THE BLUE CHIP QUEST: A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

OF COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL RECRUITING,

1972-1981

By

WILLIAM ANTHONY SUTTON

Bachelor of Arts Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 1972

Master of Science Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION May, 1983

-

HOMA

Copyright

by

William Anthony Sutton



THE BLUE CHIP QUEST: A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

OF COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL RECRUITING,

1972-1981

Thesis Approved:

Thesi du

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the analysis of production, migration patterns, and the decision-making process of the college-bound High School All-American football players. The objectives were to analyze player origins and migrations to see if and under what conditions trends and patterns emerge.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. John F. Rooney, Jr., for his inspiration and guidance throughout the study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Robert B. Kamm, Dr. Betty M. Edgley, and Dr. John P. Bischoff, for their assistance and guidance.

A special note of thanks is extended to the following: Ron Touchstone, Chuck Neinas, Eric Zemper, and Kevin Dickey, for the time, assistance, and suggestions they have offered during the course of research. Thanks are also extended to Gayle Maxwell for the excellent cartography, and to Charlene Fries for the preparation and typing of the manuscript.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my wife Sharon and our sons Jason and Daniel, for their understanding, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter																			Ρ	age
١.	THE F	RESEARCH PROBLI	EM .	•••				•	•	• •	•		•	•		•	•	•	•	1
11.	PRIDE	IN PLACE: TH	HE S	I GN I	FIC	ANC	E C) F	SP	AT	IAL	A	FI	NI	ΤY	,		•		6
		Summary	•••	•••	•			•	•	• •	•		•	•				•		33
111.	METHO	D AND PROCEDU	RE .		•		•		•	•	•		•			•	•	•		39
١٧.	ANALY	SIS OF DATA .			•	••••			•	•	• •	•	•			•	•	•	•	44
		Player Product Player Migrat Summary	tion ion 	Area Patto	as ern	(0r s . 	igi	ins	5) •	• •										44 56 123
۷.	SUMMA	ARY AND CONCLU	SION	s.	•		•	•	•	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	127
		Introduction Hypothesis I Hypothesis II Hypothesis II Conclusions an Concluding Sta	· · · · I · nd S atem	 umma ent	· · · ry	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				• •	· · · ·									127 127 131 134 138 141
BIBLIOG	RAPHY		• •				•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		143
APPENDI	КА-	QUESTIONNAIRE								•							•			147
APPENDI	КВ-	STATE ROSTERS	0F	HIGH	sc	нос	L /	AL L	A	MEI	RIC.	ANS	S,							151

iv

LIST OF TABLES

•

.

Ta	able		Page
x	١.	COMPOSITE TOP TWENTY, 1972-1981	26
•	11.	A COMPARISON BETWEEN OVERALL FOOTBALL PLAYER PRODUCTION AND BLUE CHIP PRODUCTION	47
	.	TOP TWENTY PRODUCTION AREAS BY COUNTY: 1972-1981 HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL ALL-AMERICANS	52
	١٧.	FOOTBALL COUNTIES ON THE BASIS OF TOTAL PLAYER OUTPUT (1974)	53
	۷.	COMPOSITE AP-UPI TOP COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL TEAMS, 1972-1981	61
	VI.	MIGRATION PATTERNS AND TOP TWENTY SCHOOLS OF STATES LOCATED IN THE SOUTHERN REGION	66
	VII.	MIGRATION PATTERNS AND TOP TWENTY SCHOOLS OF STATES LOCATED IN THE FOUNDRY REGION	69
١	/ .	TOP TWENTY COLLEGIATE RECRUITERS BASED UPON TOP TWENTY RANKINGS (1972-1981) AND THE NUMBER OF ALL-AMERICANS SUCCESSFULLY SIGNED	103
	1X.	SIGNINGS OF HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN FOOTBALL PLAYERS BY COMPOSITE TOP TWENTY SCHOOL (1972-1981)	104
	х.	SIGNINGS OF BLUE CHIP ATHLETES BY SCHOOLS WHICH HAVE APPEARED IN THE AP-UPI TOP TWENTY (1972-1981)	. 105
	XI.	COLLEGE VISITATIONS MADE BY THE 42 RESPONDENTS 1981 <u>PARADE</u> HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN FOOT- BALL TEAM	. 108
	XII.	AGE OF RESPONDENTS' FIRST ORGANIZED FOOTBALL EXPERIENCE	. 109
>	xIII.	ORGANIZATIONS SPONSORING FOOTBALL PROGRAMS PARTICIPATED IN BY RESPONDENTS	109

v

•

Table		Page
XIV.	NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENT WAS VARSITY FOOTBALL PLAYER	110
XV.	OTHER SPORTS THE RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATED IN	111
XVI.	APPROXIMATE ENROLLMENT OF THE RESPONDENTS' HIGH SCHOOLS	113
XVII.	ANALYSIS OF SIGNINGS ON A REGIONAL BASIS	119
XVIII.	RANKING OF FACTORS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF BLUE CHIP ATH- LETES	121
xıx.	INTENDED MAJORS OF RESPONDENTS	122

LIST OF FIGURES

•-

.

.

•

~

Figu	ire	Page
1.	Player Origins by State; Total Population, 1,178	45
2.	Player Origin by State (Percent); Total Population, 1,178	46
3.	Southern States Blue Chip Production, 1972-1981	49
4.	Origin of High School All-American Football Players, 1972-1981	51
5.	Player Migration (Percent) Per State; Based on Popu- lation of 1,005	59
6.	Migration of Georgia High School All-Americans, 1972- 1981; Population Sample, 50 Players; Retained 54%; Migrated 46%	62
7.	Migration of Florida High School All-Americans, 1972- 1981; Population Sample, 54 Players; Retained 63%; Migrated 37%	63
8.	Migration of Louisiana High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population, 27 Players, Retained 67%; Migrated 33%	65
9.	Migration of Virginia High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 25 Players; Retained 8%; Migrated 92%	67
10.	Migration of Illinois High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 43; Retained 21%; Migrated 79%	. 71
11.	Migration of Michigan High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 28 Players; Retained 57.1%; Migrated 42.9%	. 72
12.	Migration of New Jersey High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 23 Players; Retained 4.4%; Migrated 95.6%	. 73

Figure

.

13.	Migration of Ohio High School All-Americans, 1972- 1981; Population, 83 Players; Retained 41%; Migrated 59%	75
14.	Migration of Pennsylvania High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 49 Players; Retained 61.2%; Migrated 38.8%	76
15.	Migration of Texas High School All-Americans, 1972- 1981; Population Sample, 100 Players; Retained 81%; Migrated 19%	78
16.	Migration of California High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 86; Retained 74.4%; Migrated 25.6%	79
17.	Migration of Washington High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 15 Players; Retained 73.3%; Migrated 26.7%	80
18.	Composite AP-UPI Top Twenty College Football Teams, 1972-1981	82
19.	University of Alabama Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 26 Signees	84
20.	University of Oklahoma Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 41 Signees	85
21.	University of Michigan Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 33 Signees	86
22.	University of Nebraska Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972–1981 22 Signees	87
23.	University of Southern California Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972–1981––50 Signees	88
24.	Ohio State University Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972–1981 54 Signees	89
25.	Penn State University Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 39 Signees	90
26.	Notre Dame Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-198176 Signees	91
27.	University of Texas Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 34 Signees	92
28.	University of Pittsburgh Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-	93

Page

Figure

29.	University of Arkansas Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 16 Signees	4
30.	University of Georgia Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 28 Signees	15
31.	UCLA Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-198136 Signees 9	16
32.	University of North Carolina Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-198119 Signees)7
33.	University of Tennessee Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972- 198125 Signees	8
34.	University of Florida Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981 23 Signees	19
35.	Points of Origin: 1981 Parade All-Americans	4
36.	College Visitations Made by 1981 Parade All-Americans 11	6
37.	Selections and Enrollments of 1981 Parade All-Americans	7

÷

Page

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Recruiting is one of the most important elements that separates the powerful collegiate football programs from the powerless. It is the factor that distinguishes successful programs such as Notre Dame, Alabama, and Oklahoma, from programs such as Washington State, Kansas State, and Oregon. The successful football programs, those schools consistently ranked in the top 20, have for years attracted the nation's elite high school football performers. As a result of this attraction or recruitment the strong teams remained strong, while those teams considered weak remained so because of their inability to attract or recruit quality players to help their program. NCAA legislation in recent years has sought to correct this situation by limiting the number of scholarships or grants-in-aid that a college or university can utilize for football. The intent of this legislation was not only to de-emphasize the football factory approach of many of the universities, but also to achieve parity for all football programs and thus more of a balance regarding the emphasis on athletics and winning. In recent years, however, recruiting scandals have been commonplace. Violations all have one thing in common: they were caused by the pressure to win. The win-at-all-costs philosophy is especially evident in the recruitment of high school athletes, particularly those blue-chip athletes referred to as high school All-Americans. The amount of time and money spent to "sell" a potential

recruit on attending a certain school is certainly out of proportion when compared to the recruitment of an outstanding professor.

The purpose of this study is to examine geographical origins, by city and state of high school graduation, of high school All American football players. This examination will show where the supply of blue chip football players originates or simply where they come from. The second phase of the study will deal with the migration patterns of these players, focusing on the colleges (if any) that these athletes chose to attend. This phase will deal with the demand aspect of where players are attending college relative to their point of origin. The third phase of the study will examine the relationship between recruiting patterns and the success of major collegiate football programs. A composite (AP and UPI) top 20 teams ranking has been established for the years 1972-1981, and will be compared with the colleges chosen by the athletes during the same time period. The fourth and final phase of the study will be a case study analysis of the 1981 Parade All-American Team. The study has been conducted through the use of a questionnaire in an attempt to find out why players choose to attend certain colleges. In essence, this portion of the study will examine why they go where they go. 2

As a basis for research, the author has taken into account the studies relating to college-bound football players, 1971-1977, by Dr. John F. Rooney, Jr., in his books <u>The Geography of American Sport</u> and <u>The Re-</u> <u>cruiting Game</u>. In addition, the author has communicated by telephone and corresponded by mail with authorities in the field of recruiting such as Haskell Cohen of <u>Parade Magazine</u>; Ron Touchstone, Director of Football Enterprises and co-publisher of <u>Inside Blue Chips</u>, a magazine which provides an in-depth analysis of potential college recruits and

college recruiting success; Kevin Dickey, former recruiting coordinator for the University of Pittsburgh; Fred Jacoby, chairman of the NCAA Research Committee; Dave Seifert and Eric Zemper, Executive Assistants of the NCAA; and Chuck Neinas, Executive Director of the College Football Association.

It is the purpose of this dissertation to indicate that the element of a winning football tradition emerges as the key factor in the migration of high school football All-Americans in their college selection (recruitment) process. Due to this element of tradition, there is a direct relationship between the number of All-Americans recruited and the success (win-loss percentages and final season rankings) of the colleges or universities attended by these athletes. Third, that states with one or more major football programs in the state have a higher retention rate of All-Americans than do states without such programs.

There are certain limitations to the conclusions reached as a result of this research. This study deals only with those high school All-Americans listed as Parade High School All-Americans or Senior Scholastic All-Americans (now referred to as Adidas All-Americans). These All-American teams were chosen because they were likely to be significant to recruiters as a means of identifying quality athletes. Because of the geographical scope of this study, a questionnaire was used in the phase of the study concerning the case study analysis of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-American Football Team. Some telephone interviews were conducted with the respondents, but due to high cost and number of athletes involved, it was impossible to conduct a telephone study of the entire population. Because of the size of the overall population, 1,178 recruits, and the time factor, 10 years, it was impossible to identify positively all

migrations (if any) made by the population. The author was, however, able to identify positively 1,005 members of the population or 85 percent.

ENDNOTES

¹Such institutions are SMU, UCLA, USC, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Wichita State, and most recently the 1981 National Champion, Clemson.

²The following terms are defined in relation to the manner in which they are used in this study: <u>Point of origin</u>-the particular geographic area (city-county) where the athlete attended high school, not necessarily his birthplace. <u>Migration</u>-the act of travel and subsequent establishment of a residence by an athlete for the purpose of participation in intercollegiate football. <u>Production area/region</u>-that geographical area consisting of one or more adjacent counties in relationship to the quantity of football players produced (state lines are not necessarily production area boundaries).

CHAPTER II

PRIDE IN PLACE: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SPATIAL AFFINITY

The migratory behavior of athletes, coaches, sports franchises, etc. are of fundamental interest to the sports geographer. According to Rooney, "Migration is generally in response to monetary, educational or fame-related inducements of one sort or another."¹ American collegiate football provides an excellent opportunity for study of this migration, because of the abundance of playing opportunities and a huge pool of potential recruits.²

This author, however, is not concerned with the masses of players signed by America's colleges and universities, but only with that select group identified as High School All-Americans who thus are recruited intensely because of their perceived potential and ultimate value. This recruiting process has since 1946 "evolved into a season of its own with standards of conduct, referees, penalties, time limits, and procedures for scoring."³ It has evolved from a process to a game--The Recruiting Game. In his book <u>The Sports Factory</u>, Joseph Durso illustrates this concept by quoting Clem Gryska, Recruiting Coordinator at Alabama. Gryska states that "to many people, it's (recruiting) like a post-season game. If Auburn signs 20 and Alabama signs 19, Auburn wins the game."⁴

This "game" has been in full swing since 1952, when the NCAA in effect legalized recruiting on a large scale. Since 1952, competition

between rival colleges and universities in recruiting has been intense and played for high stakes, namely athletic success and the prestige and financial rewards that accompany it. However, it should also be pointed out that high power recruiting is expensive--so expensive, in fact, that "forty-one colleges have dropped football in the last ten years because the pressure is so great."⁵

Pressure to win is the dominant force in collegiate recruiting. Coaches must win in order to maintain their job security; colleges and universities must win for a number of reasons: (1) to recoup the high expenses associated with college athletics, scholarships, facilities, recruiting, salaries, etc.; (2) to maintain the "pride in place" theory --in other words for residents of the area, state, etc., and alumni to have pride in their identification with the college or university. A winning athletic program is one way to enhance that identification and in most cases be able to turn that identification into financial support. For example, according to John McKay, former Head Coach at U.S.C. and now Head Coach of the NFL Tampa Bay Buccaneers,

you have a good program and it's a remarkable stimulus for endowments. Not just for athletics, but for the entire school. U.S.C.'s fund raisers tell me endowments go up when we win. That makes it easier back East to walk in and have a potential donor say, 'Hey, I saw the team win on TV Saturday. Great!' He doesn't say he'll donate because the team won, and he might not even be a big football fan, but he's proud to say, 'That's my school.'⁶

A winning athletic program can also generate additional income from outside sources such as television. "Teams in a nationally televised game will share half a million bucks, and in regional games more than \$400,000."⁷ An appearance in a major bowl game (Cotton, Sugar, Orange, Rose) enables the participants to share in excess of 1 million dollars. But it must also be remembered that a television appearance is much more

than just a pay day; it is also free advertising. Watching a game on national television, future recruits are playing "mind games" imagining themselves playing for a particular school and what role they would play. An unconscious selling job has taken place, and hopefully its benefits can be harvested at a later time. Can Oregon, Washington State, Wisconsin, and Vanderbilt compete for quality recruits on even terms with U.S.C., Notre Dame, Alabama, and Ohio State? No, and they have not done so for some time. A television appearance helps greatly to insure that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

But to be successful, and have an athletic budget in the black, is not the goal of recruiting, nor the goal of the sport of college football itself--that goal is to be "Number One." Being "Number One" guarantees successful recruitment, donations to the athletic department, television appearances, the coach's job security, pride in place, etc.; it is the ultimate accomplishment.

It is the goal of being "Number One" that makes the examination of recruiting so interesting. For example, Rich Allocco, a high school All-American quarterback from New Providence High School in New Jersey was recruited by 265 colleges, in the fervent hope that he was talented enough to lead them to the top--the mythical national championship of college football.

Rich Allocco's mail included personal letters from governors, mayors, college presidents, corporation heads, and influential individuals such as the director of NASA. They urged him to spend four delightful years on Nebraska's astroturf, in Ohio State's vaunted horseshoe, under Texas's warm sunshine or whatever else the writer's loyalty directed. He had his choice of helping Arizona build, Maryland rebuild, or Notre Dame stay just where it then was--in the top ten of the weekly football polls.⁸

This recruiting was even more intense because Rich was from New Jersey,

a state where the only football opportunities are Princeton and Rutgers, neither of which can be classified as "major or big time" football programs.

Rich narrowed his choices to five schools in which he had a legitimate interest. They were Ohio State, Michigan, Nebraska, Penn State, and Notre Dame. "Each school has its own special kicks, runs, and passes to play for scores on a prospect's attention and interest."⁹ For example,

Ohio State's approach centered on its coach, Woody Hayes, its massive 86,000 seat stadium, as well as the city of Columbus, the largest U.S. city without a professional franchise in any major sport. At Ohio State and Columbus, college football was the only game in town. Nebraska emphasized its fans and that football is king in Nebraska. Michigan emphasized its massive stadium, 101,001 seating capacity, and a dinner honoring Rich and other prized recruits. Notre Dame's approach was very low key and matter of fact, almost a take it or leave it approach,¹⁰

a challenge. Penn State's approach was to help contribute to the image of Eastern football and the charm and integrity of its head coach, Joe Paterns. Rich narrowed his choices to Notre Dame and Penn State, before finally deciding on Notre Dame.

A case similar to Rich Allocco is that of Jack Mildren, a Texas schoolboy when first referred to as a "blue chip" athlete. His recruitment is immortalized in a classic chapter entitled, "Pursuit of a Blue Chipper" in Dan Jenkins' book <u>Saturday's America</u>. Jenkins describes a "blue chipper" as

big, tough, intelligent, unselfish, a leader. And fast? He runs the hundred in 9.4--uphill. He runs the quarter in 46 flat--in the rain. And his arm? Everybody in town has seen him flick the ball sixty yards on his knees with two linebackers jerking on his face guard. He's got it all, which is why Ara Parseghian and Bear Bryant and Darrell Royal and the Detroit Tigers and the Boston Celtics and the Morgan Guaranty Trust have all been trying to sign him up since he was in the fourth grade. And it is why whoever winds up with him will announce it in a press conference on the battleship Missouri

and why those who don't will go tattling off to the NCAA, CIA, FBI and ARVN. He goes by several names, of course. He is known as the No. 1 Blue Chipper, the Prized Recruit, the Top Prospect, the Most Wanted, the Most Highly Coveted, the Leader of the Tribe, the Boss Stud, the Head Hoss.¹¹

But no matter what he is called, it is hoped that he will lead his respective team to the top, to be number one.

What type of background prepares a young man for all of this adulation and high power recruiting, as well as the accompanying pressures? The West Texas area places a great deal of emphasis on high school football as dealt with by Martin Ralbovsky in his book <u>Lords of the Locker</u>room. Ralbovsky states that

entire communities like Hereford (Texas) funnel all of their excess energies into the high school football program for three major reasons:

1. Isolated as they are, more than 300 miles from the nearest professional team and at least 70 miles to the nearest major college team, there is no team other than the high school team for a fan to follow.

2. There is a fierce community pride ('I'm from Dimmitt, Dammitt' or 'Lucky Me, I live in Lubbock' adorn car bumpers), probably because most residents spend their lives in the same community.

3. Football reflects the basic belief of small industrialized towns: that hard work and the spartan existence build strong men. 12

This lifestyle and emphasis on THE GAME, as high school football is considered in Texas, is further illustrated by George Kirk, a former high school coach in West Texas for 14 years and an assistant coach at Baylor University in Waco, Texas. According to Kirk, "the community EX-PECTS a boy who's able to play to play. Football becomes important to him because it's important to the community. It's like feudal times and each town is a kingdom at war with another."¹³ Gary Shaw, author of <u>Meat on the Hoof</u>, based on his experiences as a football player at the University of Texas, has similar sentiments remembering his high school football playing days in Denton, Texas: "There was a real feeling of community responsibility when you played for the high school team. You were defending your town against the aliens who were about to attack."¹⁴ This dedication to the cause (football) and pride in place is further illustrated by an examination of Massilon, Ohio, once the high school football capital of world, but now fighting for that distinction with other Ohio cities and towns (Cincinnati) as well as those in Texas. In Massilon, "within minutes after bearing a male child, a Massilon woman is presented with a football, a gift of the Massilon High School Booster Club."¹⁵ But this is not the only football-oriented devotion in Massilon, a town of 32,539 with a football stadium seating capacity of 21,345.

The high school team's payroll includes a team dentist, a team chiropodist, and a team historian. Among the three adult booster clubs is the Sideliners, whose function, according to their press brochure, is to be an adult group of buddies for the football players during the season. Each member of the Sideliners adopts a player for a buddy. He listens to any complaints a player may have or suggestions; he greets him before and after games, sits down and eats with him, takes him to a movie the night before a game.¹⁶

This adulation and pre-occupation with football as a way of establishing pride in place is the key to widespread involvement by fans and other interested parties in the recruitment of high school athletes to attend colleges and universities. This involvement with and interest in highly heralded athletes such as All-Americans is extremely intense but even more so in a geographic area where there is only one major university, no professional teams, and college football is a twelve-month obsession or, if you will, a regional religion.

Nebraska, like Ohio, is such a place. In order to understand the true importance of football in Nebraska, we must accept the following statement from Novak's <u>Joy of Sports</u>: "A team is not only assembled in one place; it also represents a place. Location is not merely a bodily

necessity; it gives rise to a new psychological reality. . ,¹¹⁷ namely, that thousands of citizens gain a focal point for their affections and despairs. These affections and despairs manifest themselves in participation in the sporting event. By participation it is meant "to extend one's own identification to one side, and to absorb with it the blows of fortune, to join with that team in testing the favors of the Fates."¹⁸ And nowhere is this participation greater than in Lincoln, Nebraska, on a game day.

On the day of a home football game for the University of Nebraska, the five largest cities in the state in terms of population are as follows:

- 1. Omaha, 347,328
- 2. Lincoln, 149,518
- 3. Memorial Stadium on a football Saturday, 76,000
- 4. Grand Island, 32,358
- 5. Hastings, 23,580.¹⁹

In Nebraska, the Cornhuskers are the number one item. It is a genuinely statewide obsession, a uniting factor, a common bond. In his book <u>Sports in America</u>, Michener describes his visit to Nebraska during foot-

ball seasons.

I flew out to Nebraska to watch as an entire state went bananas over football. Ranchers rode in from three hundred miles away, dressed all in red, they and their wives, and they painted the town the same color. At two in the afternoon the stadium was a pulsating red mass. Once I stopped at a town in the remote southwest corner of the state, and the local bank had purchased a monstrous billboard to proclaim 'Go Big Red.' I took the trouble to stop by the bank and ask why a business four hundred miles from the University would be so excited about football, and this banker said, 'Our clients take it for granted that we're solvent. But if they suspected for one minute that we were not solvent as far as Big Red is concerned, they'd drive us out of business.'²⁰ There are a number of ways that fans can get involved to demonstrate their support for the Big Red:

Nebraska football provides a plan for every pocketbook. The Extra-Point Club can be joined for one dollar on up, and for five dollars you can get the coaches' printed comments following each game. The Touchdown Club costs twenty-five dollars on up and a hundred dollars gets you a parking space. The Husker Educational Award Rate is a thousand dollars and the Husker Beef Club contributes steers for the football training table. A two-thousand dollar contribution to the press box carries the right to purchase tickets for the enclosed seating.²¹

Michener, in an interview with some Nebraska fans, also reports on the

year-round dedication to Nebraska football:

Fans in other states think that football fever strikes the nation from late summer to midwinter, but in Nebraska we follow it longer. We expect news coverage from August practice, through the fall season, including bowl practice in December and the bowl game in January. The balance of January and February are ugh. We look at the line-ups in March, follow Spring Practice in April, and attend the Spring Red-White squad game in May. Somehow we manage through June, but pro football with some former Big Red players starts in July which carries us back to August.²²

But no mention of Nebraska football would be complete without mentioning the ultimate Nebraska fan, Charlie Winkler, who just might be the ULTIMATE fan, period.

Charlie Winkler was renowned for organizing every aspect of his life so as to better worship the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers. An average of four times a week Winkler drove the 210-mile round trip between his home in Grand Island and the stadium in Lincoln. He made a point of attending all games, home, away, varsity and freshman, with serious illness the only acceptable excuse for absence. On occasion he drove to the stadium when it was empty, just to sit there and dream of football.²³

Winkler held six season tickets, and spent about \$2,000 a year following the team. He wrote letters to high school players, encouraging them to enroll at Nebraska, and on his honeymoon stopped off at Sturges, South Dakota, to try and recruit a player. Winkler styled himself the No. 1 fan in the nation:

'When the team comes running on the field, and the band strikes up "Dear Old Nebraska U," the tears damn near scale my cheeks. It's life's ultimate experience,' he said. Of course he had a plan for the perfect death. He would suffer a heart attack during a game, be rolled over by companions to see the Big Red score one last touchdown, and then expire in bliss. At the next game, a helicopter would hover above the field, scattering his ashes over the sacred turf.²⁴

This obsession is not limited to Nebraska, but probably is at its zenith in Nebraska because it is essentially the only show in town (or in this case, state). In Oklahoma, for example, there are three universities playing major college football: the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, and the University of Tulsa. The University of Oklahoma has enjoyed a winning tradition over the years and as such is the object of attention by most of the state's football-crazy fans. Michener also journeyed to Norman, Oklahoma, and he recalls his visit by describing a fan he met there:

The first Oklahoma fan I met was Earl Wells, an oil magnate from Henrietta, Oklahoma, who told me, 'The doctors said it was a matter of life and death. Open heart surgery immediately.' I told them, 'Hold on! I've got to be able to walk up four flights of stadium steps on the opening day of football season.' They said, 'No way,' so I said, 'then no operation.' And they said, 'Then you'll die.' So we compromised. They'd operate and I'd come to this game. When they warned me that if I did I might drop dead, I told them, 'If I'm gonna die, let me die doin' what I love most in this world. Watchin' Oklahoma football. And here I am!'²⁵

Is there then a "regional religion" concerning football? Is devotion so intense to the "pride in place" concept and such a vicarious thrill to be enjoyed when the home turf is successfully defended, that it almost approaches a religion? It is the author's contention that this is so; that like religion, football devotees can be "lukewarm" participants or fervent believers, and that there is also a geographical

perspective to these regional religions. In his book <u>The Joy of Sports</u>, Novak uses the term "Regional Religions." Novak makes the statement that "Christianity has many denominations, and Judaism many traditions. Sports, too, awaken different symbolic echoes in different areas of the nation."²⁶ This regional attitude not only affects the way fans perceive and follow the sport, but also the way it is played in a particular area, and as a combination of the two previous factors, how the region recruits and is recruited. For example, Novak states that "the football of the Deep South is a rugged kind of football, but it is best described as fleet, explosive and difficult to contain."²⁷ He also goes on to say, "In the South, to play a good game is to honor one's state, one's university, the South, and the true spirit of the American nation."²⁸

Could not a recruiter then surmise that in his recruiting process if he was looking for athletes in the Deep South, he would be looking for individuals who were tough, durable, fleet, and dedicated to doing their best. It is the author's contention that this is so. The author further contends that a recruiter from outside the Deep South would have little or no chance of signing an athlete to attend a school outside the South, because of that individual's commitment to honor state, university, and the South. This commitment to honor state, university, and the South is evident in the case of Tommy Nobis, who was ultimately recruited to attend the University of Texas in his homestate. Nobis says,

I knew that either Coach Royal (University of Texas) or Bud Wilkinson (University of Oklahoma) would be the two best men to play for--if I wanted to become a coach. So I went up to visit 0.U., but you know what? I got real mad hearin' some of these guys talk bad about Texas. I guess the pride just came out in me.²⁹

This pride also manifests itself in Jenkins' portrayal of a native Texan,

Harold Phillips, talking about native Texans playing football for the University of Oklahoma: "Why that's just like somebody from the United States playing for Nazi Germany."³⁰

There is a logical connection between pride, place, football, and recruiting. Namely, that most everyone has pride in where they come from; this can be manifested by a Texan now living in New York bragging that "I'm from Beaumont," or a steel worker in Pittsburgh being proud of his ethnic heritage and wearing a "Kiss me, I'm Polish" T-shirt. Second, football is a way of expressing this pride in place by identifiying with a team that represents this "pride in place," and hopefully a successful team that can cause a relationship to occur which relates winning and success to this "place." Finally, recruiting plays a very important role. Recruiting is used as the tool or method to insure that winning keeps taking place, thus maintaining the pride in place feeling and identification with the football team.

The use of recruiting to insure that winning takes place is an area that has been troublesome in the past and probably will continue to be so in the future. Fans and alumni have become involved in the recruiting process and have used abilities and involvement to "buy" athletes for the respective colleges and universities. Dave Meggysey, in his book <u>Out of Their League</u>, admits that he was paid after games, but also talks about an inducement made to him while deciding whether or not to accept a football scholarship to Syracuse University (he did):

I received a call from Colonel Byrne, Head of the Air Force ROTC program at Syracuse. The Colonel said he had just talked with Ben Schwartzwalder (at that time Head Coach) and was calling because he had learned I was interested in becoming a jet pilot. He <u>personally assured</u> me I would be able to go through the Air Force ROTC program and could enter flight school when I graduated from college.³¹

However, one of the most interesting recruiting capers concerned Jerry Eckwood, a talented player who decided to attend the University of Arkansas. According to Bob Hattibaugh, Eckwood's coach at Brinkley High School in Arkansas:

Jerry was besieged with offers. He could have driven off in anything from a VW to a Caddy. One alumnus wanted to give Jerry five hundred dollars a month to attend his school. Jerry kidded him and said he needed more. The guy came back and said, 'I got it up to a thousand.' Another alumnus offered me a job and said he'd fix Jerry up with a twenty-five-hundred-amonth job and all the cars he needed. One school said they would build his mother a nice brick house, get his girlfriend a scholarship, give Jerry a Cadillac, and get him a thousanda-month summer job in addition to his scholarship.³²

But how has recruiting evolved, what were its original intentions, and how did it reach the twisted purpose for which it is used for the Jerry Eckwoods of the world?

In examining recruiting and its origins, the author discovered that the first reference to recruiting and colleges dealt with American colonial colleges recruiting students, "if only to have enough warm bodies in attendance to justify their existence."³³ But in collegiate football recruiting was for the most part done on a very limited basis until about 1917. Recruiting inducements prior to 1917 included fraternity memberships, bath tickets, meals, lodging, or employment.

There are several theories as to what developments contributed to the development of formalized recruiting. The most popular theory links collegiate football not to sport, but to what it really is--entertainment--and as such, it is a business. The diffusion of collegiate football which had occurred immediately prior to and after WWI had established collegiate football as a spectator sport throughout the country. This ascension of collegiate football stimulated a boom in stadium construction. Most of the big name schools felt compelled to erect a colossal structure to house their gridiron show. Because the majority of the colleges were located in small towns, the gigantic buildings could serve no other purpose.

The schools built facilities with borrowed funds, planning to pay them off with gate receipts. Since attendance was markedly influenced by the quality of play (people follow winners), the stadium debt provided a powerful motive to field a successful team. With so many universities seeking the same goals, severe competition for the available talent resulted. The modern era of high pressure recruiting had begun.³⁴

The "era of high pressure recruiting" dominated the 1920's. This pressure to fill the stadium was marked with questionable practices by colleges and universities such as "serving as an employment agency providing jobs paying between \$125-150/month, jobs that included 'guarding the fieldhouse and changing light bulbs.' It also included selling complimentary game tickets and the like."³⁵ These practices raised concern among responsible individuals in the field of higher education, the result of which became <u>Bulletin 23</u>, <u>American College Athletics</u>, published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1929. The report issued under the directorship of Howard Savage "sought to examine the current practices of colleges and universities regarding athletics and suggested reforms thereof."³⁶ The report recommended a return to purely amateur sport, but for obvious reasons, investments in stadiums and desire for national recognition through football, the recommendations of the Carnegie Foundation went unheeded.

Social and political factors, namely the Great Depression and WVII, caused a decrease in recruiting; but after WVII, returning military veterans created an intensive recruiting struggle for their services.

NCAA rules also played an important role in recruiting because of new rule legislation governing player substitution.

Prior to WWII, football had been an eleven-man game. The NCAA rules committee legalized substitution in 1941 to compensate for the loss of quality players to the war effort. Substitution was liberalized further in 1946, and again in 1949, thereby increasing the number of athletes necessary to field a quality team, 37

and thus intensifying the search for skilled players.

In 1952, the NCAA established a set of standards to deal with this search for skilled players we call recruiting. This was an attempt to legitimize what had been going on for years, namely, offers of food, lodging, etc. to play collegiate football. The NCAA at this time elected to legalize financial aid to collegiate athletes. "Athletic scholar-ships and grants-in-aid were formalized and given official status. Any institution (according to a standardized formula) could recruit and subsidize athletes from any area of the country."³⁸ This for the most part continues to be the current practice in recruiting.

This national search for football talent--and the origin and migrations of these athletes, as well as the relationship between sport and a geographical region--gave birth to a new subfield called the Geography of Sport. The relationship between an athlete's point of origin, or where he competed in the sport on an amateur or high school level, and his migration to a college or professional team to once again participate in the sport on a higher level, has been the subject of several studies.

In his book <u>A Geography of American Sport</u>, Rooney maintains "that some areas excel in the production of large quantities of first class players, while others produce few or none at all."³⁹ This can be

interpreted two ways: first, a region could offer only a few sports, thus encouraging specialization and a high level of skill in that particular area. On the other hand, a region or area such as Minnesota, could offer a large number of sports or activities and encourage young men to participate in a variety of these sports, the result being that very few of them would become proficient in any one sport or activity.

This analogy can also be interpreted in terms of collegiate football and recruiting. For example, an area like Texas, which is very high in the production of collegiate-level football players, would not have the need to recruit many players from out of state. But Wyoming, which produces very few collegiate-level football performers, would have to be very diligent in searching outside of its state in order to secure enough quality athletes to satisfy its football needs. The degree to which a town's citizenry supports the sport dictates the amount of interest and participation the potential athletes will show.

An excellent example of this would be the Moeller High School football team in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Moeller High School is a Catholic all-boys high school with an enrollment of approximately 1,000. Of these 1,000 students in 1980, 210 participated as players in the football program, on either the varsity team, the reserve team, or the freshman team. 40

The support organization for this football enterprise consisted of "18 coaches, 24 team doctors, a hundred thousand dollar budget," and a booster club of 500 men.

Cliff Martin, himself a football coach, went to a Moeller game to observe the famed Moeller Machine and had some interesting comments regarding the composition of the football team:

I expected to see eighty of the finest high school specimens in Ohio. But these are just like all other high school kids. There are skinny kids, fat kids, and some real studs. This team doesn't have a special bunch of athletes; they win with fantastic organization and coaching.⁴¹

This fantastic organization was responsible for selling in excess of 10,000 season tickets; in fact, Moeller frequently played in front of over 20,000 spectators.

Football was and is definitely the focal point of the popularity of Moeller. When Moeller High School opened its doors for its first year of operation in September, 1959, it also was the first year of its football team. Brother Eveslage of Moeller had previously taught at Purcell High School and recalls the importance of football: "I was there during the glory years. I saw what football can mean to a school. A successful football team set the tone for the whole year."⁴²

This attitude along with the organization and support of the community provided Moeller with an

overall varsity record from 1963-1981 of 186 wins, 18 losses, and 2 ties. A reserve football team record of 153 wins, 29 losses, and 7 ties; and a freshman record of 102 wins, 32 losses, and 15 ties. During this time span Moeller has won 5 Ohio State football championships and 4 national championships.⁴³

Moeller has played and defeated teams from Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, and Michigan, and was invited to play in Japan. Over 300 of Moeller's football graduates received scholarships to colleges and universities throughout the country during this period. Moeller football is certainly significant to the fans of Cincinnati, and in their interstate contests, surely a source of "pride in place" for all of Ohio.

The number of scholarships produced due to the high productivity of Moeller football would also seem to support another of Rooney's

generalizations, namely, that "specialization in high school and junior high athletic programs tends to result in a proportionately greater number of university-calibre athletes."44 The number of scholarships from Moeller football are evidence of the "enforced specialization" that was part of the Gerry Faust philosophy at Moeller. For example, "If a boy plays baseball for an all-star team after football starts, he can't play football at Moeller." 45 To explain the philosophy behind the rule, one need only to examine a case where this rule was enforced. In 1980, Moeller had a talented halfback named Hiawatha Francisco, who had been chosen to play in a baseball all-star game that would have interfered with summer football practice. Gerry Faust's philosophy is very evident in that telephone conversation: "Hello, Mrs. Francisco? Gerry Faust. Mrs. Francisco, I just want to explain our summer baseball rule to you so you can help Hiawatha decide whether he's going to play for that all-star team or play football at Moeller this year." He described the rule briefly and added: "Mrs. Francisco, the mediocre teams don't have rules like that, and that's why they're mediocre."⁴⁶

Simply stated, the success of Moeller--not only in win-loss percentage but also in the production of college-calibre athletes--is the result of two factors. First, the emphasis and support from the citizenry, students, and community in general. Second, the degree of specialization encouraged by the organizational structure of the sport itself. This encouragement can manifest itself in several forms: rules like those at Moeller, peer pressure, adult recognition, and encouragement or other factors relating to the struggle in the attaining and securing of a successful price in place relationship. In the case of Moeller, the "pride in place" actualization was fourfold. First, it was pride in school;

second, pride in place--Cincinnati. This struggle would manifest itself in games pitting Moeller against traditional "power-houses" throughout Ohio. The third facet was pride in place, meaning Ohio. This pride was evident in the games Moeller would play against teams from Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, Texas, and California. Finally, pride in place meaning being a representative of Catholic schools and the Catholic educational system. This pride in place is not separate, but must be considered as intertwined throughout the other three. The nickname of the team itself, "Crusaders," is emblematic of a struggle or conquest of a religious nature.

Before concluding the analysis of Moeller High School as a production area of college-calibre athletes, there is one other consideration that must be discussed, namely, the role that a "winning tradition" plays in this production. When Moeller was first established as a Catholic high school in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, parishes, Catholic elementary schools, etc. had to be assigned to Moeller for the purpose of providing students to attend the new school. The areas assigned to Moeller had previously been assigned to Roger Bacon and Purcell, two Catholic schools that had enjoyed a heritage of winning football programs. The area known as Reading had been a productive area for high school football talent, and had been sending this talent to Roger Bacon. Roger Bacon High School, in fact, had been under the leadership of Coach Bron Bacevich, the most successful high school of all time, with 315 victories over a forty-season career. "The parish of Sts. Peter and Paul in downtown Reading submitted a long petition to the archbishop asking that it remain a part of the Bacon district instead of being assigned to Moeller."⁴⁷ This was before Moeller became the dynasty which it is now

considered, before the winning tradition had been established. "Twenty years later parents were moving across town to live in the Moeller district."⁴⁸

Another point of inquiry might be, is there a relationship between factors involved in the production of high school athletes who might be described as "college calibre" and the successful recruiters and colleges who are able to sign these players and thus affect their migrations? In the opinion of the author, the three factors previously cited as important to the production of athletes, namely, community emphasis and organization, specialization and a "winning tradition" are also inherent characteristics of college programs that have achieved high levels of success in the recruitment of these athletes.

An excellent example of community emphasis and organization would be an examination of the Ohio State University football program. In his book <u>Buckeye</u>, Robert Vare portrays a community (Columbus, Ohio) where football is extremely important and an organizational structure that supports the coach and is enlisted to aid the coach in the recruitment of talented "major college-calibre" football players. The organizational structure that Vare refers to throughout the book as the "Machine" has an essential group known as the "Athletic Committee." The "Athletic Committee" is a

predominantly alumni organization whose 250 members in Ohio and 50 other members nationwide help recruit high school stars for Ohio State, provide Coach Hayes with strong personal support, and contribute money to the Ohio State football program.⁴⁹

"Unofficial" duties of an "Athletic Committee" member also include arranging summer jobs for players, providing Christmas gifts, and other "extras." Clearly, this emphasis on Ohio State football throughout Ohio

and across the country speaks not only of the level of organization of Ohio State football but also of degree of support for the program.

In terms of recruiting and identifying potential blue chip athletes, the role of the "committeeman" cannot be overemphasized. "There are over 750 high schools in Ohio; all are covered by 'committeemen' so that it's almost impossible for an athlete with any talent to go unnoticed."⁵⁰ Thus any blue chippers "discovered would have the opportunity to consider Ohio State, to help maintain a winning pride in place association for Columbus, Ohio, and Ohio State fans across the nation."⁵¹ With regard to local support for the Ohio State football program, John Galbreath, a member of the "Athletic Committee" who lives in Columbus, states: "You can't live in Columbus and not be part of it. We don't have a big league baseball, football or basketball franchise, so the Buckeyes are our team."⁵²

Similar organizations and philosophies can be found at the homes of other successful practitioners in Norman, Oklahoma; Austin, Texas; Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Lincoln, Nebraska; and Baton Rouge, Louisiana. For example, Ex-Governor McKeithen of Louisiana used the power and considerable influence of his office to recruit a young man named Warren Capone for LSU. McKeithen says:

I had him over to the Governor's Mansion for coffee and cake. I invited them all (recruits) to the Governor's Mansion. I'd ask them 'Why do you want to leave Louisiana? You want to live someplace in Colorado or Indiana? How's your family and friends going to cheer for you there.'⁵³

The second component, specialization, can best be explained by an examination of a composite top twenty ranking of college football finishers during the period of the study, 1972-1981 (see Table I). (This composite ranking will be examined in greater detail in Chapter IV.)

TΑ	B	LE	
IA	D		- 1

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Alabama Oklahoma Michigan Nebraska U.S.C. Ohio State Penn State Notre Dame Texas	11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19.	Arkansas Houston Georgia UCLA Arizona State Florida State North Carolina Clemson Maryland
9.	Texas	19.	Maryland
10.	Pitt	20.	Auburn

COMPOSITE TOP TWENTY, 1972-1981

Note: The composite top twenty is based upon combined UPI-AP final polls with point values assigned relating to finish, e.g., 1st place, 20 pts.; 2nd place, 19 pts; ... 20th place, 1 pt.

An examination of the top ten teams would reveal only one basketball program of note, Notre Dame. This is due to the coverage and exposure affording the coverage of the Notre Dame mystique. While the Notre Dame basketball program is successful (appearances in NCAA and NIT postseason tournaments), there can be no doubt that the emphasis at Notre Dame is football.

Teams ranked 11 to 20 are a slightly different case; Arkansas and Houston are similar to Notre Dame in that they have successful basketball programs, but the primary emphasis is on football. However, UCLA is definitely a basketball school, as are North Carolina and Maryland. North Carolina seems to be the one school in the top twenty capable of major program emphasis in both sports, but basketball will always be number one in the state. Clemson offers a different explanation, in the author's opinion; Clemson was a school looking for a sport. Since it
was a member of the prestigious basketball-conscious Atlantic Coast Conference, the thrust in the late sixties through the late seventies was basketball. When "significant" success was not realized, the emphasis shifted to football. After the 1981 "National Championship," it is the author's opinion that football is where the emphasis will be.

The final component, the "winning tradition," has been mentioned earlier in reference to "the importance of being No. 1." However, it is also highly important financially, in terms of community support, and also to attract and successfully recruit potential athletes. This part of the winning tradition can be maintained by finishing high in the national rankings, and securing postseason bowl bids.

In an analysis of college football, the winning tradition of Notre Dame and the relationship between that tradition and recruiting merits examination. Notre Dame tradition is built upon a history of winning and national champions. Notre Dame football has been immortalized by films such as The Knute Rockne Story, and in journalism by such notables as Grantland Rice in his epic tribute to the "Four Horsemen." How does this tradition affect recruiting? Brian Boulac, Notre Dame Assistant Head Coach and Recruiting Coordinator, states that the power image of Notre Dame often works against him in recruiting. "The biggest thing we have to overcome," he says, "is that people think we've got a bunch of super athletes stacked up on the sidelines."54 Notre Dame might not have them stacked up, but the search to find these athletes is intense and ultimately selective. "The recruiting process begins in the summer with a mail campaign sent to high school coaches across the country soliciting these coaches to identify and supply names of athletes who might be considered prospects.⁵⁵ According to Boulac, these replies

usually generate a list of about 1,000 prospects. Each of these prospects receives a questionnaire to ascertain if he is interested in Notre Dame. After these questionnaires have been returned, the goal is to cut the list to about 100 by December. At this time Boulac begins weekly jet tours to various high schools, meeting players and coaches, and viewing game films, trying to decide upon the 20 to 25 blue-chip prospects he should visit at home. It is the home visit which determines the athletes who will be chosen to visit Notre Dame and be offered an opportunity to become part of the tradition.

Rich Allocco recalls his recruitment by Notre Dame by saying, "They didn't go overboard in recruiting me. They felt the school should recruit itself."⁵⁶ And in recalling his visit, Allocco adds, "There were no recaps of the school's unmatched football tradition. The Irish assumed that if a prospect didn't know about Notre Dame's past, well....¹⁷⁵⁷

Notre Dame's tradition has been built over many years and has had a colorful history to enhance it. The Four Horsemen, The Gipper, Rockne, and so on. But a winning tradition can be utilized in a number of ways. For instance, it can be used in a geographic sense, such is the manner of usage employed by Joe Paterno of Penn State. In the late sixties and early seventies, Paterno's rallying cry for recruits from New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, etc. was "Come to Penn State and help prove to the country that an Eastern school could be No. 1."⁵⁸ Paterno was appealing to the native sons of the East to "stay at home" and defend their regional pride.

A third way tradition can be used as a tool to recruit is at a college or university where no winning tradition exists, or where that tradition has been tarnished over a period of years because of losing

seasons. In the Allocco case once again, Rich had his choice of helping Arizona build or Maryland rebuild.

In summation of this point, tradition plays a critical role in recruiting and maintaining the "pride in place" relationship, whether it be maintaining an established tradition, rebuilding to establish past glories, or building to establish new loyalties and hopefully future memories.

A final area of examination would be an analysis of recruiting in terms of the athlete's decision-making process regarding his choice of colleges to attend. There have been two unpublished studies done relating to this phase of recruiting. The first study was an examination of the University of Pittsburgh recruits and signees done by Kevin Dickey, former recruiting coordinator at Pitt. Dickey refers to his study as "Why Athletes Choose Pitt."

In his study Dickey analyzes the following recruiting components relating to the University of Pittsburgh.

- 1. Educational opportunities
- 2. Career opportunities
- 3. Professional opportunities
- 4. City of Pittsburgh
- 5. Location of school
- 6. Game day visit
- 7. Official campus visit
- 8. Campus facilities
- 9. Dorms
- 10. Football facilities
- 11. Personal letters from Coach Sherrill or recruiting coach
- 12. Mailouts
- 13. Recruiting coach
- 14. Campus host
- 15. Pitt Alumni or Golden Panther.⁵⁹

Pitt's 1979 signees were asked to rank these components based upon the following scale: (1) Had great effect; (2) Had some effect; (3) Had little effect. The five factors that had the greatest effect were the following:

(1. Career opportunities

2. Official campus visit

- Tie < 3. Campus facilities
 - 4. Football facilities
 - 5. Recruiting coach.⁶⁰

Educational opportunities barely edged out professional football opportunities for sixth place.⁶¹ From a study such as this, Dickey and other recruiting coordinators can see where to place their emphasis during the contact with recruits. In other words, how best to make a sale. But there are many intangibles a recruit might be aware of that a recruiter might not consider. The case of Doug Williams, a high school football All-American from Moeller High School in Cincinnati, Ohio, illustrates this point. Most All-Americans from Moeller attend Notre Dame. This has been the case so many times it is almost expected. Williams indicated going to Notre Dame was never a big deal to him: "I wanted to go to the school that was the most comfortable for me." His choice? Kentucky. "It's my kind of place. I like fishing and hunting and like to do a lot of outdoor things. The weather is nice in Lexington, and I could do those outdoor things."⁶² Football was also important and the players in the professional ranks who had played under Kentucky Coach Fran Curci made an impression on Williams. "I remember when I went into Coach Curci's office that it was real impressive. And did you know that there are 28 players in the pros right now from Kentucky who have played under Coach Curci, and 18 of them are starters?"⁶³ Everyone has his priorities and the things that are important to one athlete might not be important to another.

The second study is a report of the College Football Association, with the results restricted to its membership. Thirty-three member institutions participated in the survey and completed questionnaires were received from 2,116 athletes. The universities participating in the survey represent a cross section of the College Football Association memberships in terms of geographic location and success on the playing field over the past five years.

One issue that was dealt with in terms of recruiting was the win/ loss percentage of the institutions attended by the respondents. The survey results indicated:

1. 18.4 percent of the respondents played for a team that won 75 percent or more of its games during the past five years.

2. 15.8 percent played for a team that won between 60 and 74 percent of its games over the same time span.

3. 26.2 percent played for a team that won between 50 and 59 percent of its games.

4. 19.2 percent played for teams that won between 40 to 49 percent of their games.

5. 20.4 percent played for teams that won less than 40 percent of their games over the last five years. 64

An analysis would show that 60.4 percent of the athletes studied played on winning football teams; but without knowing which schools participated in the study, the analysis could be misleading. According to the official interpretation of the study: "A winning tradition is a factor in recruitment and was of increasing importance to athletes playing on teams with a high winning percentage during the past five years."⁶⁵ For example, an institution's football program was very important to 70.3 percent of the players from a team with a 75 percent or better winning percentage and to 42.2 percent of the players on teams winning less than 40 percent of their games.

Another area of the athlete's decision-making process would be that area considered one of the most difficult to deal with. Visitations, how many to take, where to go, etc. According to the CFA study, 77 percent of the athletes visited four schools or less on an expense-paid basis, while 13 percent took advantage of the allowable maximum of six institutional visits. Also, 40 percent of the players visited one or more institutions at their own expense.⁶⁶ This last section regarding players making visitations at their own expense is very interesting. It suggests that athletes are interested enough in their future to make visits on their own time and at their own expense in order to observe a potential "home" without any sales tactics or pressures; they want to be able to get a true picture of the institution.

In its final statement the study made the following conclusion: "The survey confirmed that the football program is more important than an institution's academic offerings during the recruiting process."⁶⁷ This statement raises a very interesting question. Namely, to what extent do recruiters inform potential recruits concerning the role of academics in the college selection process? To answer this question, the author had decided to quote various top level college recruiters. According to Brian Boulac, Notre Dame's chief recruiter since 1974,

I think the important thing for most high school kids to realize is that you go to school to get an education. Very few will have the opportunity to play pro ball. Obviously, some schools will give a better education than others. We feel academics should be the primary consideration in an athlete's decision as to what school he should attend.⁶⁸

Ken Dabbs, recruiting coordinator for the University of Texas, states: "We stress three things here: excellence, academics, and a winning program."⁶⁹

Unfortunately for themselves, a great many athletes do not consider the academic portion of the scholarship or give it enough "weight" in their consideration. However, movements such as C.A.R.E., the Center for Athletes' Rights and Education, are helping to create an educational awareness of the rights of athletes and of the recruiting process in general.

Summary

In conclusion, the author has attempted to demonstrate that college athletics are not only sports, but also entertainment and big business. Unfortunately, the three have become so intermingled that it would take a long hard struggle to overcome the present system.

Another point to be reiterated is the concept of "pride in place." This concept is the underlying theme in the entire study. "Pride in place" is the catalyst that creates or is responsible for community support, specialization, alumni, and also for involvement with recruiting, fund raising, booster clubs, and participation in the sport by prospective athletes. "Pride in place" is also the factor most responsible for "fanaticism" displayed by various supporters, for example, Nebraska football fans.

This review also dealt with the "Blue Chip" athlete, the pressures to which he is subjected during recruiting, his pride and how he feels about his community, his decision-making process regarding his ultimate college selection and the manner in which that choice affects him, his

college selection and the manner in which that choice affects him, his hometown, and the college that is successful in recruiting him.

Finally, the "geographic regions" that were high in the productivity of these "blue chip" athletes were analyzed, and a theory advanced as to the three concepts that make an area a high productivity area in terms of "blue chip" athletes. The three concepts--(1) community support, (2) specialization, and (3) the winning tradition--are also linked to a theory as to what makes a college or university recruiting program successful in attracting and signing these athletes. The pride in place is also the key component that "gives life" to the three concepts.

Pride in place is the one ingredient upon which collegiate sports revolve; it creates a sense of belonging, a unifying factor that provides motivation for community support, finances, winning traditions, and, finally, recruiting.

ENDNOTES

¹John F. Rooney, Jr., <u>A Geography of American Sport</u> (Reading, Mass., 1974), p. 6.

²John F. Rooney, Jr., "Up From the Mines and Out From the Prairies: Some Geographical Implications of Football in the United States," <u>The</u> Geographical Review, Vol. 59 (Oct., 1969), pp. 471-472.

³"The Blue Chips," <u>National Recruiting Magazine of Collegiate Ath-</u> <u>letics</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1980), pp. 29-34.

⁴ Joseph Durso, The Sports Factory (New York, 1975), p. 6.

⁵Ibid., p. 20.

⁶John Underwood, <u>Death of an American Game</u> (Boston, Mass., 1979), p. 224.

⁷Ibid., p. 226.

⁸Jim Benagh, Making It to #1 (New York, 1976), p. 32.

⁹Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 49.

¹¹Dan Jenkins, <u>Saturday's America</u> (Boston, Mass., 1970), pp. 172-173.
¹²Martin Ralbovsky, <u>Lords of the Lockerroom</u> (New York, 1974), p. 125.
¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Michael Roberts, <u>FANS!</u> How We Go Crazy Over Sports (Washington, D.C., 1976), p. 30.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 31

¹⁷Michael Novak, The Joy of Sports (New York, 1976), p. 143. ¹⁸Ibid. p. 144. ¹⁹Bureau of the Census, University of Nebraska. ²⁰James A. Michener, <u>Sports in America</u> (New York, 1976), p. 274. ²¹Ibid., p. 275. ²²Ibid., p. 276. ²³Roberts, p. 16. ²⁴Michener, pp. 278-279. ²⁵Ibid. . ²⁶Novak, p. 232. ²⁷Ibid., p. 237. 28_{1bid} ²⁹Jenkins, p. 140. ³⁰Ibid., p. 77. ³¹Dave Meggyesy, Out of Their League (Berkeley, Calif., 1970), pp. 32-33. ³²Benagh, pp. 75-76. ³³Edwin H. Cady, The Big Game (Knoxville, Tenn., 1978), p. 163. ³⁴John F. Rooney, Jr., The Recruiting Game (Lincoln, Neb., 1980), p. 16. 35 Benagh, p. 202. ³⁶Howard J. Savage, American College Athletics (New York, 1929), p.

31.

³⁷Rooney, <u>The Recruiting Game</u>, p. 18. ³⁸Ibid., p. 20. ³⁹Rooney, A <u>Geography of American Sport</u>, p. 16. ⁴⁰Ibid., p. 140. ⁴¹Denny Dressman, <u>Gerry Faust:</u> Notre Dame's Man in Motion (San Diego, Calif., 1981), p. 11. 42_{Ibid}. ⁴³Ibid., p. 23. 44 Moeller High School Gridiron Guide (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1982), p. 32. ⁴⁵Rooney, <u>A Geography of American Sport</u>, p. 142. ⁴⁶Dressman, p. 16. 47_{Ibid}. ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 43. 49_{Ibid}. ⁵⁰Robert Vare, <u>Buckeye</u> (New York, 1974), p. 80. ⁵¹Ibid., p. 81. ⁵²Ibid., p. 79. ⁵³Durso, p. 63. ⁵⁴"Brian's Pitch," <u>Time</u> (March 3, 1975), p. 53. ⁵⁵Brian Boulac, speech to the "Blue Chips Bureau" Convention, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, April 27, 1982. ⁵⁶Benagh, p. 49. ⁵⁷Ibid., p. 50.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 32.

⁵⁹Kevin Dickey, 'Why Athletes Choose Pitt' (unpublished study, 1979).
⁶⁰Ibid.

61 Ibid.

⁶²Al Eschbach, "When You Make a Commitment," <u>The Blue Chips</u>, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1981), pp. 36-37.

⁶³Ibid., p. 37.

⁶⁴College Football Association, "Section IV, Recruiting" (unpublished study, 1981), p. 2.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 6. ⁶⁶Ibid. ⁶⁷Ibid., p. 7.

⁶⁸"Interview with Brian Boulac, <u>Blue Chip Magazine</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1980), p. 56.

⁶⁹"Who's Who in College Recruiting," <u>Blue Chip Magazine</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1980), p. 57.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Due to the large population (1,178 athletes), the time span (ten years), and the geographic scope of the study (the entire United States), the methods and procedures used in the compilation of the data were complex and varied. The author utilized college football press guides from over 105 different colleges and universities for the years 1973-1980; pro-football rosters and lists of signees; and telephone conversations not only with athletes involved in the study, but also with individuals such as Chuck Neinas, Executive Director of the College Football Association; and Ron Touchstone, Executive Director of the Blue Chip Bureau, an organization involved in the computerization of college football recruiting. It was also necessary for the author to converse by telephone with various high school coaches, athletic directors, and high school administrators to confirm college selections and migrations of high school All-Americans during the 1972-1976 portion of the study. While it was impossible for the author to determine the precise migration of all 1,178 athletes in the study, the author was able to identify positively the migrations of 1,005 athletes or 85 percent of the population.

The study involves 1,178 subjects from 45 states and the District of Columbia.¹ The research deals exclusively with high-school All-American football players who were selected to either the Parade All-American High School Football Team as compiled by Haskell Cohen, or the

Senior Scholastic/Adidas All-American High School Team as compiled by Bruce Weber. Members of the population may also have been members of other All-American teams, but for the purpose of this study the author was only concerned with the <u>Parade</u> and Senior Scholastic/Adidas teams. These particular teams were chosen because of the amount of prestige associated with membership on the team, and thus the more highly sought after or recruited the potential blue chip athlete would be. The amount of prestige associated with membership in the Parade team and its usage by coaches and recruiters are most evident in the case of Jim Bukata, a New York City journalist, who as one of his periodic assignments, compiles the Parade All-American teams in football.

Bukata was constantly badgered by college recruiters to release his 'All-American' list early. Coaches habitually wandered into his office and asked for just a quick look. Once a coach from the Southwest was so brash as to call Bukata's home and tell his wife that Jim said she should read off the list to him. Bukata began to make only two copies of his all-star team selections. One he hand-delivered to <u>Parade</u> and the other he judiciously guarded himself. Still some coaches have tried to entice Bukata into writing letters to youngsters, saying that such-and-such coach has recommended the athlete for <u>Parade's coveted honors.</u>²

One reason for the prestige associated with <u>Parade</u> is the amount of readership <u>Parade</u> has. <u>Parade</u> is a supplement in the Sunday newspaper in many of the cities across the United States. In his book <u>Making It</u> to #1, Jim Benagh, in referring to All-American Rich Allocco, states that when Rich was named to <u>Parade</u>'s team, "It made it nearly impossible for anyone who might have missed scouting him, to miss him because of its circulation--in excess of sixteen million."³ In the same book, Benagh refers to Senior Scholastic's team as the "other most publicized High School All-American football team."⁴

In the decision-making analysis phase of the study, the method of instrumentation used was a questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to secure information regarding the 1981 <u>Parade</u> High School All-American Football Player, his recruitment, and his subsequent decision on which college or university (if any) to attend. The author relied upon a questionnaire because of the geographical scope of the study which included 25 states and the District of Columbia. The questionnaire was mailed to the 64 members of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-American Football Team because they would be the most familiar with the reasons for choice of a particular school (having been recently recruited). Of the 64 members of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> Almones) signed a professional baseball contract, and one (Paul Jokisch) signed a grant-in-aid to play college basketball. Of a possible 62 responses, the author was able to obtain 42 or 68 percent.

Essentially there were four types of data to be collected: point of origin, migration patterns, composite top twenty football ranking for the period 1972-1981, and the previously discussed questionnaire data. Point of origin data were obtained from the annual rosters listed in <u>Parade</u> and <u>Senior Scholastic</u>. Migration pattern data were obtained by three methods: (1) National Football League Rosters, 1976-1982; (2) collegiate press guides, 1972-1981; and (3) telephone calls to high schools attended by the athletes during the time they were selected as All-American. During these telephone conversations, the author conversed with football coaches, athletic directors, administrators, guidance counselors, and in some cases, the parents of the subject. The data relating to the compilation of the composite top twenty football teams for

1972-1981 were obtained from the offices of United Press International and the Associated Press.

The data collected were analyzed by mapping, state by state, rosters and response/result tables. The author has produced maps dealing with the following aspects of the study:

1. Origin of the population by county

2. Origin of the population by state

3. Origin of 1981 Parade All-Americans

4.. College visitations of 1981 Parade All-Americans

5. College selections of 1981 Parade All-Americans

6. AP-UPI composite top twenty football teams

7. Player migrations point percentage per state

8. Migrations of High School All-Americans (selected states)

9. Recruiting patterns of selected universities.

The author has also compiled response/result charts from information pertaining to information obtained from the questionnaire and a state roster for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia of the subjects in this study (see Appendix B).

In summation, the author has attempted to collect data pertinent to origins, migrations, and decision-making processes of the High School All-American, and to organize and analyze that data in order to make determinations regarding trends or patterns in these processes. The author has chosen to utilize maps and tables to display these data in order to provide a greater opportunity for comprehension and application.

ENDNOTES

¹There were no members of the population from Alaska, Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont, or Wyoming.

²Jim Benagh, <u>Making It to #1</u> (New York, 1976), p. 78.

³Ibid., p. 33.

⁴Ibid., p. 78.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Because of the breadth of this study, it is necessary to divide this chapter into three sub-chapters. These sub-chapters will be analyzed as follows: (1) player production areas (origins), (2) player migration patterns, and (3) factors influencing the decision-making process of high school All-Americans: an analysis of the 1981 Parade All-American Football Team. Certain regions and states produce more blue chip players than others. A further examination of these areas indicates that there are pockets or sub-areas within each state, that for one reason or another rank high in the production of blue chip athletes. Definite trends emerge in the migration patterns of these blue chip athletes. The reasons for these trends will be dealt with in sub-chapters two and In sub-chapter three, the author has attempted to discover the three. why component of college selection. Those elements which cause a recruit to select one college over another are considered.

Player Production Areas (Origins)

The map shown as Figure 1 depicts the United States on state-bystate basis in terms of overall player production of high school football All-Americans, 1972-1981. Figure 2 portrays the same information in terms of percentage of the population sample (1,178).



Figure 1. Player Origins by State; Total Population, 1,178 (Note: number within state boundary equals the number of players originating in the state)

ۍ بې



Figure 2. Player Origin by State (Percent); Total Population, 1,178 (Figures have been rounded off)

.

9'n

An examination of Figure 1 shows that three states--Texas, California, and Ohio, when combined total 316 athletes out of a population of 1.178 or 26.8 percent. This would confirm Rooney's findings in his book <u>A Geography of American Sport</u>¹ in which these three states ranked as follows-first, California; second, Ohio; fourth, Texas--in gross production of football players. The state that ranked third in Rooney's study, Pennsylvania, ranked fourth (tied with Florida) in this study. When Pennsylvania is included, the four states above account for 376 players or 32 percent of the blue chip population as compared with 5,416 players or 38 percent of Rooney's national study of all collegiate football players. A comparison of the top ten producing states in terms of gross production is presented in Table II.

TABLE II

А	COMPARISON	BETW	EEN OVE	RALL	FOOTBALL	PLAYER
	PRODUCTI	ON A	ND BLUE	CHIP	PRODUCT	ON

Production	Rooney, 1974 ² (All Football	Players)	Sut Production	ton, 1982 (Blue Chip Only)
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)	California Ohio Pennsylvania Texas Illinois New York New Jersey Massachusetts Michigan Florida		(1) (2) (3) Tie (4) (4) (6) (7) (8) (9) Tie (10)	Texas California Ohio Pennsylvania Florida Georgia Illinois Michigan Louisiana Virginia New York

While eight states are common to both studies, the southern states in Rooney's study ranked fourth (Texas) and tenth (Florida), while in the author's study these same states ranked first (Texas) and fourth (Florida). In addition, the three states not included in Rooney's study but included in the author's study--Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia--are considered Southern states.

An examination of Figure 3 illustrates that the eleven-state region of Southern states (excluding Texas) account for 334 blue chip players or 28.3 percent of the total population. This emergence of Southern states in the production of blue chip athletes can be attributed to several factors. First is the emphasis placed upon football relating to the success of collegiate football programs in the South, such as Georgia, Alabama, Auburn, Clemson, and North Carolina. The socio-cultural emphasis on football has been established in the high school programs and as a result the emphasis is on local production. This is a facet of pride in place, but in the South there is much more emotionalism associated with this pride. In the book <u>The Nine Nations of North America</u>, Garreau refers to Dixie as an area whose "boundaries are defined by emotion."³ Football is a definite part of this emotion, and the game is interwoven into a value system that has at its roots state and regional pride.

The role of Texas in the production of athletes was examined in Chapter II. The socio-cultural emphasis placed upon football in Texas is derived from a variety of sources: (1) increasing population; (2) an area where provincialism exceeds nationalism;⁴ and (3) strong pride-inplace philosophy linked identification of football with warfare. In Texas, a football team is a tangible, observable instrument by which prestige and hence pride in place can be measured. Rooney refers to



Figure 3. Southern States Blue Chip Production, 1972-1981

49

•

Texas as "the state where 'football mania' is perhaps strongest."⁵ Thus the emphasis by the community plays a key role in the production of football players and the blue chip athletes.

Figure 4 details the production of origins of high school All-Americans, 1972-1981, on a county-by-county basis. Table III illustrates the top twenty blue chip producing counties, while Table IV indicates the leading football counties on the basis of total player output (1974, Rooney).⁶ An analysis of Table III shows that of the 21 counties listed, 15 are located in the top ten blue chip producing states. Further analysis shows that unlike the counties listed in Rooney's study (Table IV), all of the counties except one (St. Clair County, Illinois) are the homes of major college or professional football teams. This would then add further support for the contention that community support and emphasis is a factor very instrumental in the production of football players, and hence the greater likelihood of producing blue chip athletes. It should also be noted that while St. Clair County, Illinois, is not the home county for a major college or professional team, its major city, East St. Louis, is directly across the river, separated only by the span of a bridge from St. Louis, home of the professional St. Louis Cardinals football team.

A comparison with Rooney's study (Table IV) also bears examination. This comparison shows that there are twelve counties common to both tables. Further examination shows that of the eight counties appearing in Rooney's 1974 study (dealing with player production) which do not appear in the author's study, seven are in the Middle Atlantic/Northeast area of the country. These seven counties are located in Massachusetts (1), New York (1), Connecticut (1), Pennsylvania (1), Ohio (1), and



TABLE III

.

.

Rank		County	No. of Players	State	Largest City in County
1		Los Angeles County	41	California	Los Angeles
2		Cook County	28	Illinois	Chicago
3		Hamilton County	27	Ohio	Cincinnati
4		Dallas County	23	Texas	Dallas
5		Wayne County	20	Michigan	Detroit
6	e	Allegheny County	16	Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh
7	Ï	Harris County	16	Texas	Houston
8		St. Louis County	15	Missouri	St. Louis
9		Dade County	14	Florida	Miami
10		Orange County	13	California	Anaheim
11		Maricopa County	11	Arizona	Phoenix
12		Pulaski County	10	Arkansas	Little Rock
13		Cuyahoga County	. 9	Ohio	Cleveland
14		Orleans County	9	Louisiana	New Orleans
15		Santa Clara County	9	California	San Jose
16		St. Clair County	9	Illinois	East St. Louis
17		Fulton County	9	Georgia	Atlanta
18		Hillsborough County	9	Florida	Tampa
19		Jefferson County	8	Alabama	Birmingham
20		Douglas County	8	Nebraska	Omaha
21		Davidson County	8	Tennessee	Nashville

TOP TWENTY PRODUCTION AREAS BY COUNTY: 1972-1981 HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL ALL-AMERICANS

TABLE IV

.

Rank	County	Total Produced	State	Largest City or Cities
1	Los Angeles	492	California	Los Angeles
2	Cook	354	Illinois	Chicago
3	Allegheny	333	Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh
4	Cuyahoga	247	Ohio	Cleveland
5 ·	Harris	130	Texas	Houston
6	Hamilton	129	Ohio	Cincinnati
7	Wayne	127	Michigan	Detroit
8	Middlesex	122	Massachusetts	Waltham/Neuton
9	Dallas	112	Texas	Dallas
10	Bergen	109	New Jersey	Hackensack, Bergenfield, Teaneck
11	Lucas	109	Ohio	Toledo
12	Orange	104	California	Anaheim
13	Nassau	104	New York	Long Island
14	San Diego	102	California	San Deigo
15	Dade	94	Florida	Miami
16	Westmoreland	91	Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh, Monessen, Irwin
17	Essex	83	New Jersey	Newark
18	Fulton	82 .	Georgia	Atlanta
19	Santa Clara	. 79	California	San Jose
20	Fairfield	79	Connecticut	Bridgeport

FOOTBALL COUNTIES ON THE BASIS OF TOTAL PLAYER OUTPUT (1974)

Source: John F. Rooney, Jr., <u>A Geography of American Sport</u> (Reading, Mass., 1974), p. 123.

New Jersey (2). This is an area that in recent years has shown population loss of migration for a number of reasons, most related to economy. In contrast, of the nine counties appearing in the author's study but not in Rooney's 1974 study, two counties are in the Midwest in similar areas of population loss: St. Louis, Missouri; and St. Clair County, Illinois; another in the Midwest in Douglas County, Nebraska; five in the South: Jefferson County, Alabama; Orleans, Louisiana; Pulaski County, Arkansas; Davidson County, Tennessee; and Hillsborough County, Florida; the remaining county is Maricopa County, Arizona. With the exception of the first two counties, the remaining seven counties have experienced population growth for a variety of reasons, with climate and economics being interrelated and the most important.

The emergence of the South as a producer of major college football players has been documented by Rooney in his book <u>The Recruiting Game</u>. In the book Rooney illustrated, by use of a map, the high productivity of the South.⁷ Several of the counties cited by the author in Table III appear in Rooney's further studies conducted in 1976 and 1977. Another aspect of Rooney's studies in 1976 and 1977 supported by the author's research is the high degree of urban concentration. Rooney's research showed that Los Angèles and Chicago account for over 20 percent of all the football players produced in the United States. In this study these two cities account for 5.9 percent of the population or more than any state with the exceptions of Texas, California, and Ohio.

It should also be noted that while all of the 21 counties mentioned in the study (Table III) consist of high schools with quality football programs, some schools exceed normal expectations. Some high schools have been referred to as "football factories" which attract quality

athletes hoping to gain the attention of college recruiters. Banning High School in Los Angeles, California, and Moeller High School in Cincinnati, Ohio (see Chapter II) are examples of these schools. The dominance and success of these schools is also a matter of record. For example, Moeller High School has been the mythical football national champion four times and in the process has produced 14 of Hamilton County's 27 All-Americans. In fact, Moeller has produced 1.01 percent of the High School All-Americans in this study, or more than New Mexico, Idaho, Nevada, Wyoming, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine combined.

This study also revealed that athletes do indeed attend certain high schools solely because of their athletic programs and thus the possibility of recruitment and a college scholarship. For instance, Bob White, a member of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-American Football Team left Haines City, Florida, and moved to Freeport, Pennsylvania. White chose Freeport after a middle school coach in Haines City, who was originally from Freeport, suggested he make the move. According to White,

There were better opportunities here (Freeport). You don't get much publicity or notoriety down where I'm from. I think the football team (in Haines City) has won just three games in three years. I think I still might have gotten a college football scholarship if I had stayed in Florida, but it would have been a lot tougher.

Further documentation of athletes in other sports leaving their parents and homes to attend certain high schools in hope of attracting a college scholarship is evidence in the case of Bishop Boyle High School in Homestead, Pennsylvania. Boyle won the state basketball championship in Pennsylvania in 1982 with two team members being from Puerto Rico. Boyle, a parochial school, was charged with recruiting these students. Simply stated, the situation is as follows: wealthy Puerto Rican families send their children to Boyle (a relationship exists between a

Puerto Rican YMCA director and the Boyle basketball coach) for two reasons: (1) to receive "good schooling," and (2) to play basketball. The children are placed with host families and reside with them during high school years (and in some cases junior high). The parents (in Puerto Rico) voluntarily place their children in the host homes and pay all costs incurred by this arrangement. As a result of this exchange program, "in the last decade Boyle has been a frequent basketball contender, winning this year's state championship and five section titles."⁹ Successful players such as Santiago "Chago" Gotay have received full athletic scholarships. So it appears that migration patterns can appear prior to college matriculation and that a "point of origin" or a "production area" in some cases might really not be the real "point of origin" or real production area.

Player Migration Patterns

Player migration patterns are determined by a combination of factors. The first factor to be considered would be the number of opportunities for a player to participate in major college football in his home state or in his production or origin area. For example, a player whose point of origin was in Indiana would have the possibility of being able to remain in Indiana by electing to participate in a major football program at Notre Dame, Purdue, or the University of Indiana. On the other hand, a player whose point of origin was in New Jersey would only have one major football program, Rutgers, in which to participate.

A second factor to be considered is the level of success or "winning tradition" of the major college program. For example, while an individual whose point of origin was in Illinois would have an option

of attending the University of Illinois or Northwestern, neither has had what might be termed a winning tradition for some time. A player whose point of origin was Pennsylvania would have a choice of participating at Pitt or Penn State, both schools with winning traditions, especially within the last ten years.

These first two factors, opportunities and winning tradition, when combined form a third factor which will be referred to by the author as the supply/demand factor. This supply/demand factor can best be illustrated by the University of Nebraska, a school with a very high winning tradition, serving as the only major college football program in the state, with a low production of All-American players according to the study (see Figures 1 and 2). The <u>demand</u> for quality players forces the football program to search outside of its boundaries or recruit from lowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Although these states are also low in the production of All-Americans, the absence of winning tradition football programs within these states forces those quality All-American athletes to search elsewhere, and ultimately migrate to nearby major college programs such as Nebraska to meet their own needs as well as those of the program and the residents of the home state of the program.

A fourth factor to be considered in migration is location. Miami of Florida has been very successful in the recruitment of players from Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York to its warm, surfside environment. Joe Namath, a native of Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, describes why, in his opinion, climate is a factor in recruiting: "All I knew was that I wanted to go South. I think a lot of kids from the East and Midwest do because of the climate."¹⁰ In recent years location and climate have had

a measurable impact on the economy of the United States. High energy costs, cold and extremely harsh winters, and inflation and lack of jobs in the Northeast and upper Midwest areas of the country have produced a population shift to the "Sunbelt" or southeast and southwest parts of the country. The changing economy and population patterns are forcing coaches of major college programs in the northern part of the United States, such as Michigan's Bo Schembechler, to look toward the Sun Belt in terms of recruiting. According to Schembechler, "The Big Ten Conference in an area in which the emphasis on high school football has waned. Millage (taxation) defeats have hurt a lot. They have resulted in many cuts (funding for football and other interscholastic activities)."¹¹

In contrast, the Southern Region depicted in Figure 3 shows a migration of only 40 percent based on 290 athletes identified, 173 of whom remained within their home state or point of origin. The emergence of state pride is evidenced by this fact. However, it would be appropriate to the winning tradition schools located within the state and the migration pattern within each of these states in the Southern Region. An examination of the chart on a state-by-state basis is illustrative of the migration of players who do leave their home state but remain in the Southern Region.

An examination of Figure 5 reveals the actual player migrations per state in terms of percentage migrated. Three states have player migration percentages of 0 percent for the High School All-Americans produced by the states. Two of the three states, Nevada and New Hampshire, each produced only one All-American who then chose to enroll in a football program/University within the state. However, the third state, Alabama, had a 0 percent of migration based upon a production of 27 High School



Figure 5. Player Migrations (Percent) Per State; Based on Population of 1,005 (Figures Rounded)

All-Americans. Further examination and breakdown of these 27 athletes shows that 18 enrolled at the University of Alabama and 9 enrolled at Auburn University. Both of these universities also have enjoyed winning traditions. In fact, an examination of a composite of the top twenty college football teams from 1972 to 1981 (Table V) shows that Alabama ranks number one for this period and Auburn ranks number twenty, thus providing an excellent incentive for an Alabama High School All-American to remain at home. Because of its low migration rate, the Southern Region will be examined on a state-by-state basis. (Alabama will be excluded because it has been previously examined.)

An examination of the identified athletes from the state of Arkansas reveals that 10 of the 17 players remained in-state to attend the University of Arkansas. The remaining athletes migrated as follows: 1 to Louisiana, 2 to Texas, and 4 to Oklahoma. Thus 11 athletes of a possible 17 remained in the Southern Region. (It should be noted that Arkansas is a border state of the Southern Region, and that Oklahoma and Texas offer a great number of similarities in culture and lifestyle to those found in Arkansas. When considering out-of-state migration (Figure 6), Georgia shows a high migration rate with 27 of a possible 50 athletes leaving the state. However, when this migration is examined on a regional basis rather than a state basis, it shows that 44 of Georgia's 50 athletes remain in the Southern Region. Florida (Figure 7) is very similar to Georgia in that 43 of Florida's identified 54 players remained in the Southern Region. The 11 players migrating outside of the Southern Region enrolled at highly ranked Top Twenty football programs such as U.C.L.A., Michigan, Ohio State, and Oklahoma. Seven of Kentucky's eleven identified athletes chose to remain in Kentucky, even

TABLE V

COMPOSITE AP-UPI TOP COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL TEAMS, 1972-1981

1.	Alabama	21.	Washington	40.	California
2.	Oklahoma	22.	Texas A&M	41.	Stanford
3.	Michigan	23.	Maimi (of Ohio)	42.	West Virginia
4.	Nebraska	24.	Brigham Young	43.	Missouri
5.	U.S.C.	25.	L.S.U.	44.	Arizona
6.	Ohio State	26.	Texas Tech	45.	Kansas
7.	Penn State	27.	North Carolina State	46.	lowa
8.	Notre Dame	28.	Tennessee	47.	San Diego State
9.	Texas	29.	Purdue	48.	Louisville
10.	Pitt	30.	Colorado	49.	Rutgers
11.	Arkansas	31.	Baylor	50.	lowa State
12.	Houston	32.	Michigan State	51.	South Carolina
13.	Georgia	33.	Kentucky	52.	Washington State
14.	U.C.L.A.	34.	S.M.U.	53.	North Texas State
15.	Arizona State	35.	Miami (Florida)	54.	Utah State
16.	Florida State	36.	Florida	55.	Southern Mississippi
17.	North Carolina	37.	Oklahoma State	56.	Georgia Tech
18.	Clemson	38.	Mississippi State	57.	Temple
19.	Maryland	39.	Tulane	58.	Tulsa
20.	Auburn				

Teams listed appeared at least once in either the final AP or UPI poll in at least one year.

.



Figure 6. Migration of Georgia High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population Sample, 50 Players; Retained 54%; Migrated 46%


1.1

Figure 7. Migration of Florida High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population Sample, 54 Players; Retained 63%; Migrated 37%

though the state can boast of no top quality football program (Division 1) during the span of the study. Of the remaining four players, 2 remained in the Southern Region for a total of 9 of a possible 11. Louisiana (Figure 8) is a state with a very high retention rate. Of Louisiana's identified athletes, 23 of a possible 27 remained in the Southern Region. In terms of state migration, Mississippi, because of its five major college football opportunities, enjoys a rather low rate, 25 percent. When examined further, in terms of regional migration, the Southern Region retains 17 of Mississippi's 20 identified players. The three Mississippians migrating outside the Southern Region attended Notre Dame, Oklahoma, and Pitt, all members of the Top Twenty. Of Tennessee's 19 identified All-Americans, 11 remained in-state and 3 additional athletes remained in the Southern Region. Tennessee's remaining 5 athletes enrolled at Top Twenty schools including Notre Dame, Ohio State, and U.C.L.A. (see Table VI).

In contrast, Virginia has the highest out-of-state migration rate in the Southern Region and, in fact, one of the highest in the country, 92 percent. Several factors can account for this fact. First, Virginia is a border state between North and South, between two cultures and two ways of life. Second, the five major football playing opportunities--(1) University of Virginia, (2) Virginia Tech, (3) VMI, (4) Old Dominion, and (5) William and Mary--can hardly be considered major or successful. In fact, the states of Oregon and Virginia would probably have to be considered the chief competitors to claim the dubious distinction of which state was the most unsuccessful in terms of football win/loss percentage. Only 12 of Virginia's identified 25 All-Americans chose to remain in the Southern Region (see Figure 9).



Figure 8. Migration of Louisiana High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population, 27 Players; Retained 67%; Migrated 33%

TABLE VI

MIGRATION PATTERNS AND TOP TWENTY SCHOOLS OF STATES LOCATED IN THE SOUTHERN REGION

State	Players Identified	Migration (Percent)	Players Not Migrating	Top Twenty School Located in State
Alabama	27	Ŏ	27	Alabama #1 Auburn #20
Arkansas	17	41	10	Arkansas #11
Georgia	50	54	23	Georgia #1 <u>3</u>
Florida	54	37	30	Florida State #16
Kentucky	11	36	· 7	None
Louisiana	27	33	18	None
Mississippi	20	25	15	None
North Carolina	25	24	19	North Carolina #17
South Carolina	15	53	7	Clemson #18
Tennessee	19	42	11	None
Virginia	25	92	2	None



Figure 9. Migration of Virginia High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population Sample, 25 Players; Retained 8%; Migrated 92%

Of the 290 athletes whose points of origin were within one of the 11 states comprising the Southern Region, 243 or 84 percent remained in the Southern Region. This not only provides support for the author's contention of the existence in the South of a regional pride, but also substantiates Rooney's 1974 findings that only 12 percent of Southeastern Conference football players came from outside the region. (The Southeastern Conference is the major conference in the region.)

A second region that should be examined is the region referred to by Garreau as the Foundry. The Foundry includes a highly industrialized nine-state section of the United States with a substantial ethnic population. The nine states comprising the Foundry are Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.¹² (See Table VII.)

On a state-by-state basis the Foundry appears to have a significantly higher migration rate than does the Southern Region. The migration rate for players leaving their home state in the Foundry is 64 percent, while in the Southern Region the migration rate is 42 percent. But does there exist in the Foundry in the Southern Region a regional pride which serves to help retain these blue chip athletes? A state-by-state examination of the Foundry would prove beneficial in trying to ascertain this aspect of regional pride.

Connecticut offers two opportunities to play intercollegiate football: the University of Connecticut, a member of the Yankee Conference; and Yale, a member of the Ivy League. Neither of these schools has been successful in the recruitment of blue chip athletes and the future outlook is about the same. Of Connecticut's nine identified players, one attended the University of Connecticut, and one attended Top Twenty power,

TABLE VII

.

MIGRATION PATTERNS AND TOP TWENTY SCHOOLS OF STATES LOCATED IN THE FOUNDRY REGION

State	Players Identified	Migration (Percent)	Players Not Migrating	Top Twenty School Located in State
Connecticutt	9	89	1	None
Delaware	4	100	0	None
Indiana	20	25	. 5	Notre Dame
Maryland	10	70	3	Maryland
Michigan	28	43	16	Michigan
New Jersey	23	96	1	None
New York	22	86	3	None
Ohio	83	59	34	Ohio State
Pennsylvania	49	39	30	Pitt Penn State

The remaining seven players migrated from the Foundry. Notre Dame. The majority (four) going to New England to attend Boston College, a football team on the rise. Many of Connecticut's players attended parochial high schools so that the movement to Notre Dame or Boston College reflects continued religious orientation in scholastic choice. Delaware offers no major college football opportunities and as such suffers a 100 percent migration from the state. All four of the migrating athletes, however, remain in the Foundry, enrolling at Top Twenty schools such as Notre Dame, Ohio State, and Penn State. An examination of the state of Indiana shows a great contrast to the two states previously discussed. Indiana offers three major college opportunities for football--Notre Dame, Purdue, and Indiana--and retains 75 percent of its blue chip athletes. Interestingly enough, the 25 percent that leave the state of Indiana also migrate from the Foundry, three to schools in nearby Illinois(Figure 10) and one to Top Twenty member U.C.L.A. The state of Maryland offers one opportunity for major college-football, Top Twenty member Maryland is able to retain only three of its ten blue chip Maryland. athletes. Including the three players at Maryland, five players remain in the Foundry, while the remaining five migrate to schools in the Midwest, the South, and California. Blue chip athletes from Michigan (Figure 11) have two major college football opportunities afforded them if they wish to remain home, Michigan and Michigan State. Michigan is able to retain 57 percent of its blue chip athletes, losing several to other Top Twenty teams in the Foundry--Notre Dame, Ohio State, and Penn State. Only 21 percent of Michigan's blue chip athletes leave the Foundry, half of them to warmer climates, two to Top Twenty member U.C.L.A., and one to Florida. New Jersey (Figure 12) offers major college football



Figure 10. Migration of Illinois High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population Sample,43; Retained 21%; Migrated 79%



Figure 11. Migration of Michigan High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population Sample, 28 Players; Retained 57.1%; Migrated 42.9%



:

Figure 12. Migration of New Jersey High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 23 Players; Retained 4.4%; Migrated 95.6%

1

opportunities, Ivy League member Princeton and Independent Rutgers. New Jersey, perhaps because of the lack of successful football programs, suffers a 96 percent migration rate, retaining only 1 of 23 blue chip athletes. The majority (9) of the 22 migrating players attend Penn State. In fact, 61 percent of the New Jersey blue chip athletes remain in the Foundry. The remaining 39 percent who do leave the Foundry opt for Top Twenty members such as U.C.L.A., U.S.C., and Nebraska. New York is similar to New Jersey in that its two major college football opportunities, Ivy League Cornell and Independent Syracuse, only retain a small percentage of the blue chip athletes produced. New York has an 86 percent migration rate as a state, losing athletes to Top Twenty teams in the Foundry like Michigan, Notre Dame, Ohio State, and Penn State. In fact, only 18 percent of New York's blue chip athletes leave the Foundry region. Of those 18 percent, half leave for Top Twenty teams in warmer climates, U.C.L.A. and Florida State. Ohio (Figure 13) has several opportunities to play collegiate football. But while the University of Cincinnati plays a rather ambitious schedule, it can hardly be considered major college in terms of football. For this reason, all 34 of Ohio's 83 blue chip athletes remaining in Ohio attended Ohio State. While this shows a state migration rate of 59 percent, by a large margin the majority of blue chip athletes migrating from Ohio attended Notre Dame. Of the 49 migrating blue chip athletes, 19 or 39 percent attend Notre Dame. In fact, 70 or 84 percent of Ohio's blue chip athletes remained in the Foundry Region. The final state to be examined in the Foundry, Pennsylvania, is unique in that it is the home of two Top Twenty members, Pitt and Penn State. In fact, Pennsylvania (Figure 14) is the only state to be the home of two Top Ten teams, seventh-ranked Penn State and tenth-ranked



Figure 13. Migration of Ohio High School All-Americans, 1972-1981; Population, 83 Players; Retained 41%; Migrated 59%



Figure 14. Migration of Pennsylvania High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 49 Players; Retained 61.2%; Migrated 38.8%

Pitt. The other major college football opportunity is Temple, a school with aspirations but not a factor in football recruiting. Of Pennsylvania's 49 identified blue chip athletes, 30 remained within the state. The majority (12) of the 19 players who migrate from Pennsylvania also leave the Foundry. They attend Top Twenty schools such as U.C.L.A. and Arizona State as well as other schools in the Southern Region.

The most interesting aspect of the athletes produced in the Foundry Region is that even though the individual state migration percentages are higher than those of the states in the Southern Region, the regional retention rates are comparable. As has been previously stated, of the 290 blue chip athletes produced in the Southern Region, 243 remained in that region. On the other hand, of the 248 athletes produced in the Foundry, 188 remained in the region. In terms of percentages, 84 percent of all blue chip athletes produced in the Southern Region remained in that region, and 76 percent of all blue chip athletes produced in the Foundry remained in that region. On this basis a case can be made for the existence of a regional affiliation or pride. Simply stated, this affiliation can be defined as areas enjoying similarities in climate, ethnic heritage, and cultural ways of life.

Other states with interesting migration patterns meriting examination are Texas, California, and Washington (see Figures 15 through 17). Texas (Figure 15) and California (Figure 16) are similar in that both have relatively low percentages of migration, a large number of major college football programs within the state. In conference members alone, California is the home of four members of the Pac Ten, and Texas contains eight of the nine Southwest Conference members. Each state has two members of the Composite Top Twenty Football Teams. California has USC



Figure 15. Migration of Texas High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 100 Players; Retained 81%; Migrated 19%

78



Figure 16. Migration of California High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 86; Retained 74.4%; Migrated 25.6%



:

Figure 17. Migration of Washington High School All-Americans, 1972–1981; Population Sample, 15 Players; Retained 73.3%; Migrated 26.7%

No. 5 and U.C.L.A. No. 14, while Texas has Texas No. 9 and Houston No. 12. Texas had only 19 of a possible 100 identified players leave the state; of those 19, 18 enrolled at other football programs which are members of the Top Twenty. It would appear evident that the only reason for leaving a state with a high degree of state pride and emphasis on football is to attend a school with a similar football related price and tradition. California, on the other hand, retained 64 of its identifiable 86 All-Americans. Only 10 of the 22 migrating athletes enrolled at Top Twenty institutions. In fact, 5 athletes enrolled at schools notoriously poor in football such as Oregon and Kansas State; 2 enrolled for reasons of academic excellence at Harvard; 2 enrolled at Washington, a school not in the Composite Top Twenty for the period 1972-1981, but ranked No. 21 mostly on the basis of its success in the last four years.

The last state to be examined in terms of migration is the state of Washington (Figure 17). As previously mentioned, the University of Washington has enjoyed recent success and ranks No. 21 in a composite ranking. It is not surprising then that Washington retains 11 of its 15 identifiable All-Americans. Two of the remaining four migrated to California schools such as U.S.C., while the other two migrated to Notre Dame.

It is also possible to examine geographical migrations and patterns from the standpoint of recruitment at Top Twenty schools. Of the 1,003 players identified positively by the author as enrolling in college and participating in collegiate football programs, 559 or 56 percent enrolled at Top Twenty schools. Figure 18 shows a breakdown of the Top Twenty schools and the blue chip or number of high school All-Americans



Figure 18. Composite AP-UPI Top Twenty College Football Teams, 1972-1981

successfully recruited by each school. Figures 19 through 34 further illustrate this recruitment.

Figure 19, illustrating Alabama's blue chip recruiting, shows that Alabama is content to recruit mainly within the state. Alabama can do this because its winning tradition insures that it will secure the majority of local talent. Alabama then branches out to neighboring states to try and secure the outstanding athletes to insure that the winning tradition of Alabama remains intact. Georgia and North Carolina's recruiting (Figures 30 and 32, respectively) indicate similar philosophies with regard to recruitment.

In his book <u>Buckeye</u>, Richard Vare alludes to the "committeemen" system of Ohio State recruiting, not only in Ohio but throughout the country. Under this type of plan, "committeemen"¹³ are assigned areas in which they are to scout, observe, and visit blue chip players and point these players out to Ohio State football staff as young men who can help the Buckeye tradition endure.¹⁴ An analysis of Figure 24 shows that Ohio State has successfully recruited blue chippers from as far west as Arizona, as far south as Florida, and as far north as Massachusetts.

On the other hand, Penn State, Ohio State's neighbor to the east, recruits within a very limited sphere of adjacent states. For years Paterno has had his pick of the top Pennsylvania talent because of the lack of another quality football program within the state. The emergence of Pitt in the mid-seventies has challenged his ability to recruit within the state to meet all of his needs, so he continues to look to talent in rich states such as New Jersey and New York, which have no established major football programs. As has been explained earlier in this chapter, the New Jersey blue chip athlete is limited to Rutgers, while the



Figure 19. University of Alabama Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--26 Signees

<u>η</u>8



•



. 85



Figure 21. University of Michigan Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--33 Signees



Figure 22. University of Nebraska Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--22 Signees



Figure 23. University of Southern California Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--50 Signees



Figure 24. Ohio State University Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--54 Signees



Figure 25. Penn State University Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--39 Signees



Figure 26. Notre Dame Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--76 Signees



Figure 27. University of Texas Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--34 Signees



Figure 28. University of Pittsburgh Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--17 Signees

 $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{G}}$





,

1 1



Figure 30. University of Georgia Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--28 Signees



Figure 31. UCLA Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--36 Signees







Figure 32. University of North Carolina Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--19 Signees



Figure 33. University of Tennessee Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--25 Signees


Figure 34. University of Florida Blue Chip Recruiting, 1972-1981--23 Signees

New York athlete faces only slightly better opportunities choosing between independent Syracuse and Ivy League Cornell. Paterno has always done well recruiting and signing athletes from New York and New Jersey. Penn State recruiting is analyzed in Figure 25.

The two arch-rival schools in California, U.S.C. (Figure 23) and U.C.L.A. (Figure 31), are located not only in the No. 1 blue chip producing county in the country but in the same city. This type of rivalry produces a recruiting battle with national implications. To insure a successful program, which in turn will provide financial support, the search for talent has no geographical limitations. Simply stated, both schools are fighting not only for football victories but for community support among the same community members. Thus a nationwide search for talent to aid the respective teams in their quest is underway.

U.S.C. has fared much better in the signing of California All-Americans than has cross-town rival U.C.L.A. (33-31), but nevertheless has still managed to recruit and sign All-Americans from Hawaii to New Jersey. In trying to keep pace, U.C.L.A.'s sphere of influence extends from California northeast to Massachusetts and southeast to Florida, even securing three of Texas' All-Americans. However, the importance of the winning tradition cannot be overemphasized in analyzing the recruiting of these rivals. Both play in the PAC-Ten Conference and thus their accomplishments are compared in light of final standings and a postseason encounter in Pasadena's prestigious Rose Bowl. This is an important consideration when both schools are competing for All-Americans from California who choose to remain in-state. Southern Cal ranks fifth in the composite Top Twenty while U.C.L.A. ranks fourth. U.S.C. has signed 50 All-Americans, during the course of the study, while U.C.L.A.

has signed 36. More interestingly, U.S.C. has signed 33 Californians or 66 percent of its All-Americans, while U.C.L.A. has signed 13 All-Americans from California or 33 percent of its All-Americans. The winning tradition of U.S.C. forces U.C.L.A. to have to rely on more outside talent and thus a much more difficult approach to recruiting.

Oklahoma and Texas recruiting practices are also interesting cases. Oklahoma is more dependent upon Texas than vice versa. Oklahoma has raided Texas for such notable talents as Jack Mildren, Joe Washington, and Billy Sims, while Texas has signed performers such as Rodney Tate from its northern neighbor. Both schools are the No. 1 program within their respective states and, as such, sign the majority of All-Americans. Both schools successfully recruit nearby bordering states. But Texas, because it is the No. 1 supplier of blue chip talent in the country (gross production--state basis), relies more on home-grown athletes. In fact, 24 of Texas' 34 All-Americans or 71 percent are native sons as compared to 16 of Oklahoma's 41 signees or 39 percent. Oklahoma's recruiting map indicates success in recruiting two of the top producing counties in the country: Dade County, Florida, and Los Angeles County, California.

A final map to be analyzed in terms of recruiting is that of Notre Dame, Figure 26. As has been illustrated, Notre Dame is the top recruiting program in the country in terms of signing All-Americans. Notre Dame's 76 signees come from 24 different states. Notre Dame has several advantages in terms of recruiting that must be considered. First is a strong winning tradition going back many years and interwoven with such legendary figures as Knute Rochne and the "Gipper." This tradition acts as an inducement for a blue chip athlete wanting to become a part of the mystique and tradition. Other athletes are induced to come and see how

they measure up compared to other athletes in a highly competitive environment (e.g., Rich Allocco, Chapter II). A second inducement is its religious heritage and affiliation with the Roman Catholic church. This gives Notre Dame an edge in recruiting some of the outstanding All-Americans produced by Catholic high schools such as Cincinnati Moeller, Detroit's Brother Rice, and Msgr. Farrell in New York. Finally, Notre Dame must be considered a national university. Notre Dame has alumni scattered across the country, and these alumni can be divided into two types: traditional alumni, comprised of graduates of the University; and "subway alumni," comprised of people who are interested in the fame and fortune of Notre Dame who did not attend the University. This national image is enhanced by the Notre Dame broadcasting system, which provided radio coverage of Notre Dame athletics across the country, and rebroadcasts or highlights on television following the actual game. The combination of these factors will continue to insure Notre Dame a recruiting advantage for years to come.

In examining the signings of the Top Twenty schools it should be emphasized that this is a Composite Top Twenty for a ten-year period, 1972-1981. Many other teams have placed in the Top Twenty during this period, but the Composite Top Twenty is based upon continued success over a period of time, thus ensuring a winning tradition and securing the support of the community on behalf of its football endeavors.

In Table VIII the author has re-ranked the Composite Top Twenty with regard to recruiting, that is, according to the number of All-Americans signed by each university (Table IX). What makes this chart even more interesting is the fact that these 20 schools are not the 20 schools that have signed the most All-Americans; those figures appear in Table X. Another

TABLE VIII

Rank School No. of Signees 1 Notre Dame 76 2 Ohio State 54 3 U.S.C. 50 4 Oklahoma 41 5 Penn State 39 6 U.C.L.A. 36 7 Texas 34 8 Michigan 33 . 28 9 Georgia 10 Alabama 26 11 Nebraska 22 12 North Carolina 19 13 Pitt 17 14 Florida State 16 15 Arkansas 16 16 Houston 14 17 Auburn 14 18 Arizona State 13 19 Maryland 11 20 Clemson 10

TOP TWENTY COLLEGIATE RECRUITERS BASED UPON TOP TWENTY RANKINGS (1972-1981) AND THE NUMBER OF ALL-AMERICANS SUCCESSFULLY SIGNED

TABLE IX

SIGNINGS OF HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN FOOTBALL PLAYERS BY COMPOSITE TOP TWENTY SCHOOLS (1972-1981)

Rank	School	No. of Signees
1	Alabama	26
2	0klahoma	41
3	Michigan	33
4	Nebraska	22
5	U.S.C.	50
6	Ohio State	54
7	Penn State	39
8	Notre Dame	76
9	Texas	34-
10	Pitt	17
11	Arkansas	16
12	Houston	14
13	Georgia	28
14	U.C.L.A.	36
15	Arizona State	13
16 ·	Florida State	. 16
17	North Carolina	19
18	Clemson	10
19	Maryland	11
20	Auburn	14

Total signees: 559 or 56% of all recruits.

TABLE X

SIGNINGS OF BLUE CHIP ATHLETES BY SCHOOLS WHICH HAVE APPEARED IN THE AP-UPI TOP TWENTY (1972-1981)*

-

		No. of			No. of
Rank	School	Signees	Rank	School	Signees
1	Notre Dame	76	29	lowa	11
2	Ohio State	54	30	Maryland	11
3		50	31	Clemson	10
4	Oklahoma	41	32	Missouri	10
5	Penn State	39	33	North Carolina State	9
6	U.C.L.A.	36	34	Kentucky	9
7	Texas	34	35	California	8
8	Michigan	33	36	Texas Tech	8
9	Georgia	28	37	Arizona	7
10	Alabama	26	38	Baylor ·	7
1,1	Tennessee	25	39	Oklahoma State	7
12	Florida	23	40	Washington	7
13	Nebraska	22	41	Mississippi State	6
14	L.S.U.	20	42	West Virginia	6
15	North Carolina	19	43	lowa State	5
16	Colorado	18	44	Miami (Florida)	5
17	Pitt	17	45	Southern Mississippi	· 5
18	Kansas	17	46	Washington State	4
19	Florida State	16	47	Brigham Young	3
20	Arkansas	16	48	South Carolina	3
21	Stanford	16	49	Miami (Ohio)	2
22	Purdue	15	50	San Diego State	2
23	Texas A&M	15	51	Tulane	2
24	Houston	14	52	Utah State	2
25	Auburn	14 .	53	Georgia Tech	1
26	Arizona State	13	54	North Texas State	1
27	Michigan State	12	55	Rutgers	1
28	S.M.U.	12		Total Signees, 873	

*These schools have appeared in the AP-UPI Top Twenty at least once.

.

interesting aspect of Table X is that the 55 teams comprising the table have signed 873 of all blue chip athletes or 74 percent of the entire population. This is indicative of the role of winning tradition and its relationship to recruiting.

Obviously a winning tradition is important; but it is also obvious that there must be other considerations involved in the recruitment and selection of universities and football programs by highly recruited All-American athletes. Do athletes such as these All-Americans desire to remain at home or relatively close-by (as is evidenced by examination of the Southern Region)? Do the mountains of Colorado or the beaches of California serve as an attraction for some athletes? What is the role of academics in presenting a case for an athlete to attend a certain school?

It was the purpose of the author to attempt to identify specific factors that are considered by a blue chip athlete when making his final choice of which college to attend. The author was also interested in which schools the athlete chose to visit, and if there were certain visitation patterns relating to the area of the country the athlete was from and the schools he chose to visit.

In order to answer the questions identified in the preceding paragraph, the author developed a questionnaire to be mailed to the 64 members of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-American team (see Appendix A). It was hoped that these athletes who at the time the survey was mailed (February) were involved in their visitations, and recruiting and selection processes, and would be able to answer on the basis of first-hand experience. The questionnaire was mailed to the 64 members of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-American Team, of which 62 enrolled in college in the fall of 1982,

on a grant-in-aid (football scholarship). The remaining two players did not accept football scholarships. One accepted a basketball scholarship and one signed a professional baseball contract.

The data discussed in the remainder of this chapter are based upon information gathered from the 42 respondents of the 62 players who received the questionnaire. These 42 respondents represent a 67.7 percent return rate of the questionnaire (see Table XI).

The first characteristics to be discussed here deal with the athlete himself and the type of football background of which he is a product (are there factors common to production of All-Americans?). The second area deals with the visitations and ultimate signings of the All-Americans (do certain visitation patterns emerge?). Finally, the third section attempts to analyze why the All-American chose the particular school or football program.

In the questionnaire (Appendix A), the following question was asked: At what age did you begin playing organized football? The question was answered by 40 of the 42 respondents as follows (see Table XII). The average age of the All-American when he began playing football was 10 years of age, modal age of 8. One of the respondents mentioned that he started playing at age 6, "because my father pulled some strings to get me on the team." However, there does not seem to be any advantages gained from beginning a football program at age 6, 7, or any other specific age. Age seems to be a consideration more relevant to the individual than to a group.

In response to question No. 5, "What type of organization sponsored this youth football?" all 42 respondents replied to this question. The .results indicate most athletes participate in one the three following

TABLE XI

COLLEGE VISITATIONS MADE BY THE 42 RESPONDENTS 1981 PARADE HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICAN FOOTBALL TEAM (3 OR MORE VISITS)

School	No. of Visits
Notre Dame*	12
Ohio State*	10
Michigan*	9
U.C.L.A.*	9
U.S.C.	8
Penn State*	8
Alabama*	7
Georgia*	7
Tennessee	7
Pitt*	6
Arizona State*	6
Miami (Florida)	. 6
Stanford	6
North Carolina*	6
Purdue	5
Texas*	4
0klahoma*	4
Washington	4
Nebraska*	4
Florida	3
Tulane	3.
Michigan State	3
lowa	3
North Carolina State	3
Wake Forest	3
Arizona	3
Auburn*	3
Virginia Tech	3
Kentucky	3
Arkansas*	3
Syracuse	3

*Denotes Top Twenty member.

TABLE XII

Age	Number of Respondents
6	2 or 05%
7	4 or 10%
8	7 or 175%
9	2 or 05%
10	5 or 125%
11	4 or 10%
12	3 or 075%
13	7 or 175%
14	5 or 125%
15	1 or 025%

AGE OF RESPONDENTS' FIRST ORGANIZED FOOTBALL EXPERIENCE

TABLE XIII

ORGANIZATIONS SPONSORING FOOTBALL PROGRAMS PARTICIPATED IN BY RESPONDENTS

Type of Program	No. of Replies	Percent- age
Junior High School	10	238
Park & Recreation Dept.	9	214
Elementary School	8	19
Other (Unspecified)	3	071
Pop Warner League	2	047
Junior All-American		
(California	2	047
High School	2	047
Boy's Club	2	047
Salvation Army	1	023
Jaycees	1	023
Dad's Club	1	023
Optimist's Club	1	023

types of programs as their first football experience: junior high school, elementary school, park-recreation departments (see Table XIII, page 109).

The following question, "What is the number of years as a varsity football player?" was asked to determine whether blue chip athletes were members of the varsity for more than two years. Many high schools have three teams: freshman teams, J.V. or reserve teams, and varsity teams (see Moeller, Chapter II). The results were conclusive, showing that 37 of the 42 respondents, or 88 percent, were members of the varsity team for at least three years, thus having had at least three years in the top program of the school or most emphasized program (Table XIV). Results were based on 42 respondents.

TABLE XIV

No. of	No. of	Percent-
Years	Respondents	age
2	5	0.12
3	29	0.69
4	8	0.19

NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENT WAS VARSITY FOOTBALL PLAYER

The following question, "What other sports were played in high school?" was asked to determine specialization. It was the author's feeling that because of the talent and ability of a football high school All-American, he would naturally possess other athletic ability and

would participate in other varsity sports. The survey results supported this theory with 95 percent of the 42 respondents answering in the affirmtive that they participated in other varsity sports. Only two respondents or 5 percent of the respondents replied that they did not participate in other varsity sports.

The results of question No. 7 (Appendix A), "What other sports were played in high school?" are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV

OTHER SPORTS THE RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATED IN

Sport	No. of Participants
Track	26
Basketball	25
Baseball	9
Wrestling	4
Volleyball	2
Soccer	1
Tennis	1

Since 26 of the 42 respondents or 62 percent of the respondents replied that they participated in track, the author would seem to find support for the traditional coaching approach that track is an acceptable off-season conditioning for football.

The results of question No. 8, "Did your football coach also coach any other sports in which you participated?" are: yes, 13 respondents (33%); no, 26 respondents (66%). The author's assumption was that a high percentage of athletes would participate in other sports for the reason of maintaining identification with the football coach during the off-season. However, the results of the survey did not support the author's assumption. In fact, two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they participated in other varsity sports that were not coached by the football coach. The results are based upon 39 respondents. (Yes indicates the football coach also coached other sports.)

The results of question No. 10, "Did the student participate in intramural sports?" are: yes, 19 respondents (45%); no, 23 respondents (55%). This question, like No. 7, deals with the question of specialization. However, unlike the varsity sports examined in questions No. 7 and No. 8, intramurals are looked upon by coaches as "unsanctioned" because of the lack of "professional" coaching and supervision. It might also be thought that because of these conditions the probability of accident or injury would be greater than a supervised varsity sport. Results tended to support the author's view. (Yes indicates that the athlete participated in intramurals; no indicates that he did not participate; results are based on 42 respondents.) (Note: 8 of the 19, or 42 percent, who responded affirmatively served as class officers.)

The results of question No. 12, "What is the approximate enrollment of your high school?" are presented in Table XVI. The purpose of this question was to gain information relating to the size of the high school, thus the calibre of football program. The results are inconclusive because several Catholic all-male schools are included with enrollments of 1,000 or less, but are not necessarily indicative of calibre of football program, conference, or division ranking, e.g., Moeller (see Chapter II). Results are based on 40 responses.

TABLE XVI

APPROXIMATE ENROLLMENT OF THE RESPONDENTS' HIGH SCHOOLS

Less than 500 students 501 to 1000 students 1001 to 1500 students 1501 to 2000 students 2001 to 2500 students 2501 to 3000 students 3001 to 3500 students 3501 to 4000 students	0 10 12 6 7 3 0 2	or or or or or or or	0% 25% 30% 15% 17.5% 7.5% 0% 5%
3501 to 4000 students	2	or	5%
More than 4000 students	0	or	0%

The assumption can be made that 55 percent of the respondents came from schools with enrollments of 1,500 or less, but no assumption can be made regarding the calibre of football programs with regard to enrollment.

The results of question No. 13, "Does your high school sports program have a booster club?" are: yes, 35 respondents (83%); no, 7 respondents (17%). The purpose of this question was to determine if these programs enjoy community support, an element identified by the author as essential in the production of blue chip football players. The questionnaire demonstrated a high degree of support for this assumption. Yes indicates the existence of a booster club; no indicates that a booster club does not exist. Results are based on 42 respondents. Questions No. 14 and No. 15 dealt with visitations made by All-Americans and their ultimate college selection.

Figure 35 shows the origins of the 64 players named to the 1981 Parade High School All-American Football Team. Texas, California, and



Figure 35. Points of Origin: 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-Americans (Includes All 64 Players Named to the Team)

114

Ohio are the top producers of this particular class with 7, 7, and 6, respectively. Figure 36 denotes the visitations of the 42 respondents in their college selection process, and Figure 36 denotes the Top Twenty colleges and the number of All-Americans signed by each member of the composite Top Twenty, 1972-1981.

An examination of Figure 36 shows that 195 total visits were made by the 42 respondents or an average of 4.6 visits per respondents. An analysis of schools visited and the number of visits per school is illustrated in Table XI. This table reveals that of the 160 visits depicted, 106 visits or 66 percent were to schools which finished in the Composite Top Twenty as presented in Table V. In fact, of the total 195 visits of the 42 respondents, 112 visits or 57 percent were made to Top Twenty schools.

Figure 37 presents the actual signings of the 1981 <u>Parade</u> All-Americans (based upon 62 actual signees); 40 or 65 percent of the 62 <u>Parade</u> All-Americans attending college on football scholarships chose Top Twenty schools. It should also be pointed out that some university programs which enjoyed Top Twenty seasons last year also were successful in signing recruits. Such schools include West Virginia with two signees.

Further analysis of signings can be made by examining these signings on a regional basis. For the purpose of this study, the respondents will be divided into four regions. The Southern Region will be concerned with those athletes whose point of origin includes Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The second region to be considered will be the Western Region which includes California, Washington, Oregon, and Washington. The third region will be considered as the Southwest-Midwest Region which includes



•







•

:

.

Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Nebraska. The fourth and final region will be referred to as the Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Region which includes Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, West Virginia, and Washington, D.C. (see Table XVII). In comparing the data from the four regions, the similarities are striking. The average number of visits in the Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Region is 4.7, only slightly higher than the 4.5 average number of visits in the other three areas. A consideration of outside visitation patterns in the Southern Region, whose state and regional pride have been alluded to earlier in this chapter, has an average number of outside visits per respondent of 1.2. But this figure is only the second lowest; the lowest figure is 0.83 of the Western Region (the six respondents took the majority of their visits to PAC 10 schools and other schools in the California system, e.g., San Diego State) (see Figure 35).

The most interesting regional characteristic seems to be the weather or climate consideration that Joe Namath spoke of earlier in this chapter. The schools in the Southern and Western Regions enjoy the sunshine and coastal climates, while those respondents from the Midwest portion of the Southwest-Midwest Region and the entire Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Region endure the cold and snow of long winters. The average number of outside visits in the former two regions are 1.2 and 0.83, respectively, while the average number of visits in the latter two regions to areas outside the region are 1.7 and 1.9, respectively. The majority of these outside visits are to schools in Florida and California. It should also be pointed out that only 3 of the combined 23 respondents from the Southwest-Midwest and Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Regions migrate from that area (all from the Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Region).

TABLE XVII

· ·

ANALYSIS OF SIGNINGS ON A REGIONAL BASIS

Southern Region, 13 Respondents, Total Visits =	58
Average number of visits per respondent Total number of visits outside of region Average number of outside visits per respondent Players remaining within region Players migrating from region Total number of visits to Top Twenty schools Average number of Top Twenty visits per respon- dent	4.5 18 or 26% 1.2 11 or 85% 2 or 15% 30 or 52% of all visits 2.3
lop lwenty signees	or 73%
Western Region, 6 Respondents, Total Visits = 27	
Average number of visits per respondent Total number of visits outside of region Average number of outside visits per respondent Players remaining within region Players migrating from region Total number of visits to Top Twenty schools Average number of Top Twenty visits per respon- dent Top Twenty signees	 4.5 5 or 19% 0.83 4 or 67% 2 or 33% 14 or 52% 2.3 4 of 6 respondents or 67%
Southwest-Midwest Region, 6 Respondents, Total V	isits = 27
Average number of visits per respondent Total number of visits outside of region Average number of outside visits per respondent Players remaining within region Players migrating from region Total number of visits to Top Twenty schools Average number of Top Twenty visits per respon- dent Top Twenty signees	4.5 10 or 37% 1.7 6 or 100% 0 or 0% 18 or 67% 3.0 4 of 6 or 67%
Middle Atlantic-Great Lakes Region, 17 Responden	ts, Total Visits = 80
Average number of visits per respondent Total number of visits outside of region Average number of outside visits per respondent Players remaining within region Players migrating from region Total number of visits to Top Twenty schools Average number of Top Twenty visits per respon-	4.7 32 or 40% 1.9 14 or 82% 3 or 18% 49 or 61%
dent Top Twenty signees	2.9 11 of 17 or 65%

.

But is this then a valid consideration in the recruitment process? Or is it only a consideration when taking a "free visit"? To find the answer to this question, the author utilized page 2 of the instrument (Appendix A) to ask the athletes what factors had the most impact on the decision-making process of the blue chip athlete. The author asked each of the 42 respondents to rank the following 13 criteria in order of importance to their final decision: geography, academics, winning tradition, opportunity to play immediately, friends or relatives, alumni, close to home, coach, campus, faculty, integrity, athletic facilities, athletic living accommodations.

These factors were assigned point values from 1 to 13, with 1 being the highest or most influential factor in the decision-making process and 13 being the lowest or least influential factor in the decisionmaking process. Thirty-seven responses for an item were the most recorded, as some respondents did not feel that all of the above 13 criteria were important or entered into the decision-making process at all. The results of the study, in numerical order of importance to the decisionmaking process of a blue chip athlete, are presented in Table XVIII.

It was the author's assumption at the beginning of the study that tradition, namely a winning tradition, would emerge as the key factor in the migration of high school athletes. It is obvious throughout this study that a winning tradition ranks very high in the consideration of blue chip athletes, but when given an opportunity to state this factor in print, athletes tended to rank it second, third, or fourth.

The overwhelming choice was the importance of academics. This fact is manifested in a number of ways. The first of these is by their choice of school. Besides being schools ranked in the Top Twenty, the schools

chosen by the blue chip athletes such as Michigan, Notre Dame, and U.S.C. are also well thought of in terms of academics.

TABLE XVIII

RANKING OF FACTORS CONSIDERED IMPORTANT IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF BLUE CHIP ATHLETES

Rank	Factor	Numerical Value
1	Academic	2.6
· 2	Integrity	4.2
3	Coach	4.4
4	Winning tradition	4.4
5	Close to home	6.8
6	Athletic facilities	6.9
7	Opportunity to play immediately	7.0
8	Faculty	7.5
9	Campus	7.9
10	Friends or relatives	8.8
11	Athletic living accommodations	9.0
12	Geographical	9.2
13	Alumni	9.5

A second consideration is the declared majors by blue chip athletes. Question 16 of the instrument asked respondents to specify the subject in which they intended to major. The results are presented in Table XIX.

The third factor is related directly to factors one and two, and is mentioned directly in the instrument, namely location of a professional school in law, medicine, etc. While this factor is not directly supported by the results of the instrument, it is dealt with in supportive journalism regarding the recruiting season. For example, Pittsburgh sports writer, Phil Musick, in writing about the recruiting battle waged for <u>Parade</u> All-American Bob Schilken between Pitt and Penn State, says: "Schilken's primary interest is the pursuit of a medical career. Edge: Pitt, which traditionally has used its fine medical school as an honest recruiting inducement."¹⁴ Another athlete bound for Pitt--although not an All-American--Pat Schipani, echoes Schilken's sentiments: "I always wanted to play for the University of Pittsburgh. I've gotten to know the coaching staff well and they're outstanding people. Plus, I want to go to medical school."¹⁵ The combination of a Top Twenty football team and professional or career opportunities after football seem to present a very attractive opportunity.

TABLE XIX

INTENDED MAJORS OF RESPONDENTS

	<pre>l. Business (Marketing, finance, etc.)</pre>	30 or 71%
	2. Undecided	5 or 12%
	3. (Pre-Medicine	l or 2%
	Pre-Veterinary	1 or 2%
	Journalism	l or 2%
Tie	\prec Sports Medicine	l or 2%
	Physical Therapy	l or 2%
	Hotel and Motel Management	l or 2%
	Graphic Arts	l or 2%

The importance of academics was also stressed by Oklahoma Universitybound, Spencer Tillman, of Tulsa Edison High School. Tillman, a <u>Parade</u> All-American, was highly recruited and had narrowed his choices to three schools: Top Twenty and Big Eight Conference rivals, Oklahoma and Nebraska, and Southwest Conference contender S.M.U. According to Tillman, "In the end, the difference was academics, O.U. (Oklahoma) has petroleum land management, which is my major, while the other two schools had similar fields but not under that title."¹⁶

While academics was the number one factor in the decision-making process of blue chip athletes, it was not the only factor cited by All-Americans when asked what factors influenced their final selections. Pitt-bound <u>Parade</u> All-American Rich Bowen cited several factors in his final selection of Pitt: "I liked Pitt the best out of all the schools. It's close to home, it has a winning program, and I get to play under Danny Marino (current Pitt All-American QB) for one year."¹⁷

An interesting case to consider is that of Matt Stennett, a highly recruited <u>Parade</u> All-American from the Pittsburgh area. Stennett's final two choices were Pitt and Oklahoma. Stennett eventually chose Pitt, and his reason as quoted by <u>Pittsburgh Press</u> writer John Clayton was that Stennett 'Wanted the people I grew up with to see me play for the next four years."¹⁸ However, <u>Tulsa Daily World</u> writer Margaret French stated in her column that ''Stennett's father is a Lutheran minister, and he had to respect his parents' wishes when they asked him to play there."¹⁹

Summary

There appears to be a regional consideration in both the production and migrations of High School All-Americans. Athletes from the Southern Region, for example, tend to remain within that region when making a choice relating to college. The pride in place concept appears to be deeply root in the Southern Region and also in Texas. Recruiting patterns of major colleges, except for a few such as Notre Dame, U.C.L.A., U.S.C., and Ohio State, are primarily concerned with recruiting a region or group of states usually bordering the program. An example would be the Penn State recruiting map, Figure 25, which depicts Penn State as being concerned with Pennsylvania and its border states, Ohio, West Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York. These recruiting regions are especially prevalent in the Southern Region.

Finally, while the winning tradition is an important factor in production and migration of blue chip athletes, academics and academicallyrelated areas such as professional schools and majors have been identified as the most important consideration by 1981 <u>Parade</u> High School All-Americans.²⁰

ENDNOTES

¹John F. Rooney, Jr., <u>A Geography of American Sport</u> (Reading, Mass., 1974), pp. 132-133.

²Ibid.

³Joel Garreau, <u>The Nine Nations of North America</u> (New York, 1981), p. 131.

⁴Rooney, p. 138.

⁵Ibid., p. 112.

⁶Ibid., p. 123.

⁷John F. Rooney, Jr., <u>The Recruiting Game</u> (Lincoln, Neb., 1980), pp. 73-74.

⁸Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 21, 1982, p. 4D.

9_{Ibid}.

¹⁰Dan Jenkins, Saturday's America (Boston, Mass., 1970), pp. 164-165.

¹¹USA Today, October 15, 1982, p. 2C.

¹²Garreau also includes three cities--Chicago, Wheeling, and Milwaukee--in his foundry. Since only these cities and not the states of Illinois, West Virginia, and Wisconsin are included, the author has chosen not to include these cities in the analysis.

¹³Richard Vare, Buckeye (New York, 1974), p. 80.

¹⁴Phil Musick, "Touted Recruit Committed to Being Noncommital," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, February 9, 1982, pp. 19-21.

¹⁵"Gateway's Buczkowski Follows Old Line Foe Frolic to Pitt," <u>Pitts</u>burgh Post-Gazette, February 8, 1982, p. 28. ¹⁶Steve Schoenfeld, "It Was Fun, But Tillman is Glad It Is All Over Now," <u>The Tulsa Tribune</u>, February 10, 1982, p. 1E.

¹⁷"Panther's Land Serra QB Bowen," <u>Pittsburgh Press</u>, February 12, 1982, p. 22.

¹⁸John Clayton, "Stennett, Schilken Make Pitt's Year," <u>Pittsburgh</u> <u>Press</u>, February 11, 1982, p. 16.

¹⁹Margaret French, "Homebodies," <u>Tulsa Daily World</u>, February 12, 1982, p. 23.

²⁰It should be pointed out that the answer, academics, could be viewed as an attractive answer for the respondents. It might be the answer respondents feel people most like to hear or an answer giving validity to their decisions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

There are three assumptions made by the author at the outset of this study that must be addressed in this chapter. The first assumption, or hypothesis, states that the element of tradition will emerge as the key factor in the migration of high school football All-Americans in their college selection or recruiting process. The second assumption, or hypothesis, deals with the relationship between the number of All-Americans recruited and the success or Top Twenty placement of the college or university attended by these athletes. The third and final assumption, or hypothesis, maintains that states with a major football program within the state will have a higher retention rate of All-Americans than states which do not have such a program. Each of these assumptions will be examined individually, and a determination of their validity or credibility will also be made.

The author will also present his recommendations for further research dealing with aspects or points of interest that arose during the course of this study but that merit further investigation.

Hypothesis I

A re-examination of the data analyzed in Chapter IV shows that a winning tradition seems to be instrumental in the recruiting process of

High School All-Americans, but that it is only one consideration. ١n other words, that blue chip athletes are going to be heavily recruited by the major college powers (Top Twenty Teams), or teams with a history or trend in producing winning teams. The importance of a winning tradition, therefore, might more appropriately be considered as a factor when limiting or reducing the number of potential schools for initial consideration. A winning tradition might be considered a given or an assumption of an obvious consideration in the case of some athletes. For example, a native Pennsylvanian might narrow his choices to Pitt, Penn State, Notre Dame, and Ohio State. All four of these schools are members of not only the author's "Composite Top Twenty" but also rank in the Top Ten of that list. After initial selection, a winning tradition has ceased to be a factor because it is a quality possessed by all four schools equally; therefore, the final decision would be made based upon some other consideration. However, if this same athlete had narrowed his choices to Penn State and Temple, a winning tradition might still be the final consideration.

A re-examination of Tables IV through VII has merit at this point. These tables analyze the author's Composite Top Twenty and the number of High School All-Americans signed by each of the 20 schools. These 20 schools, or 7 percent of the 270 possible university football teams,¹ signed 569 of the 1,003 identified players, or 56 percent. This finding would further substantiate Crase's study, also based upon AP and UP1 polls, which demonstrates that "Post World War II collegiate football has been dominated by about 25 schools, or the rich are getting richer."² In his book <u>The Recruiting Game</u>, Rooney updated Crase's study and showed that for most part the same teams, "Notre Dame, Oklahoma, Alabama, Texas,

Michigan, and Ohio State, maintain clear superiority and that former powers, Wisconsin, Rice, TCU, and Syracuse, have slipped, giving way to Houston, Arizona State, and Pittsburgh.¹¹³

But if a winning tradition is perceived by many athletes as a given, and indeed it must be if 55 percent of the blue chip athletes are signed by 7 percent of all playing opportunities represented by the Top Twenty Teams, then what other considerations are involved in recruiting?

In <u>The Recruiting Game</u>, Rooney lists the ten variables he believes affect collegiate athletic recruiting. These ten factors are:

- 1. Supply of athletic talent.
- 2. Demand for the talent.
- 3. Social and geographical biases of both recruiters and athletes.
- 4. Location and attitudes of alumni.
- 5. The athletic tradition associated with the universities in the marketplace.
- 6. Athletic facilities.
- 7. Coach's reputation.
- 8. Reputation of former players.
- 9. Chance.
- 10. University-associated amenities.4

While the author is in agreement with the ten factors mentioned by Rooney, one factor not addressed by him but surfacing in the author's research, academics, must be acknowledged.

Academics, as has been mentioned in Chapter IV, emerged as the primary consideration based upon the questionnaires returned by 42 of the 62 possible respondents. The broad concept of academics was defined in the instrument as: reputation for fine program in area of major. Also, location of a professional school in law or medicine if these are in the student's plan (see Appendix A). This concept is dealt with in greater detail in Chapter IV, but to re-emphasize it here, when ranking the importance of academics on a scale of 1 to 13 (1 being most important) the factor of academics ranked first with a rating of 2.6, with the next closest consideration, integrity, ranking second with a 4.2 rating. Clearly, the academic factor is given a great degree of consideration by a highly sought after blue chip athlete.

The related factors, integrity and the coach, are interrelated. According to the instrument, integrity is defined as the honesty of the coach and reputation for honesty of the institution. "Coach" is defined by the instrument as (the recruit was) "influenced by coach's reputation or personality." These considerations ranked 2 and 3, respectively, rated by respondents at 42 and 44, respectively, with the winning tradition (which we have discussed as a given) tied for third at 44. Rooney believes that these considerations are interrelated, and the author is inclined to agree with him. According to Rooney:

Tradition is frequently associated with a famous coach. When names like Bear, Woody or Bo (Bryant, Hayes and Schembechler) are mentioned, most people don't need any other identification. But how many athletes know Earle Bruce, Steve Sloan, Charley Pell, or William Mallory, each of whom coached top notch teams in 1977 and 1978? The celebrity value associated with a big name coach cannot be ignored.⁵

The relationship between coaches and integrity is similar. For example, Joe Paterno of Penn State is the coach most commonly thought of when the term "integrity" is used.

The remaining factors are also worthy of some consideration, most notably the proximity of the school to the athlete's point of origin, ranked fifth and rated at 6.8. Although there was a rating drop of almost 2.5 points between factors four and five, the close-to-home factor was the source of several comments by the respondents. One of the respondents, a Texan, replied that his choice was based solely upon the consideration of how close he was to home (a similar example is discussed in Chapter IV). The remainder of the factors attracted few comments and few high rankings.

Based upon the results of the author's research and a review of <u>The</u> <u>Recruiting Game</u>, the author would offer the following observation: that while a winning tradition is an important element in the college decision-making process of a blue chip athlete, it is not the key element or most important. In most cases the blue chip athlete will have limited his choices to one or more Composite Top Twenty teams and thus the winning tradition element will be considered as equal. It is at this point in the decision-making process that individual considerations will determine the athlete's final choice. These individual considerations can range from academic considerations or post-graduate opportunities to the influence of a coach's personality or to geographical considerations. There seems to be no pattern for these individual considerations. Finally, the winning tradition element will usually be utilized by the athlete for a screening process to establish a shorter list of schools for further consideration.

Hypothesis II

This hypothesis deals with the relationship between the successful recruitment of blue chip athletes and Top Twenty placement. The fact that the Composite Top Twenty Teams which comprise 7 percent of the 270 college football teams have signed 55 percent of the identified players in the study indicates a strong relationship between recruitment of quality athletes and success or Top Twenty placement. Obviously, a continuing supply of quality athletes enhances the chances of a successful team, and hence a continued winning tradition. With two exceptions, the

same teams that comprise the Top Ten Teams of the composite Top Twenty are the same teams that have signed the most blue chip athletes, although not in the same order. The two schools that break the Top Ten in recruiting are Composite Top Twenty members. Georgia and UCLA rank 13th and 14th, respectively, in the Top Twenty based on win/loss AP/UPI final results.

While the theory that the rich get richer is generally true, there are exceptions. The school that ranks tenth in the Composite Top Twenty for 1972-1981 does not appear in that elite group prior to 1975. In fact, Pitt, a perennial powerhouse in the early days of collegiate football, had not had a successful season in the ten years prior to this return to glory. How does a team re-establish itself, especially to the degree that Pitt has been able to do? In the opinion of this author, Pitt's return to power is a result of what the author will call "the magnet theory." By "magnet theory," the author refers to a catalyst or occurrence that serves as an attraction or inducement. In the case of Pitt, the "magnet theory" begins with two initial components. The first of these components was in the hiring by Pitt of Johnny Majors to become head football coach in 1972. The second component of the "magnet theory" was the successful recruiting by Johnny Majors of a high school All-American from Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, named Tony Dorsett. Johnny Majors came to Pitt as a man who promised to turn things around--to make Pitt a winner. In fact, during his first season at Pitt, Majors was moved to say, "We have the kind of schedule where if we recruit well enough and coach well enough, we can have a national championship at Pitt."⁶

The recruiting of Dorsett during Majors' first year, and prior to the start of his first season, was probably the most important event of

Majors' four-year tenure at Pitt, and ultimately in Pitt's return to the Top Twenty in the last ten years. During the tenure of Majors and Dorsett (1972 to 1976; Dorsett graduated and Majors accepted the head coaching position at Tennessee), Pitt's record was 33 wins, 13 losses, and 1 tie. The record during the 1972 season, the season prior to the arrival of Majors and Dorsett, was 1 win and 10 losses. In fact, under Pitt's three previous coaches, the record was 32 wins and 112 losses. The Majors-Dorsett era at Pitt produced among other honors a national championship, a Heisman trophy, several bowl victories, and a successful return to the elite of college football. When asked to assess the importance of Dorsett, Majors replied, "He made a Pitt a winner, when really we didn't have the personnel to win."⁷

Obviously, this return to the winning tradition helped Pitt attract athletes, and quality athletes at that. Majors initially served as a "magnet" or an attraction to the new emphasis on successful athletics at Pitt. Dorsett came to Pitt because he felt he would have a chance to play immediately in the new situation at Pitt. Dorsett then, in turn, served as a "magnet" by attracting other blue chip athletes to Pitt. When asked if having Dorsett helped recruiting, Majors replied: "Yeah, he made it a little easier to recruit. High school kids like to play with a winner, and Tony showed them Pitt could win. That made it easier for some of the kids to decide to come to Pitt."

The "magnet theory" also has some other features; besides having a quality coach attract quality players and quality players attracting other quality players and thus becoming a winner, there are some benefits to be derived from winning or success. These benefits are in the form of community support, booster clubs, and ultimately dollars to help the

athletic program continue to maintain is lofty Top Twenty or Top Ten position, and thus be able to continue to attract quality athletes. The effect of the Majors-Dorsett duo on this process was astounding. According to Pitt's Athletic Director, Cas Myslinski, prior to the arrival of Majors and Dorsett in 1972, "There were 15 Golden Panthers (Pitt Booster Club) and now we're up in the thousands."⁹ O'Brien also points out that "(Pitt) alumni contributions had quadrupled since 1972 to 1976."¹⁰ Thus the "magnet theory" provides us with the three characteristics found to be the most important, not only in the production of blue chip athletes but also in the successful recruitment thereof, namely, a winning tradition, specialization, and community support. In the case of Pitt, these three elements have added up to a secure place in the Top Twenty and a continued blueprint for success in the recruitment of blue chip athletes or High School All-Americans.

Hypothesis III

This final hypothesis theorizes that states with a major football program (Division I) within the state will have a higher retention rate of blue chip athletes than states which do not have such a program. A re-examination of Figures 5 and 19 will aid in the evaluation of this hypothesis. An examination of Figure 5 indicates eight states (Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia, Illinois, Idaho, and South Dakota) have migration rates in excess of 75 percent. A state-bystate analysis of these eight states in terms of major college football programs will aid in the evaluation of the hypothesis.

The most notable major college in Connecticut is Yale, a member of the Ivy League; as such, there is little or no emphasis on recruiting.
The other program in Connecticut, the University of Connecticut, is a member of the Yankee Conference, in which there is little or no major college competition. Thus the two schools in Connecticut offer few attractions to merit consideration by blue chip athletes. Delaware is very similar to Connecticut and is also unable to provide attractions to retain its blue chip athletes. New Jersey offers two opportunities, Rutgers and Princeton. The status of Princeton is identical to Yale, but Rutgers is a different situation. Rutgers has attempted to upgrade its football program by scheduling teams such as Alabama, Pitt, and Penn State. Unfortunately for Rutgers, the athletic fortunes of the football program have been so low for so long that New Jersey has become a recruiter's heaven, and as such is presently unable to prevent the exodus of blue chip talent from the state. New York offers two playing opportunities and is similar in many regards to New Jersey. The opportunities in New York are Cornell and Syracuse. Cornell is an Ivy League school and is in the same situation as Yale and Princeton. Syracuse, on the other hand, is an institution with a rich football tradition including national championships. Syracuse, although it has been unsuccessful in recent years, would seem to have the potential to attract and retain some of the state's blue chip athletes, but not a sufficient number to significantly reduce the migration/retention ratio. A similar situation can be found at the University of Maryland. Although there are two major college opportunities in Maryland, only the University of Maryland merits serious consideration. The other opportunity is the Naval Academy, which is at a severe disadvantage in terms of recruiting because of its highly selective admission standards and subsequent career commitments. The University of Maryland is a member of the Top Twenty that has fallen upon

hard times since the early seventies. Maryland, like Syracuse, seems to have the potential to retain a larger percentage of the state's blue chip athletes if the football programs can again become successful.

136

Virginia and Illinois present interesting cases in that both states offer two or more major college football opportunities. Virginia offers three major college opportunities: William and Mary, Virginia Tech, and the University of Virginia. Virginia Tech experienced brief success in the early seventies but little since then. William and Mary and the University of Virginia have long been at the bottom of the college football standings and will probably continue to do so. The state offers additional playing opportunities at VMI and Old Dominion, but still managed to retain only 8 percent of its 25 All-Americans. Virginia will in all probability continue to lose its players to Atlantic Coast Conference rivals such as North Carolina and North Carolina State. In contrast, Illinois offers two major college opportunities: Northwestern and the University of Illinois. In recent years, Northwestern has been one of the worst football teams in the country. Illinois has fallen on hard times since the mid-sixties, but in the last two years has shown signs of recovery. Since Illinois is such a productive state, the recent success of Illinois could lead to a higher retention rate for blue chip athletes.

South Dakota and Idaho, however, seem destined to endure high migration rates far into the future. Both are low in the production of blue chip athletes and neither state offers a major football program to retain those athletes the states do produce.

The next step in this analysis should be to consider the six states with the highest retention rate with regard to the number and quality of

ſ?

major college football programs within those states. The states to be examined are Alabama, Texas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Indiana, and Mississippi.

Alabama is the only state to retain all of the blue chip athletes it produces. The two major college playing opportunities are Alabama and Auburn, both ranked in the Composite Top Twenty. Both schools enjoy winning traditions and successfully attract other quality players from other areas of the South. North Carolina offers four major college playing opportunities: North Carolina, North Carolina State, Wake Forest, and Duke. The number of playing opportunities not only serves as a great retention factor, but also adds an interesting component to the recruiting struggle, namely, all four schools belong to the Atlantic Coast Conference. Indiana offers three major college playing opportunities: Notre Dame, Indiana, and Purdue. The recruiting struggle in Indiana for the blue chip athlete is essentially between Notre Dame and Purdue, because of Indiana's lack of success in recent years. Texas presents an interesting case for player retention. Not only is Texas one of the top blue chip producing states, but also offers the most major college playing opportunities. Texas offers eight playing opportunities in the Southwest Conference alone. Two of these Southwest Conference teams, Texas and Houston, are also ranked in the Composite Top Twenty. The high degree of pride in place and rich football tradition combine to give Texas a very high 81 percent retention rate of its blue chip athletes. A state similar to Texas in its pride in place philosophy and football tradition is Oklahoma. The state of Oklahoma offers three major college playing opportunities: Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, and Tulsa. While the majority of Oklahoma blue chip athletes remain in Oklahoma, Oklahoma

1

State and Tulsa are far behind in the chase to catch frontrunner Oklahoma. In the recruiting contest between these three schools, the saying that the rich get richer (the University of Oklahoma) is definitely true. The final state to be examined, Mississippi, offers three major college football opportunities: Mississippi, Mississippi State, and Southern Mississippi. Mississippi is also the home state of Alcorn University, a predominantly black school with a notable football tradition. While the University of Mississippi has fallen on difficult times in the last ten years, Mississippi State and Southern Mississippi have been successful. The outlook is for Mississippi to continue to retain the majority of its quality players to represent the schools within the state.

An analysis of these states shows that many more playing opportunities exist: an average of four per state as compared to a little more than one and a half per state in the states with the highest migration rates. It can then be assumed that the number of major college football opportunities is related to the migration/retention ratio of each state.

Conclusions and Summary

There are three factors--winning tradition, specialization, and community support--that are both fundamental and instrumental in the production patterns of blue chip athletes; these same three factors are the essential elements of a successful recruiting program. For example, in Texas, the emphasis and importance of football is very high and an integral part of community affairs. Football is the number one priority in athletics; thus a specialization based on emphasis and financial support exists. High school booster clubs are prevalent in communities across the state because of the importance associated with football throughout

the state, thus adhering to the concept of community support. The winning tradition element in player production is caused by the desire of a pre-high-school-age youth to work hard to become part of a successful program upon reaching high school age. These three factors play similar roles in the recruiting process. Specialization is important because a blue chip athlete wants to enroll in a program that is the number one priority at a particular school. For example, the coverage and attention related to Indiana University football is insignificant compared to that of Indiana University basketball. A winning tradition insures the prospective blue chip athlete of television appearances, bowl games, and a chance to play for a national championship. The role of booster clubs and the community support concept is to demonstrate to the recruit a compatible relationship between the fans, the alumni, and the state of the football program. It also can demonstrate an alliance to help the university recruit quality athletes, e.q., Ohio State's "committeemen."

There are regions or subregions in the United States that, because of certain elements in culture relating to values and pride in place, tend to be higher or lower in the production of blue chip athletes. These same factors also influence migration and retention patterns in these regions. An excellent example of this would be a comparison between the approach to high school athletics in Texas and Minnesota. Simply stated, in Texas high school athletics, the emphasis on dollars spent and coaches per sport is clearly on football. In Minnesota, however, the approach is not to emphasize one sport over another--there is no emphasis on a particular sport but rather on participation in some sport. In Minnesota, there are more high school sports offered than in Texas. The result of this emphasis or non-emphasis is a higher production rate of

4 ?

blue chip football players in Texas than in Minnesota. The cultural phenomenon of the relationship between football and Texas communities is the prime reason for the emphasis and thus the production.

Tradition, specifically a winning tradition, is an important consideration in the college selection process of blue chip athletes. There is a strong relationship between success (win/loss percentage and Top Twenty rankings) and number of blue chip athletes signed by a particular school. Top Twenty schools which comprise 7 percent of all football playing opportunities have signed 55 percent of the author's identified population. This winning tradition may be more important in the athlete's screening process of which schools merit serious consideration than in the final selection of which school to attend. After the screening process, academic considerations and other similar personal factors will be the most significant criteria on which blue chip athletes make their final decisions.

Finally, the presence of a number of major college football opportunities within the boundaries of a state affects the migrations of blue chip athletes originating within that state. Furthermore, the success or winning tradition of these major college programs further influences the migration process. Quality players seek quality programs. For example, even though Virginia offers five major college playing opportunities compared to two in Alabama, the migration rate in Alabama is much lower than that of Virginia, due to the success and quality of the two opportunities in Alabama, Auburn, and the University of Alabama.

The scope and breadth of this study suggest several possibilities for future research:

15

 Production of All-Americans (blue chips): a comparison of public and private or parochial schools. A study of programs such as Cincinnati Moeller, Detroit Brother Rice, and New York Msgr.Farrell.

• 2. Migration patterns of All-Americans (blue chips): a study of migration through college graduation or completion of eligibility. In the course of this study the author discovered several athletes in each state who transferred, dropped out of college or football or both.

3. A regional analysis of athletics. A detailed study of regional traditions, customs, and values influencing such factors in athletics as attendance, recruiting, player production, etc.

4. An analysis of the community support concept relating to sport would be a final area worthy of consideration for further study. This study would examine the role of booster clubs, attendance, and financial contributions to support collegiate athletic programs.

Concluding Statement

It is the author's intention to continue gathering information regarding the production, migration, and recruitment of blue chip athletes. A follow-up study is planned with regard to 1982-1984 <u>Parade</u> All-Americans in order to re-assess the validity of this study, and also to examine new patterns and trends (if any) emerging within the next three years. It is further hoped that this study will prove of value to college recruiters and athletic directors in the hope that geographic and sociological considerations can be utilized to cut costs in both money and time, and that these savings might be utilized to improve the athletic programs of benefit to the recruited athletes.

ENDNOTES

¹Darrell Crase, "Inner Circles of Football," <u>Athletic Administra-</u> <u>tion</u>, Vol. 7 (1972), p. 29.

²Ibid.

³John F. Rooney, <u>The Recruiting Game</u> (Lincoln, Neb., 1980), pp. 67-68.

⁴Ibid., pp. 71-72.

⁵Ibid., p. 85.

⁶J. M. O'Brien, <u>Hail to Ritt: A Sports History of the University</u> of Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh, Penn., 1982), p. 164.

⁷Ibid, p. 165. ⁸Ibid. ⁹Ibid., p. 166. ¹⁰Ibid.

.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Amdur, Neil. <u>The Fifth Down</u>. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, Inc., 1971.
- Benagh, Jim. Making It to #1. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1976.
- Boyle, Robert H. <u>Sport-Mirror of American Life</u>. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1963.
- Cady, Edwin H. <u>The Big Game</u>. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1978.
- Cromartie, Bill. Braggin' Rights. Atlanta: Gridiron Publishers, 1978.
- Dressman, Denny. <u>Gerry Faust: Notre Dame's Man in Motion</u>. San Diego: A&S Barnes Co., 1981.
- Durso, Joseph. <u>The All-American Dollar</u>. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1971.

- Eitzen, D. Stanley. <u>Sport in Contemporary Society</u>. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.
- Evans, J. Robert. Blowing the Whistle on Intercollegiate Sports. Chicago: Nelson Hall Co., 1974.
- Garreau, Joel. <u>The Nine Nations of North America</u>. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1981.
- Gildea, William, and Christopher Jennison. <u>The Fighting Irish</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1976.
- Hart, Marie, and Susan Birrell. Sport in the Sociocultural Process. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, 1981.
- Issacs, Neil D. Jock Culture, U.S.A. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1978.

Jenkins, Dan. Baja Oklahoma. New York: Atheneum, 1981.

^{. &}lt;u>The Sports Factory</u>. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Co., 1975.

. Dead Solid Perfect. New York: Atheneum, 1974.

_____. <u>Saturday's America</u>. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970. . Semi-Tough. New York: Atheneum, 1972.

Lipsky, Richard. How We Play the Game. Boston: Beacon Press, 1981.

- Locke, Tates, and Bob Ibach. <u>Caught in the Net</u>. West Point: Leisure Press, 1982.
- Meggyesy, Dave. Out of Their League. Berkeley: Ramparts Press, Inc., 1970.

Michener, James. Sports in America. New York: Random House, 1976.

- Novak, Michael. The Joy of Sports. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.
- O'Brien, Jim. <u>Hail to Pitt: A Sports History of the University of</u> Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh: Wolfson Publishing Co., 1982.
- Ralbovsky, Martin. Lords of the Locker Room. New York: Peter H. Wyden Publisher, 1974.
- Rooney, John F., Jr. <u>A Geography of American Sport</u>. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
 - . The Recruiting Game. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.
- Shaw, Gary. Meat on the Hoof. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972.
- Snyder, Eldon E., and Elmer A. Spreitzer. <u>Social Aspects of Sport</u>. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Tatum, Jack, and Bill Kushner. <u>They Call Me Assassin</u>. New York: Everest House, 1979.
- Underwood, John. <u>The Death of an American Game</u>. Boston-Little Brown & Co., 1979.
- Vare, Robert. Buckeye. New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1974.
- Wallace, Francis. <u>Notre Dame: From Rockne to Parseghian</u>. New York: McKay Co., 1966.
- Warner, Gary. <u>Competition</u>. Eglin, Ill.: David C. Cook Publishing Co., 1979.

Journals, Periodicals and Newspapers

Clayton, John. "Sherrill Still a Factor in Recruiting." <u>Pittsburgh</u> Press (Feb. 7, 1982), p. D-6.

Coughlan, Robert. "What Happens to Football Players?" Sports Illustrated, Vol. 5, No. 13 (Sept. 24, 1956), pp. 109-115.

- Crowl, John A. "Coaches Ask Penalties for Colleagues Caught Cheating." The Chronicle of Higher Education (June 16, 1982), pp. 1, 10.
- Davidson, David. "Ex-Georgia Aide Accepts Blame in Smith Recruiting SNAFU." Atlanta Constitution (July 13, 1982), p. 18.
- Eschbach, Al. "Another Football Factory?" <u>The Blue Chips</u>, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1981), pp. 71-72.

_____. "The Factory." <u>The Blue Chips</u>, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1980), pp. 68-69.

- Hyman, Mervin. "Brains, Agility and a Big Game." Sports Illustrated, Vol. 15, No. 12 (Sept. 18, 1961), pp. 28-31.
- Jenkins, Dan. "This Year the Fight Will Be in the Open." Sports Illustrated, Vol. 27, No. 11 (Sept. 11, 1967), pp. 29-34.
- Keitz, Hank. "College Recruiting--Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going?" The Blue Chips, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1981), pp. 104-118.

______. ''Lannie Julias--A Candid Conversation With America's Flamboyant Recruiter.'' The Blue Chips, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1979), pp. 21-23.

- Kew, Francis C. "Values in Competitive Games." Quest, Vol. 29 (Winter, 1978), pp. 103-112.
- Loy, John W., Jr. "The Cultural System of Sport." Quest, Vol. 29 (Winter, 1978), pp. 73-101.
- Preston, Frederick W. "Hucksters at the Circus." Urban Life, Vol. 7, No. 2 (July, 1978), pp. 205-212.
- Rooney, John F., Jr. "Athletic Recruiting." <u>National Forum: Phi Kappa</u> Phi Journal, Vol. 62, No. 1 (Winter), pp. 32-36.

. "Up From the Mines and Out From the Prairies: Some Geographical Implications of Football in the United States." <u>The Geo-</u> graphical Review, Vol. 59, No. 4 (1969), pp. 471-492.

"Sherrill Beefs, Georgia Drop Recruit." <u>Pittsburgh Post-Gazette</u> (June 18, 1982), p. 19.

Stuhldreher, Mary. "High-Heeled Recruiter and a Mama's Boy." Sports Illustrated, Vol. 19, No. 13 (Sept. 23, 1963), pp. 72-76. ______. ''That Orange Shirt Means Something.'' <u>Sports Illustrated</u>, Vol. 46 (March 28, 1977), pp. 68-78.

Unpublished Studies

College Football Association. "IV Recruiting." March 25, 1981.

Dickey, Kevin. "Why Athletes Choose Pitt." Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1979, 1980.

Catalogs, Manuals, Guides, and Moeller

High School Gridiron Guide, 1982

Cincinnati Moeller High School, 9001 Montgomery Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45242.

NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete. Mission, Kansas: NCAA, February, 1982.

Personal Communications

Cohen, Haskell. Telephone interview, January 15, 1982, New York, NY.

Dickey, Kevin. Telephone interview, February 9, 1982, Pittsburgh, PA.

Neinas, Chuck. Telephone interview, March 9, 1982, Leawood, KS.

Touchstone, Ron. Telephone interview, February 9, 1982, and April 2, 1982, Oklahoma City, OK.

Touchstone, Ron, Hank Keitz, and Brian Boulac. Personal interviews. Second Annual Blue Chip Convention, April 27-28, 1982, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

APPENDIX A

.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to identify factors in the decision making process of highly recruited athletes in regard to college selection.

Your cooperation and completion in this study is essential. The dample of this study is limited to 68 athletes who have been selected to the 1981 Parade All-American Football Team.

If possible, I would like to have the completed questionnaires returned to me by May 15, 1982. I realize that school schedules and graduations vary from school to school, so please try to complete the form as soon as possible. If you have any questions, I can be reached by calling me collect at Area Code (405) 372-5833 (day) or (405) 377-6159 (night).

Please indicate any comments or whether you would like a copy of the results mailed to you upon completion of the study.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Bill Sutton

BS/jrs

QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1. Name:
- 2. Address:
- 3. Date of Birth: Place of Birth:
- 4. Age you began playing "organized" football:
- 5. Type of organization sponsoring this youth football:
 - grade school
 - junior high school
 - YMCA
 - Boys Club

0ther

- 6. Number of years as a varsity high school football player:
- 7. Other sports played in high school:
- 8. Did your football coach also coach any other sports in which you participated?
- 9. If so, which sports?
- 10. Did you participate in intramural sports? If so, which sports?
- 11. Other high school activities in which you participated:
- 12. Approximate enrollment of your high school:
- Does your high school sports program have a booster club? If so, name of your booster club:
- 14. Please list the schools you visited:
- 15. If you have made your choice of college to attend, please list that school:
- 16. In what subject do you intend to major?

17. Please rank the following reasons that played a role in your decision regarding college visitations or your final choice. The most important factor should be ranked one, the next most important, two and so on.

	geographical	includes climate, coastal, large city, resort area, a change from what I am used to.
	academic	reputation for fine program in area of major. Also location of a pro- fessional school in law or medicine if these are in the student's plan.
	winning tradition	an opportunity to play at a school with a reputation for high national rankings, bowl games and a rich tradition of success.
	an opportunity to play immediately	playing at a lesser known school in terms of football reputation, with an opportunity to play as a fresh- man or to help turn a program around.
	friends or relatives	influenced by friends attending there.
	alumni	influenced by alumni of the institu- tion.
	close to home	want to remain close to home so friends and family can see me play and pride in the area I live.
	coach	influenced by coach's reputation or personality.
	campus	attractiveness of campus facilities.
	faculty	impressed by quality and interest of faculty.
<u></u>	integrity	honesty of coach and reputation for honesty of the institution.
	athletic facilities	quality of stadium, capacity of training room, etc.
	athletic living accomodations	athletic dorm, apartment, etc.

APPENDIX B

STATE ROSTERS OF HIGH SCHOOL ALL-AMERICANS, 1972-1981

~~~~~~			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Year	Name	City .	High School	College Attended
		ALABAMA		
1072	Rill Evans	Montgomery	Jefferson Davis	Auburn
1972	Calvin Culliver	Brewton	W.S. Neal	Alabama
1972	Chris Vacarella	Birmingham	Ramsay	Auburn
1973£		Dirimingham	Rainbuly	
1974	Tony Nathan	Birmingham	Wood Lawn	Alabama
1973	Jeff Rutledge	Birmingham	Banks	Alabama
1974	Anthony Jones	Birmingham	Phillips	Auburn
1975	Tim Travis	Huevtown	Hueytown	Alabama
1975	Curtis McGriff	Cottonwood	Cottonwood	Alabama
1975	Charles Trotman	Montgomery	Jefferson Davis	Auburn
1975	Freddie Smith	Athens	Athens	Auburn
1976	Maior Ogilvie	Mountain Brook	Mountain Brook	Alabama
1976	Jerry Beasley	Montgomery	Hooper Academy	Auburn
1976	Frank Warren	Birmingham	Phillips	Auburn
1976	Byron Bragg	Montgomery	Carver	Alabama
1977	Bart Krout	Birmingham	W. A. Berry	Alabama
1977	Adolph Crosby	Athens	Athens	Auburn
1978	Doug Collins	Andalusia	Andalusia	Alabama
1979	Linnie Patrick	Jasper	Walker County	Alabama
1979	Andy Martin	Muscle Shoals	Muscle Shoals	Alabama
1979	Marcus Hill	Dothan	Dothan	Alabama
1979	Doug Vickers	Enterprise	Enterprise	Alabama
1980	Hardy Walker	Huntsville	Grissom	Alabama
980	David Gilmer	Attalla	Etowah	Alabama
1980	Ricky Moore	Huntsville	Lee	Alabama
1981	Alan Evans	Enterprise	Enterprise	Auburn
1981	Jon Hand	Sylacauga	Sylacauga	Alabama
1981	Wes Neighbors	Huntsville	Huntsville	Alabama

.

152

.

•

.

'ear	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		ALASKA		
		NONE		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ARIZONA		
972 972	Jesse Parker Greg Hubbell	Tucson Phoenix	Rincon Central	Arizona X
973	Ron Bonner	Mesa Phoenix	Westwood Central	X Arizona
973	Bichard Rucker	Canvon Del Oro	Canvon Del Oro	X
974	Jimmy Moore	Tempe	Marcos De Niza	Ohio State
975	Speedy Hart	Phoenix	St. Mary's	Notre Dame
975	Ron Washington	Tempe	McClintock	Arizona State
976	Greg Brady	Scottsdale	Coronado	U.S.C.
976	John Mistler	Tucson	Sahuaeo	Arizona State
977	Riki Gray	Tucson	Ampitheater	U.S.C.
979	Kevin Smith	Tucson	Sahuaro	Notre Dame
979	Mossy Cade	Eloy	Santa Cruz	Texas
979	Dave Wood	Phoenix	. Washington	Arizona
980	Fred Sims	Tucson	Sunnyside	0klahoma
980	Tom Roggeman	Tucson	Sahuaro	Notre Dame
981	Glenn Dennard	Tempe	Corona del Sol	Arizona State
		ARKANSAS		
972	Bruce Woolridge	Little Rock	Ole Main	Rice
972	Phil Dokes	Little Rock	Ole Main	Oklahoma State
972	Tommy Koonce	Hot Springs	Hot Springs	L.S.U.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1973	Jerry Eckwood	Brinkley	Brinkley	Arkansas
1973	Leotis Harris	Little Rock	Hall	Arkansas
1974	Donnie Bobo	Atkins	Atkins	Arkansas
975	Robert Farrell	Little Rock	Central	Arkansas
975	Jerome Harris	Dumas	Dumas	0klahoma
975	Houston Nutt	Little Rock	Central	Arkansas
976	Bobby Duckworth	Hamburg	Hamburg	Arkansas
976	Ronnie Elam	Des Arc	Des Arc	None
976	George Stewart	Little Rock	Parkview	Arkansas
977	Darryl Mason	Little Rock	Parkview	Arkansas
979	Shawn Jones	Little Rock	Ole Main	Oklahoma State
979	Jerry Grigsby	Malvern	Malvern	Texas
980	Marcus Elliott	Little Rock	Central	Arkansas
978	Chet Winters	Jacksonville	Jacksonville	0klahoma
981	Billy Warren	Newport	Newport	Arkansas
972	Steve Javert	La Puente	Bishop Amat	Х
972	Mark Baily	Poco Rivera	El Rancho	California
972	Wesley Walker	Torrance	Carson	California
972	Greg Fields	San Francisco	Mission	Grambling
972	Bob Acosta	Anaheim	Western	Х
972	Randy Garcia	Los Angeles	Wilson	X
972	Jim Miller	San Jose	Leland	Х
972	Wally Henry	San Diego	Lincoln	U.C.L.A.
972	Steve Tetrick	Los Angeles	• Baptist	Х
973	Dwight Ford	Los Angeles	Bell	U.S.C.
973	Otis Page	Saratoga	Saratoga	U.S.C.
973	Ray Cardinelli	Monterey	Monterey	Stanford
973	Frank Manumaleuna	Banning	Banning	U.C.L.A.
973	George Freitas	Visalia	Redwood	California

154

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1973	Gary Bethel	Turlock	Turlock	U.S.C.
1973	Dennis Sproul	Los Altos	Los Altos	Arizona State
1973	Kevin Drake	Lompoc	Cabrillo	X
1973	Rod Connors	Cordova	Cordova	U.S.C.
974	Markey Crane	San Francisco	Galileo	California
974	Myron White	Santa Ana	Santa Ana Valley	х
974	Dan Farrell	Sacremento	Christian Brothers	х
974	Rod Horn	Fresno	Hoover	Nebraska
974	Pat Howell	Fresno	Fresno	U.S.C.
974	Steve Shoemaker	Anaheim	Servite	х
974	Turk Schonert	Anaheim	Servite	Stanford
974	Jeff Houghton	Bakersfield	Woodhill	X
974 .	Don Morovik	Bellflower	St. Bosco	U.S.C.
974	Brian Bethke	Covina	South Hills	Nevada-Las-Vegas
974	Carter Hartwig	Fresno	Central	U.S.C.
975	Mark Malone	El Cajon	Valley	Arizona State
975	Kenny Moore	San Fernando	San Fernando	U.S.C.
975	Fred Ford	Bellflower	St. Bosco	U.C.L.A.
975	Artie Hargrove	Longbeach	Polytechnic	х
975	Anthony Munoz	Ontario	Chaffey	U.S.C.
975	Kevin Williams	San Fernando	San Fernando	U.S.C.
975	Tyrone Sperling	Wilmington	Banning	U.S.C.
975	Alan Pugh	Santa Barbara	San Marcos	U.S.C.
975	Steve Anderson	Arcadia	Arcadia	Х
975	Glen Simmington	El Cerrito	El Cerrito	X
975	Charles White	San Fernando	San Fernando	U.S.C.
975	Van Wiese	Los Angeles	Carson	х
975	Glenn Cannon	San Jose	Mt. Pleasant	U.C.L.A.
976	Craig Landis	Napa	Vintage	х
976	Ron Lott	Rialto	Eisenhower	U.S.C.
976	Freeman McNeil	Los Angeles	Banning	-U.C.L.A.
976	Touissant Tyler	Oceanside	El Camino	Washington
976	Chris Elias	Anaheim	Servite	U.C.L.Ā.

. .

• • • •

1

1.55

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1976	Bob Woolway	Los Angeles	Loyola	Harvard
1976	Dennis Smith	Santa Monica	Santa Monica	U.S.C.
1976	Rich Campbell	San Jose	Santa Terrea	California
1976	Billy Williard	Los Angeles	Bell Gardens	х.
1976	Patrick Graham	San Jose	Leland	California
1977	Ron Cuccia	Los Angeles	Wilson	Harvard
1977	Dokie Williams	Oceanside	El Camino	Х
1977	Marcus Allen	San Die <u>g</u> o	Lincoln	U.S.C.
1977	Tim Wrightman	San Pedro	Mary Star	U.C.L.A.
1977	Dave Morze	Mountain View	St. Francis	Stanford
1977	Ken McAlister	0akland	Oakland	California
1977	Joe Murray	Los Angeles	Loyola	X
1977	Charles Ussery	Long Beach	Polytechnic	U.S.C.
1977	Steve Ballinger	Camarillo	Camarillo	Stanford
1977	Dennis Edwards	Stockton	Edison	U.S.C.
1977	Babe Laufenberg	Encino	Crespi	Stanford
1977	Willie Gittens	Fountain Valley	Fountain Valley	Х
1977 E				
1978	Stanley Wilson	Los Angeles	Banning	Oklahoma
1977	Reggie Young	Rancho Cordova	Rancho Cordova	Х
1977	Darryl Green	Bakersfield	West	U.C.L.A.
1977	Mike Carnell	San Jose	Mission	California
1978	Anthony Gibson	San Fernando	San Fernando	U.S.C.
1978	John Elway	Granada Hills	Granada Hills	Stanford
1978	Rob Moore	Santa Ana	Foothill	Х
1978	Malcolm Moore	San Fernando	San Fernando	U.S.C.
1978	Don Mosebar	Visalia	Mt. Whitney	U.S.C.
1978	George Achica	San Jose	Andrew Hill	U.S.C.
1979	Frank Seurer	Huntington Beach	Edison	Kansas
1979	John Mazur	Woodland Hills	El Camino Real	U.S.C.
1979	Kerwin Bell	Huntington Beach	Edison	Kansas
1979	Kevin Nelson	Downey	Pius X	U.C.L.A.
1979	Todd Spencer	El Cerrito	El Cerrito	U.S.C.

ł

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1979	Theodore Green	Compton	Compton	Washington
1979	John Truitt	Los Angeles	Banning	0klahoma
1979	Darnell Coles	Rialto	Eisenhower	U.C.L.A.
1979	Matt McLaughlin	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	U.S.C.
1980	Sean Salisbury	Escondido	Orange Glen	U.S.C.
1980	Michael Alo	Los Angeles	Banning	U.S.C.
1980	Larry Williams	Los Angeles	Mater Dei	Notre Dame
1980	Jack Del Rio	Hayward	Hayward	U.S.C
1980	Neil Hope	Los Angeles	Fairfax	U.S.C.
1980	Elbert Watts	Venice	Venice	0klahoma
1980	Danny Andrews	Los Angeles	Banning	U.C.L.A.
1980	Emile Harry	Fountain Valley	Fountain Valley	Stanford
1980	Brent Martin	Madera	Madera	Stanford
1980	Greg Sims	Los Angeles	Manual Arts	0klahoma
1980	Fred Crutcher	Pasadena	Muir	U.S.C.
1980	Shawn Avant	Ontario	Ontario	Stanford
1980	Joe Faramo	Vista ,	Vista	Kansas State
1981	Matt Stevens	Fountain Valley	Fountain Valley	U.C.L.A.
1981	Jim Plum	La Mesa	Helix	San Diego State
1981	Kevin Willhite	Rancho Cordova	Cordova	Oregón
1981	Albert Bell	Los Angeles	Crenshaw	Purdue
1981	Bruce Parks	Ontario	Chaffey	U.S.C.
1981	Rick DiBernardo	Huntington Beach	Edison	Notre Dame
1981	Kennedy Pola	Santa Ana	Mater Dei	U.S.C.
1981	Ron Brown	LaPuente	Bishop Amat	U.S.C.
1981	James McCullough	Hemet	Hemet	U.C.L.A.
1981	Alfred Jenkins	Lynwood	Lynwood	Arizona
1981	Edward Allen	Los Angeles	Verbum Del	Arizona State

.

.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		COLORADO		
1972	Tom Tesone	Cherry Creek	Cherry Creek	Colorado
1972	Doug Sincik	Northglen	Northglen	Х
1973	Jeff Knapple	Boulder	Fairview	U.C.L.A.
1973	Terry Miller	Colorado Springs	Billy Mitchell	Oklahoma State
1974	James Howard	Littleton	Arapahoe	Arkansas
1974	Chris Foote	Boulder	Fairview	U.S.C.
1974	Pete Cyphers	Grand Junction	Grand Junction	Colorado
1975	Mike Edwards	Denver	Kennedy	Х
1975	Laval Short	Littleton	Columbine	Colorado
1976	Lance Olander	Littleton	Arapahoe	Colorado
1976	Brant Thurston	Arvada	West	Colorado
1977	Steve Williams	Lakewood	Lakewood	0klahoma
1977	Dean Haugum	Arvada	West	Texas
1978	Vincent White	Denver	Mullen	Stanford
1978	Jeff Guy	Aurora	Gateway	Texas
1978	Guy Thurston	Arvada	West	Colorado
1979	Kevin Call	Boulder	Fairview	Colorado State
1979	Vaugn Williams	Denver	George Washington	Х
1979	Guy Egging	Broomfield	Broomfield	Colorado
1980	Mike Gann	Lakewood	Lakewood	Notre Dame
1980	Craig Holthus	Fruita	Monument	Baseball Scholarship
1980	Kevin Sherman	Colorado Springs	Academy	Notre Dame
1981	Barry Remington	Boulder	Fairview	Colorado
1981	Darryl Clark	Security	Widefield	Arizona State
		CONNECTICUT		
1972	Don Herzog	West Haven	West Haven	X
1972	Greg Woods	Middletown	Xavier	Kentucky
1973	Roger Ings	Ansonia	Ansonia	Connecticut

'ear	Name	City	High School	College Attended
974	Anthony Brown	Middletown	Xavier	Boston College
974	Clint Gaffney	Middletown	Xavier	Boston College
975	Paul Matasavage	Waterbury	Holy Cross	Boston College
976	Tony Elliot	Bridgeport	Harding	X
976	Dewey Raymond	Norwalk	McMahon	X
978	Sandy Osiecki	Ansonia	Ansonia	Arizona State
978	Bob Biestek	Meridian	Maloney	Boston College
979	Roosevelt Reed	Norwalk	Norwalk	Notre Dame
980	Edwin Esson	Seymour	Seymour	Missouri
		DELAWARE		
972	Mark McLane	Wilmington	Salesianum	Notre Dame
974	Anthony Anderson	Wilmington	McKean	Temple
975	Chuck Hunter	Wilmington	St. Mark	Ohio State
977	Mike Meade	Dover	Dover	Penn State
	•	FLORIDA		
972	Larry Brown	Jacksonville	Raines	Miami
972	Larry Jones	Sanford	Seminole	Florida State
972	Darrell Carpenter	Jacksonville	Parker	Florida
972	Waldo Williams	Merritt Island	Merritt Island	X
973	Elvis Peacock	Miami	Central	0klahoma
973	Herman Jones	Miami	South Dade	Ohio State
973	Melvin Flournoy	Gainesville	Gainesville	Florida
973	Terry LeCount	Jacksonville	Raines	Florida
974	John Blue	Orlando	Edgewater	X
974	Wayne Pettis	Orlando	Monahans	X
974	Joe Gasper	Miami Beach	South	Colorado
974	Wally Woodbam	Tallabassee	Loop	

•

.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1974	Curtis Williams	Macclenny	Baker County	X
1974	Willie Jones	Homestead	South Dade	Florida State
1975	Scott Brantley	Ocala	Forest	Florida
1975	Jimmy Jordan	Tallahassee	Leon	Florida State
1976	Chris Collinsworth	Titusville	Astronaut	Florida
1976	Mike Riley	Miami	Columbus	0klahoma
1976	David Little	Miami	Jackson	Florida
1976	Doc Lu Luckie	Fort Pierce	Central	Florida
1976	Keith Ferguson	Miami	Edison	X
1976	Wally Hough	Tampa	Plant	Florida
1977	Carleton Gunn	Tampa	Robinson	Tennessee
1977	Lester Williams	Opa Locka	Miami Coral City	Miami
1977	Mark Cooper	Miami	Killian	Miami
1977	Tyrone Young	Ocala	Forest	Florida
1977	Terry Daniels	Opa Locka	Miami Coral City	Tennessee
1977	George Peoples	Tampa	King	Auburn
1978	Derald Williams	Jacksonville	Wilson	Florida
1978	Anthony Carter	Riviera Beach	Sun Coast	Michigan
1978	Spencer Jackson	Boca Raton	Boca Raton	Florïda State
1978	Al Blue	Orlando	Edgewater	Alabama
1978	Vince Jones	Tampa	Plant	Florida
1978	Donal Dixon	Jacksonville	Ribault	Georgia
1978	Johnell Brown	Gainesville	Gainesville	Florida
1978	James Jones	Pompano Beach	Pompano Beach	Florida
1979	Wayne Peace	Lakeland	Lakeland	Florida
1979	Fred Miles	Miami	Springs	Miami
1979	Wilber Marshall	Titusville	Astronaut	Florida
1979	Alan Campbell	Perry	Taylor County	Florida State
1979	Tom Thurson	Jacksonville	Bishop Kennedy	Georgia
1979	Charles Kerr	Tampa	Plant	Florida
1979	George Rhymes	Miami	Northwestern	0klahoma
1979	Jessi Bendross	Miramar	Miramar	Alabama
1979	Stephan Humphries	Ft. Lauderdale	St. Thomas Aquinas	Michigan

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1980	Fred Buckley	Ft. Lauderdale	Cardinal Gibbons	Stanford
1980	Tony Smith	Miami	Southridge	Florida State
1980	Mike Rendino	Pompano Beach	Pompano Beach	Florida State
1980	Alton Jones	Tampa	Plant	Florida
1980	Gregory Allen	Milton	Milton	Florida State
1980	Gregory Bain	Belle Glade	Central	Florida
1981	Tony Robinson	Talahassee	Leon	Tennessee
1981	Jeff Wickersham	Merritt Island	Merritt Island	L.S.U.
1981	John Williams	Palatka	Palatka	Florida
1981	Hassan Jones	Clearwater	Clearwater	Florida State
1981	George Almones	Lakeland	Kathleen	Pro Baseball Contract
1981	Richard Rellford	Riviera Beach	Sun Coast	Michigan
1981	Derex Wimberly	Miami	American	Purdue
1981	Leonard Wilson	Ft. Lauderdale	St. Thomas Aquinas	U.C.L.A.
1981	Patrick Miller	Panama City	Mosley	Florida
1972 ·	Mark Cantrell	Atlanta	Marist	Х
1972	Andy Spiva	Chamblee	Chamblee	Tennessee
1972	Ray Goff	Moultrie	Moultrie	Georgia
1972	Theopilus Bryant	Tifton	Tifton City	Kansas State
1972	Mike Johnson	Atlanta	Lakeside	Х
1973	Anthony Flangan	Atlanta	Southwest	Х
1973	Greg Graves	DeKalb	Southwest	Х
1973	Stan Rome	Valdosta	Valdosta	Clemson
1973	Steve Dennis	Macon	Central	Georgia
1974	Mack Guest	Macon	Central	Georgia
1974	Robert Shaw	Marietta	Wheeler	Tennessee
1974	Mike Hubbard	Columbu's	Columbus	X
1974	William Andrews	Thomasville	Thomasville	Auburn
1974	Mike Wilcox	Atlanta	Carver	Х
1975	Jeff Pyburn	Athens	Cedar Shoals	Georgia
1975	Ed Guthrie	Marietta	Wheeler	Georgia
1975	Mike Norris	Americus	Americus	Х
1975	Ray Donaldson	Rome	East	Georgia

161

. . .

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1975	Mike Jolly	Macon	Central	U.C.L.A.
1975	Matt Jackson	Ft. Valley	Peach County	Ohio St.
1976	James Brooks	Warner Robbins	Warner Robbins	Auburn
1976	Ron Simmons	Warner Robbins	Warner Robbins	<ul> <li>Florida State</li> </ul>
977	Mike Cofer	Chamblee	Peachtree	Tennessee
1977	Lindsay Scott	Jessup	Wayne County	Georgia
1977	Larry Kennebrew	Rome	East	Tennessee State
977	Lee North	Decatur	Shamrock	Tennessee
977	Lee Otis Burton	Americus	Americus	Tennessee
977	Chip Banks	Augusta	Laney	U.S.C.
977	Buck Belve	Valdosta	Valdosta	Georgia
977	Darish Davis	Augusta	Academy	Georgia Tech
978	Bob Berry	Decatur	Southwest	Auburn
978	John Tutt	Rome	East	X
978	Joe Browner	Atlanta	Southwest	U.S.C.
978	Damon McCurty	Atlanta	Washington	Clemson
		GEORGIA		
1978	Wil Forts	Fayetteville	Fayette County	Georgia
1978	Randy Edwards	Marietta	Wheeler	Alabama
1978	Andrew Provence	Savannah	Benedictine	South Carolina
978	Melvin Dorsey	Atlanta	Lakeside	Georgia
979	John Bond	Valdosta	Valdosta	, Mississippi State
979	Herschel Walker	Wrightsville	Johnson County	Georgia
979	Winford Hood	Atlanta	Therrell	Georgia
979	Freddie Gilbert	Griffin	Griffin	Georgia
979	Landy Ewings	Tifton	Tift County	Georgia
980	Ken Hobby	Tifton	Tift County	Auburn
1980	Ricky Holt	Tifton	Tift County	Tennessee
980	Antonio Render	Decatur	Columbia	Georgia
1980	Bill Mayo	Dalton	Dalton	Tennessee
1980	Eric Thomas	Valdosta	Lowndes	Florida State

. .

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1980	Cedric Jones	Valdosta	Lowndes	Florida State
1980	Robert Lavette	Cartersville	Cartersville	Georgia Tech
1981	Tyrone Sorrells	Buford	Buford	Georgia
1981	Gerald Browner	Atlanta	Woodward Academy	Georgia
1981	George Smith	Douglas	Coffee	Texas A&M
1981	Herman Archie	Columbus	Carver	Georgia
1981	Cedrick Cornish	Warner Robbins	Northside	Georgia
1981	Jay Floyd	Hartwell	Hart County	Georgia
1981	Venson Elder	Decatur	Towers	Alabama
1981	Ben Logue	Atlanta	North Springs	Michigan
	· ·	HAWATI		
1973	Mosiula Tatupu	Punahoa	Punahoa	U.S.C.
1974	Alfred Harris	Honolulu	Leilehua	Arizona State
1978	Wayne Apuna	Honolulu	St. Louis	Arizona State
		I DAHO		
1973	Larry Kemp	Poccatello	Highland	Brigham Young
1979	Randy Holmes	Boise	Borah	Oregon State
		ILLINOIS		· · · ·
1972	Scott Dierking	Chicago	Community	Purdue
1972	Dave Ostrowski	Peru	St. Bede	X
1972	Bob Lang	Chicago	Gordon Tech	Michigan
1973	Jim Kogut	Aurora	Marmion	Illinois
1973	Terry Colby	Danville	Danville	Х
1973	Pete Allard	0ak Lawn	St. Lawrence	Missouri
1973	Clay Matthews	Winnetka	New Trier East	U.S.C.
1973	Mike Morgan	Chicago	Lane Tech	Wisconsin
1974	Jerome Heavens	East St. Louis	Assumption	Notre Dame

.

.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1974	Roy Parker	Chicago	Phillips	X
1974	Cleveland Crosby	East St. Louis	East St. Louis	Purdue
1974	Stuart Walker	Rockford	East	Colorado
1974	Tom Domin	Villa Park	Willowbrook	X
1974	Steve Dietz	Chicago	Gordon Tech	None
1974	Jim Koslowski	Burbank	St. Lawrence	X
1974	Jack Moller	Glenbrook	North	X
1975	Bob Niziolek	Chicago	Weber	Colorado
1975	Mike Holmes	Chicago	St. Leo	Illinois
1975	Scott Zettek	Arlington Hts.	St. Viatur	Notre Dame
1975	Bill Roe	South Holland	Thornwood	Colorado
1975	Mark Osman	Wilmette	Loyola	X
1975	Mark Carlson	Deerfield	Deerfield	Minnesota
1975	Gerald Diggs	Chicago	Sullivan	Michigan
1976	Jeff Hornberger	Edwardsville	Edwardsville	Colorado
1976	Al Moton	Peoria	Manval	lowa State
1976	Rich Weiss	Winnetka	New Trian East	Illinois
1976	Wayne Strader	Geneseo	Geneseo	Illinois
1976	Tom Chakos	Hillcrest	Hillcrest	х
1976	Tim Norman	Chicago	Community	Illinois
1977	Gary Turner	Belleville	Althoff Catholic	Illinois
1977	Chris Boskey	Chicago	St. Francis	lowa State
1977	Ron Mishler	Peoria	Spalding	Notre Dame
1978	Dan Gregus	Burbank	St. Lawrence	Illinois
1978	Jimmy Smith	Kankakee	Westview	Purdue
1979	Tim Marshall	Chicago	Weber	Notre Dame
1979	Kris Jenner	Mascoutah	Mascoutah	Basketball Scholarship
1979	Alvin Jones	E. St. Louis	E. St. Louis	Tennessee
1979	J. C. Love	0ak Lawn	Richards	lowa
1979	Mansel Carter	E. St. Louis	Assumption	Notre Dame
1980	Tom Knobel	Chicago	St. Rita	Michigan
1980	Jessie Hester	Bell Glade	Central	Florida State
1980	John Sullivan	Chicago	St. Francis	Ohio State

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1980	Mike Tomczak	Calumet City	Thornton	Ohio State
1980	Julius Grantham	Mascoutah	Mascoutah	Duke
1980	Alvin Ross	West Aurora	North	Oklahoma
1981	Brian Ward	Darien	Hinsdale South	Illinois
1981	Tony Furjanic	Chicago	Mt. Carmel	Notre Dame
1981	Ron Weisenhofer	Chicago	St. Rita	Notre Dame
1981	Jim Juriga	Wheaton	North	Illinois
1981	Tony Berry	E. St. Louis	Assumption	Kansas
1981	Mike Perrino	Elmhurst	York	Notre Dame
1981	Ron Plantz	Chicago	Gordon Tech	Notre Dame
1981	Lester Flemmons	Blue Island	Eisenhower	Notre Dame
		INDIDANA		
1972	Frank Johnson	Gary	Westside	Illinois
1972	Mike McCray	South Bend	St. Joseph	Illinois
1972	Jim Swank	Rochester	Rochester	X
1973	Marc Lunsford	Bloomington	South	Х
1973	Rick Ennis	Union City	Union City	X
1974	Vagas Ferguson	Richmond	Richmond	Notre Dame
1974	Wally Kasprzycki	Hammond	Noll	Northwestern
1974	Dan Rhoden	Martinsville	Martinsville	Indiana
1974	Derrick Burnett	Gary	Roosevelt	Х
1974	Marlon Fleming	Evansville	Reitz	X
1975	Ricky Smith	Indianapolis	Washington	Purdue
1975	Kevin Mott	Mishawaka	Marion	Purdue
1975	Jeff Phipps	Evansville	Central	Indiana
1976	Mark Herrmann	Carmel	Carmel	Purdue
1976	Chuck Oliver	Valparaiso	Valparaiso	Purdue
1976	Dana Simon	Mishawaka	Marion	. Miami of Ohio
1977	Pete Buchanan	Plymouth	Plymouth	Notre Dame
1977	Tim Seneff	Merrillville	Merrillville	Purdue
1978	Rick Sharp	Carmel	Carmel	U.C.L.A.

165

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1978	Tom Jelesky	Merrillville	Merrillville	Purdue
1978	Dave Duerson	Muncie	Northside	Notre Dame
1979	Blair Kiel	Columbus	East	Notre Dame
1980	Dave Cravens	Indianapolis	Decatur Central	Purdue
980	Bob Kobza	Hobart	Hobart	x
981	Ray Wallace	Indianapolis	North Central	Purdue
981	Shawn Heffern	Carmel	Carmel	Notre Dame
		I OWA		
972	Billy Schultz	lowa City	City	X
972	Scott Smith	Cedar Rapids	Jefferson	X
972	Gene Campbell	Audubon	Audubon	X
973	Vic Vacco	Des Moines	Dowling	X
973	Curtis Craig	Davenport	Central	Nebraska
974	Jon Lazar	South Tarma	South Tarma	lowa
974	Joe Hufford	Mt. Vernon	Mt. Vernon	lowa
974	Doug Benschoter	Waverly	Shell Rock	lowa
975	Mike Leaders	Council Bluffs	Lincoln	lowa St.
976	Mike Courey	Sioux City	Heelan	Notre Dame
976	Matt Petrzelka	Cedar Rapids	Regis	lowa
976	Kelly Ellis	Waterloo	West	Northern Iowa
976	Jack Seabrooke	Des Moines	Dowling	lowa State
977	Jamie Williams	Davenport	Central	Nebraska
977	Dave Berry	Waterloo	Columbus	Notre Dame
977	Steve McWhirter	Fairfield	Fairfield	Nebraska
977	Mike Walsh	Sioux City	Heelan	Notre Dame
978	Regaie Roby	Waterloo	East	lowa
978	Bruce Reimers	Humboldt	Humboldt	lowa State
979	Pual Hufford	Mt. Vernon	Mt. Vernon	lowa
980	Treve Jackson	Newton	Newton	lowa
981	Milt Jackson	Fairfield	Fairfield	Notre Dame

•

.

:

.

ear	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		KANSAS		
972	Dan Bowden	Shawnee Mission	Bishop Miege	Pittsburg State
973	James Emerson	Great Bend	Great Bend	Kansas
973	Steve Little	Shawnee Mission	South	Arkansas
974	Brad Horchem	Ness City	Ness City	Kansas State
974	Kurt Tushaus	Shawnee Mission	Bishop Miege	Kansas
975	Michael Gay	Salina	South	Kansas
975	Mark Gingell	Shawnee Mission	Bishop Miege	Kansas
975	Tracy Levy	Wichita	Southeast	Kansas
976	David Verser	Kansas City	Sumner	Kansas
976	Floyd Smith	Wichita	Southeast	West Texas State
976	John O'Dell	Wellington	Wellington	Kansas
977	Mike Boushka	Wichita	Kapaun Mt. Carmel	Notre Dame
977	Russ Bastin	Emporia	Emporia	Kansas
979	Jeff Smith	Wichita	Southeast	Nebraska
979	Mike Ruether	Shawnee Mission	Bishop Miege	Texas
980	Harvey Fields	Arkansas City	Arkansas City	Kansas
981	Richard Estell	Kansas City	Harmon	Kansas
		KENTUCKY		
972	Bob Kupper	Louisville	Bishop David	Х
972	Robert Morton	Madisonville	Richmond	Х
972	Mike Northington	Louisville	Jefferson	X
973	Keith Autry	Louisville	Valley Station	Х
973	Keith Calvin	Louisville	Trinity	Х
973	Bob Blackmon	Paducah	Tilghmon	х
974	Lester Boyd	Franklin	Simpson	Kentucky
974	Robin Chaney	Ashland	Boyd County	Kentucky
975	Tom Kearns	Lexington	Tates Creek	Kentucky
975	Mike Deaton	Greensburgh	Green County	X
076	Rich Ruchner	Louisville	. St. Xavier	Х

.

• •

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1976	Donnie Evans	Franklin	Simpson	Tennessee
1977	Chris Jones	Danville	Danville	Kentucky
1977	Jim Campbell	Louisville	Trinity	Kentucky
978	Richard Abraham	Paducah	Tilghman	Kentucky
979	Chris Brown	Owensboro	Catholic	Notre Dame
980	Tim Joiner	Morganfield	Union County	Arkansas
980	Marcus Moss	Mayfield	Mayfield	Murray St.
981	Preston Gray	Louisville	DuPont Manual	Michigan St.
		LOUISIANA		
972	Lionel Johnson	Winfield	Winfield	Х
972	Terry Robiskie	Edgard	Second Ward	LSU
973	Carlos Pennywell	Shreveport	Capt. Shreve	Florida
974	Spencer Smith	Baton Rouge	Glenn Oaks	LSU
974	Elgin Stewart	Baton Rouge	Capital	х
975	Jim Blackshire	Bossier City	Bossier City	Х
975	Terry Williams	New Orleans	DeLassalle	Х
976	Benjy Thibodeaux	Crowley	Notre Dame	LSU
976	Joe Delaney	Haughton	Haughton	Northwest Louisiana
076	Mark Innolite	Now Orleans	Brother Martin	state
9/0 77	lobe Fourcado	New Of Tealls	Shaw	Mississippi
2// 07Ω	Orlando McDaniol	harlero	lake Charles	
970			Salmen	
970	Atam Kisher	New Orleans	Archhichon Shaw	
9/0		New Uliteans		
970	Malaalm Seatt	New Orleans	St Augustino	
3/0 078	Marcolm Scoll Maadu Criss	Winnfield	Winnfield	Micciccinni
5/0	WOODY Grigg	Now Iboria	New Iberia	
13/0			St Augustine	Oklahoma
	Mike Combrell		Slidell	
צ/צו סדמו	Pick Chatman	Winnfield	Winnfield	150
19/9	KICK Chatman	winntiela	winnfield	L30

•

•

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1979 1979 1980 1980 1980 1980 1980 1981	Billy Cannon, Jr. Kelvin Robinson Jeff Dale Benton Reed Greg Dubroc Weldon Cager Raymond Tate	Baton Rouge Denham Springs Winnfield Baton Rouge New Orleans New Orleans Minden	Broadmoor Denham Springs Winnfield Woodlawn John Curtis St. Augustine Minden	LSU Tulane LSU Mississippi LSU LSU Houston
1981 1981 1981	Scott Baily Roland Barbay Gary James	New Orleans New Orleans	John Curtis Holy Cross West Jefferson	LSU LSU LSU
		MAINE		
		NONE		
		MARYLAND		
1972 1973 1973 1976 1978 1978 1978 1979 1979 1980 1981 1981	Steve Brownley Mark Manges Dave Fadrowski Kip Jawish Clyde Duncan Leon Evans Weldon Lefbetter Ricky Gray Terance Nichols Terry Jackson Eric Drain Steve Smith Santio Barbosa	Elliott City Cumberland Howard County Rockville Oxon Hill Silver Springs Clayton Hyattsville Cambridge Hyattsville Germantown Hyattsville Oxon Hill	Howard Fort Hill Howard County Georgetown Prep Potomac Blair Christian Brothers De Matha S. Dorchester De Matha Seneca Valley De Matha Oxon Hill	X Maryland Maryland Tennessee Miami X X Penn State Stanford Missouri Penn State Missouri

169

ļ

•

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		MASSACHUSETT	<u>S</u>	
1972	Bill Seibolt	Brookline	Brookline	X
1972	Dave Fennette	Brockton	Brockton	Х
1972	Donald Peterson	Holliston	Holliston	Х
1972	Mark Cannon	Malden .	Catholic	Holy Cross
1973	Ken MacAfee	Brockton	Brockton	Notre Dame
1973	Brian Buckley	Marble Head	Marble Head	Harvard
1974	Mark Sullivan	New Bedford	New Bedford	Ohio State
1974	Fred Smerlas	Waltham	Waltham	Boston College
1974	Ron La Pointe	Holliston	Holliston	Penn State
1975	Charles Kirouac	Leominster	Leominster	Syracuse
1975	Doug Mackie	Saugus	Saugus	Ohio State
1975	Pat Cornelius	Milford	Milford	Utah State
1976	Art Akers	Lvnn	Classical	UCLA
1977	Jim Budness	Chicopee	Chicopee	Boston College
1978	Bob Clasby	Dorchester	Boston College High	Notre Dame
1979	Gene Mewborn	Lexington	Lexington	UCLA
1980	Mark Bavaro	Danvers	Danvers	Notre Dame
1980	Bob Brown	Chelmsford	Chelmsford	Pitt
1981	Dan Rice	W. Roxbury	W. Roxbury	Michigan
		MICHIGAN	· ·	
1972	Rob Peters	Kalamazoo	Hackett	X
1972		Jackson	Parkside	Minnesota
1973	Gary Forystek	Dearborn	Divine Child	Notre Dame
1973	Bill Dufek	E. Grand Rapids	E. Grand Rapids	Michigan
1973	Paul Rudzinski	Detroit	Catholic Central	Michigan State
1973	Marvin Baker	Detroit	Southwestern	X
1974	Rick Leach	Flint	Southwestern	Michigan
1974	Harlan Huckleby	Detroit	Cass Tech	Michigan
1974	Gene Johnson	Flint	Southwestern	X
1973 1973 1974 1974 1974	Paul Rudzinski Marvin Baker Rick Leach Harlan Huckleby Gene Johnson	Detroit Detroit Flint Detroit Flint	Catholic Central Southwestern Southwestern Cass Tech Southwestern	Michigan Stat X Michigan Michigan X
Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
------	------------------	---------------	------------------	------------------------
1975	Mike Marshall	Detroit	Southwestern	Michigan State
1975	Ron Simpkins	Detroit	Western	Michigan
1975	Mike Leoni	Flint	Powers	Michigan
1975	Mark Brammer	Traverse City	Traverse City	Michigan State
1975	Chuck Hetts	Taylor	Taylor	Michigan
1975	K. C. Ryan	Birmingham	Brother Rice	X
1976	Fred Brockington	Detroit	Redford	UCLA
1976	Booker Moore	Detroit	Southwestern	Penn State
1977	Luis Sharpe	Detroit	Southwestern	UCLA
1977	Jerome Foster	Detroit	Kettering	Ohio State
1977	Tony Green	Detroit	Kettering	х
1977	Jim Paciorek	Orchard Lake	St. Mary	Michigan
1978	Ron English	Birmingham	Brother Rice	Michigan State
1978	Cameron Foster	Detroit	Central	Florida
1978	Winfred Carraway	Detroit	McKenzie	Michigan
1978	Shelby Gamble	South Haven	South Haven	Boston College
1979	Steve Smith	Grand Blanc	Grand Blanc	Michigan
1979	David Hall	Livonia	Stevenson	X
1979	Jeff Nault	Escanaba	Escanaba	Wisconsin
1980	Aaron Roberts	Detroit	Catholic Central	Michigan State
1980	Rick Rogers	Wayne	Memorial	Michigan
1981	Tom Johnson	Detroit	McKenzie	Ohio State
1981	Paul Jokisch	Birmingham	Brother Rice	Basketball Scholarship
1981	Greg Dingens	Detroit	Brother Rice	Notre Dame
1981	Todd Lezon	Temperence	Bedford	Notre Dame
1981	Thomas Wilcher	Detroit	Central	Michigan
		MINNESOTA	<u>\</u>	
1972	Jim Perkins	Red Wing	Red Wing	Minnesota
1973	Ross Baglion	Minneapolis	Washburn	Х
1974	John Ruud	Bloomington	Jefferson	Nebraska
1974	Kent Kitzmann	Rochester	Marshall	Minnesota

· · ·

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1975	Glenn Lewis	Edina	West	Minnesota
1978	Todd Spratte	Rochester	John Marshall	Nebraska
1979	John Alt	Columbia HTS	Columbia HTS	lowa
1979	Jeff Mortiko	Minneapolis	Edison	Minnesota
1980	Pete Najarian	Minneapolis	Central	X
1981	Kevin Blackmer	Minneapolis	Central	Nebraska
		MISSISSIPP	1	
1972	Robert Dow	Jackson	St. Joseph	X
1972	Frank Pilate	Gulfport	Gulfport	X
1972	Melvin Moncrief	Biloxi	Biloxi	Х
1973	Dennis Johnson	Weir	Weir	Mississippi State
1973	Michael Sweet	Vicksburg	Vicksburg	Mississippi
1973	Richard O'Bryant	Greenwood	Greenwood	X
1973	Ben Garry	Pascaqoula	Pascagoula	Southern Mississippi
1974	Bobby Moldin	Moss Point	Moss Point	Mississippi State
1974	Jeff Moore	Kosciusko	Kosciusko	Jackson State
1975	Jay Stewart	Hattiesburg	Hattiesburg	Southern Mississippi
1975	James Jones	Vicksburg	Vicksburg	Mississippi State
1976	Ray Jones	Pascagoula	Pascagoula	Pitt
1976	Tyrone Keys	Jackson	Callaway	Mississippi State
1977	James Berry	Natchez	North	Tennessee
1978	Buford McKee	Durant	Durant	Mississippi
1978	Eddie Hornbeck	Ocean Springs	Ocean Springs	• Notre Dame
1979	Paul Carruth	Summitt	Academy	Alabama
1979	George Wonsley	Moss Point	Moss Point	Mississippi State
1980	Willie Portis	Meridian	Meridian	Southern Mississippi
1980	Greg Walker	Meridian	Meridian	Mississippi
1980	Richard Byrd	Jackson	H111	Southern Mississippi
1980	Tim Moffett	Taylorsville	Taylorsville	Mississippi
3 08ei	Marcus Dupree	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	Oklahoma

•

172

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1981	Marcus Dupree	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	Oklahoma
1981	Fred Molden	Moss Point	Moss Point	Southern Mississippi
		MISSOURI		
1972	Pete Blake	Hazlewood	Hazlewood	Х
1972	Larry Birt	Kansas City	Southwest	Х
1974	Chris Garlich	Kansas City	Rockhurst	Missouri
1974	Ben Cowins	St. Louis	Sumner	Arkansas
1974	Dennis Balagna	Kansas City	Winnetonka	Х
1975	Brad Budde	Kansas City	Rockhurst	U.S.C.
1975	Keith Angel	St. Louis	Kirkwood	0klahoma
976	Tom Sunstrop	St. Louis	Desmet	0klahoma
976	Dave Davis	Kirkwood	Kirkwood	X
1976	Wayne Washington	Kansas City	Southeast	Missouri
977	Ted Stipanovic	St. Louis	Chaminade	Colorado
977	Randy Theiss	St. Louis	Lindbergh	Nebraska
978	Mike Harper	Kansas City	Hickman Mills	USC
978	Mike Buchanan	St. Louis	University	Texas
978	Daryl Goodlow	Maplewood	Maplewood	0klahoma
1979	George Shorthose	Jefferson City	Jefferson City	Missouri
979	Ron Bachman	St. Louis	Lindbergh	Nebraska
1979	Mike Arbanas	Grandview	Grandview	Kansas
1979	Terry Moore	St. Louis	Ladue	UCLA
1979	Brad Griffie	Hannibal	Hannibal	Missouri
1980	Tony Edwards	St. Louis	University	Texas
1980	Dave Kniptash	St. Louis	Parkway West	Missouri
1981	Gerald Nichols	St. Louis	Hazlewood East	Florida State
1981	Tim Hebron	St. Louis	Vianney	Florida State
		MONTANA	•	
1972	Bryan Flaig	Missoula	Sentinel	Montana State
	-			

• .

.

.

• *

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1974	Rick Van Cleve	Great Falls	C. M. Russell	Montana State
1976	Tony Caldwell	Great Falls	C. M. Russell	Wyoming
		NEBRASKA	• _ ·	
1972	Jim Wrightman	Omaha	North	Х
1973	John Mascarello	Omaha	Gross	Kansas
1974	Bobby Bass	Omaha	Benson	Kansas
1975	Kerry Weinmaster	North Platte	North Platte	Nebraska
1976	Steve Michaelson	Ralston	Ralston	Х
1976	Dan Hurley	Omaha	Roncalli	Nebraska
1977	Steve Damkroger	Lincoln	Northeast	Nebraska
1977	Dave Rimington	Omaha	South	Nebraska
1978	Randee Johnson	Lincoln	Northeast	Nebraska
1978	Randy Jostes	Omaha	Ralston	Missouri
1979	Bill Weber	Lincoln	Southeast	Nebraska
1981	Larry Station	Omaha	Central	lowa
	·	NEVADA		
1974	Manny Rodriguez	Las Vegas	Gorman	Nevada-Las Vegas
		NEW HAMPSHI	RE	
1976	Skip Swiezinski	Exeter	Exeter	New Hampshire
		NEW JERSEY	_	
1972	Richard Allocco	New Providence	New Providence	Notre Dame
1972	Mike Grimes	Willingboro	Kennedy	X
1972	Stan Waldemore	Newark	Essex Catholic	Nebraska
1972	Kurt Allerman	Kinnelon	Kinnelon	Penn State
1973	Willie Wilson	Summitt	Summitt	Pro-Baseball Contra

.

.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1973	Lafayette Donnell	Hackensack	Hackensack	Nebraska
1973	Pete Prather	Ramsey	Don Bosco	X
1974	Rich Dimler	Bayonne	Bayonne	USC
1974	Willie Young	Jersey City	Lincoln	Х
1975	Dave Nowacki	Hackensack	Hackensack	X
1975	Brian Matera	Pennsauken	Pennsauken	Maryland
1976	Ted Blackwell	New Providence	New Providence	Rutgers
1976	Tom Vigarito	Wayne	De Paul Diocesan	Virginia
1976	Pete Kugler	Cherry Hill	East	. Penn State
1977	Tim White	Asbury Park	Asbury Park	USC
1977	Chet Parlevecchio	South Orange	Seton Hall	Penn State
1977	Bill Lichtenstein	Colonia	Colonia	Tulane
1977	Vyto Kab	Wayne	De Paul Diocesan	Penn State
1977	Ken Kellev	Somerdale	Sterling	Penn State
1979	Ken Jackson	South River	South River	Penn State
1979	Glen Moore	Deptford	Deptford	Syracuse
1979	Jon Williams	Somerville	Somerville	Penn State
1979	Jim Clymer	Phillipsburg	Phillipsburg	Stanford
1980	Dave Baran	Franklinville	Delsea Regional	UCLA
1980	Chuck Faucette	Willingboro	Willingboro	UCLA
1981	lvan Hicks	Pennsauken	Pennsauken	Michigan
1981	Darrell Giles	Montclair	Montclair	Penn State
1981	Tom Wilk	Union	Union	Penn State
		NEW MEXICO	-	
1972	Rav Barrs	Albuquerque	West Mesa	Colorado
1972	Bibl Hamilton	Las Cruces	Mayfield	X
1973	Tim Taliferro	Clovis	Clovis	Texas Tech
1973	Rick Horacek	Grants	Grants	New Mexico State
1977	Mike Carter	Albuquerque	Sandia	New Mexico
1978	Roderick Bone	Las Cruces	Las Cruces	Notre Dame
		Hobbs	Hobbs	Texas Tech

• ·

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
,		NEW YORK		
1972	Steve Wanamaker	Nyack	Nyack	Penn State
1972	Jack Heffernan	Staten Island	Msgr. Farrell	Michigan
1972	Nick Buonamici	Smithtown	St. Anthony	Ohio State
1972	Chad Smith	Sayville	Sayville	Х
1972	Ardie Segars	New York City	Far Rockaway	Х
1973	Pierre Davis	Queens	Bayside	Х
1973	Jeff Weston	Rochester	Cardinal Mooney	Notre Dame
1973	John Sullivan	W. Islip	St. John	Illinois
1973	Dave Martin	Brooklyn	St. Francis	X
1973	John D'Amato	New York City	Msgr. Farrell	Ohio State
1973	Richard Scudellari	New York City	Holy Family	X
1974	Tony Cappazzoli	Oyster Bay	St. Dominic	Penn State
1974	Tony Alguero	Bronx	Hayes	Penn State
1974	Tom Donavan	Huntington	Holy Family	Penn State
1975	Mark Lyles	Buffalo	Grover Cleveland	Florida State
1975	Frank Bruno	Croton	Harmon	Harvard
1975	Bob Bush	Amsterdam	Amsterdam	X
1975	John Scully	Huntington	Holy Family	Notre Dame
1975	Mandell Robinson	Syracuse	North	Syracuse
1975	Tom Blinco	Youngstown	Lewiston-Porter	Ohio State
1976	Mike Caruso	Elmira	Shenendehowa	Cornell
1976	Pete Holohan	Liverpool	Liverpool	Notre Dame
1976	Joe Mortis	Rome	Academy	None
1976	Henry Feil	Massapequa	Berner	Purdue
1977	Kevin Akins	Webster	Schroeder	Ohio State
1978	Shawn McNamara	Lake Ronkonkoma	Sachem	Penn State
1978	John Skronski	Staten Island	Msgr. Farrell	Notre Dame
1980	Ronnie Pitts	Orchard Park	Orchard Park	UCLA
1981	Tim Green	Liverpool	Liverpool	Syracuse

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		NORTH CAROLINA		
1972	Marvin Powell	Fayetteville	Seventy-First	USC
1972	Johnny Stratton	Salisbury	Price	X
1973	Johnny Evans	High Point	Andrews	North Carolina St.
1973	Ron Smith	Sylva	Webster	Х
1973	Ed Calloway	Elkin	Elkin	North Carolina St.
1974	Ricky Adams	High Point	Ragsdale	North Carolina St.
1974	David Simmons	Goldsboro	Rosewood	North Carolina
1975	Jim Streeter	Sylva	Webster	North Carolina
1975	Mike Brewington	Greenville	Rose	East Carolina
1975	Tom Singleton	Maiden	Maiden	North Carolina St.
1976	Donnell Thompson	Lumberton	Lumberton	North Carolina
1976	Ron Wooten	Kinston	Kinston	North Carolina
1977	Glenn Ford	Greensboro	Grimsley	Tennessee
1978	Kelvin Bryant	Tarboro	Tarboro	North Carolina
1979	Tyrone Anthony	Winston Salem	West Forsythe	North Carolina
1979	Dwayne Green	Raleigh	Broughton	North Carolina State
1979	Al Young	Hickory	Hickory	North Carolina
1979	Clifford Powell	Rocky Mtn.	Rocky Mtn.	North Carolina
1979	Bobby Pope	Hickory	St. Stephan	Clemson
1980	Lance Smith	Kannapolis	Brown	LSU
1980	Eathan Horton	Kannapolis	Brown	North Carolina
1980	Joe McIntosh	Lexington	Lexington	North Carolina State
1981	Dennis Barron	Wilson	Beddingfield	North Carolina
1981	Bill Viggers	lcard	East Burke	North Carolina
1981	Lee Gliarmis	Wilson	Fike Senior	North Carolina
1981	Anthony Flack	Greensboro	Smith	Georgia
1981	Steve Griffin	Pineville	S. Mecklenburg	Clemson

•

•

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		NORTH DAKOTA		
1974	Rob Mihulka	Grafton	Grafton	North Dakota
1977	Steve Cichy	Fargo	Shanley	Notre Dame
		<u>OHIO</u>		
1972	Don Hasselbeck	Cincinnati	La Salle	Colorado
1972	Gary Jeter	Cleveland	Cathedral Latin	U.S.C.
1972	Ross Browner	Warren	W. Reserve	Notre Dame
1972	Tom Friericks	Circleville	Circleville	X
1972	Steve Grote	Cincinnati	Elder	Х
1972	Mike Gayles	Cincinnati	Princeton	Х
1972	Rob Lytle	Fremont	Ross	Michigan
1972	Tom Hannon	Massillon	Massillon	Michigan State
1973	Ted Bell	Youngstown	Cardinal Mooney	Michigan State
1973	Harry Woebkenberg	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1973	Aaron Brown	Warren	W. Reserve	Ohio State
1973	Stan Johnson	Sandusky	Sandusky	X
1973	Tyrone Harris	Mifflin	Mifflin	X
1973	Mark Lang	Cincinnati	Moeller	Ohio State
1973	Robert Robertson	Barberton	Barberton	X
1973	Jeff Logan	Canton	Hoover	Ohio State
1974	Jonathan Moore	Canton	McKinley	Kentucky
1974	Mark Schmerge	Cincinnati	St. Xavier	X
1974	Jay Case	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1974	Tom Cousineau	Lakewood	St. Edwards	Ohio State
1974	Jim Browner	Warren	W. Reserve	Notre Dame
1974	John Ziegler	Warren	Harding	X
1974	Rod Stewart	Lancaster	Lancaster	X
1974	Ernie Andria	Wintersville	Wintersville	Ohio State
1974	Farley Bell	Toledo	BeVilbiss	Ohio State
1975	Brian Mentas	Canton	McKinley	Х

.

178

÷

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1975	Willard Browner	Warren	W. Reserve	Notre Dame
1975	Tyrone Hicks	Warren	Harding	Ohio State
1975	Ernie Washington	E. Liverpool	E. Liverpool	Х
1975	Ron Barwig	Willoughby	South	Ohio State
1975	Doug Marsh	Akron	East	Michigan
975	Ken Fritz	Ironton	Ironton	Ohio State
975	Joe Portale	Lakewood	St. Edward	Florida
975	Mike Schneider	Cincinnati	LaSalle	Ohio State
975	Jeff Kraus	Cincinnati	Colerain	X
976	Tim Koegel	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1976	Alvin Washington	Cleveland	Benedictine	Ohio State
976	Andy Schramm	Findlay	Findlay	Michigan State
1976	Todd Bell	Middletown	Middletown	Ohio State
976	Jim Brown	Cincinnati	Moeller	Penn State
976	Fred Motley	Dayton	Meadowdale	Michigan
976	David Allen	Warren	Harding	X
1976	Cliff Belmer	Mansfield	Mansfield	Ohio State
1976	Ray Ellis	Canton	McKinely	Ohio State
1976	Terry Bach	Centerville	Centerville	Ohio State
976	Larry Lee	Dayton	Roth	UCLA
977	Art Schlicter	Washington Court House	Miami-Trace	Ohio State
977	Jim Houston	Akron	St. Vincent	Ohio State
977	A. J. Jones	Youngstown	North	Texas
977	Harold Brown	Kent	Roosevelt	Ohio State
977 [.]	Bob Crable	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
977	Chuck Rowland	Barberton	Barberton	Michigan
977	Dean Masztak	Toledo	Central Catholic	Notre Dame
977	Kevin Bates	Wyoming	Wyoming	Stanford
977	Tim Tripp	Dayton	Jefferson ,	Notre Dame
977	Craig Pack	Orrville	Orrville	Ohio State
977	Ed Muransky	Youngstown	Cardinal Mooney	Michigan
977	Mark Warth	Zanesville	Zanesville	Michigan

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1977	Bryan Thomas	Elyria	Catholic	Pitt
1977	Ricky Asberry	Canton	McKinley	Pitt
1978	Brent Offenbecher	Massillon .	Washington	Wake Forest
1978	Kelvin Lindsey	Sandusky	Sandusky	Ohio State
1978	Tim Spencer	St. Clairsville	St. Clairsville	Ohio State
1978	Tony Hunter	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1978	Joe Lukens	Cincinnati	Moeller	Ohio State
1978	lrv. Eatman	Dayton	Meadowdale	UCLA
1978	Glenn Cobb	Washington Court	Miami-Trace	Ohio State
1978	Rob Harkrader	Middletown	Fenwick	Indiana
1978	Steve Gemza	Dayton	Chaminade	UCLA
1978	Bernie Brown	Marietta	Marietta	Ohio State
1979	Scott Grooms	Washington Court House	Miami Trace	Notre Dame
1979	Thad Gibbs	Cincinnati	Princeton	Ohio State
1979	John Apke	Cincinnati	Moeller	Ohio State
1979	Tim Moriarity	Euclid	Euclid	Ohio State
1979	Rick Naylor	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1979	Tom Hassel	Cincinnati	Purcell	Ohio State
1979	Judd Groza	Berea	Berea	Ohio State
1979	Orlando Lowery	Shaker Hts.	Shaker Hts.	Ohio State
1980	Mark Brooks	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1980	Chris Smith	Cincinnati	Lasalle	Notre Dame
1980	Tom Bowman	Portsmouth	Notre Dame	West Virginia
1980	Brian Mercer	Cincinnati	Forest Park	Michigan
1980	Garin Veris	Chillicothe	Chillicothe	Stanford
1980	Eric Kattus	Cincinnati	Colerain	Michigan
1980	Doug Williams	Cincinnati	Moeller	Kentucky
1980	Jim Lachey	St. Henry	St. Henry	Ohio State
1980	Mike Larkin	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1980	Mike Golic	Cleveland	St. Joseph	Notre Dame
1980	Joe Johnson	Fostoria	Fostoria	Notre Dame
1981	Keith Byars	Davton	Roth	Ohio State

:

·

.

.

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1981	Arnold Franklin	Cincinnati	Princeton	North Carolina
1981	Ed Boone	Cleveland	St. Joseph	Penn State
1981	Bob Maggs	Youngstown	Cardinal Mooney	Ohio State
1981	John Askin	Cincinnati	Moeller	Notre Dame
1981	Hal Von Wyl	Wilson	Walsh Jesuit	Notre Dame
1981	Mike Kee	Columbus	Eastmoor	Ohio State
1981	Mark Hammerstein	Wapakoneta	Qapakoneta	Michigan
		OKLAHOMA		
1972	Chez Evans	Seminole	Seminole	Oklahoma
1972	Ross Murphy	Tulsa	Memorial	Х
972	Joe McReynolds	Purcell	Purcell	Oklahoma
1973	Myron Shoate	Spiro	Spiro	Oklahoma
1973	Sam Claphon	Stilwell	Stillwell	0klahoma
1973	James Norton	Davenport	Davenport	Х
1973	Melvin Barnes	Tulsa	Washington	Kansas
1974	Mike Gaither	Tulsa	Memorial	0klahoma
1975	Barry Burget	Stroud	Stroud	0klahoma
1975	Terry Jones	Roland	Roland	X
1975	J. C. Watts	Eufaula	Eufaula	Oklahoma
1976	Jim Jimmerson	Norman	Norman	0klahoma
1976	Bruce Compton	Norman	Norman	X
1976	Frank Moore	Milwood	Milwood	0klahoma
1976	Richard Turner	Edmond	Edmond	0klahoma
1977	Scott Tinsley	Oklahoma City	Putnam City West	U.S.C.
977	Steve Holmes	Yukon	Yukon	0klahoma
1977	Rod Tate	Beggs	Beggs	Texas
977	Ken Muncy	Shawnee	Shawnee	Notre Dame
1977	Kelly Phelps	Oklahoma City	Putnam City	0klahoma
1978	Bryce Vann	Oklahoma City	Putnam City	North East Oklahoma
1978	Paul Parker	Tulsa	Washington	0klahoma
1978	Steve McKeaver	Altus	Altus	Oklahoma

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
İ979	Tim Randolph	Midwest City	Midwest City	0klahoma
1979	Jeff Leiding	Tulsa	Union	Texas
1980	Eddie Goodlow	Altus	Altus	Oklahoma State
1980	Clay Miller	Norman	Norman	Michigan
1981	Spencer Tillman	Tulsa	Edison	Oklahoma
		OREGON	•	
1972	Jeff Butts	Portland	Parkrose	Х
1972	Ron Goss	Grant's Pass	Grant's Pass	X
1972	Elton Moore	Beaverton	Jesuit	Х
1973	Jeff Brown	Medford	Medford	X
1973	Jeff Salta	Hillsboro	Hillsboro	Х
1974	Terry Beck	Corvallis	Corvallis	Oregon State
1974	Greg Hartling	Aloha	Aloha	Colorado
1975	Stan Brock	Beaverton	Jesuit	Colorado
1975	Steve Dienstel	Portland	Benson	х
1976	Nick Westerberg	Albany	South	Oregon State
1976	Dan Ainge	Eugene	North	Basketball Scholarship
1976	Scott Tiesing	Beaverton	Sunset	U.C.L.A.
1977	Rourk Lowe	Aloha	Aloha	Oregon
1978	Dave Lewis	Oregon City	Grant	California
1979	Jim Rogers	Aloha	Alohạ	Washington
1980	Joe Holvey	Eugene	Marist	San Diego State
1981	Jim Fitzpatrick	Beaverton	Beaverton	U.S.C.
		PENNSYLVANIA		
1972	John Harcher	Pittsburgh	Thomas Jefferson	Х
1972	Anthony Dorsett	Aliquippa	Hopewell	Pitt
1972	Bobby Thomas	King of Prussia	Upper Merion	Missouri
1972	John DeFeliciantonio	Philadelphia	Neuman	Illinois
1972	Russ Clark	Leechburg	Kiski-Area	X

.

•

÷

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1972	Bob Baker	King of Prussia	Upper Merion	Temple
1972	Joe Able	Coatesville	Coatesville	Х
1973	Joe Montana	Donora	Ringgold	Notre Dame
1973	Jim Cefalo	Pittston	Pittston	Penn State
1973	Carmen Frangiosa	Plymouth-White	Plymouth-White	Х
1973	Richard Musgrove	Germantown	Germantown	X
1973	Gil Lewis	New Castle	New Castle	X
1973	William Brown	McKeesport	McKeesport	Х
1974	Larry Graziani	New Castle	New Castle	X
1974	Mickey Dudish	Wilkes-Barre	Meyers	Maryland
1974	Kevin Thrower	New Kensington	Valley	X
1974	Tony Petruccio	Levittown	Egan	Penn State
1975	Mike Guman	Bethlehem	Catholic	Penn State
1975	Matt Suhey	State College	State College	Penn State
1975	Frank Case	Doylestown	Central Bucks	Penn State
1975	Bruce Clark	New Castle	New Castle	Penn State
1975	George Schechterly	Berwick	Berwick	South Carolina
1975	Marlin Van Horn	Selinsgrove	Selinsgrove	Maryland
1975	Larry Reid	Philadelphia	Cardinal Dougherty	Michigan
1976	Benji Pryor	New Kensington	Valley	Pitt
1976	Michael Gold	Philadelphia	Bartram	Х
1976.	Bob Tomko	Wilkes-Barre	G.A.R.	Х
1976	Geroge Atiyeh	Allentown	Dieruff	LSU
1977	Dan Lute	King of Prussia	Upper Merion	North Carolina St.
1977	Charles Jones	Donora	Ringgold	Pitt
1977	Mike Munchak	Scranton	Central	Penn State
1977	Emil Boures	Norristown	Bishop Kendrick	Pitt
1977	Frank Rocco	Pittsburgh	Fox Chapel	Penn State
1977	Terry Rakowski	Ashland	North Schuylkill	Penn State
1978	Mike [´] White	Philadelphia	Cardinal Dougherty	Arizona State
1978	Kevin Ward	Doylestown	Central Bucks	Arizona

١

.

183

•

•

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1978	Dan Marino	Pittsburgh	Central Catholic	Pitt
1978	Mike McCloskey	Philadelphia	Father Judge	Penn State
1978	Julius Dawkins	Monessen	Monessen	Pitt
1978	Jeff Hostetler	Davidsville	Conemaugh Township	Penn State
1979	Steve Bono	Norristown	Norristown	UCLA
1979	Dwight Collins	Beaver Falls	Beaver Falls	Pitt
1979	Ivan Lesnick	Doylestown	Central Bucks	Arizona
1979	Leroy Shepard	New Castle	New Castle	Garden City Community College
1979	Steve Sefter	Cedar Cliff	Cedar Cliff	Penn State
1979	Pat Daily	Butler	Butler	Penn State
1979	Ron Solt	Wilkes-Barre	Coughlin	Maryland
1980	Ken Karcher	Pittsburgh	Shaler	Notre Dame
1980	Nick Merrick	Pittsburgh	Seton-LaSalle	Virginia
1980	Bill Fralic	Pittsburgh	Penn Hills	Pitt
1980	Tony Piccin	Whitehall	Whitehall	Notre Dame
1980	Greg Golanowski	Nanticoke	Nanticoke	Penn State
1980	Caesar Aldisert	Pittsburgh	Mt. Lebanon	Pitt
1981	Rich Bowen	McKeesport	Serra Catholic	Pitt
1981	Matt Stennett	Pittsburgh	Shaler	Pitt
1981	Bob White	Freeport	Freeport	Penn State
1981	Bob Schilken	Pittsburgh	Mt. Lebanon	Pitt
1981	Scott Saylor	Whitehall	Whitehall	West Virginia
1981	Dean Dimideo	West Chester	East	Penn State
1981	Bob Buczkowski	Monroeville	Gateway	Pitt
		RHODE ISLAND		

### NONE

## SOUTH CAROLINA

1972

Mickey Sims

Lockhar t

Lockhart

184

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1972	Stanley Morgan	Easlev	Easlev	Tennessee
1973	Jeff Mills	Greenville	Mann /	Clemson
1973	Marty Crosby	James Island	James Island	Х
1974	Steve Fuller	Spartanburg	Spartanburg	Clemson
1975	Brooks Williamson	Burlington	Mayo	Х
1975	Tim Singleton	Charleston	Ft. Johnson	North Carolina
1975	Alonzo Middleton	Orangeburg	Wilkinson	Michigan State
1976	Steve Lee	Dillon	Dillon	South Carolina
1976	Chuck Allen	Anderson	T. L. Honna	X
1977	Derek Hughes	Charleston	Bishop England	Michigan State
1978	Morris Brown	Laurens	Laurens	Georgia
1978	Alex Hudson	Spartanburg	Spartanburg	Clemson
1979	Clarence Kay	Seneca	Seneca	Georgia
1980	Perry Ċuda	Summerville	Summerville	Alabama
1980	William Perry	Aiken	Aiken	Clemson
1980	Ardell Fuller	Gaffney	Gaffney	Vanderbilt
1981	David Barnett	Moncks Corner	Berkeley County	Clemson
		SOUTH DAKOT	<u>A</u>	
1974	Tom Murphy	Watertown	Watertown	Minnesota
1975	Randy Schleusner	Rapid City	Stevens	Nebraska
	•	TENNESSEE		
1972	Adolph Groves	Nashville	Maplewood	Vanderbilt
1972	Willie Fry	Memphis	Northside	Notre Dame
1972	George Heath	Bristol	Bristol	Х
1973	GregJones	Bristol	Tennessee	Х
1973	Ralph Carnahan	Nashville	0verton	X
1974	Mike Wright	Nashville	Ryan	Vanderbilt
1974	Billy Arbo	Knoxville	Webb	Tennessee
1975	Wilbert Jones	Brownsville	Haywood	Tennessee

-

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1975	Hubert Simpson	Athens	McMinn County	Tennessee
1976	E. J. Junior	Nashville	Maplewood	Alabama
1976	Peter Boll	Chatanooga	Notre Dame	Nebraska
1977	Kenny Jones	Nashville	Stratford	Tennessee
1978	Mike Cofer	Knoxville	Rule	Tennessee
1978	John Matthews	Memphis	Hamilton	Tennessee
1979	Norman Hill	Nashville	Hillsboro	Texas Tech
1979	Tim Bryant	Mt. Juliet	Mt. Juliet	Vanderbilt
1979	Reginald White	Chattanooga	Howard	Tennessee
1980	Todd Upton	Alcoa	Alcoa	Tennessee
1980	Ketn Austin	Brentwood	Academy	Mississippi
1980	Tommy Taylor	Chattanooga	Chattanooga	UCLA
1981	Roman Bates	Memphis	Hamilton	Ohio State
981	Jimmy Hockaday	Brentwood	Academy	Georgia
1070		<u> </u>	-	v
19/2	Alcy Jackson	Dallas	South Oak Cliff	X
19/2	Wilson Whitley	Brenhem	Brenhem	Houston
9/2	Jeff Bergeron	Port Neches	Groves	X
19/2	SCOTT Mann	Udessa	Permian	
19/2	Jimmy Dean		Brazoswood	Texas A & M
19/2	Konnie Kogers		Uvalde	
19/2		Arington San Antonio	Artington	
19/2				Tawaa
19/3				rexas v
נ/לי נקו		Lewisville	Dichfield	
レフ/ン ロフ2	Alfred Senders	Tomple		SHU V
ל/כי 1072	Ron Burns	Arlington	Sam Houston	Ŷ
<i>כוכ</i> י 1973	John Washington			Ŷ
1973	Joel Estes	Sherman	Sherman	Oklahoma
1973	Mike Renfro	Arlington	Arlington Hts.	TCU
212		in ring con	All this con neor	

`

· ·

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attende
1973	Jim Yarborough	Galveston	Ball	Texas
1973	John Kramer	Houston	Clear Lake	X
1973	Mike Mock	Longview	Longview	Texas Tech
1973	Rodney Allison	Odessa	Odessa	Texas Tech
1974	Billy Sims	Hooks	Hooks	Oklahoma
1974	Dave Hodge	Clute	Brazoswood	Houston
1974	Tom Lott	San Antonio	John Jay	0klahoma
1974	Ted Constanzo	San Antonio	Churchill	Texas
1974	Ronnie Smith	Baytown	Sterling	Texas A & M
1974	Stan Singleton	Mesquite	Mesquite	Х
1975	Sammy Bickham	Plano	Plano	Baylor
1975	Curtis Dickey	Bryan ,	Bryan	Texas A & M
1975	Paul Haggerty	Corpus Christi	Mary Carooll	Texas A & M
1975	Wesley Roberts	Amarillo	Pate	TCU
1975	Junior Miller	Midland	Lee	Nebraska
1975	Rich Guthrie	Tyler	John Tyler	Texas A & M
1975	Wesley Hubert	Houston	South '	Texas
1975	Lance Taylor	El Paso	Coronado	Texas
1976	Darrell Shepard	Odessa .	Odessa	Houston
1976	Billy Don Jackson	Sherman	Sherman	UCLA
1976	Clark Broaddus	Freeport	Brazoswood	Х
1976	Ronnie Greer	Ennis	Ennis	Texas
1976	Tim Huffman	Dallas	Jefferson	Notre Dame
1976	Alvin Rubin	Baytown	Lee	Houston
1976	Hosea Taylor	Longview	Longview	Houston
1976	Maurice McCloney	Beaumont	Herbert	Х
1976	Mark Harrelson	San Antonia	Churchill	Texas Tech
1976	Eric Herring	Houston	Yates	Houston
1976	Jim Ward	Conroe	Conroe	Texas A & M
1977	Rod Pegues	Gainesville	Gainesville	Oklahoma
1977	Booger Brooks	Andrews	Andrews	Texas
1977	Lawrence Sampleton	Seguin	Seguin	Texas
1977	Eric Ferguson	Houston	Kashmere	SMU

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1977	Brad Beck	Perryton	Perryton	Texas
1977	Milton Collins	Blooming Grove	Blooming Grove	North Texas State
1977	Jerry Sanders	Garlands	South	0klahoma
1977	Maceo Fifer	Kerrville	Tivy	Houston
1977	Perry Harnett	Galveston	Ball	SMU
1977	Mark Weber	Texas City	Texas City	Texas
1977	Donnie Little	Dickinson	Dickinson	Texas
1977	Jimmy Turner	Sherman	Sherman	UCLA
1977	Adrian Price	Galveston	Ball	Texas
1978	Kyle Money	Dallas	Samuel	Baylor
1978	Rick Mclvor	Ft. Stockton	Ft. Stockton	Texas
1978 ·	Eric Dickerson	Sealy	Sealy	SMU
1978	Carl Robinson	Temple	Temple	Texas
1978	Gabriel Rivera	San Antonia	Jefferson	Texas Tech
1978	Phillip Boren	Dallas	Carter	Arkansas
1978	Stanley Godine	Houston	Kashmere	SMU
1978	Carl Robinson	Temple	Temple	Texas
1978	Ronnie James	Houston	Yates	Texas A & M
1978	Charles Wagoner	Dallas	Carter	SMU
1978	Craig James	Houston	Stratford	SMU
1978	Gary Kubiak	Houston	St. Pius X	Texas A & M
1978	Brian Millard	Dumas	Dumas	Texas
1979	Lance Mcllhenny	Dallas	Highland Park	SMU
1979	Ricky Byars	LaPorte	LaPorte	0klahoma
1979	Lloyd Archie	Huntsville	Huntsville	Houston
1979	David Randle	Dallas	White	SMU
1979	Tommy Robinson	Gregory	Portland	Texas A & M
1979	Keith Guthrie	Tyler	John Tyler	Texas A & M
1979	Ed Williams	Odessa	Ector	Texas
1979	Alfred Anderson	Waco	Richfield	Baylor
1979	Victor Langley	Richardson	Richardson	Ohio State

•

•

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attende
1979	Terry Orr	Abilene	Cooper	Texas
1979	Mark Lewis	Houston	Kashmere	Texas A & M
1979	James Lorfing	Channelview	Channelview	SMU
1979	Ron Faurot	Hurst	Bell	Arkansas
1980	Todd Dodge	Port Arthur	Jefferson	Texas
1980	Van Pearcy	Andrews	Andrews	Notre Dame
1980	Ken Davis	Temple	Temple	TCU
1980	Brent Duhon	Port Arthur	Jefferson	Texas
1980	Robbie Finnegan	Dallas	Jesuit	Notre Dame
1980	Ray Childress	Richardson	Pearce	Texas A & M
1980	John Barnes	Dallas	Highland Park	Stanford
1980	Alan Jamison	Houston	Westchester	Baylor
1980	Kevin Hancock	Texas City	Texas City	Baylor
1980	Bernard Giddings	Marlin	Marlin	Houston
1980	Bill Heathcock	Garland	North	Texas
1980	Brian Camp	Lewisville	Lewisville	Baylor
1980	Gerald Turner	Pittsburg	Pittsburg	Houston
1980	Lawrence Hardin	Orange	Stark	0klahoma
1981	Anthony Byerly	Newton	Newton	Texas
1981	Craig Kennington	Dallas	Highland Park	SMU
1981	James Lee	Ft. Worth	Dunbar	0klahoma
1981	T. J. Turner	Lufkin	Lufkin	Houston
1981	Ty Allert	Houston	Northbrook	Texas
1981	Gerald Taylor	Dallas	South Oak Cliff	TCU
1981	Egypt Allen	Dallas	South Oak Cliff	TCU
1981	Jeffrey Fields	Houston	Yates	Houston
1981	Johnny Cooper	Port Arthur	Jefferson	Texas
1981	Sebastian Harris	Houston	Yates	Houston
1981	Joseph Geobel	Midland	Midland	· UCLA
1981	Tom Muecke	Angleton	Angleton	Baylor
1981	Arthur Allen	Dallas	Kimball	SMÚ
1981	Todd Tschantz	Dallas	Lake Highlands	Texas A & M

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
		UTAH	_	•
1972	Dean Paynter	Kearns	Kearns	Х
1973	Bruce Hardy	Bingham	Bingham	Arizona State
1974	Randy Nuckolls	Bountiful	Viewmont	X
1975	Marcus Watts	Bountiful	Bountiful	Arizona State
1976	Jim McMahon	Roy	Roy	BYU
1977	Steve Clark	Salt Lake City	Skyline	Utah
1978	Chuck Ehin	Layton	Layton	BYU
1980	Mike Woodbury	Bountiful	Bountiful	X
1980	Kelly Angel	Murray	Murray	Utah State
		VERMONT		
		NONE		
		VIRGINIA	-	
1972 ·	Bill Housewright	Gate City	Gate City	Х
1972	Julius Campbell	Alexandria	Williams	Х
1972	Mike Voight	Chesapeake	Indian River	North Carolina
972	George Woodhouse	Norfolk ·	Maury	X
973	Larry Bethea	Norfolk	Ferguson	Michigan State
1974	Ruseell Davis	Woodbridge	Woodbridge	Michigan
1974	Harold Cook	Alexandria	Williams	X
1974	Mike Dunn	Hampton	Bethel	Ohio State
1974	Steve Atkins	Spotsylvania	Spotsylvania	Maryland
1975	Eric Sievers	Arlington	Washington-Lee	Maryland
1975	Larry Stewart	Portsmouth	Woodrow Wilson	Maryland
1975	Simon Gupton	Hampton	Behtel	North Carolina St.
1975	Woodrow Wilson	Hampton	, Bethel	North Carolina St.
1976	Ken Easley	Chesapeake	Smith	U.C.L.A.

.

190

ę

Year	Name	City	High School	College Attended
1976	Amos Lawrence	Norfolk	Lake Taylor	North Carolina
1977	Dennis Mahan	Martinsville	Martinsville	Tennessee
1977	Eric Brown	Hampton	Bethel	U.C.L.A.
1978	Lou Bartek	Hampton	Bethel	Penn State
1979	Shawn Gale	Hampton	Bethel	Ohio State
1979	Billy Davis	Alexandria	Mt. Vernon	Clemson
1979	Glenn Phillips	Roanoke	Patrick Henry	Virginia
1980	Jay Underwood	Newport News	Denby	Notre Dame
1980	Eric Wilson	Charlottesville	Charlottesville	Maryland
1981	Jamie Harris	Danville	Washington	Georgia
1981	Walter Baily	Hampton	Bethel	North Carolina
1981	Danny Burmeister	Vienna	Oakton	North Carolina
1981	Carl Carr	Alexandria	Williams	North Carolina
1981	Kent Thomas	Roanoke	Northside	Virginia Tech
1981	Allen Pinkett	Sterling	Parkview	Notre Dame
		WASHINGTO	<u>N</u>	
1972	Mike Cordova	Seattle	Seattle Prep	Stanford
1972	Kjel Kiilsgard	Spokane	Ferris	х
1973	Steve McDaniels	Renton	Renton	х
1973	Dean Pedigo	Everett	Cascadw	Washington State
1973	Dan Doornink	Wapato	Wapato	Washington State
1974	LaVoy Wilkerson	Tacoma	Mt. Tahoma	None
1975	Joe Steele	Seattle	Blanchet	Washington
1976	Cameron Mitchell	Richland	Columbia	Washington State
1976	Curt Marsh	Snohomish	Snohomish	Washington
1976	Jim Stone	Seattle	Kennedy	Notre Dame
1977	Ryne Sandberg	Spokane	North Central	Pro Baseball Contract
1977	Ken Driscoll	Tacoma	Mt. Tahoma	Washington
1977	Mark Jerve	Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Washington
1978	Phil Carter	Tacoma	Wilson	Notre Dame
1978	Rob Hedequist	Spokane	Gonzaga	U.S.C.

'ear	Name	City	High School	College Attended
979	Neil Palmer	Kennewick	Kennewick	Х
979	Ted Brose	Port Orchard	South Kitsap	Washington
980	Mark Rypian	Spokane	Shadle Park	Washington State
980	Mike Vindivich	Tacoma	Mt. Tahoma	Washington
980	Dennis Soldat	Richland	Columbia	Washington
980	Michael Collins	Vancouver	Ft. Vancouver	X
		WEST VIRGINIA		
972	Danny Williams	Charleston	Du Pont	Х
973	Claude Geiger	East Bank	East Bank	Marshall
974	Robin Lyons	Clendenin	Hoover	West Virginia
974	Bernie Salvey	Wheeling	Central	X
975	Walt Easley	Charleston	Jackson	West Virginia
976	Robt. Alexander	South Charleston	South Charleston	West Virginia
976	Dave Phillips	Parkersburg	Parkersburg	Ohio State
978	Curt Warner	Pineville	Pineville	Penn State
979	Tim Stevens	Parkersburg	South	Ohio State
981	David Griffith	South Charleston	South Charleston	West Virginia
		WISCONSIN		
972	Mike Kaffka	Antigo	Antigo	Notre Dame
973	Pete Johnson	Fond DuLac	Goodrich	Notre Dame
973	Tom Sobocinski	Milwaukee	South	Х
974	Frank Bouressa	Kaukauna	Kaukauna	X
974	Rick Olson	New Auburn	New Auburn	Wisconsin Stout
975	Tom Schremp	Antigo	Antigo	Wisconsin
976	Greg Rabas	Keewaunee .	Keewaunee	Nebraska
978	Jay [¯] Bachmann	Whitewater	Whitewater	lowa
978	Kyle Borland	Ft. Atkinson	Ft. Atkinson	Wisconsin
979	Jim Melka	West Allis	Central	Wisconsin

,

Year	Name	Ċity	High School	College Attended
1980	Jeff Dellenback	Wausau	East	Wisconsin
1981	Kurt Schlicht	Madison	West	Wisconsin
		WYO	1 I NG	
		Ň	DNE	
		DISTRICT OF	T. COLUMBIA	
1978	Greg Brown		Woodson	Miami
1978	Claybon Fields	•	Woodson	Purdue
1978	Darryl Sheffey		Ballou	Oklahoma State
1979	John Chesley		Eastern	Oklahoma State
1980	Dwayne Pugh		Woodson	Illinois
1981	Demise Williams		Eastern	Oklahoma State

.

The letter X is used in cases when the author was unable to positively identify the college (if any) attended by the High School All-American.

.

# VITA

#### William Anthony Sutton

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

### Thesis: THE BLUE CHIP QUEST: A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS OF COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL RECRUITING, 1972-1981

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor Field: Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

Biographical:

- Personal Data: Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, January 12, 1951, the son of Mr. and Mrs. William N. Sutton.
- Education: Graduated from South Hills Catholic High School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in June, 1968; received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Oklahoma State University in 1972; received the Master of Science degree in Health, Physical Education and Leisure Science from Oklahoma State University in 1980; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.
- Professional Experience: Counselor, Ward Home, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1974-1978; Program Director, Stillwater Family YMCA, 1978-1980; Associate Executive Director, Stillwater YMCA, 1980-1981; Executive Director, Stillwater Family YMCA, 1981-1982; Assistant Professor, Sports Management Department, Robert Morris College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1982.