAT, score below 700 and blacks on the average, score more than 200 points below whites. The ETS, the service that develops and administers the SAT and the ACT, opposed the minimum test score requirements because the use of a fixed cutoff score on a national standardized admissions test, will have effects that may not have been fully realized before the decision was reached. If the new rule would have been in effect in 1981, 51% of all black male freshmen would not have qualified for athletic competition at NCAA Division I institutions because their test scores would have been too low. Test scores of 60% of black female athletes would have kept them off the playing fields (Vance, 1983). Because of the high percentage of black athletes affected by the standardized test scores, Anrig states:

The issue, therefore, cuts across racial lines in addition to affecting minorities disproportionately. (Vance, 1985, p. 18)

In reviewing the most recent research and statistics completed regarding the impact of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on black athletes, it can be seen that black athletes have been impacted on a higher proportion than whites. A study done by Advanced Technologies, Inc., done for the NCAA analyzed the academic records of more than 16,000 freshmen who received partial scholarships or full scholarships in 1977 and 1982 at 206 of the 272 institutions then at the Division I level. The study found that a larger proportion of black male and female athletes would not have qualified to
participate as freshmen. Sixty-nine percent of black men would not have qualified, while 59 percent of black women would not have qualified (Farrell, 1984). In a list reported in Black Issues in Education (1986), it was reported that from a total of 2,227 signees from all Division I-A institutions, in all sports, there were 206 reported ineligible players. Of these 206, 175 were black and 25 were white. The Big 10 had 14 blacks ineligible and one white. And, a 1986 Associated Press survey showed that the schools hit the hardest were small, predominately black institutions such as Bethune-Cookman and Alabama State University, each of which lost almost their entire recruiting classes (Neither of these two schools are a member of Division I-A, rather they are Division I-AA members who are required to meet the standards of Bylaw 5-1-j). Bethune-Cookman, which plays in the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC) recruited twelve freshmen football players in 1985 and lost all of them. Morgan State University, in the same conference, lost thirteen players. Alabama State University, a member of the South-Western Conference, lost nineteen of twenty-five football recruits (Bock, 1986).

In addition to the criticism that NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) discriminates against blacks and other minorities, there is an additional charge of discrimination against the Bylaw, by those who claim that the Bylaw is unjust because it requires something of athletes which is not required of other high school students (Harper, 1986). With the Bylaw there is a distinction between the treatment student-athletes receive versus the treatment other students are afforded. High schools have the legal right to set up their own admissions policies, but must make sure all students meet legal requirements. Opponents of the Bylaw argue that it violates equal protection, and that it
creates a dual standard of admission. One group of students is required to meet eligibility requirements while others are not. These critics of the Bylaw often are not unsupportive of minimum standards students must attain, rather they dispute the fact that student-athletes are treated distinctly different.

In colleges and universities, many other student groups share characteristics of intercollegiate athletics (Greene, 1984). Activities such as band, orchestra, fraternities and sororities, clubs, theatre, student government, and the student newspaper consume students' time and divert energy and attention from their studies. These students involved in the above activities do not have any initial academic standards imposed on them, unlike intercollegiate student-athletes at Division I and Division II institutions. The members of various other activities must only meet the general admissions standards of the school they wish to attend. Even at the time of this writing, students at Division III and NAIA institutions are not required to meet the same standards as those at Division I and Division II to participate as a freshman. Thus, students involved in extracurricular activities other than intercollegiate athletics, or at another level of play, have unlimited freedom as freshmen to pursue activities in spite of the clear potential for academic peril, while the eligibility and participation of freshmen student-athletes at the Division I and Division II level is controlled. Critics, thus ask the question, is this distinction between student-athletes at the Division I and II level and others participating in extracurricular activities arbitrary or irrational (Greene, 1984)?

The greatest opposition to Bylaw 5-1-(j) in terms of constitutional law is whether or not the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment
guarantees the uniform treatment of similarly situated persons in relation to a government action (Keyes, 1980). According to Greene (1984), the Bylaw presents several possible violations of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. It can be argued that the decision to adopt the new initial eligibility requirements were made with a conscious intent to exclude black athletes from college sports competition. It also can be argued that the new rules violate the equal protection clause because they will disproportionately exclude black athletes. Additionally, it may be argued that the equal protection clause is violated because the new initial eligibility requirements draw an irrational distinction between those eligible for intercollegiate competition and those who are ineligible. Finally, it may be argued that the equal protection clause is violated when eligibility distinctions are applied to athletes but not to other students involved in demanding extracurricular activities.

Prior to the adoption of Bylaw 5-1-(j), the equal protection argument had not been a particularly effective vehicle for student-athletes attempting to protect their interest in participation since only the unusual case would trigger a strict scrutiny analysis of the regulation rendering them ineligible. Prior to 1980, NCAA eligibility cases rarely involved actual discrimination against suspect classes (i.e. race, religion, sex) or infringement against fundamental rights, therefore making the equal protection guarantee an unsuitable remedy for the student-athlete (Keyes, 1980). However, presently with the NCAA imposing a rule that appears to treat similarly situated individuals differently, and affects one group more than another, the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment may be a more
successful means to challenge the NCAA's academic requirements (Yasser, 1983/84).

Another group which has been a critic of Bylaw 5-1-(j) are representatives of secondary educational institutions. While most representatives of this faction would not disagree that freshmen collegiate student-athletes should achieve some level of academic proficiency, many object to the Bylaw because of the responsibility which was handed to them without their input. Neither the ACE or the NCAA included representatives from the secondary educational institutions in the decision making process pertaining to the new rule (Greene, 1984). The exclusion of representatives from the secondary school institutions may be more significant when viewed from the perspective of the potential student-athlete affected by the initial eligibility rules. The secondary educational institutions and their representative bodies, including interscholastic athletic associations, constitute the groups most closely related to the pool of high school athletes the NCAA seeks to exclude from first year competition. Whether these student-athletes are entitled to representation directly or indirectly need not now be decided to conclude that their interests are profoundly affected by the regulation of initial eligibility (Green, 1984). Unfortunately for the high schools, the NCAA constitution fails to allow any representatives of the secondary schools to participate as affiliate members in any NCAA matters, therefore they were not included (Greene, 1984).

The authority and responsibility concerning public school policy is given to state and local officials. This historical control, intruded upon by the NCAA, has created a controversy in the secondary schools, with the most serious objections coming from urban, southern, and higher minority
enrollment schools (Jenkins, et al., 1984). These high schools have since had to make changes in programs and academics, and counsel student-athletes with Bylaw 5-1-(j) in mind, activities they may not perceive as their responsibility because they were not involved in the formation and implementation of the Bylaw. Secondly, the Bylaw effects student-athletes not when they are in high school, but rather when they are in college. Greene (1984) concludes:

These rules were formulated via a process in which important interest groups were unrepresented, thereby rendering the legitimacy of the rules questionable. (p. 140)

The use of standardized tests (SAT and ACT) as a requirement for freshmen participation is not only opposed by black educators and the predominately black colleges as being racially biased, but there are other individuals who advocate that the tests add little to predicting college performance (Blair, 1933; Cook and Mottley, 1984; Ravich, 1984; Slack and Porter, 1984). In addition, several researchers advocate that the standard tests are more biased toward an individual's socio-economic status (Linn, 1982; Ravich, 1984; Stotlar and Williams 1986).

Since 1960, such predictors as class rank, high school GPA, SAT results, and ACT results have been used to predict college academic success for student-athletes (NCAA, 1971). However, since the NCAA has begun using standards and requirements, it has been the use of the SAT and ACT tests which have drawn most of the criticism. Many of the studies done in this area have concluded that high school grades and/or high school rank have been shown to be the best predictor of college grades (Peters and Plog, 1961). The ACE though believes that the grade-point-average/core
curriculum rule provides an indication of student performance over a sustained period of time, and they believe that history at one school may not be the same as history at another school, and that an A at one school might not have the identical meaning of an A at another school. Thus, the standardized test is used as a national indicator of academic performance by the NCAA (Wieder, 1986).

Back in 1931, John Lewis Blair at the University of Chicago investigated significant factors which could be used to predict the success of college freshmen. While the SAT and ACT tests were not being used at this time, Blair did investigate other standardized tests including the George Washington Test of Social Intelligence, and the Ohio State University Psychological Examination. Other predictors which he examined included high school marks, personal ratings, the application for admission, and classes taken while in high school. In his conclusion Blair stated:

This study has demonstrated that the high school record is the best single predictive index among the various measures analyzed. The importance of giving further attention to high school marks cannot, therefore, be overestimated. (1933, p. 44)

The author also concluded that if high school grades are to be used, a percentage system would be more predictive than those grades issued in letters (i.e. A, B, C, D, F), and in addition, in a conclusion which would seem to support the NCAA's use of a GPA and standardized tests, his date found that predictive accuracy is increased if grades and examinations are used in tandem, and by this means, he hoped to obtain predictive coefficients in the neighborhood of .65 to .70 (1933).
In 1961, Frank R. Peters and Eugenia L. Plog of The Ohio State University investigated the effectiveness of the American College Testing Program Examinations (ACT) and of courses and course grades. Their conclusions, like Blair were that the ACT increases error in placement into colleges, and that the high school grade ranks are much better predictors than the ACT.

Nairn (Linn, 1982), claims that 88 percent of the applicants on an SAT will predict a college student’s grade rank no more accurately than a pair of dice.

Slack and Porter (1980) also object to the use of standardized tests being used as a predictor for college success in academics. Their results, contrary to the conclusions of the American Council on Education who believe the scores are good indicators of good performance, disagree. Slack and Porter (1980) note that the scores are not a good predictor of college performance and do not measure capacity to learn. They further state:

If stripped of the aura of aptitude and considered together with the other achievement tests and high school grades, the SAT is a third-rate predictor of college performance. This stands to reason. Despite their variability from school to school, school courses provide the experiences, in class and on examinations, that most closely relate to college courses; high school grades would be expected to have the best relation with college grades. (1980, p. 171-172)

Hargadon (1984) contends that Bylaw 5-1-(j) represents an unwise and improper use of the SAT scores. His primary objection has to do with the indiscriminate application of a minimal test score for purposes of athletic eligibility to all institutions of higher education. He states:

A student with less than a 700 total SAT score might very well have a reasonable chance of successfully completing the
academic program at a college where the median SAT scores are in the 800's or 900's. Or, that same student might very well have a reasonable chance of successfully completing a given program within a large university where the median test scores of the majors in that program are in the 800's or 900's, even though the university as a whole has higher median test scores. (p. 85)

The author believes that the usefulness of the tests will vary from institution to institution and also within institutions, therefore he questions Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Ravich (1984) also describes several forms in which standardized tests can be misused. She states that standardized tests measure only a narrow spectrum of abilities. While she adds that the odds do favor the future academic success of a student who scores a 700 on the SAT over another student who achieves a score of 400, the odds are not always right. For various reasons students may not do well on the test because they "freeze-up" or have other gifts that the tests do not measure. Sensible admissions offices she believes understand this and often look out for other criteria (1984). Eddie Robinson, head football coach at Grambling College, is one who would be willing to take his chances with student-athletes who score below the minimum average, because there is a chance that they may still be successful in the college environment (The Columbus Dispatch, 1986).

In a study done by Walter, Smith, Hoey, Wilhelm, and Miller (1987), they state:

If Bylaw 5-1-(j) had been in effect in 1976, it would have disqualified 60% of previous, college-admissible black athletes compared with about 15% of nonblack athletes, primarily due to the SAT cutting score. Furthermore, among those who would have been disqualified had the requirement been in place in
1976, some two thirds of blacks actually graduated from college while one third of disqualified nonblacks actually graduated. Overall then, pre-facto studies indicate that, in its present form, Bylaw 5-1-(j) would be grossly inequitable to black athletes because it over predicts failure. (p. 273)

In their study predicting the academic success of college athletes, the authors found that by limiting admission to students without a SAT sum (verbal plus math) of 700 would have resulted in rejection of 60% of blacks and 15% of nonblacks. They also revealed that of the 43 blacks in their study who predicted to fail, 37 (86%) actually succeeded. Among nonblacks, of 17 predicted to fail, 12 (70%) succeeded. They conclude that the high school grade-point-average is the single best predictor of college success among predictors commonly used, and is not improved by adding an aptitude measure. They found that the SAT correlates with graduation rates to the extent of only $r = .210$ ($p > .05$).

While there is a general consensus supported by research regarding the strength of the relationship of high school grade-point-average to success in college, there is also research which supports the relationship between standardized scores and success in college (Ravich, 1984), and research which supports the use of a combination of standards (Breland, 1985). Breland (1985) in his study of state university and college admissions for the Educational Testing Service, concluded that standardized test scores have been shown to be valid predictors of college performance. The author suggests use of a Predicted Performance Model to predict college performance in academics. This model is based on the past performance of students in specific institutions. Usually, high school GPA (or rank) is combined with a test score (or scores) to predict college freshman GPA. A
regression equation is developed from data on past students and is used to predict performance for applicants.

Ravich (1984), while stating that standardized test scores can be misused, also finds them to be useful. She feels that high school grades are a questionable standard because of variability from school to school and because of the prevalence of grade inflation. She also questions the use of personal interviews because their value is limited by the prejudice of the interviewer. She claims that when taking these factors in mind, the tests are left as the fairest measure of a student's academic ability. In her own view:

The chief virtue of the standardized test is that it may serve as an early warning system. If a student scores a 350 on the SAT, counselors and teachers should be alerted to find out why and do something about it. (pp. 61-62)

The obvious statistic that coincides very closely with the difference in standardized test scores among blacks and whites is the fact that socioeconomic status and test scores correlate very closely (Burns, 1985). According the Spaeth (1976), test scores are clearly correlated with socioeconomic status, and he reveals that \( r \) is typically about .30. Research has indicated that as family income increases, so does standardized test scores. According to Maly (1983), the lower quality of education often found in large city schools and inner-city metropolitan schools could result in underprepared individuals. A study in 1977 concerned with the relationship between SAT scores and income, done by the Educational Testing Service, demonstrated such results (Stotlar and Williams, 1986). This study revealed that students of family incomes less than $6,000 scored less than students of family incomes of $18,000 or more. And, according to figures released by the
College Board in October, 1983, blacks from families with annual incomes of more than $50,000 scored an average of 130 points higher than those from black families with incomes of less than $6,000/year. For whites, the difference was 66 points (Burns, 1985). Finally, in a summary report compiled by the Columbus, Ohio Public School System, it was noted that economics play an important factor in ACT scores. The lower the family income, the lower the ACT scores. This was found true at the local, state, and national level (Beck, 1987).

The assumption made, especially by blacks, is that since a greater number of whites have more income than a greater number of blacks, the requirements of the Bylaw are biased against poorer blacks. Most black Americans can be found in the poorest sections of the nation's urban centers. Each of these poorer sections, regardless of the city in which it is found has the following characteristics; rampant unemployment, homes in poor condition, and most importantly, education is the poorest where schools are the oldest, classrooms are the most crowded, and the dropout rates are the highest (Jenifer, 1984). Considering these factors, it is not very surprising that student-athletes from the lower classes, especially minorities, score lower than their more wealthier, white peers.

One factor which must be considered when attempting to determine how socioeconomic status affects test scores is coachability, the fact that students can successfully train for the SAT and ACT. Linn (1982) states:

> It has been suggested that susceptibility to coaching is a major source of inequity, since coaching schools are more readily available to those who come from wealthier homes. Furthermore, these claims are seen as invalidating the claim that the test is a measure of scholastic aptitude. (p. 288)
Private prep schools and wealthy school districts are more likely to have classes preparing students for standardized tests, while students at less wealthy high schools would be unable to receive any training. Worthington High School, located in a wealthy suburb of Columbus, Ohio, started what is believed to be the first public school SAT prep course in Ohio, in 1983 (Bridgman, 1987). Because quality of high schools vary so widely, students are bound to receive radically different measures of preparation.

While Linn (1982) states that there is a need for more solid evidence regarding the effects of coaching on the predictive value of test scores, he does add that a review of the related literature reveals that coaching and training can and does inflate SAT and ACT scores. Slack and Porter (1980), in their comprehensive review of studies dealing with coachability, dispute the claim by the Educational Testing Service that students cannot effectively study for the SAT. They found that coaching can increase scores and state:

There is ample evidence that students can successfully train for the SAT and that the more time students devote to training, the higher their scores will be, particularly if the coaching materials are well prepared and the training program is part of the school curriculum. (p. 164)

Messick found that abilities of verbal and mathematical reasoning and comprehension can be developed, and that these abilities and SAT scores are increased as the result of effective instruction. Messick also estimated that a 10-point increase in the SAT is expected to be associated with about eight hours of student contact time for math and twelve hours for verbal. A 30-point increase, however, is associated with approximately 45 hours for math and 260 hours for verbal (Linn, 1982). Messick and Jungeblut (1981), conclude that the soundest long-range mode of preparation for the SAT
would appear to be a secondary school program that integrates the development of thought with the development of knowledge.

The opposition and controversy surrounding NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) provides a good case study of how difficult it is to shape a fair standard across institutions of higher education. In a well-intended effort to prevent the exploitation of student-athletes, and regain academic integrity, the NCAA adopted a rule for eligible freshmen to participate in athletics (Anrig, 1985). Unfortunately for the NCAA, there has been substantial opposition to the Bylaw since its original proposal and adoption from many sides. Most of the opponents do not question the NCAA's attempt and need for some standards, they do question the Bylaw as written. The NCAA however has had support for the Bylaw, most notable from the American Council on Education, and others who believe that the Bylaw will act to motivate students to work harder in the classroom and eventually receive a college diploma. The ACE contends that a standardized test used in combination with high school performance is the best predictor of college success, and believes that far from being discriminatory, the Bylaw is designed to promote educational opportunity by assuming a set of conditions in which the marginal student has a better possibility of getting an education. This new rule, the ACE continues is in the best interest of the student (Atwell, 1983).

Possibly the most resounding endorsement for the Bylaw came surprisingly from several members of the black education community who claimed that the standards set by the NCAA were fair. Edwards (1984b) and Ashe (1983), argue that the intentions of the NCAA were honest. Unlike many other black leaders who have protested the imposition of higher academic standards for athletes, Mr. Edwards said that he was heartened by
the new NCAA rules, though he did not believe they were tough enough. While Edwards does not deny that there are shortcomings with the Bylaw, he does state:

I am fundamentally supportive of Rule 48 because it communicates to young athletes, beginning with those who are sophomores in high school, that we expect them to develop academically as well as athletically. Indeed, this motivational aspect of Rule 48 may, in the final analysis prove most beneficial to that vast majority of high school student-athletes who are never going to enroll in college because they will face the realities of life after sports in a 'high tech' world immediately upon graduation from high school. (p. 10)

The NCAA membership also appears to favor the Bylaw as presently written. At the January, 1988 NCAA Convention in Memphis, during the general business session, Division I members voted to keep its current legislation intact, although there was an attempt to add a satisfactory progress requirement to it (Lederman, 1988).

Proposed and Accepted Modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j)

Among the controversies and criticisms of the Bylaw, there have been several modifications to the rule made, along with many other calls to make changes to, and modify the rule, which have not been adopted by the NCAA.

Bylaw 5-1-(j) was modified in January, 1986 at the NCAA convention to allow more students to meet the requirements of the rule. Proposal No. 16, which amended Bylaw 5-1-(j), called for the Bylaw to act as a sliding scale for 1986-87, and 1987-88. For these two years, a higher GPA would offset a lower SAT or ACT score. In 1986-87, freshmen with high school core GPA's of 2.200 or higher could qualify with SAT scores as low as 660 or ACT scores
of 13. Freshmen with GPA's of 1.800 needed a score of 740 on the SAT or 17 on the ACT to qualify.

In 1987-88, the minimum qualifying GPA in the core was 1.900; it had to be combined with a SAT score of at least 720 or an ACT score of 16. Those with GPA averages of 2.100 or higher could qualify with test scores of 680 on the SAT or a 14 on the ACT.

For this present year, 1988-89, the minimum standards are those that were originally adopted: 700 on the SAT or 15 on the ACT with a 2.000 grade-point-average in the core curriculum (Lilley, 1986, Stotlar and Williams, 1986).

At the 1988 NCAA Convention, additional modifications were proposed for Bylaw 5-1-(j). Proposal No. 39 would have required athletes to attain minimum grade-point-averages at the end of each season of competition. Advocates of the plan said the rule was necessary to improve graduation rates. However, opponents argued successfully that legislating these standards nationwide would be impossible, and that athletes would take fewer and less challenging courses in order to insure meeting the standards. The proposal, while approved in a morning session, was subsequently reconsidered and rejected that same afternoon (Lederman, 1988). There were also no changes made in the high school requirements necessary for athletic participation as a freshman.

One piece of legislation which was passed at the NCAA Convention in January, 1988 was Proposal No. 45 which states that in certain instances an NCAA Committee will have the ability to authorize exceptions to the rule; specifically in cases where extenuating circumstances caused a student-athlete to be declared ineligible under Bylaw 5-1-(j).
While the NCAA has discussed and considered modifications, and has attempted to remediate the problems inherent with Bylaw 5-1-(j) as presently written, there are those who want additional changes and are vociferous in their arguments, however, while other alternatives have been offered, none have since been approved.

In 1984, Dr. Robert Klitgaard of Harvard University developed an approach which used an index based on a combination of standardized test scores (ACT or SAT) and high school GPA (known as "Pred" 200). In line with Bylaw 5-1-(j), this option included a requirement that athletes take a specified core curriculum in high school (Klitgaard, 1984). Klitgaard's index, it was contended, would simultaneously improve the prediction of persistence, allow more black and white freshmen athletes to be eligible, and reduce adverse impact against blacks. Under Klitgaard's plan, a student-athlete would be eligible if SAT + 200 was greater than or equal to 1100. A similar type combination would be developed for the ACT. Pred 200 would require the core curriculum and keep the test score while helping in mitigating any incentives to "fudge" or alter high school grades. This rule would have done what most institutions do in their own admissions policies and what the Educational Testing Service recommends; it combines grades and test scores, rather than insisting upon an absolute cut score for high school grades or test scores, or both. Klitgaard further states:

Compared to Rule 48, this option is equally stringent in terms of academic performance in college, allows more students to play in their freshman year, and almost triples the proportion of black athletes who would be able to play in the freshman year. (p. 4)
Ervin, Saunders, and Gillis (1984) offer a proposal which they believe would be a much sounder policy than Bylaw 5-1-(j). They proposed to admit those athletes into a college or university who meet that institution's admissions standards for all incoming freshmen. This policy would assure that athletes would be academically competitive and the policy would be equitable for all institutions and all athletes. It would be difficult to denigrate a program with one admission standard for all students.

Another change which was rejected was a proposal to allow freshmen who do not meet the standards of the Bylaw, be allowed four years of playing eligibility after their freshman year instead of three, as is the case under the rule as now written. Apparently, one reason for rejecting this idea was due to the concern of the council of the NCAA that the public might perceive this change as a weakening of academic requirements (Farrell, 1985).

Other modifications have been proposed since 1983. Some of the common suggestions have been to delete the test scores, delete the loss of eligibility, select test scores for each ethnic group, make all freshmen ineligible, implement a reading test, and more specifications of courses in core curriculum (Stotlar and Williams, 1986).

In Breland's examination of undergraduate admissions models (1986), he identified five different policies; single-index minimum (GPA or test score, or high school rank), multiple-index minimums, either-or minimums, sliding scales, and predicted performance. The predicted performance model advocated by Breland, is based on the past performance of students in specific institutions, and utilizes a regression equation from data of these past students to predict performance for applicants. Breland states that this model is clearly preferable to the other four models because it helps
minimize differential impact, it recognizes institutional differences, and customizes the weightings of the indexes.

Finally, in review of literature concerned with proposed modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), several authors have examined what some high schools are doing themselves in an effort to establish higher expectations for student-athletes and to assist youngsters with academic problems.

The Lynchburg, Virginia Public Schools have utilized a mandatory athletic study hall held after school but before practice begins. The study hall was not a part of the regular school day (Jones, 1986). Emphasis in the study hall was placed on providing tutorial assistance and on providing a place where students could study and complete homework assignments. While the district found that the program did not produce the miraculous results they envisioned, there was some success, with many students increasing their grades, and the study hall also emphasized to students that academics were the top priority.

During the summer of 1985, the Schools of Education and Medicine of the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) in cooperation with the Kansas City, Missouri School District (KCSD) developed a pilot program to address some typical problems high school athletes encounter when they reach college. The summer program was designed to acquaint high school athletes with information and skills that would make the transition easier from high school to college or university, and even to professional sports. During the two week summer session, selected junior high school athletes (equally divided between the sexes) learned from lectures, demonstrations, and participation in a curriculum which included the following topics:
(a) Diagnostic assessment in reading - The students underwent a diagnostic test to assess current reading levels. Suggestions to improve scores and encouragement were given to continue to practice reading skills and to improve vocabulary.

(b) Recruiting - A general summary of NCAA and NAIA rules were presented. The guidelines were concerned with recruiting and eligibility of prospective athletes.

(c) Test-taking skills - This activity was designed to assist students in preparing for college entrance examinations such as the SAT and ACT. The activity emphasized a review of the necessary math, reading comprehension, and vocabulary skills needed for college and university entrance examinations.

Other curriculum components also included; ethics in athletics, interviewing skills, parental concerns, study skills, and future considerations. It was hoped from these varying components, that with appropriate cooperation between a university and a school district, that high school athletes could make a successful transition to a college or university (Mares, Levine, and Eubanks, 1986).

The Role of Secondary School Personnel

While there is considerable research already completed regarding the number of student-athletes who have been, and will be affected by NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), little research has been completed which attempts to determine the attitudes, awareness, and impact on secondary school personnel in urban, rural, and suburban, and private high schools. As the Bylaw now exists, it is applicable to all potential Division I and Division II grant-in-aid recipients in the 23,440 senior high schools across the nation.
To alert all secondary schools about the implications of Bylaw 5-1-(j), the NCAA prepared and mailed a guide to the rule entitled, *Guide to New College Freshman Eligibility Requirements for NCAA Division I Institutions*, to every secondary school in the nation (Toner, 1984). Presently, the NCAA sends a double mailing of the updated guide entitled, *Guide to the College Freshman Eligibility Requirements for NCAA Division I Institutions*, to each high school principal and guidance counselor in the nation (Todd Petr, personal communication, January 14, 1988). Conferences such as the Mid-American Conference (MAC), and The Big 10 make materials available upon request for prospective student-athletes at their institutions. The Mid-American Conference mails out a bulletin entitled, *Bulletin for Student-Athletes*, in addition to an NCAA publication, *NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete* (Jamie McCloskey, personal communication, December 16, 1987). The Ohio State University, offers the same materials to prospective student-athletes as does the Big 10 conference office (Larry Romanoff, personal communication, December 16, 1987).

Included in the guides the NCAA sends to principals and guidance counselors is a definition of the Bylaw and the requirements a student must achieve, a definition of core courses, core-curriculum interpretations, test score requirements, test-score interpretations, and general information (Petr, 1987). Contained in the bulletins for the students are; planning suggestions for meeting the requirements for the Bylaw, facts about the ACT and SAT requirements, an explanation of each requirement, and a worksheet in which students can list the core courses they have already completed.

Secondary school guidance counselors are one influential group of secondary school personnel who are important to the success of the Bylaw.
Guidance counselors now must make sure that potential Division I and Division II student-athletes are placed in the correct curriculums, complete the specified number of core courses which are called for, and are generally kept abreast of NCAA policies and rules. Given the opportunities for student-athletes to receive athletic scholarships, and the requirements a student must meet, the responsibility on the counselors is great. These opportunities, plus the fact that prospective student-athletes may be in more need than others of dispassionate, objective information and advice, is justification for their attention (Gilbert, 1974). Gilbert further states the athlete is somewhat less likely than most to get objective and disinterested advice in decisions. Therefore, the guidance counselor’s role is important, and it is imperative that counselors clearly understand the Bylaw and support it.

Larry Romanoff, athletic counselor for the athletic department at The Ohio State University, provided his own view on what might be the high school counselors’ responses to the Bylaw. Prior to January, 1986, he believes that high schools had been negligent in providing quality guidance to many students, and that the new requirement might force them to do a better job. He believes that high school counselors are overworked and the Bylaw will simply add more work for them, and it may not be beyond the realm of possibility to see parents and students suing their counselors because the student failed to take eleven core courses. Furthermore, high school coaches, counselors, and principals may someday need to take out malpractice insurance much like physicians do (Larry Romanoff, personal communication, January 28, 1986).

Coaches as well have the responsibilities to the student-athlete and must be aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j). According to Weber, McBee, and Christopher
(1981), coaches have more power over students in their charge than other faculty members. And, according to McDonald (1986), coaches have the extra role of being a counselor and a teacher. Coaches should make themselves available to the student for personal counseling and guidance. These coaches, McDonald adds, must prepare for this role, and assume responsibility for this role because they are the most approachable person to high school athletes.

Because of the student-athletes' actions and feelings toward their coaches, and the influence coaches have on their players, it would be an advantage for the coach to be aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j), be able to counsel students, and be supportive of its standards.

Clint Alburg, head football coach at Miami, Florida's Killian High School (35 percent Hispanic, 30 percent black), was largely responsible for raising the grade-point-average for his team from 1.3 to 2.45 in just two years (Milverstedt, 1987). During the 1985 season, Alburg had 26 seniors on the football team, and following the season 23 were offered athletic scholarships, including seven at Division I schools. Every one of the athletes met the requirements of the Bylaw. The key to Alburg's success was that he took full responsibility for his players' classroom application, he made sure that they were receiving proper assistance from other high school personnel, and he went so far as to add a special course to the curriculum called, 'SAT Prep' to help students comply with the requirements. Alburg states:

A coach has a lot more power than a lot of people want to admit. If a kid wants to play football, then he has to do it according to the coach's rules. (p. 25)

While the NCAA and Division I and Division II conferences have done a great deal to notify students and high school personnel of Bylaw 5-1-(j),
many of these individuals still are not receiving the message. In 1983, Richard E. Lapchick, Director of Northeastern University's Center for the Study of Sport in Society, which operates a program that is aimed in part at impressing upon high school students, particularly athletes, the importance of education, found that of the 7,000 high school students he had spoken with, none of them were aware that the new standards would be adopted. Unfortunately, this author's review of the literature found no other recent studies pertaining to the awareness of the Bylaw by high school students.

According to Weber et al. (1981), the individual who has primary control over students in academic situations is the principal. Principals play an important role in the Bylaw process because it is the principal who makes the decision as to whether a course qualifies as a core course. Because of the impact of the rule, the principal should sense the legal liability now present to inform students and parents of the rule and document the fact that such information was made available (Jenkins et al., 1984).

A review of literature did reveal one study which had as its purpose, to determine the awareness, attitudes, and actions taken within the national secondary school community as a result of the initiation of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Jenkins et al. (1984), in their study, which was completed prior to implementation of the Bylaw, randomly sampled 20 percent (4,688) of the secondary school principals in the United States. Approximately 1,957 completed questionnaires were returned from a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural schools. Fifty-two percent of the secondary schools included in the survey were located in rural areas, 17 percent in urban areas, and 31 percent in suburban areas. Sports that the researchers were interested in at the high schools were: football, basketball, baseball, track, soccer, hockey,
tennis, golf, wrestling, and some additional sports, as well as male and female teams.

A major purpose of the study was to determine the level of awareness to NCAA Rule No. 48. From the data it was observed that 75 percent of the sample were aware of the existence of the rule, however, only 49 percent had taken measures to insure their students knew about it. Nearly 10 percent of the principals had received information about the rule from colleges or universities, while 68.4 percent learned of the rule from news reports. The differences between urban, rural, and suburban schools appeared negligible to the authors, perhaps they believe this is so because of the exposure to the news media. However, the authors note that rural schools were the least aware, even though they comprised some 53 percent of the respondents (Jenkins, et al., 1984). The lowest level of awareness was found within those schools with the smallest percentage of minority students.

In terms of approval of the rule, 94 percent of the responding principals approved the 2.0 GPA requirement and 93 percent approved the core course requirement. However, only 79 percent approved of the SAT/ACT requirements. Rural respondents approved of the rule less than the other two community types.

The study also found:

1. More schools would have been affected by the eleven academic course requirements than by the other parts of the rule. This was especially true for rural schools.

2. Rule 48 will have its greatest impact on public schools.

3. Only 11 percent of the schools made specific curriculum changes as a direct response to the rule.
4. Twenty-eight percent of the schools included in the sample were modifying guidance and counseling procedures as a result of their awareness of the rule.

No other studies were found concerning this area of study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes the methodology used to describe the similarities and differences between principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches in 49 Columbus, Ohio area rural, urban, and suburban, and private high schools on the awareness of, the impact of, the response to, satisfaction with and perceived changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). The relationship of the responses of high school principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches is correlated with the type of high school; rural, urban, or suburban, and private. An interview was conducted with each principal to determine their approval of the study and to describe to them the nature of the study. The methodology section will describe the type of research conducted, the population involved, questionnaire development and administration, subject selection, instrumentation and data analysis.

Type of Research

This study utilizes survey type research to describe the distribution and characteristics of high school personnel and the status of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) in various public and private high schools.

All high schools who were members of the Mid-State League (Cardinal and Buckeye Divisions), the City League (North and South Divisions), the Central
Buckeye League (Central and Buckeye Divisions), the Ohio Capital Conference (Ohio Division), and the Ohio Catholic League, were sampled, excluding one City League high school, one suburban league high school, and two rural high schools. Frame error was controlled by obtaining the frame of guidance counselors directly from each school's principal, and coaches from the 1987-88 Ohio High School Athletic Association Directory, and updates from the high school principals. A questionnaire was distributed to each coach of a sport which is played at the Division I and Division II collegiate level. The researcher delivered the questionnaires to each school and retrieved them personally, except for Upper Arlington High School which requested the questionnaires be directly mailed to them.

Population

The urban, rural, and suburban, and private high school population included forty-nine high schools in central Ohio. The frame for the population was extracted from the 1987-88 Ohio High School Athletic Association Directory (1987), and are listed below:

Urban/City League
Beechcroft High School
Briggs High School
Brookhaven High School
Centennial High School
East High School
Eastmoor High School
Independence High School
Linden-McKinley High School
Marion Franklin High School
Northland High School
South High School
Walnut Ridge High School
West High School
Whetstone High School
Rural/Mid-State League
Bloom-Carroll High School
Canal Winchester High School
Logan Elm High School
Teays Valley High School
Hamilton Township High School
Amanda-Clearcreek High School
Berne Union High School
Liberty Union High School
Licking Heights High School
Millersport High School

Suburban/Central Buckeye League and Ohio Capital Conference (Ohio Division)
Westerville North High School
Worthington High School
Grove City High School
Groveport-Madison High School
Upper Arlington High School
Westland High School
Lincoln (Gahanna) High School
Westerville South High School
Grandview High School
Olentangy High School
West Jefferson High School
Jonathan Alder High School
North Union High School
Bexley High School
Big Walnut High School
Buckeye Valley High School
Dublin High School
London High School
Marysville High School

Private/Ohio Catholic League
DeSales High School
Hartley High School
Wehrle High School
St. Charles High School
Watterson High School
Ready High School
Questionnaire Development and Administration

The validity question is concerned with the extent to which an instrument measures what one thinks it is measuring, and it is absolutely essential that the researcher ask this question (Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh, 1985). Content validity was periodically evaluated by a panel of experts and a measurement expert. The panel of experts consisted of two professors from the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the director of the same department, and the measurement expert was a professor from the Department of Agricultural Education. This questionnaire was not adapted from any previously designed instrument used by others, but rather was developed entirely by the researcher who was advised by professors in the school of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

The development of the instrument as mentioned previously was done by the researcher with help from a panel of experts. However, administration of the instrument was done by the researcher alone, as was the recording and analyzing of the data. Administration included delivering the questionnaire personally to each high school, and picking up the same.

Before data was collected from all forty-nine high schools, the instrument was distributed to personnel at Franklin Heights High School to assess the clarity of the questionnaire, and to determine if changes would need to be made to the directions or any of the questionnaire items.

Subject Selection

Subjects were selected to participate in the study if they were principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches presently employed at the
high schools participating in the study. The population was readily accessible because of the intact groups of personnel associated with a high school, and each school's principal's willingness to have his or her staff participate. A questionnaire was distributed to the principal who was then responsible for distributing the questionnaires to staff members. Obtaining a high response rate was accomplished in the following manner:

a. The researcher contacted each high school district to obtain permission to survey staff members.

b. Procedures for requesting approval and conducting research in school systems within Franklin County was conducted through the College of Education at The Ohio State University. Schools outside Franklin County do not use this procedure.

c. After receiving permission to survey the prospective high schools, the researcher mailed a letter to each principal describing the nature of the study and the approximate date the questionnaires would be delivered.

d. A phone call was made to each principal several days prior to delivery of the questionnaire to finalize details.

e. Delivery of the questionnaire in all but one case was done personally to insure a high response rate. In the case of Upper Arlington, the questionnaires were mailed to the high school per their request.

f. The administrator of the questionnaire personally retrieved completed questionnaires, except in the case of Upper Arlington High School, which mailed their completed questionnaires to the researcher.

g. To assure confidentiality, and acknowledge receipt of the questionnaires, the questionnaires were placed in large envelopes with each school's name on them. Questionnaires did not have individuals' names on them.
h. The cover page assured measures of confidentiality as well as requested respondents to complete the questionnaire within three days and return them to the principal.

i. Principals were periodically contacted to determine how many questionnaires had been completed in their schools. Additional questionnaires were delivered to schools if necessary to be redistributed to guidance counselors and head athletic coaches.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was developed to gather data for the following variables:

1) awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j); 2) perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j); 3) changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j); 4) impact of and responses to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j); and 5) demographics.

The instrument used to measure these variables of interest was designed by the researcher, with assistance from two professors from the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER), the Director of the School of HPER, and a measurement expert from the Department of Agricultural Education.

Awareness

Part I of the instrument was designed to measure principals', guidance counselors', and head athletic coaches' awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Items 1, 2, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), and 4 of the instrument asked respondents to answer YES or NO to indicate whether or not they were aware of the item or not. A response of YES was given a value of two (2), while a response of NO was given a value of one (1). Responses to these items were summed to determine an awareness score. A maximum score of twelve (12) could be
attained. A minimum score of two (2) was possible because items 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), and 4 were skipped if item 2 was answered NO. Scores were then converted to the following scale for clearer interpretation by the reader:

2-1
3-2
7-3
8-4
9-5
10-6
11-7
12-8

(A score of eight (8) represents the highest level of awareness, and a score of one (1) represents the lowest awareness score that could be attained)

**Satisfaction and Fairness**

Part II of the instrument was designed to measure principals’, guidance counselors’, and head athletic coaches’ perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Part II consisted of statements to which the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement using a four-point, Likert-type scale. The four points of the scale were:

4-Strongly Agree
3-Agree
2-Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

Items were listed both positively and negatively to help respondents avoid response sets (Dillman, 1978). During data analysis, the weighing of responses of negatively worded items were reversed to provide consistent measurement. For example, a negatively stated item (items 13, 14, 16) would be reverse coded. Items 15 and 19 were omitted. The total score of an
individual across all items would indicate perceived level of satisfaction and fairness with the Bylaw.

**Changes and Modifications**

Part III of the instrument was designed to measure perceived changes and modifications that principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches approved or disapproved of regarding NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Each item was examined individually. Following this, respondents were asked to rank changes to the Bylaw which they believed to be most important (see Appendix C).

**Impact and Responses**

For Parts I, II, and III, principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches each answered identical questions. While each job type received a questionnaire designed specifically for their own group, Parts I, II, and III were the same, as were the demographic items. The items in Part IV, Impact of and Responses to Bylaw 5-1-(j), however differed for each job type.

Part IV of the survey instrument was designed to measure the impact of the Bylaw and responses to it. For principals, items 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, and 50, asked respondents to answer YES or NO to indicate whether or not they had been impacted by the item. A response of YES as given a value of two (2), and a response of NO was given a value of one (1). Responses to these items were summed to determine an impact score. A maximum score of sixteen was possible, while the minimum possible score was an eight. The scores were then converted to the following scale for clearer interpretation by the reader:
(A score of 9 represents the greatest impact, a score of 1 represents the least impact)

For guidance counselors, items 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, and 50, were summed in the same manner as were the principals' items. A maximum score of twenty (20) was possible, while a minimum score of ten (10) was possible. No individuals scored a ten. The scores were converted to the following scale:

11-1
12-2
13-3
14-4
15-5
16-6
17-7
18-8
19-9
20-10

(A score of 10 represents the greatest impact, a score of 1 represents the least impact)

For head athletic coaches, items 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46, were summed in the same manner as items of principals' and guidance counselors'. A maximum score of sixteen (16) was possible, while a minimum
score of eight (8) was possible. The scores were converted to the following scale:

8=1
9=2
10=3
11=4
12=5
13=6
14=7
15=8
16=9

(A score of 9 represents the greatest impact, a score of 1 represents the least impact)

Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) computer program which is available at The Ohio State University.

A descriptive analysis was performed on survey items to compare means and percentages and to summarize the data among variables. Analysis of variance was performed to compare relationships among job types, school types, awareness, satisfaction, the impact of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), and demographic variables. Tests of significance were performed at the .05 alpha level.

Spearman correlation coefficients were used to determine rankings of changes and modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j) and to determine the nature and strength of relationships between variables.
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

The data analysis and interpretation chapter has been divided into five sections corresponding to the major areas of emphasis in the questionnaire. These sections correspond with the objectives/research questions of the study: 1) Demographic profiles of the respondents, 2) Awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), 3) Perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), 4) Changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), and 5) Impact of and responses to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). The data have been displayed in tabular form and summarized in written form.

Demographic Profiles of Respondents

Data were collected from 49 Columbus, Ohio area high schools. Table 1 displays the distribution of the four types of high school. The greatest number of schools were suburban, nineteen, which represents 38.8 percent of the total. Private schools were the least in number, six, which represents 12.2 percent of the total. Fourteen urban schools participated in the research as did 10 rural schools.

Data were collected from 512 respondents which represents a 74.7 percent return. Principals at all 49 high schools returned completed questionnaires, a response rate of 100 percent. One-hundred and
eighteen guidance counselors responded to the questionnaires which represents a response rate of 78.1 percent. Three-hundred and forty five head athletic coaches responded to the questionnaire, which represents a 71.1 percent response rate. Table 2 displays the response by type of school and by type of job.

TABLE 1

Distribution Of School Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of H.S.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

Response Rates To Questionnaires Sent To Columbus, Ohio Area Suburban, Urban, Rural, And Private High School Principals, Guidance Counselors, And Head Athletic Coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 displays the data regarding the variable gender. Males (n=391) account for 77.7 percent of the respondents, while females (n=112)
account for 22.3 percent of the respondents. Some individuals did not indicate their sex identities (n=9). In terms of job type, females comprised only 4.0 percent of the principals, and 16 percent of head athletic coaches. However, females accounted for 48.3 percent of guidance counselors. In terms of type of high school, the percentage of females ranged from 25.6 percent in rural schools, to 20.4 percent at urban schools.

**TABLE 3**

**Distribution Of Respondents By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 96.0% | 4.0% | 51.7% | 48.3% | 84.0% | 16.0% | 77.7% | 22.3% |

There were 498 respondents to the item which asked individuals to designate their race (Table 4). Fourteen respondents did not indicate their race. Of the 498 who did respond, 454 indicated they were white, 38 black, 2 indicated they were Asian-American, 2 Native-American, and 2 indicated they were other, without specifying their race. For data analysis, and this study, two levels of race are used, white (91.4 percent), and minority (8.6 percent), which includes blacks, Native-Americans, Asian-Americans, and other. Thirty-six minorities were from urban schools, and only 1 a rural high school. There were 30 minority coaches, and 3 minority principals.
TABLE 4

Distribution of Respondents by Race (n=498)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93.9% 6.1% 90.4% 9.6% 91.0% 9.0% 91.4% 8.6%

Tables 5 and 6 display frequency distributions for age, and number of years employed, by job type and type of school.

Of the 499 respondents who indicated their age level, 75 (15 percent) were 21-30 years of age, 224 (44.9 percent) were 31-40 years of age, 155 (31.1 percent) were 41-50 years of age, and 45 (9.0 percent) were between the ages of 51 and 65. No respondents were below the age of 21, or above 65 years of age. There were no principals between 21-30 years of age (Table 5). Only two guidance counselors were in that age range, indicating that most guidance counselors probably have several years of experience.

Table 6 displays years employed as principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches. Of the 499 respondents to the item years employed, 77 (15.4 percent) were employed 0-2 years, 114 (22.8 percent) were employed 3-5 years, 18 (3.6 percent) were employed 6-8 years, 74 (14.8 percent) were employed 9-11 years, and the largest number, 166 (33.3 percent) were employed greater than 11 years. Only 9 guidance counselors had 0-2 years experience which appears to
correspond with the fact that only 2 responding counselors were in the 21-30 year old category.

**TABLE 5**

Distribution Of Respondents By Age (n=499)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Age 21-30</th>
<th>Age 31-40</th>
<th>Age 41-50</th>
<th>Age 51-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Age 21-30</th>
<th>Age 31-40</th>
<th>Age 41-50</th>
<th>Age 51-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Age 21-30</th>
<th>Age 31-40</th>
<th>Age 41-50</th>
<th>Age 51-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Age 21-30</th>
<th>Age 31-40</th>
<th>Age 41-50</th>
<th>Age 51-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | 15.0%     | 44.9%     | 31.1%     | 9.0%      |
### TABLE 6

Distribution Of Respondents By Years Employed (n=499)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-2 Years</th>
<th>3-5 Years</th>
<th>6-8 Years</th>
<th>9-11 Years</th>
<th>&gt;11 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awareness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

The purpose of the awareness section of the survey was to determine how aware respondents were of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), how aware they were of its requirements, how they initially became aware of the Bylaw, and if they continue to require more information.

To determine measurements of awareness, and in order to compare relationships between levels of awareness, it was necessary to develop an awareness score. Items 1, 2, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), and 4 were given values of two (2) if the response was YES, a value of one (1) if the response was NO. In this way, an individual could achieve an awareness score in the range from 12 (six YES responses), to 2 (item 2 was a skip question). It was not possible to score a 4, 5, or 6. These scores were then converted to the following scale:

- 2-1
- 3-2
- 7-3
- 8-4
- 9-5
- 10-6
- 11-7
- 12-8

(A score of 8 represents the highest level of awareness, a score of 1 represents the lowest level).

The mean awareness score for all individuals who responded to this section (n=511) was determined to be a 6.73, with a standard deviation of 2.2. Both the minimum and maximum awareness scores were achieved by several respondents. Clearly the greatest number of respondents scored an 8 (63.2 percent), the highest possible awareness score. Over 76 percent of respondents scored a 7 or 8. Only 14.5 percent of respondents
were not aware of any aspects of Bylaw 5-1-(j), having answered NO to all six awareness items. Table 7 displays the frequency distribution of awareness scores for all 511 respondents.

### TABLE 7

**Frequency Distribution For The Awareness Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=6.732  
Standard Deviation=2.231  
Minimum=1.00  
Maximum=8.00

When examining individually each of the six items which comprised the awareness score, it can be observed that 87.9 percent of respondents were aware of the difference between Division I, II, and III institutions, and 85.4 percent were aware of the Bylaw itself. Of the 437 individuals who responded that they were aware of the Bylaw, 81.8 percent were aware of the standardized test score requirement, 83.2 percent were aware of the high school grade point average requirement, 77.7 percent were aware of the core course requirement, and 71.7 percent considered themselves familiar with the characteristics of a core course.
### School Type

An analysis of variance was performed on mean scores of awareness for the four high school types (Table 8). Significant differences were found at the .05 alpha level. The mean awareness score for private schools was the highest, 7.46, while the lowest mean score was found for rural schools. Their mean awareness score was determined to be 6.23. The mean awareness score for urban schools was 7.01, and the mean awareness score for suburban schools was 6.51.

### Job Type

No significant differences were found using analysis of variance between the three job types (Table 9). The mean awareness score for principals was the highest, 6.96, guidance counselors scored 6.86, and head athletic coaches scored a 6.65. This appears to be normal as the NCAA claims to send information explaining NCAA Bylaw 5-1-1(j) to every high school principal and guidance counselor in the country.

### Gender

Analysis of variance indicates that there is a significant difference between mean awareness scores for males and females. The mean score for males (n=390) was considerably higher than for females (n=112), with males mean awareness score found to be 6.92, while females averaged a 6.01, indicating that males are more aware of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-1(j) and its component requirements (Table 10).
TABLE 8

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of
Mean Awareness Scores By School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.9937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>2.5758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.2501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df | SS    | MS     | F*    | p
Between groups | 3     | 75.4677| 25.1559| 5.1787| .0016
Within groups  | 507   | 2462.8023| 4.8576 |
Total         | 510   | 2538.2701|

*p<.05

TABLE 9

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of
Mean Awareness Scores By Job Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>2.0408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.2680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.2457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df | SS    | MS     | F*    | p
Between groups | 2     | 6.6869| 3.3434| .6709| .5117
Within groups  | 508   | 2531.5832| 4.9834 |
Total         | 510   | 2538.2701|

*p<.05
TABLE 10
Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of
Mean Awareness Scores By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.1199</td>
<td>60.1199</td>
<td>12.3013</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2443.6430</td>
<td>4.8873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2501.7629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Race, Age, and Years Employed

No significant differences were found using analysis of variance on the awareness variable for race, age levels, and years employed in respective professions.

Minorities (n=44) had a higher mean awareness score than whites (n=453). The mean awareness score for minorities was 6.96, while the mean awareness score for whites was 6.72.

With respect to age levels, those respondents 31-40 years of age (n=223) had a mean awareness score of 6.84, respondents age 41-50 (n=155) scored 6.83, respondents age 21-30 (n=75) had a mean score of 6.47, and respondents 51-65 years of age (n=45) had a mean awareness score of 6.44.

In analyzing the variable years employed, no significant differences were found between means for the five levels examined. However, the highest mean score was attained by individuals employed greater than 11 years (n=166). The mean score for this group was 6.82. Conversely,
the lowest mean score was attained by respondents employed fewer than three years (n=77). The mean score for this group was 6.41.

Source of Initial Awareness

All respondents to the survey were asked to indicate the means by which they initially became aware of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Choices included, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a workshop and/or inservice, a college or university, an individual at their high school, the media, or other sources. Table 11 displays the sources by which principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches initially became aware of the Bylaw (respondents were able to indicate more than one source).

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Principals (n=43)</th>
<th>Counselors (n=102)</th>
<th>Coaches (n=292)</th>
<th>Total (n=437)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>23 (53.5)</td>
<td>40 (39.2)</td>
<td>56 (19.2)</td>
<td>119 (27.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/Inservice</td>
<td>4 (9.3)</td>
<td>27 (26.5)</td>
<td>23 (7.9)</td>
<td>54 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>3 (7.0)</td>
<td>11 (10.8)</td>
<td>35 (12.0)</td>
<td>49 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>5 (11.6)</td>
<td>27 (26.5)</td>
<td>56 (19.2)</td>
<td>88 (20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>14 (32.6)</td>
<td>30 (29.4)</td>
<td>135 (46.2)</td>
<td>179 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (4.7)</td>
<td>6 (5.9)</td>
<td>22 (7.5)</td>
<td>30 (6.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the principals who responded to this item (53.5 percent) were initially made aware of the Bylaw from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, which should not be surprising since the NCAA mails information pamphlets to all high school principals. Only 4
principals attended a workshop or inservice concerned with the Bylaw.

While the NCAA also sends information to all high school guidance counselors in the country regarding the Bylaw, only 39.2 percent of the counselors indicated that the NCAA was their initial source of awareness. Additionally, while workshops and inservices are available to most guidance counselors in Central Ohio, only 26.5 percent of counselors were made aware in this manner. Finding out from another individual at the high school was the means by which 26.5 percent of counselors found out about the Bylaw. Only 10.8 percent of counselors found out from a college or university.

Most head athletic coaches, 46.2 percent, were initially made aware of the Bylaw through media sources. The NCAA and high school personnel were the two means by which 19.2 percent of coaches respectively were made aware of the Bylaw. The relatively low percentage (19.2 percent) of coaches who became aware of the Bylaw from other personnel at their high school, may indicate that principals and guidance counselors who are receiving information regarding the Bylaw are not passing it on to coaches.

Overall, looking at all respondents (n=473), 41.0 percent initially became aware through the media, 27.2 percent from the NCAA, 20.1 percent through their high school, 12.4 percent became aware through a workshop and/or inservice, and 11.2 percent became aware from a college or university.

Additional Information Needed

Five-hundred and nine individuals responded to the item which asked if the individuals would like more information about NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j).
Three-hundred and ninety-one responded that they would like more information (76.8 percent). Looking individually at the three job types, it was found that 57.1 percent of principals would like additional information about the Bylaw, 74.6 percent of guidance counselors would like more information about the Bylaw, and 80.4 percent of head athletic coaches still desire more information regarding the Bylaw.
Perceived Satisfaction and Fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with statements describing their extent of perceived satisfaction and fairness regarding NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). As indicated in Figure 1, the actual scale was scored from one to four. A score of one would indicate strong disagreement with the statements, a score of four would indicate strong agreement with the statements. Negatively worded items were reversed coded so that the total score of an individual across all items would indicate perceived level of satisfaction and fairness of the Bylaw in the following way: the higher the score across all items, the higher the perceived satisfaction and fairness.

To aid in interpretation, the scale was modified as shown in Figure 1. General levels of disagreement were indicated by scores of 1.00 to 2.50. General levels of agreement were indicated by scores of 2.51 to 4.00. Each table in this section was interpreted using the scale in Figure 1.

### Interpretation Of Scaling Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale Used For Interpretation Of Responses**

- **SD** (1.00-1.50)
- **D** (1.51-2.50)
- **A** (2.51-3.50)
- **SA** (3.51-4.00)

**DISAGREEMENT** \(\rightarrow\) \(\leftarrow\) **AGREEMENT**

**FIGURE 1**
The mean response for all respondents (n=312) was scored as 2.87, indicating satisfaction with the Bylaw, and scores ranged from 1.09 to 4.00. Four respondents scored a 4.0. There were four scores in the strongly disagree category (0.8 percent), 91 responses in the disagree category (17.8 percent), 382 scores in the agree category (74.6 percent), and 33 scores in the strongly agree category (6.8 percent). More than 81 percent of the responses occurred in the agree to strongly agree category, indicating that a high number of respondents were in agreement that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is fair and satisfactory (Table 12). While it can be observed in the section concerned with perceived changes and modifications that respondents would like to see some modifications to the Bylaw, this section would indicate there is a high level of satisfaction with the Bylaw.

Items 15 and 19 were omitted because they were neither positively or negatively stated. Looking at these two items individually, it can be noted that 97.3 percent of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that minority students should have separate standards from non-minority students (item 15), and 40 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that freshmen should not be allowed to participate in collegiate athletics (item 19).

The following subsections will be concerned with describing the levels of satisfaction and fairness, and determining if there are relationships and differences between job types, school types, gender, race, age, and number of years employed. Means, frequencies, percentages, and analysis of variance will be utilized to describe the data.
TABLE 12

Frequency Distribution (n=512) For Overall Satisfaction And Fairness Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.50)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (1.51-2.50)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (2.51-3.50)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (3.51-4.00)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=2.87
Standard Deviation=.443
Range=2.91

School Type

When looking at the levels of satisfaction and fairness for school types (suburban, urban, rural, and private high schools), suburban high schools (2.88) and urban high schools (2.89) scored highest, although historically student-athletes from these two school types have been affected most frequently by NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). The mean satisfaction and fairness score for respondents in private schools was the lowest, 2.82. Even though urban high school personnel scored highest of all school types, there were no significant differences among the means (Table 13).

No respondents in suburban, rural, or private schools scored in the strongly disagree category, while four respondents from urban high schools did.
### TABLE 13

**Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Perceived Satisfaction And Fairness Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By School Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2404</td>
<td>0.0801</td>
<td>0.4062</td>
<td>0.7436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100.2081</td>
<td>0.1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>100.4485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban (n-207)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (n-162)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (n-84)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (n-59)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Type

High school guidance counselors had the highest mean score in regards to their level of perceived satisfaction and fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Their score was in the agree category (2.95). The maximum score by any one guidance counselor was a 4.00, the minimum score a 1.36. The mean scores for principals and head athletic coaches were identical, 2.85, also falling in the agree category (Table 14). However, while the maximum score attained by coaches was a 4.00 (strongly agree), the highest mean score attained by any one principal was a 3.45 (agree). Not one principal scored in the strongly agree category, while 6 guidance counselors, and 6 head athletic coaches did. Though guidance counselors had the highest mean score of the three job types, the means did not differ significantly (p<.0745).

TABLE 14

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance
Of Perceived Satisfaction and Fairness Of
NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Job Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals (n=49)</th>
<th>Counselors (n=118)</th>
<th>Coaches (n=345)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0199</td>
<td>.5099</td>
<td>2.6105</td>
<td>.0745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>99.4285</td>
<td>.1953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>100.4484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

The mean satisfaction score for males (n=391) was 2.87, while the average mean score for females (n=112) was 2.89. Both mean scores were in the agree category. The mean scores did not differ significantly (Table 15).

No male responses fell in the strongly disagree category, while 3 females strongly disagreed. The minimum score by a female was 1.09, by a male, 1.55. Twenty-nine males strongly agreed, while 5 female responses fell in the strongly agree category.

TABLE 15

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance
Of Perceived Satisfaction And Fairness Of
NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=391)</th>
<th>Females (n=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.4387</td>
<td>.4394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>96.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>96.5597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race

The mean score for white respondents (n=454) was a 2.90, while for minority respondents (n=44) the average mean score for satisfaction was calculated to be a 2.60, not far beyond the disagreement category. In fact, unlike school type, job type, and gender, there is a significant difference between means with respect to race at the .05 significance level (Table
Twenty minority respondents, 45.4 percent, disagreed that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is satisfactory and fair, while only 16.1 percent of white respondents disagreed. Almost 84 percent of whites agreed, or strongly agreed that they perceive NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) as satisfactory and fair. The indication is that a higher proportion of whites are satisfied with the Bylaw in the Columbus, Ohio area (Table 17).

Several items within this section bear individual inspection, these being the items concerned with the alleged discriminatory aspect of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Item 13 asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with a statement suggesting that the Bylaw will affect a higher proportion of minorities and therefore is discriminatory. For the overall number of respondents who answered this question (n=509), 25.9 percent agreed or strongly agreed. However, regarding the same item, 54.5 percent of minority respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the item.

Item 16 states that non-minority students have greater educational support than minority students, therefore indicating the Bylaw adversely affects minorities. Of the 511 overall respondents to this item, 28.6 percent agreed, or strongly agreed that minorities are affected to a greater degree in part because they had access to fewer educational support services. On the other hand, 52.3 percent of the minorities within this study agreed or strongly agreed that minorities have less access to educational support while in high school, and are more adversely affected.
TABLE 16

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance
Of Perceived Satisfaction And Fairness
Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites (n=454)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Minorities (n=44)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.4101</td>
<td>.6185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df  SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F*</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1  3.7243</td>
<td>3.7243</td>
<td>19.9408</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>496  926375</td>
<td>.1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>497  963618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

TABLE 17

Frequency Distribution For Perceived Satisfaction
And Fairness of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.00 - 1.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.51 - 2.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.51 - 3.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.51 - 4.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No significant differences were found through analysis of variance among respondents in the following age ranges: 21-31 (n=75), 31-40 (n=224), 41-50 (n=155) and 51-65 (n=45). Average mean scores for groups ranged from 2.83 for respondents aged 31-40, to 2.98 for respondents aged 51-65. Mean scores for the four age levels were in the agree range, as the four groups appeared to experience comparable levels of satisfaction with the Bylaw (Table 18).

**TABLE 18**

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Perceived Satisfaction And Fairness Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Age Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21-30 (n=75)</th>
<th>31-40 (n=224)</th>
<th>41-50 (n=155)</th>
<th>51-65 (n=45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.3806</td>
<td>.4394</td>
<td>.4744</td>
<td>.3957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9938</td>
<td>.3313</td>
<td>1.7200</td>
<td>.1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>95.3340</td>
<td>.1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>96.3278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Years Employed**

The mean satisfaction score for respondents employed 9 to 11 years, and greater than 11 years was determined to be 2.91. Individuals employed 0-2 years scored a 2.88, individuals employed 3-5 years had a mean score of 2.81, and the lowest satisfaction score, 2.80 was achieved by respondents employed from 6-8 years. No significant differences were found between any of the mean scores.

**TABLE 19**

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Perceived Satisfaction And Fairness Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Years Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1664</td>
<td>.2916</td>
<td>1.5232</td>
<td>.1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>94.5707</td>
<td>.1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>95.7371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes and Modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

All 512 respondents were asked to indicate their approval or disapproval with items concerning possible changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Fifteen changes and modifications were listed on the survey instrument (items 21-35). Included was an item which stated that the Bylaw should be eliminated, another which stated the Bylaw should remain as it is, and one which proposed that all students, regardless of whether or not they played athletics, should have identical participation requirements. The five most frequently approved changes and modifications, in order, were to require student-athletes to have the same academic requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, disallowing freshmen collegiate athletic participation, eliminating the SAT/ACT test score requirement, and lowering the SAT/ACT test score requirement. Increasing the SAT/ACT test score requirement, allowing each college to set their own standards, lowering the high school GPA requirement, lowering the number of required core courses, and using the SAT/ACT test score as the sole requirement were the items least frequently approved of by the respondents (Table 20).

Only 43 (8.4 percent) respondents cited their approval for the elimination of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), indicating that of the 512 respondents in the 49 Columbus, Ohio area high schools, most perceived, at least to some degree, a need for the Bylaw, or some form of it. Appendix C reveals the changes and modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j) respondents believed to be the most important.
TABLE 20

Total Group (n=512) Frequency Distribution And Rankings Of Approved Changes And Modifications To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have same standards as non student-athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This part of the survey was concerned with describing perceived changes and modifications to the Bylaw as well as determining the nature and the strength of the relationships between these changes and school types (suburban, urban, rural, private), job type (principal, guidance counselor, head athletic coach), gender, race, age, and years employed. In addressing these relationships (associations) and differences, it is necessary to utilize and describe a means for illustrating relationships. This is necessary because tables utilized within this study report Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients to illustrate the correlation between the rankings of changes and the previously listed variables (i.e., type of job and how each type responded, approve or disapprove). In order to achieve consistency, a format for describing measures of
association in written descriptions of data has been offered by Smith (1971). This study will utilize Smith's descriptors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 to 1.00</td>
<td>Very strong relationship (association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial relationship (association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate relationship (association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low relationship (association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible relationship (association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Smith's model is not the only model available to measure association and relationships, it is intended to be used as a general guide.

School Type

The most frequently cited changes to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) approved of by suburban high school principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches (n=207) were requiring student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, not allowing freshmen to participate in collegiate athletics, eliminating the SAT/ACT test score requirement, and lowering the SAT/ACT test score requirement (Table 21). Increasing the SAT/ACT test score requirement, allowing each college to set their own standards, lowering the number of required core courses, lowering the high school GPA requirement, and using the SAT/ACT test score as the sole requirement were the least frequently approved of changes to the Bylaw.

Urban high school personnel (n=162) most frequently approved of requiring student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, disallowing freshmen collegiate participation, eliminating the SAT/ACT test score requirement, and lowering the test score requirement. These same individuals least
frequently approved of increasing the test score requirement, lowering the high school GPA requirement, allowing each college to set their own standards, using the test score as the sole requirement, and lowering the number of required core courses.

Rural high school personnel (n=84) approved most frequently the need to require student-athletes and non student-athletes to have identical requirements, leaving the Bylaw as it is, eliminating the SAT/ACT test score requirement, and using the 2.0 high school GPA requirement as the sole requirement. Rural respondents were the only group who listed this last change in their top five. They also respectively, least approved of the same five changes as did suburban and rural high school personnel.

Private high school personnel (n=59) most frequently approved of in order, the same five changes as did suburban and urban high schools. However, they differed from the other three school types in that one item they least approved of, was to use the eleven high school core courses as the sole requirement for freshmen collegiate participation at the Division I and Division II levels.

Spearman correlation coefficients evidenced very strong relationships and associations between school types. The strongest relationships however, were between suburban and urban schools, and suburban and rural schools ($r_s = .97$). One of the most controversial issues surrounding Bylaw 5-1-(j) is the use of a standardized test score requirement. Each school type frequently approved of the need to lower or eliminate the SAT/ACT requirement. In all but rural schools, the schools least approved of using the SAT/ACT as the sole requirement (Table 21).
### TABLE 21

Rankings* Of Approved Changes And Modifications
To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have same requirements as non student-athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT require.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT require.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA require.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 2.0 GPA require.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT require.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole require.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Between School Type Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Type

Principals in the suburban, urban, rural, and private schools (n=49) approved of most frequently, the need to leave the Bylaw as it is (59.2 percent). Principals also highly approved of identical requirements for athletes and non-athletes alike (53.1 percent) and not allowing freshmen collegiate participation (49.0 percent). No other changes to the Bylaw however were approved of more than 8 times. Allowing each college to set their own standards for freshmen eligibility, using the SAT/ACT test score requirement as the sole requirement, and decreasing the number of required high school core courses from eleven were not approved of by any of the principals (Table 22).

While principals most frequently approved of leaving the Bylaw as it is, guidance counselors (n=118) as a group, most frequently approved of requiring identical requirements for student-athletes and non student-athletes (72.0 percent). Guidance counselors then cited most frequently the following changes: leaving the Bylaw as it is, not allowing freshmen participation, increasing the number of core courses, and eliminating the test score requirement. Few guidance counselors approved of eliminating the Bylaw (5.1 percent), allowing each college to set their own standards (4.2 percent), lowering the GPA requirement (2.5 percent), lowering the number of required core courses (0.8 percent), and using the SAT/ACT test score as the sole requirement (0.0 percent).

Head athletic coaches (n=345) approved most frequently, as did guidance counselors, of the item which stated that athletes and non-athletes alike should have the same requirements. Following the above, the changes most frequently cited by coaches were leaving the Bylaw as it is, and not allowing freshmen to participate. The change least approved
of was using the SAT/ACT test score requirement as the sole requirement. Guidance counselors and head athletic coaches each least approved of the same five changes.

Spearman rank correlation coefficients evidenced that principals and head athletic coaches had the highest association in the changes they approved of ($r_s = .91$). The lowest association between changes and modifications approved of was with head athletic coaches and counselors ($r_s = .84$). Principals and guidance counselors also evidenced a strong association ($r_s = .89$). All three correlation coefficients are considered strong associations (Table 22).

**Gender**

Males ($n=391$) at all four high school types most frequently approved of the change which stated that student-athletes and non student-athletes should have the same requirements. They then approved of in order, leaving the Bylaw as it is, not allowing freshmen to participate, eliminating the SAT/ACT requirement, and lowering the SAT/ACT test score requirement. Females ($n=112$) approved most frequently of the same top three changes as did males (Table 23).

Males least frequently approved of allowing each college to set their own standards, lowering the high school GPA requirement, increasing the SAT/ACT requirement, lowering the number of required core courses, and using the SAT/ACT test score requirement as the sole requirement. The changes least frequently approved of by females were eliminating Bylaw 5-1-(j), allowing each college to set their own standards, lowering the high school GPA requirement, and using the SAT/ACT requirement as the sole measure for collegiate participation.
There was a very strong association ($r_s = .85$) in the rankings of approved changes and modifications by the total group of males and females (Table 23).

**TABLE 22**

Rankings* Of Approved Changes And Modifications
To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Job Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Principals (n=49)</th>
<th>JOB TYPE</th>
<th>Coaches (n=345)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same requirements as non</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole require.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between Job Type Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 23
Rankings* Of Approved Changes And Modifications
To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Male (n=391)</th>
<th>Female (n=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have same requirements as non student-athletes</td>
<td>1 63.7</td>
<td>1 66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>2 55.8</td>
<td>2 50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3 43.0</td>
<td>3 25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>4 17.4</td>
<td>6 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>5 17.1</td>
<td>6 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>6 13.6</td>
<td>4 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>7 12.0</td>
<td>9 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>8 9.2</td>
<td>11 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>9 8.2</td>
<td>10 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase GPA requirement</td>
<td>10 7.7</td>
<td>5 17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>11 3.6</td>
<td>11 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>12 3.3</td>
<td>8 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>13 3.1</td>
<td>13 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>14 2.0</td>
<td>15 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td>15 1.5</td>
<td>13 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient = .85

Race

Table 24 displays the frequency distribution and ranking of approved changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) by race. Whites (n=454) most frequently approved of requiring student-athletes having the same requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, disallowing freshmen collegiate participation, lowering the SAT/ACT test score requirement, eliminating the SAT/ACT test score requirement, and increasing the number of required core courses. Lowering the high school GPA requirement, lowering the number of core courses, and using the
SAT/ACT as the sole requirement were the least frequently approved of changes by white high school personnel (Table 24).

Minorities (n=44), also cited most frequently, the item which stated student-athletes and non student-athletes should have identical requirements. Minorities cited eliminating freshmen participation as their second most approved of change. More than 56 percent of white respondents approved of leaving Bylaw 5-1-(j) as it is compared to 38.6 percent of minority respondents. A review of the literature has indicated dissatisfaction among minorities regarding the Bylaw which can also be noted in this study. Almost 16 percent of minorities approved of eliminating the Bylaw, compared to 7.5 percent of whites. Because of the small number of minority respondents (n=44), it is unclear as to whether these results regarding race can be generalized beyond this study and to other minorities outside the scope of this study.

There was a very strong association (r_s=.92) in the rankings of changes and modifications to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) by the total group of whites and minorities.
TABLE 24

Rankings* of Approved Changes and Modification To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Minority (n=44)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>White (n=454)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have same requirements as non student-athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole require.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient = .92
Respondents in the 21-30 year old age group (n=75) approved most often of requiring student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, and not allowing freshmen participation. The 31-40 year old age group (n=224), the 41-50 year old age group (n=155), and the 51-65 year old age group (n=45) also respectively listed the same three changes most often (Table 23).

The age group category 21-30 least frequently approved of lowering the number of required core courses, lowering the high school GPA requirement, and using the SAT/ACT test score requirement as the sole requirement. Respondents in the 31-40 year old age group, and the 41-50 year old age group also listed these three changes least frequently. The age group category of respondents aged 51-65 differed somewhat in the changes they least approved of. Like the other three age groups, no respondents aged 51-65 approved of lowering the number of core courses, and few (2.2 percent) approved of using the SAT/ACT test score as the sole requirement. Unlike the other three age groups, no respondents aged 51-65 approved of allowing each college to set their own standards for freshmen eligibility.

All age groups had associations above $r_s=.91$ between them, except for age levels 21-30 and 51-65. Their Spearman correlation coefficient, while considered a strong relationship ($r_s=.76$), is lower than all other associations which are extremely strong (Table 25).
### TABLE 25

**Rankings of Approved Changes and Modifications To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>AGE LEVEL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td>(n=224)</td>
<td>(n=155)</td>
<td>(n=45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have same requirements as non-student-athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT required</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT required</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set its own standards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase GPA requirement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole require</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between Age Level Spearman Correlation Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years Employed

Three proposed changes to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) were clearly approved of more frequently than the others by each group categorized by the number of years employed. Those employed 0-2 years (n=72), 3-5 years (n=114), 6-8 years (n=68), 9-11 years (n=74), and more than eleven years (n=166) each most frequently approved of in order, requiring student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, and disallowing freshmen collegiate participation (Table 26).

Lowering the number of core courses required for freshmen participation, and using the SAT/ACT test score requirement as the sole requirement were the two least approved of changes to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) by all levels of years employed.

While it may be expected that the level 0-2 years and greater than eleven years employed would not rank similarly, these two groups had a surprisingly strong association ($r_s=.83$). The strongest correlations though were between those employed 3-5 years and 6-8 years ($r_s=.97$), and 3-5 years and more than eleven years ($r_s=.96$).
TABLE 26
Rankings* Of Approved Changes And Modifications
To NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) By Years Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No freshmen participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase GPA requirement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of core courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only 2.0 GPA requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower GPA requirement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower number of core courses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between Years Employed Level Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-11</th>
<th>&gt;11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV of the survey instrument was designed to measure the impact of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) and the responses to it by high school principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches. This part of the questionnaire differed from previous sections (awareness, satisfaction, changes, demographics) in that each job type responded to a series of items designed specifically for them. In all other sections, items were identical for all 512 respondents.

**Principals**

For principals, items 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, and 50 were used to determine levels of impact and response. By assigning a two (2) to responses of YES and a one (1) to responses of NO to the above items, a score of between 8 and 16 could be attained. These scores were then converted to a scale of 1 to 9, with a score of 1 representing the least impact and a 9 representing the greatest impact (see Chapter III, Instrumentation).

The mean score for impact and response for all principals (n=49) was a 4.06. The minimum score of 1.00 was attained by three principals, while the highest score of 8.00 was attained by two principals. The greatest number of principals (20) attained an impact score of 4.00. Thirty-eight of the 49 respondents scored between 3.00 and 5.00 (77.6%). Table 27 displays the frequency distribution for the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) for 49 principals in suburban, urban, rural, and private high schools.
**TABLE 27**
Frequency Distribution Of Impact Scores For
High School Principals (n=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=4.061
Standard Deviation=1.449
Minimum=1.00
Maximum=8.00

Analysis of scores attained by principals in each school type indicate, concurrent with popular belief, that the greatest impact of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) is within urban high schools. The mean impact score of principals in the urban high schools was 5.29, with the lowest mean (3.00) achieved by rural high school principals. The mean score for suburban high school principals was 3.79, while the mean score for private high school principals was 3.83 (Table 28).

This section of the research also reveals, by looking at several items individually, the responses secondary schools have made as a result of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Forty-six of the principals indicated that their schools inform students of the Bylaw, 37 responded that their schools inform parents, but only 6 principals (12.2 percent) indicated their schools are making any curriculum changes as a result of the Bylaw. Two
principals stated they have altered the number of credits required to graduate as a result of the Bylaw, 12 altered school policy for student participation in interscholastic athletics, and 10 have added a class which prepares student-athletes for the SAT/ACT.

TABLE 28
Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Impact Scores Of Principals At Four High School Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban (n-19)</th>
<th>Urban (n-14)</th>
<th>Rural (n-10)</th>
<th>Private (n-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.9177</td>
<td>1.4373</td>
<td>1.4142</td>
<td>1.1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.9680</td>
<td>11.3227</td>
<td>7.6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66.8484</td>
<td>1.4855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.8163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Guidance Counselors

For high school guidance counselors, items 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, and 50 were analyzed to determine levels of impact and response. YES responses were assigned a value of 2, while NO responses were assigned a value of 1. Because there were 10 items, the maximum score an individual could attain was a 20, the minimum score possible was a 10. No respondents scored a 10. These scores were then converted to a scale of 1 to 10 with a score of 1 representing the least impact, and a score of 10 representing the greatest impact. The mean score for all guidance counselors (n=117) was a 5.63. The minimum score of 1.00 was attained by 4 guidance counselors, while the maximum score of 10 was
attained by only one guidance counselor. Twenty-five guidance counselors scored a 7.00, 19 guidance counselors scored a 5.00, and 16 scored a 6.00. Table 29 displays the frequency distribution for the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) for guidance counselors in suburban, urban, rural, and private high schools.

Sixty-six guidance counselors stated they have altered counseling procedures encouraging athletes to enroll in eleven core courses as a response to the Bylaw. Over 77 percent make student-athletes aware of activities they can take part in to raise their grades, 86.3 percent claim to offer activities which address standardized testing techniques, and 30.8 percent of guidance counselors feel that the Bylaw has placed an extra burden on their workload.

**TABLE 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean-5.63  
Standard Deviation-2.0661  
Minimum-1.00  
Maximum-10.00
Analysis of mean scores attained by guidance counselors in each school type indicates there is a significant difference between means at the .05 alpha level. Guidance counselors at private high schools (n=14) had a mean score of 6.50 while the mean score of urban high school guidance counselors (n=39) was 6.23. The mean score for suburban guidance counselors (n=50) was a 5.10, and rural guidance counselors (n=14) scored a mean of 5.00. The greatest impact of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) appears to be on private and urban high school guidance counselors (Table 30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44.2735</td>
<td>14.7578</td>
<td>3.6983</td>
<td>.0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>450.9231</td>
<td>3.9905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>495.1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

TABLE 30

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Impact Scores Of Guidance Counselors At Four High School Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban (n=50)</th>
<th>Urban (n=39)</th>
<th>Rural (n=14)</th>
<th>Private (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.0127</td>
<td>1.8276</td>
<td>2.5115</td>
<td>1.8292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of note in analyzing the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) by high school guidance counselors is the disparity between the number of counselors who supply information to students regarding the Bylaw, and the number who stated they need more information to advise effectively. While 67.5 percent of the counselors revealed that they supply information to students, 59.8 percent claim they need additional information regarding the Bylaw if they wish to be effective in their counseling. Forty percent of the guidance counselors claim to be insufficiently prepared, while 30.8 percent feel that Bylaw 5-1-(j) has placed an extra burden on their workload.

**Head Athletic Coaches**

For head athletic coaches (n=342), items 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, and 46 were analyzed to determine levels of impact and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) in the same manner as was done with principals and guidance counselors. After converting scores to a scale of 1 to 9 (a score of 1 represents the lowest impact score, a 9 represents the highest impact score), it can be seen that three coaches attained the score of 1.00, while 14 coaches, or 14.1 percent scored a 9.00. The mean score for all coaches was 5.43. Most scores though were in the range of 3.00 to 6.00 (73.9 percent). Table 31 displays the frequency distribution for the impact of and response to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) for 342 head athletic coaches in suburban, urban, rural, and private high schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.43
Standard Deviation = 1.7614
Minimum = 1.00
Maximum = 9.00
Analysis of mean scores attained by head athletic coaches in each of the four school types indicates a significant difference between impact and responses by coaches. Coaches at urban high schools \((n=108)\) were most greatly impacted, followed by, in order, private high school coaches \((n=39)\), suburban high school coaches \((n=136)\), and rural high school coaches \((n=59)\). The mean scores ranged from 5.88 for urban coaches, to 5.07 for rural high school coaches (Table 32).

### TABLE 32

Means, Standard Deviations, And Analysis Of Variance Of Impact Scores Of Head Athletic Coaches At Four High School Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F*</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.6633</td>
<td>11.8878</td>
<td>3.9305</td>
<td>.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1022.2899</td>
<td>3.0245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1057.9532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

A high number of head athletic coaches, 90.4 percent, claim to provide academic advisement to their players, however, 66.7 percent of coaches need more information regarding NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), and 40.3 percent do not feel adequately prepared to counsel their players if the athletes have questions regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j).
Number of Students Affected by NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

All respondents who were head athletic coaches (some principals and guidance counselors were also head coaches), were asked to indicate the number of their players who were unable to participate in collegiate athletics as freshmen as a result of not meeting the requirements of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Fourteen student-athletes in suburban high schools did not meet the requirements, 18 urban high school student-athletes, 9 private high school student-athletes, and only 3 rural high school student-athletes did not meet the requirements for freshmen athletic competition (Table 33).

TABLE 33
Number Of High School Student-Athletes Who Did Not Meet The Requirements Of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) In The Columbus, Ohio Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>number/school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) in 49 Columbus, Ohio area public and private high schools. Principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches were surveyed in suburban, urban, rural, and private schools to describe and determine their awareness of the Bylaw and its component parts, their perceived satisfaction with the Bylaw, changes and modifications they believe are necessary to improve the Bylaw's effectiveness, and the impact of the Bylaw's implementation. Demographic variables which were analyzed included job type, school type, gender, race, age, and number of years employed in respective positions. The information gathered provides some evidence as to how Bylaw 5-1-(j) is regarded by selected high school personnel in Central Ohio. The NCAA will only derive support from the high school community if principals, counselors, and coaches are aware of the Bylaw, perceive it as fair, and respond favorably to it.

Chapter I of the study contains background information about the history of academic standards, a statement of the problem, research questions and objectives investigated, and the significance of the study.
Chapter II, the Review of Literature, discusses the origin and control of intercollegiate athletics from a student organized and controlled activity to a faculty controlled activity. Also reviewed is the history of eligibility requirements and standards from the early 1800's to the present, opposition to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), and proposed and accepted modifications to the Bylaw. The role of secondary school personnel concludes the Review of Literature.

Chapter III, Methodology, includes sections covering the type of research employed, the population utilized, questionnaire development and administration, subject selection, instrumentation, and data analysis.

Chapter IV contains the analysis and interpretation of data in tabular and written form. The results of the questionnaire survey utilized in the study are presented in thirty-three tables along with discussions of each.

Data were collected during the months of April, May and June of 1988 from 512 principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches employed in 49 Columbus, Ohio area high schools.

Summary and Conclusions

Summaries and conclusions associated with research questions and objectives are summarized below.

Demographics

1. Forty-nine high schools participated in the study. The majority of the schools were suburban (19), the fewest were private Catholic high schools (6). Fourteen urban schools participated in the study and 10 rural high schools participated.
2. One-hundred percent of principals responded to the questionnaire, 78.1 percent of counselors responded, and 71.1 percent of head athletic coaches responded. This represents an overall response rate of 74.7 percent.

3. The majority of respondents were male, 77.7 percent. Of the 112 female respondents, exactly half were guidance counselors, which represents 48 percent of the counselor population, 54 were coaches which represents 16 percent of all coaches, and only 2 principals were females.

4. Of the 498 respondents who indicated their race, 454 were white and 44 described themselves as minorities (8.6 percent). Of the 44 minority respondents, 38 were black, 2 were Asian-American, 2 were Native-American, and 2 described themselves as other. Thirty-six of the minorities were employed in urban schools, while the remaining 6 were within rural, suburban, and private school. This may indicate a severe lack of minority role models for athletes in these three type schools.

5. Most respondents were from 31-40 years old (44.9 percent). The fewest respondents were 51-65 years of age (9.0 percent). Only 2 guidance counselors were between 21-40 years of age, probably indicating most had several years experience.

6. Most respondents were employed greater than 11 years (33.3 percent). Almost 23 percent were employed 3-5 years, 14.8 percent were employed 9-11 years, 15.4 percent were employed 0-2 years, and 13.6 percent were employed 6-8 years.

**Awareness**

1. The mean awareness score for all 512 respondents was a 6.73 on an 8 point scale. Seventy-six percent of respondents scored a 7.0 or better which
indicates a very high level of awareness. Only 74 individuals were unaware of the Bylaw. Of those who were aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j), 18.2% were unaware of a standardized test score requirement, 16.8% were unaware of the grade point average requirement, and 22.3% were unaware that 11 core courses were a component part of Bylaw 5-1-(j). Clearly, many respondents are aware of the Bylaw, yet do not fully understand what requirements a high school student-athlete must meet before becoming eligible for collegiate athletics as a freshman.

2. There are significant differences between awareness scores for the four high school types. Private schools were found to have the highest awareness, 7.46, while rural schools had the lowest mean score, 6.23. This finding is similar to Jenkin's et al. conclusions (1984) described in Review of Literature. The mean awareness score for private schools was significantly higher than the other three school types, indicating they are most aware.

3. Both principals (6.96) and guidance counselors (6.86) were more aware than coaches (6.65). This difference may be accounted for because the National Collegiate Athletic Association distributes information about the Bylaw to all principals and guidance counselors in the country. However, coaches are not notified in this manner.

4. There is a significant difference between the awareness of males as compared to females. The mean awareness score for males was 6.92. The mean score for females was found to be 6.01. Jenkins, et al. (1984), when examining awareness of principals, found no differences between males and females.
5. Whites and minorities who participated in the study had similar awareness scores, although minorities, identified in the review of literature as most greatly affected by the Bylaw, scored slightly higher than whites.

6. Respondents aged 31-40 were the most aware, while respondents in the age category of 51-65 were the least aware.

7. No significant differences were found with respect to awareness scores between individuals in the years employed category.

8. Forty-one percent of respondents initially were made aware of the Bylaw from various media sources, 27.2 percent from the NCAA, 20.1 percent from their high school, 12.4 percent from a workshop, and 11.2 percent from a college or university. When looking at principals, 53.5 percent were made initially aware from the NCAA, and when examining guidance counselors, it was found that 39.2 percent were initially made aware by the NCAA. This indicates that many principals and guidance counselors are not receiving their mailings regarding the Bylaw. Only 26.5 percent of guidance counselors were made aware of the Bylaw from a workshop or inservice, even though workshops are available to guidance counselors in Central Ohio.

9. A large number of respondents to the questionnaire still claim to need more information about the Bylaw (76.8 percent). This may mean that those individuals who most need to be aware of the Bylaw, as well as comprehend it, are lacking in knowledge of it. Mechanisms may be necessary to inform high school personnel about the intent, make-up, and consequences of the Bylaw.
Satisfaction and Fairness

1. Over 81 percent of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) was fair and satisfactory, indicating that while many respondents would make changes to it, overall they view it as satisfactory and non-discriminatory.

2. Urban high school personnel had the highest mean satisfaction score. This may be surprising because the review of literature indicates that student-athletes at urban high schools are most frequently affected by the Bylaw. Private school personnel attained the lowest mean satisfaction score.

3. Principals and head athletic coaches were similarly satisfied, although neither was as satisfied as guidance counselors.

4. The mean satisfaction score for males was 2.87 on a 4 point scale. The mean satisfaction score for females was 2.89, which indicates no significant differences.

5. Whites are significantly more satisfied with the Bylaw than are minority respondents. More minority respondents believed the Bylaw would have its effects on a higher proportion of minorities and therefore was discriminatory. More than 52 percent of minorities believed whites had greater access to superior educational services.

6. Respondents aged 51-65 years old were most satisfied with the Bylaw. Respondents aged 31-40 were least satisfied.

7. The mean satisfaction score of 2.91 calculated for individuals employed 9-11 years was the highest. No significant differences were discovered between groups.
Changes and Modifications

1. Requiring student-athletes to have the same standards as non student-athletes, leaving the Bylaw as it is, disallowing freshmen participation, eliminating the SAT/ACT requirement, and lowering the SAT/ACT requirement were the changes to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) most frequently approved of for the total group of respondents. Lowering the high school GPA requirement, lowering the required number of core courses, and using the SAT/ACT as the sole requirement were least frequently approved of.

2. All 4 school types evidenced strong associations between the ranks of changes they approved of. Each school type most frequently approved of similar entrance requirements for athletes and non-athletes alike. Suburban, rural, and private high schools least frequently approved of using the SAT/ACT as the sole requirement, while urban schools least frequently approved of lowering the required number of core courses.

3. The most frequently approved change to the Bylaw according to guidance counselors and coaches was to require student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes. Most principals (n=29) felt the Bylaw should remain as it is. It should be pointed out that increasing the SAT/ACT requirement was approved of by 11 percent of guidance counselors, but only by 2.0 percent of principals, and 3.5 percent of coaches.

4. There was a very strong association between ranks of males and females (r_s=.85). Women however more frequently approved of increasing the high school GPA requirement.

5. Leaving the Bylaw as it is was approved of by 38.6 percent of minorities, while 56.4 percent of whites would approve of leaving the Bylaw as it is. Not surprisingly, a higher percent of minorities would eliminate the Bylaw.
6. Respondents aged 21-30 were most dissimilar to respondents aged 51-65 on what changes to the Bylaw each group approved of. Only one individual over 50 years of age would eliminate the Bylaw.

7. Three proposed changes to Bylaw 5-1-(j) were overwhelmingly approved of more frequently than the others by each group categorized by number of years employed. Requiring all students to have identical requirements, leaving the Bylaw as it is, and not allowing freshmen collegiate athletic participation were the most approved choices by all five groups.

8. Overall, lowering the high school GPA, lowering the number of required core courses, and using the SAT/ACT as the sole requirement were the least frequently approved of changes, which may mean most respondents do not wish to make the Bylaw's requirements easier for students.

**Impact and Responses**

1. The impact mean score for all principals was a 4.06 on an 8 point scale. Urban principals were impacted the most, rural principals were impacted the least.

2. Ninety-two percent of principals revealed that their schools inform students of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Seventy-four percent of the high schools inform parents of the Bylaw.

3. Of the 49 reporting principals, only 12.2 percent have made any specific curriculum changes as a result of the Bylaw.

4. Approximately 20 percent of the principals reported they have added a class which will prepare students for the standardized test score requirement.
5. There was a significant difference between the impact scores of guidance counselors. Private guidance counselors were impacted the greatest, rural guidance counselors the least.

6. In response to Bylaw 5-1-(j), sixty-six guidance counselors stated they have altered guidance counseling procedures to encourage students to take 11 core courses, 77.8% make students aware of tutorial and counseling activities they can take part in to improve grades, and 86.3% offer guidance to students helping them improve SAT/ACT scores. It can be concluded that a majority of guidance counselors are making attempts to help prospective collegiate student-athletes meet the requirements of the Bylaw.

7. Head athletic coaches at urban high schools were impacted the greatest, their impact score was found to be 5.88 on a 9 point scale. Private high school coaches scored a 5.49, suburban coaches a 5.22, and rural coaches a 5.07.

8. Over 90% of responding coaches provide academic advisement to their players, yet two-thirds of the coaches claim to need additional information about the Bylaw. And while 90% counsel their players, 40.3% do not feel adequately prepared to answer questions pertaining to the Bylaw. This may indicate a need for the NCAA to disseminate additional information to coaches, especially since so many coaches are involved with the academic aspect of their players' lives.

9. According to all respondents who coach a sport, 18 student-athletes in urban high schools in the Columbus area, were unable to participate in freshmen intercollegiate athletics because they failed to achieve the requirements of the Bylaw. Fourteen suburban athletes, 9 private high
school athletes, and only 3 rural high school athletes failed to meet the Bylaw's requirements.

**Discussion and Recommendations**

The desired effects of the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Bylaw 5-1-(j) could be dramatically altered without support of today's high school personnel. Without support and cooperation from secondary school principals, guidance counselors, and head athletic coaches, those individuals most instrumental in determining whether a student-athlete will meet the Bylaw's requirements, Bylaw 5-1-(j) will do nothing to bring integrity to the NCAA or improve student-athletes' academic achievements. This study sought to investigate several variables and their relationships with high school personnel. The findings of this study can be used by the NCAA and others interested in the success of Bylaw 5-1-(j) to help determine if their legislation is reaching the high schools, determine the means by which the NCAA may need to communicate with the high schools, determine the actual impact the Bylaw has had, and to determine whether or not high schools are responding to the Bylaw as the NCAA hopes and expects.

Jenkins, et al. (1984), stated in their study of Bylaw 5-1-(j) done before its actual implementation, that the move towards toughened academic standards in high schools appears to be growing, and that with cooperation between the NCAA and our nation's high schools, the Bylaw could be an effective means of assuring that today's athletes, at the high school and collegiate level, would make progress toward a degree. Based on this, and the results of this study, it is recommended that the National Collegiate Athletic Association seek out the secondary school community for participation in
matters of academics. The Bylaw has already been implemented and was done so without representation of our high schools. However, it is not too late to begin including secondary schools and interscholastic athletic associations when legislating policies which concern them. Closer cooperation, as well as involving the high schools in decision-making, may indeed be a necessary step in maximizing the intended effect of the Bylaw.

The people closest to the high school student-athlete are principals, guidance counselors, and coaches. These individuals must make the Bylaw known to students and parents, must inform them of the requirements, counsel them based on the requirements, and be responsible for guiding students. If any of these people are unaware of the Bylaw's requirements, do not perceive it as fair, and are negatively impacted, support will plummet.

Opposition to the Bylaw also exists from others in addition to the unrepresented high school community. Minorities, especially blacks, have criticized the Bylaw as discriminatory and racist because it will sideline a higher proportion of black athletes. This study, while not identifying the percentage of minorities ineligible due to the Bylaw's standards, does evidence stronger opposition to the Bylaw by minorities. More minorities stated the Bylaw is discriminatory and hoped for the elimination of the Bylaw. Based on these findings, as well as evidence produced in the review of literature that minorities are more adversely affected, the NCAA should examine more extensively the relationship between minorities and the Bylaw, as well as determining means of alleviating opposition to the Bylaw and changing this opposition to support.

Also based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the NCAA investigate why females are significantly less aware of the Bylaw and
its requirements as compared to males. Males and females were found to be in agreement that the Bylaw is fair and satisfactory, however; this could change if females were as aware of the Bylaw as males. It has been long asserted that collegiate and high school athletics are male dominated and governed, perhaps now is the best time to discover how females feel about the Bylaw.

Bylaw 5-1-(j) is not the first attempt by the NCAA to legislate academic standards to bring about integrity. It is though, their most ambitious attempt and most controversial. Amid the controversies and criticisms of the Bylaw have come several calls to modify and make changes to it. This study has found that most respondents in the Columbus, Ohio area are satisfied with the Bylaw, though believing some changes and modifications are necessary to make it even more effective. Based on the findings which indicated that fewer than 9 percent of respondents would eliminate the Bylaw completely, the NCAA should continue to investigate if the Bylaw is most effective as presently written, or if changes are necessary.

The NCAA intends to remove the controversies surrounding academics and athletics, and to produce better student-athletes. The NCAA hopes that Bylaw 5-1-(j) will do just this. Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made regarding secondary schools.

1. The NCAA must continue to disseminate information about the rule to high schools, even after 3 years of implementation. Division I and II colleges and universities must also share in this responsibility, especially to high schools in close geographic proximity, and to those schools in areas which they may recruit heavily.
2. Secondary school personnel must be represented when the NCAA considers matters which concern them. The NCAA must make every effort to include secondary schools in discussions and decision-making.

3. It is suggested that the NCAA highlight the requirements of the Bylaw when mailing information to high school personnel. Many people are now aware of the Bylaw and somewhat familiar with it, however, many of these same principals, guidance counselors, and coaches do not adequately comprehend the Bylaw's three requirements.

4. Associations such as the Ohio High School Athletic Association should work closely as a liaison between the college community and the member high schools to assure that high school personnel, as well as high school student-athletes are kept abreast of legislation concerning eligibility. Workshops and inservices concerned with the Bylaw must continue to be offered to all high school personnel and be widely publicized.

5. Three years after implementation of the Bylaw there is still substantial opposition to the Bylaw by minorities. It is critical that minorities are involved with the continuing investigation of the Bylaw and are represented when considering and adapting any future modifications to the Bylaw. Literature continues to reveal that minorities are impacted more adversely, and this study indicates more minorities believe the Bylaw is discriminatory. Steps must be taken by the NCAA to eliminate differences between satisfaction levels.

6. Considerable research exists which refutes the claim that standardized test scores accurately predict college academic success. Based on this, and the results of this study which indicated many respondents opting for the elimination of the SAT/ACT requirement, or at least lowering the required
scores, it is suggested that the NCAA study the results of its sliding scale requirement utilized in 1986-1987, and 1987-1988.

7. A strategy must be implemented by high schools in which information received from the NCAA pertaining to the Bylaw is distributed throughout schools, especially to coaches and athletes.

8. One or two guidance counselors from each high school should be responsible for advising students about the requirements of the Bylaw. This responsibility should be a part of the counselor(s)' job description, and in this manner would assure that there is at least one "expert" on each high school campus to which students, parents, and coaches could refer to for information and counseling. As it is now, too many counselors are ill-informed and perceive the Bylaw to be an extra burden.

9. Because many coaches indicated they offer academic assistance to their players, as well as consultation regarding the Bylaw, workshops should be offered by local colleges and universities, athletic associations, and high schools for coaches to better familiarize them with the Bylaw.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. The study should be repeated nationally to substantiate the presented research findings and to determine if there is a relationship between geographic locations of high schools and awareness, satisfaction, impact and perceived changes.

2. Investigate whether high school enrollment size is a variable worth exploring, and if school type and school size are a factor for students meeting core course requirements.
3. Compare grade point averages, standardized test score results, and high school curriculums of individuals awarded collegiate athletic scholarships, with high school non-athletic participants.

4. Assess how aware high school students are of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j), how satisfied they are with it, and what changes they would like to see made to the Bylaw.

5. Determine the role of the high school athletic director, and determine what part he/she plays in implementing and disseminating information regarding the rule to high school staff and students.

6. Investigate which component parts of the Bylaw most adversely affect potential scholarship athletes (i.e. SAT/ACT, GPA, core courses).

7. More studies concerned with the effects of the Bylaw on minorities and females.

8. Determine if there is a relationship between sport type (i.e. football, basketball) and ability to meet the requirements of the Bylaw.

9. Follow up studies examining and comparing the results and impact of Bylaw 5-1-(j) with previous results of academic legislation put forth by the NCAA.

10. More studies which measure and explore opposition and changing attitudes to the Bylaw.

11. Explorations of academic, tutorial, remedial, and counseling opportunities available to students at suburban, urban, rural, and private high schools to determine if these are factors in meeting requirements of the Bylaw.

12. And finally, this study should be repeated in the future to determine if attitudes, perceptions, awareness and impact levels change over time.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
STANDARDIZED DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine high school principals' responses and reactions to the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA), Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as Proposition 48, which was implemented in 1986 and requires high school athletes to meet certain academic standards and requirements in order to participate as freshmen in intercollegiate athletics at the Division I and Division II levels.

Please read the directions for each section, and do not omit any questions unless specifically asked to do so. The questionnaire contains 63 questions, and should not take longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. The information is confidential and will be used only as group data. No other individuals will be aware of your responses because of confidential measures taken by the researcher. The number on the upper-right hand corner of the questionnaire will be used to determine which schools have responded. The number is the same on all questionnaires for your school.

The rest of the directions for the questionnaire are included in the questionnaire. If you have any comments after completing the questionnaire, please write them on the back of the last page.
The purpose of this survey is to collect information about eligibility standards and requirements high school student-athletes must attain in order to participate as scholarship athletes in their freshman year of college. This information is confidential and will be used only as group data. Please do not omit any items unless specifically asked to do so.

PART I AWARENESS OF NCAA BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Please circle only one response for each question.

1. Are you aware of the differences between a Division I, II, and III college athletic program?
   1. YES
   2. NO

2. Are you aware of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES ----> If YES, move to #3
   2. NO ----> If NO, skip to #7

3. Are you aware that NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) has a:
   (a) standardized test score requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (b) minimum high school grade-point-average requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (c) core-course requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO

4. Are you familiar with the characteristics of a core course?
   1. YES
   2. NO

5. How did you initially become aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION (NCAA)
   2. WORKSHOP OR INSERVICE
   3. COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
   4. SOMEONE AT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL TOLD YOU
   5. MEDIA
   6. OTHER, please specify, ____________________________

6. Have you received specific information from a college or university regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

7. Would you like more information about Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

...Now please read the description of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on Page 2 and then continue with the questionnaire.
The National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as Rule 48 and Proposition 48, became effective August 1, 1986 and stated that freshmen athletes at Division I and Division II colleges and universities would be eligible to play only if they have achieved:

1. A high school cumulative Grade-point-average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale;

2. A 2.0 GPA in a specified high school curriculum consisting of eleven academic (core) courses, including at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science, and two in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class if available at the school);

3. A combined score of at least 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or a combined score of at least 15 on the American College Test (ACT).

Students who fail to attain one or a combination of the above standards will be unable to participate in athletics during their freshman year of college. However, these students are able to receive grant-in-aid (scholarship) for their initial year of college.

A Division I institution grants a full number of athletic scholarships and must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports. The Ohio State University is an example of an institution which competes with several teams at the Division I level. A Division II institution offers a limited number of athletic scholarships.

continued on next page...
PART II. PERCEIVED SATISFACTION AND FAIRNESS OF BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Much has been written and discussed concerning Bylaw 5-1-(j) and whether or not it is discriminatory and racist in nature, and whether or not it is fair. Please do not omit any items. Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part II. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates your level of Agreement or Disagreement with each statement. Please circle only one response.

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  D = Slightly Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

Example: I am satisfied that eleven core courses. (SA  A  D  SD)

In this example, if you Strongly Agree that eleven core courses are enough, the response SA should be circled.

8. The GPA requirement of 2.0 is a good indicator of academic ability. (SA  A  D  SD)
9. The standardized test score requirement is a good indicator of achievement and is fair. (SA  A  D  SD)
10. Eleven core courses are a fair number for eligibility. (SA  A  D  SD)
11. Combined GPA and test scores are good indicators of ability and achievement. (SA  A  D  SD)
12. I am satisfied that the Bylaw, as written, will motivate high school student-athletes to work harder in the classroom. (SA  A  D  SD)
13. I believe the Bylaw will effect a higher proportion of minority students; therefore the rule is discriminatory. (SA  A  D  SD)
14. The Bylaw applies only to student-athletes; therefore the rule is discriminatory. (SA  A  D  SD)
15. Minorities should have separate standards from non minority students. (SA  A  D  SD)
16. Generally, non-minority students have more educational support than minority students; therefore the Bylaw adversely affects minorities. (SA  A  D  SD)
17. The NCAA acted with the best interests of the student in mind when the Bylaw was created. (SA  A  D  SD)
18. The NCAA should be allowed to make rules which concern high schools. (SA  A  D  SD)
19. All college students-athletes should be ineligible for athletics until their sophomore year in order to acclimate themselves to a new environment. (SA  A  D  SD)
20. I am satisfied that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is a fair rule. (SA  A  D  SD)
PART III. CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS TO BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part III. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates which changes and modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j) you may APPROVE or DISAPPROVE of.

Example: Eliminate the Grade-point-average requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

In this example, if eliminating the Grade-point-average is what you approve of as a change to the Bylaw, APPROVE should be circled. Please circle only one response for each question.

21. Do not allow freshmen to play collegiate athletics. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
22. Allow each college to set their own standards. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
23. Require student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
24. Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j) completely. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
25. Use the high school GPA of 2.0 as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
26. Use the SAT/ACT scores as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
27. Use eleven core courses as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
28. Increase the SAT/ACT requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
29. Increase the 2.0 GPA requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
30. Increase the required number of core courses above eleven. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
31. Lower the GPA requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
32. Lower the required SAT/ACT scores. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
33. Lower the number of core courses required. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
34. Leave the Bylaw as it is. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
35. Eliminate the SAT/ACT requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

Using the fifteen above suggestions (*21-35) for changes to the Bylaw, if you believe changes are necessary, please rank what you believe to be the first, second, and third most important changes. For example, if you believe "Lowering the GPA requirement", #31 on the survey, to be your first choice, write 31 in the box labeled Most Important Change. If you believe no changes are necessary, skip to #39.

36. □ MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
37. □ SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
38. □ THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
PART IV. THE IMPACT OF AND RESPONSES TO BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: This information is confidential and will only be used as group data. Please do not omit any questions unless specifically asked to do so.

39. Is your school informing student-athletes of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? (circle one answer)
   1. YES —> If YES, move to #40
   2. NO —> If NO, skip to #41

40. How are students informed of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? (please circle all responses which apply)
   1. PRINCIPAL
   2. GUIDANCE COUNSELOR
   3. ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT (COACH AND/OR ATHLETIC DIRECTOR)
   4. OTHER PLEASE SPECIFY, __________________

41. Is your school informing parents of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? (circle one answer)
   1. YES
   2. NO

42. Approximately how many of your student-athletes have received full athletic scholarships to a college in the past five years? (circle one answer)
   1. 0-1
   2. 2-4
   3. 5-7
   4. MORE THAN 7

43. Of the students in #42 above, approximately how many of them would you say would not have met the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? (fill in the blank)
   1. Would not have met the requirements: ____________

44. Has Bylaw 5-1-(j) motivated your student-athletes to work harder in the classroom? (circle one answer)
   1. YES
   2. NO

45. Have you made any curriculum changes as a result of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES —> If YES, move to #46
   2. NO —> If NO, skip to #47

46. What curriculum changes have you made? (circle each answer which applies)
   1. MODIFIED EXISTING COURSES
   2. ADDED A COURSE(S)
   3. OTHER PLEASE SPECIFY, __________________

47. Have you altered the number of credits required to graduate as a result of the Bylaw?
   1. YES
   2. NO

48. Have you altered or changed specific course requirements for a diploma?
   1. YES
   2. NO

49. Have you altered school policy for student participation in interscholastic activities?
   1. YES
   2. NO

50. As a result of the Bylaw, has your school added a class(es) which prepares student-athletes for the SAT/ACT?
   1. YES
   2. NO
PART V. DEMOGRAPHICS

Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to your personal characteristics.

51. Which one of the following best describes your high school?
   1. GRADES 7-12
   2. GRADES 8-12
   3. GRADES 9-12
   4. GRADES 10-12

52. Approximately how many students attend your high school? __________

53. What percent of your high school total student population is: (total should equal 100%)
   1. BLACK (NEGRO) __________
   2. HISPANIC (MEXICAN-AMERICAN) __________
   3. NATIVE AMERICAN (AMERICAN-INDIAN) __________
   4. ASIAN-AMERICAN __________
   5. WHITE (CAUCASIAN) __________
   6. OTHER __________ 100%

54. Which athletic conference does your school belong to? (Circle the number of your response)
   1. MID-STATE LEAGUE
   2. CITY LEAGUE
   3. CENTRAL BUCKEYE LEAGUE
   4. OHIO CAPITAL CONFERENCE
   5. OHIO CATHOLIC LEAGUE

55. What is your gender?
   1. MALE
   2. FEMALE

56. Which category best describes your race?
   1. BLACK (NEGRO)
   2. HISPANIC (MEXICAN-AMERICAN)
   3. NATIVE AMERICAN (AMERICAN-INDIAN)
   4. ASIAN-AMERICAN
   5. WHITE (CAUCASIAN)
   6. OTHER, please specify, __________

57. What is the category in which your age falls?
   1. UNDER 21
   2. 21-30
   3. 31-40
   4. 41-50
   5. 51-65
   6. OVER 65
58. How many years have you been employed as a PRINCIPAL?
   1. 0-2 YEARS
   2. 3-5 YEARS
   3. 6-8 YEARS
   4. 9-11 YEARS
   5. MORE THAN 11 YEARS
59. Are you also a Head Athletic Coach?
   1. YES ----> If YES, move to *57
   2. NO ----> If NO, you have completed the questionnaire
60. What sport(s) are you the head athletic coach of?
   1. _________
   2. _________
   3. _________
61. Have you had any players on your teams in the past three years who you believe would not have met the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO
62. Have any of your players received full athletic scholarship in the last three years?
   1. YES ----> If YES, move to *60
   2. NO ----> If NO, you have completed the questionnaire
63. About how many of your players in the past three years were unable to participate in college athletics because of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? _________
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE HIGH SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELOR

STANDARDIZED DIRECTIONS FOR
QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine high school
GUIDANCE COUNSELORS' responses and reactions to the National
Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA), Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as
Proposition 48, which was implemented in 1986 and requires high school
athletes to meet certain academic standards and requirements in order to
participate as freshmen in intercollegiate athletics at the Division I and
Division II levels.

Please read the directions for each section, and do not omit any
questions unless specifically asked to do so. The questionnaire contains
60 questions, and should not take longer than 10-15 minutes to complete.
The information is confidential and will be used only as group data. No
other individuals will be aware of your responses because of confidential
measures taken by the researcher. The number on the upper-right hand
corner of the questionnaire will be used to determine which schools have
responded. The number is the same on all questionnaires for your school.

The rest of the directions for the questionnaire are included in the
questionnaire. If you have any comments after completing the
questionnaire, please write them on the back of the last page.

Your completed questionnaire is valuable and necessary to attain a
high response rate and valid results. Please complete the questionnaire
within three days and return it to your principal. Thank you very much
for your attention to this important topic.
HIGH SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELORS’ RESPONSES TO
NCAA BYLAW 5-1-(j) [PROPOSITION 48]

The purpose of this survey is to collect information about eligibility standards and requirements high school student-athletes must attain in order to participate as scholarship athletes in their freshman year of college. This information is confidential and will be used only as group data. Please do not omit any items unless specifically asked to do so.

PART I AWARENESS OF NCAA BYLAW 5-1-(j)
Directions: Please circle only one response for each question.

1. Are you aware of the differences between a Division I, II, and III college athletic program?
   1. YES
   2. NO

2. Are you aware of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES —> If YES, move to #3
   2. NO —> If NO, skip to #7

3. Are you aware that NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) has a:
   (a) standardized test score requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (b) minimum high school grade-point-average requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (c) core-course requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO

4. Are you familiar with the characteristics of a core course?
   1. YES
   2. NO

5. How did you initially become aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION (NCAA)
   2. WORKSHOP OR INSERVICE
   3. COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
   4. SOMEONE AT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL TOLD YOU
   5. MEDIA
   6. OTHER, please specify, _____________________________

6. Have you received specific information from a college or university regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

7. Would you like more information about Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

Now please read the description of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on Page 2 and then continue with the questionnaire.
A DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION'S (NCAA) BYLAW 5-1-(j)

The National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as Rule 48 and Proposition 48, became effective August 1, 1986 and stated that freshmen athletes at Division I and Division II colleges and universities would be eligible to play only if they have achieved:

1. A high school cumulative Grade-point-average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale;

2. A 2.0 GPA in a specified high school curriculum consisting of eleven academic (core) courses, including at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science, and two in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class if available at the school);

3. A combined score of at least 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or a combined score of at least 15 on the American College Test (ACT).

Students who fail to attain one or a combination of the above standards will be unable to participate in athletics during their freshman year of college. However, these students are able to receive grant-in-aid (scholarship) for their initial year of college.

A Division I institution grants a full number of athletic scholarships and must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports. The Ohio State University is an example of an institution which competes with several teams at the Division I level. A Division II institution offers a limited number of athletic scholarships.

continued on next page......
PART II. PERCEIVED SATISFACTION AND FAIRNESS OF BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Much has been written and discussed concerning Bylaw 5-1-(j) and whether or not it is discriminatory and racist in nature, and whether or not it is fair. Please do not omit any items. Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part II. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates your level of Agreement or Disagreement with each statement. Please circle only one response.

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  D = Slightly Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

Example: I am satisfied that eleven core courses.

In this example, if you Strongly Agree that eleven core courses are enough, the response SA should be circled.

8. The GPA requirement of 2.0 is a good indicator of academic ability.
9. The standardized test score requirement is a good indicator of achievement and is fair.
10. Eleven core courses are a fair number for eligibility.
11. Combined GPA and test scores are good indicators of ability and achievement.
12. I am satisfied that the Bylaw, as written, will motivate high school student-athletes to work harder in the classroom.
13. I believe the Bylaw will affect a higher proportion of minority students; therefore the rule is discriminatory.
14. The Bylaw applies only to student-athletes; therefore the rule is discriminatory.
15. Minorities should have separate standards from non minority students.
16. Generally, non-minority students have more educational support than minority students; therefore the Bylaw adversely affects minorities.
17. The NCAA acted with the best interests of the student in mind when the Bylaw was created.
18. The NCAA should be allowed to make rules which concern high schools.
19. All college students-athletes should be ineligible for athletics until their sophomore year in order to acclimate themselves to a new environment.
20. I am satisfied that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is a fair rule.
PART III. CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS TO BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part III. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates which changes and modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j) you may APPROVE or DISAPPROVE of.

Example: Eliminate the Grade-point-average requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

In this example, if eliminating the Grade-point-average is what you approve of as a change to the Bylaw, APPROVE should be circled. Please circle only one response for each question.

21. Do not allow freshmen to play collegiate athletics. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
22. Allow each college to set their own standards. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
23. Require student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
24. Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j) completely. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
25. Use the high school GPA of 2.0 as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
26. Use the SAT/ACT scores as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
27. Use eleven core courses as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
28. Increase the SAT/ACT requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
29. Increase the 2.0 GPA requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
30. Increase the required number of core courses above eleven. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
31. Lower the GPA requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
32. Lower the required SAT/ACT scores. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
33. Lower the number of core courses required. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
34. Leave the Bylaw as it is. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
35. Eliminate the SAT/ACT requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

Using the fifteen above suggestions (*21-35) for changes to the Bylaw, if you believe changes are necessary, please rank what you believe to be the first, second, and third most important changes. For example, if you believe "Lowering the GPA requirement", *31 on the survey, to be your first choice, write 31 in the box labeled Most Important Change. If you believe no changes are necessary, skip to *39.

36. [ ] MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
37. [ ] SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
38. [ ] THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
PART IV. THE IMPACT OF AND RESPONSES TO BYLAW 5-1-(j).

Directions: This information is confidential and will only be used as group data. Please do not omit any questions unless specifically asked to do so.

39. Have you attended a workshop or inservice meeting specifically concerned with Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

40. Are meetings held with students to guide them regarding to Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

41. Do you supply students with information regarding to Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES ----> If YES, move to *42
   2. NO ----> If NO, skip to *43

42. During which school year do you begin advising students about Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. FRESHMAN
   2. SOPHOMORE
   3. JUNIOR
   4. SENIOR

43. Do you need more information on Bylaw 5-1-(j) to advise effectively?
   1. YES
   2. NO

44. Do you maintain contact with parents regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

45. Do you feel sufficiently prepared to counsel students regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

46. Have you received information from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

47. Have you altered guidance counseling procedures encouraging potential scholarship athletes to enroll in eleven core courses?
   1. YES
   2. NO

48. Are students-athletes made aware of remedial and tutorial activities which they can participate to raise their grades?
   1. YES
   2. NO

49. Are activities offered which address standardized testing techniques?
   1. YES
   2. NO

50. Do you feel that Bylaw 5-1-(j) has placed an extra burden on your workload?
   1. YES
   2. NO
PART V. DEMOGRAPHICS

Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to your personal characteristics.

51. Which athletic conference does your school belong to? (Circle the number of your response)
   1. MID-STATE LEAGUE
   2. CITY LEAGUE
   3. CENTRAL BUCKEYE LEAGUE
   4. OHIO CAPITAL CONFERENCE
   5. OHIO CATHOLIC LEAGUE

52. What is your gender?
   1. MALE
   2. FEMALE

53. Which category best describes your race?
   1. BLACK (NEGRO)
   2. HISPANIC (MEXICAN-AMERICAN)
   3. NATIVE AMERICAN (AMERICAN-INDIAN)
   4. ASIAN-AMERICAN
   5. WHITE (CAUCASIAN)
   6. OTHER, please specify._____________

54. What is the category in which your age falls?
   1. UNDER 21
   2. 21-30
   3. 31-40
   4. 41-50
   5. 51-65
   6. OVER 65

55. How many years have you been employed as a GUIDANCE COUNSELOR?
   1. 0-2 YEARS
   2. 3-5 YEARS
   3. 6-8 YEARS
   4. 9-11 YEARS
   5. MORE THAN 11 YEARS

56. Are you also a Head Athletic Coach?
   1. YES --- If YES, move to *57
   2. NO --- If NO, you have completed the questionnaire

57. What sport(s) are you the head athletic coach of?
   1. __________
   2. __________
   3. __________

58. Have you had any players on your teams in the past three years who you believe would not have met the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

59. Have any of your players received full athletic scholarship in the last three years?
   1. YES --- If YES, move to *60
   2. NO --- If NO, you have completed the questionnaire

60. About how many of your players in the past three years were unable to participate in college athletics because of Bylaw 5-1-(j)? __________
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE HIGH SCHOOL HEAD ATHLETIC COACH

STANDARDIZED DIRECTIONS FOR
QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine high school HEAD ATHLETIC COACHES' responses and reactions to the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA), Bylaw 5-1-(j), also referred to as Proposition 48, which was implemented in 1986 and requires high school athletes to meet certain academic standards and requirements in order to participate as freshmen in intercollegiate athletics at the Division I and Division II levels.

Please read the directions for each section, and do not omit any questions unless specifically asked to do so. The questionnaire contains 54 questions, and should not take longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. The information is confidential and will be used only as group data. No other individuals will be aware of your responses because of confidential measures taken by the researcher. The number on the upper-right hand corner of the questionnaire will be used to determine which schools have responded. The number is the same on all questionnaires for your school.

The rest of the directions for the questionnaire are included in the questionnaire. If you have any comments after completing the questionnaire, please write them on the back of the last page.

Your completed questionnaire is valuable and necessary to attain a high response rate and valid results. Please complete the questionnaire within three days and return it to your principal. Thank you very much for your attention to this important topic.
The purpose of this survey is to collect information about eligibility standards and requirements high school student-athletes must attain in order to participate as scholarship athletes in their freshman year of college. This information is confidential and will be used only as group data. Please do not omit any items unless specifically asked to do so.

PART I AWARENESS OF NCAA BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Please circle only one response for each question.

1. Are you aware of the differences between a Division I, II, and III college athletic program?
   1. YES
   2. NO

2. Are you aware of NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES ----> If YES, move to #3
   2. NO ----> If NO, skip to #7

3. Are you aware that NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j) has a:
   (a) standardized test score requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (b) minimum high school grade-point-average requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO
   (c) core-course requirement?
      1. YES
      2. NO

4. Are you familiar with the characteristics of a core course?
   1. YES
   2. NO

5. How did you initially become aware of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION (NCAA)
   2. WORKSHOP OR INSERVICE
   3. COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
   4. SOMEONE AT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL TOLD YOU
   5. MEDIA
   6. OTHER. please specify. ____________________________

6. Have you received specific information from a college or university regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

7. Would you like more information about Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

.....Now please read the description of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on Page 2 and then continue with the questionnaire.
A DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION'S (NCAA) BYLAW 5-1-(j)

The National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Bylaw 5-1-(j), also
referred to as Rule 48 and Proposition 48, became effective August 1,
1986 and stated that freshmen athletes at Division I and Division II
colleges and universities would be eligible to play only if they have
achieved:

1. A high school cumulative Grade-point-average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale;

2. A 2.0 GPA in a specified high school curriculum consisting of eleven academic (core) courses, including
at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science, and two in natural or physical science
(including at least one laboratory class if available at the school);

3. A combined score of at least 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or a combined score of at least 15
on the American College Test (ACT).

Students who fail to attain one or a combination of the above standards
will be unable to participate in athletics during their freshman year of
college. However, these students are able to receive grant-in-aid (scholarship) for their initial year of college.

A Division I institution grants a full number of athletic scholarships and
must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports. The Ohio
State University is an example of an institution which competes with
several teams at the Division I level. A Division II institution offers a
limited number of athletic scholarships.

continued on next page........
PART II. PERCEIVED SATISFACTION AND FAIRNESS OF BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Much has been written and discussed concerning Bylaw 5-1-(j) and whether or not it is discriminatory and racist in nature, and whether or not it is fair. Please do not omit any items. Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part II. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates your level of Agreement or Disagreement with each statement. Please circle only one response.

SA = Strongly Agree   A = Agree   D = Slightly Disagree   SD = Strongly Disagree

Example: I am satisfied that eleven core courses are enough.

8. The GPA requirement of 2.0 is a good indicator of academic ability.

9. The standardized test score requirement is a good indicator of achievement and is fair.

10. Eleven core courses are a fair number for eligibility.

11. Combined GPA and test scores are good indicators of ability and achievement.

12. I am satisfied that the Bylaw, as written, will motivate high school student-athletes to work harder in the classroom.

13. I believe the Bylaw will effect a higher proportion of minority students; therefore the rule is discriminatory.

14. The Bylaw applies only to student-athletes; therefore the rule is discriminatory.

15. Minorities should have separate standards from non minority students.

16. Generally, non-minority students have more educational support than minority students; therefore the Bylaw adversely affects minorities.

17. The NCAA acted with the best interests of the student in mind when the Bylaw was created.

18. The NCAA should be allowed to make rules which concern high schools.

19. All college students-athletes should be ineligible for athletics until their sophomore year in order to acclimate themselves to a new environment.

20. I am satisfied that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is a fair rule.
PART III. CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS TO BYLAW 5-1-(j)

Directions: Below is an example question and the scale used for each question in Part III. Please circle the descriptor which best indicates which changes and modifications to Bylaw 5-1-(j) you may APPROVE or DISAPPROVE of.

Example: Eliminate the Grade-point-average requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

In this example, if eliminating the Grade-point-average is what you approve of as a change to the Bylaw. APPROVE should be circled. Please circle only one response for each question.

21. Do not allow freshmen to play collegiate athletics. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
22. Allow each college to set their own standards. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
23. Require student-athletes to have the same requirements as non student-athletes. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
24. Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j) completely. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
25. Use the high school GPA of 2.0 as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
26. Use the SAT/ACT scores as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
27. Use eleven core courses as the only requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
28. Increase the SAT/ACT requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
29. Increase the 2.0 GPA requirement of the Bylaw. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
30. Increase the required number of core courses above eleven. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
31. Lower the GPA requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
32. Lower the required SAT/ACT scores. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
33. Lower the number of core courses required. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
34. Leave the Bylaw as it is. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]
35. Eliminate the SAT/ACT requirement. [APPROVE DISAPPROVE]

Using the fifteen above suggestions (*21-35) for changes to the Bylaw, if you believe changes are necessary, please rank what you believe to be the first, second, and third most important changes. For example, if you believe "Lowering the GPA requirement" to be your first choice, write 31 in the box labeled Most Important Change. If you believe no changes are necessary, skip to *39.

36. □ MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
37. □ SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
38. □ THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CHANGE
PART IV. THE IMPACT OF AND RESPONSES TO BYLAW 5-1-(j).

Directions: This information is confidential and will only be used as group data. Please do not omit any questions unless specifically asked to do so.

39. Have you attended a workshop or inservice meeting specifically concerned with Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

40. Have you received information from your high school regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

41. Do you hold meetings with your players regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

42. Do you need more information personally regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

43. Do you feel adequately prepared to counsel one of your players if they have questions regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

44. Have you had any players on your teams in the past three years who you believe would not have met the requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?
   1. YES
   2. NO

45. Do you provide any academic advisement to your players?
   1. YES
   2. NO

46. Do you believe yourself to be a strong influence on your players academic affairs?
   1. YES
   2. NO

47. Have any of your players received full athletic scholarship in the last three years?
   1. YES ---> If YES, move to #48
   2. NO ---> If NO, skip to #49

48. About how many of your players in the past three years were unable to participate in college athletics as a freshman because of Bylaw 5-1-(j)?

49. Of what sport(s) are you the head athletic coach?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
PART V. DEMOGRAPHICS

Please answer the following questions by circling the number corresponding to your personal characteristics.

50. Which athletic conference does your school belong to? (Circle the number of your response)
   1. MID-STATE LEAGUE
   2. CITY LEAGUE
   3. CENTRAL BUCKEYE LEAGUE
   4. OHIO CAPITAL CONFERENCE
   5. OHIO CATHOLIC LEAGUE

51. What is your gender?
   1. MALE
   2. FEMALE

52. Which category best describes your race?
   1. BLACK (NEGRO)
   2. HISPANIC (MEXICAN-AMERICAN)
   3. NATIVE AMERICAN (AMERICAN-INDIAN)
   4. ASIAN-AMERICAN
   5. WHITE (CAUCASIAN)
   6. OTHER, please specify, ________________

53. What is the category in which your age falls?
   1. UNDER 21
   2. 21-30
   3. 31-40
   4. 41-50
   5. 51-65
   6. OVER 65

54. How many years have you been employed as a HEAD ATHLETIC COACH?
   1. 0-2 YEARS
   2. 3-5 YEARS
   3. 6-8 YEARS
   4. 9-11 YEARS
   5. MORE THAN 11 YEARS
APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE
December 18, 1987

Mr. Todd Petr
National Collegiate Athletic Association
Nall Avenue at 63rd St.
Mission, Kansas 66201

Dear Mr. Petr,

I received the copy of the report that you wrote for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the guidebook which you sent. Thank you very much for your help, it is good to know that I have your backing as well as the support of the NCAA.

I do have another request, this being for copies of two NCAA manuals published several years ago. They are, Procedure Manual for Implementation of the 1.600 Rule (Bulletin of the NCAA, Kansas City 1965), and the Procedure Manual for Implementation of the 1.600 Rule (6th edition, Bulletin of the NCAA, Kansas City, 1971). I don't know if copies of these exist any longer, but if they do, could you let me know how I could obtain copies of them.

Again thanks for your support. As soon as I finish my proposal, I will send you a copy. Happy holidays Todd, I hope to have something to you in the next couple months.

Sincerely,

Todd W. Roenbeck
December 16, 1987

Mr. Todd Roenbeck
1289 1/2 Dennison Avenue
Columbus
Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Roenbeck:

I am forwarding to you a copy of the report that we did for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the history of Bylaw 5-1-(j), and also the information that we send to secondary schools concerning that rule. I hope that this information helps you in your research.

Both the director of research and I are interested in the outcome of your study, and would appreciate it if you could keep us up-to-date on its progress. As I stated on the phone, I will be happy to help you in any way that I can, so please do not hesitate to write or call if you have problems. Good luck in your studies, and I hope to hear from you again soon.

Sincerely,

Todd A. Petr
Assistant Director of Research

TAP:bb
Enclosure
December 23, 1987

Dear Mr. Roenbeck:

Thank you for your letter of December 18. It sounds like you are making good progress on your research. I have enclosed the two pamphlets explaining the 1.6 rule that you have requested. These copies are part of our permanent archives, so I would appreciate it if you would return them when you are finished using them.

We will anxiously be awaiting the arrival of a copy of your proposal. In the meantime, I will keep my eyes open for anything which I think might help you in your work. Happy Holidays, and good luck in the New Year.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Todd A. Petr
Assistant Director of Research

TAP:bb

Enclosures
January 12, 1988

Mr. Todd Roenbeck
1289 1/2 Dennison Avenue
Columbus
Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Roenbeck:

I have enclosed a copy of Ron Smith and Jay Belman's article on freshman eligibility. I hope that you will find it useful in your work. Please call me if you discover anything else that we might have that would be of assistance, and I will be happy to send it to you. Keep an eye on this year's NCAA Convention, as they may pass legislation relating to Bylaw 5-1-(j) and your study. Good luck!

Sincerely,

Todd A. Petr
Assistant Director of Research

Enclosure
February 24, 1988

Mr. Todd Roenbeck
1289 1/2 Dennison Avenue
Columbus
Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Roenbeck:

Ursula Walsh and I both enjoyed reading the first chapter of your dissertation proposal, and we both feel that it is a very worthwhile and interesting project. There are a couple of things that Ursula and I thought should be included in your report, that are not currently there. One is that Bylaw 5-1-(j) now extends to Division II as well as Division I. The second is a piece of legislation that was passed at the NCAA Convention in January. Proposal No. 45, of which I have enclosed a copy, states that in certain instances an NCAA Committee will have the ability to authorize exceptions to the rule; specifically, in cases where extenuating circumstances caused a student-athlete to be declared ineligible under Bylaw 5-1-(j) (e.g. Tracy Graham).

Other than that, it seems to be a very solid beginning. I have enclosed a copy of the report, with a few minor suggestions and changes from Ursula and myself. Also included with this mailing is a copy of the guidelines for submission of research proposals, per your request of February 16.

I am anxious to see the continuation of your work, and feel that on completion it will be very useful to us. As always, please do not hesitate to contact me if you feel that I can be of assistance. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Todd A. Petri
Assistant Director of Research

TAP:ibb
Enclosures
November 17, 1987

Mid-American Conference
Four SeaGate
Suite 501
Toledo, OH 43604

Dear Mr. McCloskey,

My name is Todd Roenbeck and I am a doctoral student at The Ohio State University in the Program of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. I am presently in the early stages of developing my dissertation topic, and am hoping to research the area of Proposition 48 and its impact in the high schools.

I would appreciate it if you could send me any information you may have regarding the rule, especially statistics, references, and possible contacts. Thank you very much for your attention to this matter, it will be of great help in my research. I may be reached at: Todd W. Roenbeck
1289 1/2 Dennison Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201
(614) 299-5742

Sincerely,

Todd W. Roenbeck
Todd Roenbeck  
1289 1/2 Dennison Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43201 

Dear Todd: 

This is in response to your November 17 letter in which you requested information concerning NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). 

If after reviewing these materials you have additional specific questions, please feel free to contact me at the conference office. 

Sincerely, 

Jamie HoCloskey  
Assistant Commissioner 

JHo/cl 

enc.
November 30, 1987

Ohio High School Athletic Association
4080 Roselea Place
Columbus, OH 43214

Dear Sir,

My name is Todd Roenbeck and I am a doctoral student at The Ohio State University in the Program of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. I am presently in the early stages of developing my dissertation topic. I am hoping to research the area of Proposition 48 and its impact in the high schools. There has currently been little research done which has involved the input of high schools. This is rather unfortunate due to the fact that while the rule directly affects the high schools, they were not a part of the process which devised and implemented it.

I would appreciate it if you could send me any information you might have regarding the rule, especially statistics, references and a possible contact person I might be able to call. The statistics which I could use would include SAT scores, Grade Point Averages, minority enrollments, number of scholarship athletes in the state of Ohio, and any other statistics which concern the state of Ohio, as Ohio will be the concern of my study.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter, it will be of great help in my research. I too am interested in the state of interscholastic athletics and academics. I may be reached at: Todd W. Roenbeck
1289 1/2 Dennison Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201
(614) 299-5742

Sincerely,

Todd W. Roenbeck
Mr. Todd Roenbeck  
1289 1/2 Dennison Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dear Mr. Roenbeck:

This letter will acknowledge receipt of your correspondence relative to Proposition 48.  

The OHSAA does not maintain any of the information that you requested. I recommend that you contact the Ohio State University Athletic Department. They, in turn, may be able to put you in contact with someone with the NCAA.

Our office has a directory of member schools that may be purchased for $4.00. This could help you if you choose to survey all or some of the Ohio high schools. You may also want to check with the State Department of Education for statistical test data.

Best wishes for success in your advanced studies.

Sincerely,

Clair Muscarella  
Assistant Commissioner  

December 1, 1987
APPENDIX C

MOST IMPORTANT CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS
Each respondent to the survey was asked to rank what they believed to be the three most important changes to NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j). Respondents had the opportunity to choose three changes from items 21-35 and rank their first, second, and third choices. This ranking was optional. The following table displays the frequency of items 21-35 which were cited as most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes and Modifications</th>
<th>Number of Times Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not allow freshmen collegiate participation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student-athletes to have the same requirements</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as non student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the required SAT/ACT score</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase required number of core courses</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use high school GPA as sole requirement</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 2.0 high school GPA requirement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Bylaw 5-1-(j)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the high school GPA requirement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the Bylaw as it is</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the SAT/ACT requirement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use SAT/ACT as sole requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use eleven core courses as sole requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow each college to set own standards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the required number of core courses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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