



72-14,098

DAMORE, Patrick Richard, 1930-
FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE ATHLETES TO ACCEPT FOOTBALL
SCHOLARSHIPS AT SIX UNIVERSITIES IN THE BIG
EIGHT CONFERENCE.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1971
Education, physical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© Copyrighted by

Patrick Richard Damore

1972

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE ATHLETES TO ACCEPT FOOTBALL
SCHOLARSHIPS AT SIX UNIVERSITIES
IN THE BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
PATRICK RICHARD DAMORE

Norman, Oklahoma

1971

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE ATHLETES TO ACCEPT FOOTBALL
SCHOLARSHIPS AT SIX UNIVERSITIES
IN THE BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE

APPROVED BY

Dorothy T. T. T.
William F. Park
Stephen R. T. T.
Jack F. Parker

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

**Some pages have indistinct
print. Filmed as received.**

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the many friends and colleagues who provided the assistance and encouragement necessary for the completion of this study. In particular he wishes to thank the Chairman of the committee, Dr. Dorothy Truex, whose patient guidance and sound advice throughout the study were of inestimable value. Dr. William Eick, Dr. Herbert Hengst, and Dr. Jack Parker, members of the committee, contributed generously of their time and provided wise counsel.

Special recognition must be given to Mr. David Swank, Professor of Law, University of Oklahoma, who was instrumental in gaining the consent of the coaches from the participating universities.

To Mr. Charles Fairbanks, Head Football Coach, the late Mr. Gomer Jones, Director of Athletics, and Mr. Warren Harper, Assistant Football Coach, the writer wish to express his sincere appreciation for their cooperation during the pilot study with the University of Oklahoma Football Team.

The writer is also grateful to the coaches of the six participating universities for consenting to participate and providing the information required to conduct this study.

To my wife Nancy, and children Mary Ann, Susan Clair, and Patrick Jr., (Rick), the writer wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation for their encouragement, sacrifice, assistance and patience during the graduate program and the writing of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background for the Study	3
Need for the Study	5
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	6
Null Hypotheses	7
Major Assumptions	7
Delimitation of the Study	10
Definition of Terms	10
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE	13
III. METHODOLOGY	21
Design of the Study	22
Instrument	26
Population	29
Collection and Treatment of Data	31
IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	34
Questionnaire Results	34
Rating Scale Results	43
Analysis of the Questionnaire Data	52
Analysis of the Rating Scale	57
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64
Summary	64
Conclusions	71
Recommendations	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
APPENDICES	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Population Number by University	30
2. Questionnaire Mailing Record	32
3. Data for Questionnaires Mailed and Returned . . .	34
4. Height, Weight, Age of Respondents	35
5. Average Distance of Respondents' Residence from Selected University	36
6. Permanent Residence of Respondents	36
7. Average Number of Football Scholarship Offers Received	37
8. Major Academic Field Selected by Respondents as Their First Choice	38
9. Major Academic Field Selected by Respondents as Their Second Choice	40
10. Average Number of Siblings of Respondents	41
11. Ordinal Position of Birth of Respondents	42
12. Entering Class and Marital Status of Respondents.	43
13. Mean and Significant Level for Each Factor . . .	44
14. Total of Significant and Not Significant Factors by Universities	50
15. Significant Level of Factors for Each University as Determined by Scheffe' Method	51
16. Factors that were Significant for Specific Universities	60
17. Factors that were Not Significant for Specific Universities	62

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE ATHLETES TO ACCEPT FOOTBALL
SCHOLARSHIPS AT SIX UNIVERSITIES
IN THE BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

History reveals that a modified form of the present game of football was played between Rutgers and Princeton on November 6, 1869.

This day marked the birth of American inter-collegiate football. Although the contest bore no resemblance to today's game, it planted the seed that has blossomed into a hundred-million-dollar business. This first game was a running, kicking, continuous game with no holding of the ball, played under mixed rules agreed upon just before the game.¹

During the past 102 years, college football has grown into an organized program of great proportion. The sport of football has contributed much to the collegiate way of life on the campuses of colleges and universities in the

¹Richard I. Miller, The Truth About Big-Time Football (New York: William Sloane Associates, 1953), p. 219.

United States. It has also become a part of the American heritage. It has touched millions of people, either as participants or spectators.

In the fall of 1970, 118 major colleges and universities participated in intercollegiate football.¹ There were also many more college division institutions participating during the 1970 season. These institutions were vying for the influence, prestige, and recognition that accompanies the winning of a conference, league, or national title, along with all of the other values that football contributes to individuals and institutions.

Eight of the institutions that are classified in the major division by the National Collegiate Athletic Association are members of the Big Eight Conference: University of Colorado, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, University of Kansas, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University. This study includes all of the universities in the Conference, with the exception of University of

¹ National Collegiate Athletic Association, Official Collegiate Football Guide 1970 (Phoenix: College Athletics Publishing Service, 1970), pp. 95-124.

Colorado and the University of Missouri.

The caliber of play in the Big Eight Conference is evidenced by the fact that the University of Nebraska, a member of the Big Eight Conference, won both the Conference Title and the National Title during the 1970 season. The resulting spectator interest in the Big Eight Conference is reflected in the home attendance figures for the conference teams:

For the first time in history, Big Eight Conference football teams drew over two million fans to their home football games. The total figure of 2,062,781 for 45 contests was just one of 37 new Big Eight attendance records set during a season when an average of 45,840 watched each game, a new standard.¹

Background for the Study

There are many factors and circumstances that are important for the development of a championship team. One of the major factors that contributes to the building of a highly successful team is recruiting.

Recruiting has become one of the major responsibilities of a coach and, as such requires a high degree of organization in

¹ Mickey Holmes, 1971 Big Eight Conference Spring Football Prospectus (Kansas City: Big Eight Service Bureau, 1971), p. 3.

intensity with the seasons of the year.¹

The recruitment of a "blue chip" high school football player during the year involves the expenditure of a large amount of time and money. The coaches, administrators, faculty, alumni and players of a university are involved in the recruitment program.

The job of convincing an athlete to cast his lot with a certain institution may be shared by many individuals. Coaches have been known to employ the assistance of politicians, industrialists, girl friends, clergymen, department heads, Booster Club members, and many other characters in the recruiting process.²

The problems associated with recruiting are compounded by the limited availability of high school football players qualified to meet the demanding physical standards set by the coach and the academic requirements of the institution. The National Collegiate Athletic Association and the various Conferences also have regulations concerning the recruitment program and the amount of financial aid that can be offered athletes. Operating under identical

¹J. W. Moore, The Psychology of Athletic Coaching (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1970), p. 247.

²Ibid., p. 251.

regulations and restrictions, the coaches attempt to find a method or program that will influence athletes to matriculate at their institutions.

Athletes matriculate at a particular institution for a variety of reasons so a single approach to all prospects will not work. A good recruiter, like a good salesman, attempts to understand the philosophy of his customer. If the salesman knows the customer's chief interest, his attitude toward the features of whatever is for sale, the value he places upon such factors as price, performance, and service, he will know what to stress and what to play down.¹

In order to accomplish this objective, many methods and techniques are tried. Some coaches try to "soft sell" the athletes, while others attempt to challenge them; the academic approach is often attempted. But regardless of the technique or method used, the athlete is still the one that has to make the all important selection of an institution.

Need for the Study

With the problems associated with recruiting, the need for assistance in planning the program is ever present. If the factors that influence an athlete are readily and

¹Ibid., p. 251.

accurately identified, the coach will be able to save time and money in planning his program for the recruitment of athletes. When the specific factors that influence athletes are identified, the program can be directed toward these factors.

This study provides information concerning factors important to athletes when selecting and evaluating a particular institution. The results of this study are now available to the coaches to use in planning future programs.

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship at a university in the Big Eight Conference.

Specifically, this study was designed to determine if there are any significant factors that influenced an athlete in the selection of one Big Eight Conference University over another.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the factors that influence high school football players to accept football scholarships at universities in the Big Eight Conference.

A secondary purpose was to provide the Head Football

Coaches of the six participating universities with the factors influencing athletes to accept scholarships at their universities.

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were generated from the problem:

H_{01} - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships at the six specific universities in the Big Eight Conference.

H_{02} - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university, as compared to the overall factors for the six Big Eight Universities.

Major Assumptions

This study assumed that the participating universities are adhering to the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Big Eight Conference.

With reference to scholarships, academic requirements and financial aid, the National Collegiate Athletic Association requires the following:

Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution, that institution's conference (if the institution holds such affiliation) and this Association. In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related supplies and books, and not to exceed \$15 per month for incidental expenses) for the undergraduate period of the recipient, it shall be considered to be "pay" for participation.¹

Section 6. Institutional Eligibility

(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.6000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national experience tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables.²

¹ National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1970-71 NCAA Manual (Kansas City, Missouri: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1970), p. 16.

² Ibid., p. 42.

The Big Eight Conference has the following rules and regulations concerning financial aid and academic requirements:

3.102 In awarding financial aid to student-athletes, each institution must conform to the following provisions: (Revised, Par. 785, March, 1957)

3.1021 The total amount of financial aid shall not exceed that permitted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Under the provisions of the NCAA and this Conference, financial aid equal to any or all of the following items may be awarded:

3.10211 Tuition.

3.10212 Fees.

3.10213 Required course-related supplies and books.
(Revised, Par. 1682, (2), (e), Oct., 1964)

3.10214 Room and board at dormitory rates or less.

3.10215 \$15.00 per month for laundry and incidental expenses.¹

The academic requirements of the Big Eight Conference parallel those of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

3.1011 A student entering directly from high school shall have a predicted minimum grade-point average of 1.600 for his first year of college

¹Big Eight Conference, Rules and Regulations Governing Athletics 1970-71 (Kansas City, Missouri: Big Eight Conference, 1970), p. 27.

work on the NCAA national experience tables adopted by the Conference January 14, 1970.¹

Delimitation of the Study

This study was limited to the freshman male athletes who registered in the Fall of 1971, and who were awarded full football scholarships to one of the six participating universities. It does not include junior college transfers, other transfers, athletes on partial scholarships or students who receive a scholarship after their enrollment at the university.

This study was limited to the following six universities, which are members of the Big Eight Conference: Iowa State University, Kansas State University, University of Kansas, University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University.

Definition of Terms

The following are operational definitions as used in this study:

Factors - Reasons for selecting a specific university.

¹Ibid., p. 25.

High School Athlete - A male student recently graduated from high school who excelled in football.

Football Scholarship - An offer from a particular university to provide room, board, tuition, books, and \$15.00 per month for laundry and incidental expenses. In return, the athlete agrees to participate in intercollegiate football.

Big Eight Conference - Eight universities that have organized athletic programs and have formed a conference. This conference arrangement is for all intercollegiate sports. Only six out of the eight universities are included in this study.

Recruitment Program - An organized program, directed by the head coach, to seek out and attempt to influence athletes to attend a particular university for the purpose of participating in intercollegiate football.

Organization of the Study

This study is reported and organized in five chapters. The first chapter presents an introduction and background for the study, a need for the study, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, null hypotheses, major assumptions, delimitation of the study, a definition of terms, and the organization of the study. Chapter II is composed of a review of the research and related literature. Chapter III includes the methodology, design of the study, instrument, population, and the collection and treatment of data. The results of the study and the analysis of data are reported in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

A review of research studies and related literature revealed that little attention has been given to the factors which determine why a student accepts a scholarship offer to a specific university. Although some information exists in the form of suggestions for recruitment programs, the area in general has drawn infrequent attention and even less study. The following discussion of available research and related literature will address, first, the results of research method investigations, followed by a report of related literature. This section includes information on recruiting presently available in books. The final section of the chapter proposes the theoretical information for this study.

Only one research study was found that referred to specific reasons why an athlete accepted a scholarship to a university. Martinelli conducted a follow-up study of athletes that attended Ohio State University during the period from 1957 to 1962. He found that scholarship

recipients that attended Ohio State University during this period came from a lower socio-economic background and had a tendency to major in physical education and business administration. The study revealed that the athletes accepted scholarship offers to Ohio State University for the following reasons: "the offer of financial assistance, its athletic status, the influence of its coaching staff, alumni and their own high school coach."¹ This study compared scholarship students and non-scholarship students at Ohio State University.

A related study conducted by Hanchey discovered that persons closely associated with youth influenced their educational plans. It was discovered that the following people influenced their plans for continuing their education:

"mothers, fathers, friends, other relatives, persons that were in the occupation and teachers."² This study revealed

¹Fred M. Martinelli, "A Brief History of Subsidization and a Follow-Up Study Comparing Grant-In-Aid and Non-Grant-In-Aid Athletes at the Ohio State University 1957-1962." (Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 30, No. 7-8, 1970), p. 157A.

²Karlos W. Hanchey, "Factors Influencing Occupational Choice and Educational Plans of High School Students with Implications for Changes in the Role of the Secondary School" (Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 30, No. 7-8, 1970), p. 2756A.

that counselors exerted no significant influence on students' educational plans.¹

Hagg found that the following factors were important to students in deciding which college to attend: "cost, entrance requirements, importance of the strength of a special field of study, availability of financial aid, the unimportance of fathers or mothers having attended the college, library and living facilities."²

In a 1970 study, Rooney made a geographic analysis of football player production in Oklahoma and Texas. His findings reveal that "Texas and Oklahoma players have a much lower propensity to migrate out of state than does the average major college recruit."³ He also recommended that the following factors should be tested: ethnic and racial factors, the role of school size, financial support, local university athletic success, multi-sports emphasis, fan

¹Ibid., p. 2756A.

²Adeline M. Hagg, "Importance of Selected Factors in Choosing a College" (Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 31, No. 1-2, 1970), p. 148A.

³John F. Rooney, Jr., "A Geographic Analysis of Football Player Production in Oklahoma and Texas" Proceedings Oklahoma Academy Science, 1970, pp. 114-120.

loyalties, and a study of player's background.¹

Thistlethwaite studied 30,314 students who participated in the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test in 1958 and expected to graduate in 1959. "The most frequently mentioned reasons for college choice were 'high educational standards' (52 per cent), 'course of study offered' (36 per cent), 'low tuition costs and living expenses' (30 per cent), and 'closeness to home' (20 per cent)."² "If we accept these reasons at face value it appears that relatively few students decided which college they would attend upon the basis of the availability of financial aid opportunities."³

A review of related literature revealed that recruitment was treated from a point of view of administration. One book by Moore presented suggestions concerning recruitment programs and some methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the various programs. He stressed the need for periodic surveys among the athletes at college to reveal

¹Ibid., p. 120.

²Donald L. Thistlethwaite, Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students (Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1963), p. 179.

³Ibid., p. 196.

important reasons for their choice of that college.¹

Savage devotes one complete chapter in his book, published in 1929, to recruiting and subsidization of athletes. His approach to the subject of recruiting is informative but not current. The early history of recruiting is treated very effectively in this chapter. He also presents several suggestions for subsidizing athletes.²

A review of books and articles revealed a scarcity of information concerning recruitment. The articles that were studied in various magazines treated recruitment in an editorial manner. The information would not be relevant to this study.

In an attempt to discover why a high school student is influenced or makes a decision in a specific direction, many theories were studied. It is evident that a student's decision is influenced by many people, his environment, and his values.

¹J. W. Moore, The Psychology of Athletic Coaching (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1970), p. 252.

²Howard J. Savage, American College Athletics (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1929), pp. 224-265.

Thistlethwaite states that "the reasons students give for their college choices may be considered as indicators of their value orientations."¹

Ostrander and Dethy feel that:

The choices as to which needs are satisfied and which are not is a function of values. . . . When more than one solution to a particular problem is apparent, when alternatives are present or can be presented, the comparative worth of each can be set and a choice made. . . . Values are functions of the individual. Each person brings his own hereditary and environmental self to the process of the perception of values in the society in which the individual lives, works, and plays. He makes his own choice of components for his personal value system. . . . In spite of the societal pressures toward conformity people do make many choices on the basis of individual preference--that is, in accordance with their own value systems.²

The total environment has an effect on the development of an individual's values.

The values one chooses for guideposts depend upon the mores of the family and the community into which the individual was born, of the

¹Donald L. Thistlethwaite, Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students (Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1963), p. 179.

²Raymond H. Ostrander and Ray C. Dethy, A Values Approach To Educational Administration (New York: American Book Company, 1968), p. 6.

family and community which have been his during his youth and upon the family and community which he now calls his own. . . . Values are functions of time. The individual grows in his value choices in accordance with his maturation. His perception of the worth of things, of people, and of ideas is developmental.¹

Values are important in determining choices an individual will make.

Snygg and Combs state that:

The most important differentiations in the individual's phenomenal field is the development of his phenomenal self. . . . The phenomenal self is the most permanent part of the individual's phenomenal field and is the point of reference for his every behavior.²

Depending upon the concept of self possessed by the individual, he will choose this goal or that as appropriate for such a person as he regards himself to be.³

Values and the phenomenal self are very closely related to the concept of attitude. Thomas and Znaniecki emphasized that since attitude is directed toward some object

¹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²Donald Snygg and Arthur W. Combs, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 78.

³Ibid., p. 101.

it could be defined as a "state of mind of the individual toward a value."¹ Allport concludes that "attitudes determine for each individual what he will see and hear, what he will think and what he will do."² He also defined attitude as "a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related."³

Thus it has been established by the theories and definitions presented that values, the phenomenal self and attitudes, are factors that influence individuals when making decisions.

The review of research and literature concerning the reasons scholarship athletes select institutions reveals a lack of attention to this area of athletics. The scarcity of material suggests that this study initiates the assessment of factors that influence athletes to select specific institutions.

¹Gordon W. Allport, "Attitudes," A Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Carl Murchison, (Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1935), p. 802.

²Ibid., p. 806.

³Ibid., p. 810.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The reasons a high school football player selects a particular university in the Big Eight Conference were investigated by the use of a mail questionnaire that included a rating scale. Guilford states that "of the psychological-measurement methods that depend upon human judgment, rating-scale procedures exceed them all for popularity and use."¹ The rating scale was developed and used to measure the factors important to a high school athlete when making a decision concerning the university he would attend.

The questionnaires were mailed to all freshmen who had been recruited and had accepted football scholarships to specific universities in the Big Eight Conference. The names and addresses of the athletes were provided by the head coach of the participating universities.

¹J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954), p. 263.

The data from the returned questionnaires was punched on IBM cards and analyzed by the use of the One-Way Analysis of Variance Computer Program.¹ The computer work was performed at the State University College, Fredonia, New York Computer Center utilizing the IBM 360/20 Computer with terminal connection to the State University of New York at Buffalo, CDC 6400 Computer.

Design of the Study

Kerlinger states that the "research design is the plan, structure, and strategy of investigation conceived so as to obtain answers to research questions and to control variance."²

A review of current literature concerning research led to the conclusion that the mail questionnaire would be the most appropriate method for collecting the data required for this study. This conclusion was based on the following information:

¹J. D. Finn, NYBMUL (Buffalo, New York: Computing Center Press, 1969), pp. 1-70.

²Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 275.

1. The type of information required.
2. The distance involved between respondents.
3. The need to collect the data before the athletes arrived on campus to start football practice.

After the problem was clearly defined, the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university were identified by members of the University of Oklahoma Football Team.

To measure the factors that were identified a modified summated rating scale was developed. "A summated rating scale (also called Likert-type scale) is a set of attitude items, all of which are considered of approximately equal 'attitude value,' and to each of which subjects respond with degrees of agreement or disagreement (intensity)."¹

After the questionnaire, cover letter, page of related questions, and a rating scale were developed, the validity was judged by six selected members of the University of Oklahoma faculty. According to Cronbach "A test which looks good for a particular purpose is said to have 'face

¹Ibid., p. 484.

validity'."¹ The judges examined the cover letter and questionnaire for content, appearance, relevance, and structure. Kerlinger states that "content validation consists essentially in judgment. Alone or with others, one judges the representativeness of the items."² The six judges were selected by requesting University of Oklahoma faculty members from various disciplines, familiar with research techniques and statistics, to evaluate the questionnaire. Four judges were from the Educational Psychology Department, one from the Physical Education Department, and one from the Psychology Department.

The suggestions and corrections that were made by the judges were incorporated into the questionnaire and the cover letter. The questionnaire contained a page of questions concerning height, weight, age, the distance their residence is located from the campus, their state of residence, offers of football scholarships in the Big Eight

¹Lee J. Cronbach, Essentials of Psychological Testing (2nd. ed.; New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960), p. 143.

²Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 446.

Conference and total number of football scholarship offers. Other questions were related to academic field of interest, number of brothers and sisters, ordinal position of birth in the family, marital status, and entering class. This information was examined and evaluated to determine if any of the items formed a pattern for any specific university and if any indication for additional study was apparent.

To determine the reliability of the questionnaire a pilot study was conducted utilizing eighty-six members of the University of Oklahoma Football Team. The test-retest method described by Ferguson was used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire.¹ The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the reliability.²

The questionnaire was mailed to each athlete who had accepted a full football scholarship to one of the six participating universities. The names and addresses of the

¹George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis In Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 377.

²W. J. Dixon, ed., "BMD02D Program," Biomedical Computer Program (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 49-59.

athletes were provided by the head coach of the participating universities after the national and conference letters of intent were signed by the athletes.

When the completed questionnaires were returned, IBM punch cards were prepared on the IBM/29 Keypunch. The One-Way Analysis of Variance Computer Program was used to determine and analyze the results.

On the basis of the findings and results the null hypotheses listed below were accepted or rejected:

H₀ 1 - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships at the six specific universities in the Big Eight Conference.

H₀ 2 - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university, as compared to the overall factors for the six Big Eight Universities.

Instrument

The instrument that was developed to measure and collect the required data for this study was the questionnaire and rating scale. The following procedure was

followed to develop this instrument: eighty-six members of the University of Oklahoma Football Team were asked to list all the factors that influenced their decision to accept a football scholarship to the University of Oklahoma. They were also asked to list factors they have heard from other players in their home area. From this information, a total of fifty-six factors were accepted. Duplications were eliminated.

A rating scale was developed using a modified form of the Likert scale. The following headings and numerical intensity were used to measure the factors: 1 - Not Important, 2 - Slightly Important, 3 - Important, 4 - Very Important, and 5 - Extremely Important. The respondents were requested to check one of the boxes under the heading that demonstrated their measurement of the factor in influencing their decision to attend a specific university.

The fifty-six factors were listed on the questionnaire in order of their random selection without replacement. This method was used to control the order effect.

Questions that might indicate a pattern for a specific university, or call for further inquiry were listed on a separate sheet.

The cover letter describing the purpose of the study and the directions for completing the rating scale was prepared and attached to the front of the questionnaire.

The face validity and content validity was determined by having six judges examine the total questionnaire. They also examined the structure and appearance. The recommendations and suggestions were incorporated into the completed questionnaire.

Reliability of the questionnaire was determined by conducting a pilot study. Eighty-six members of the University of Oklahoma Football Team were administered the completed questionnaire on April 8, 1971. No instructions were given so that the cover letter and complete questionnaire could be evaluated for clarity and reliability. The same procedure was followed, with the same group of players, three weeks later on April 29, 1971. The test-retest method was utilized to examine the reliability of the instrument. The data from the questionnaire was punched on IBM cards and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Program was used to establish the reliability. The .05 level of significance was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. The test-retest data that was collected

revealed a reliability of .9912 between the total item score on the test and the total item score on retest.

On the basis of the data collected and evaluated, the questionnaire and rating scale demonstrated reliability and validity.

Population

This study was designed to determine the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships at the six participating universities in the Big Eight Conference.

The population for this study includes the total number of high school athletes who were recruited and accepted full scholarships to the six participating universities in the Big Eight Conference. The Head Football Coach at each university in the Big Eight Conference was contacted by letter and asked to participate in this study. The coaches that agreed to participate forwarded the list of names and addresses of all incoming freshman football players who had accepted full scholarships for football.

Due to the confidential nature of the information collected, and for the purpose of reporting the results of this study, the universities will be kept anonymous and have

been assigned the letters A, B, C, D, E, and F. The number of athletes included in this study are listed by university in Table 1.

TABLE 1
POPULATION NUMBER BY UNIVERSITY

University	Athletes
A	43
B	37
C	38
D	36
E	45
F	35

It should be noted that the number of scholarships offered by each university will vary from year to year, depending upon the need for the number of scholarships awarded the previous year.

The six participating universities are members of the Big Eight Conference and are classified in the major division of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The universities have similar academic programs, are state supported, and participate at the same level of competition in football. A more detailed description of each university

is included as an appendix.

Collection and Treatment of Data

A questionnaire mail survey was utilized to collect the data for this study. Good, Barr, and Scates, referring to the mail questionnaire, state that "the questionnaire procedure normally comes into use when one cannot readily see personally all of the people from whom he desires responses or where there is no particular reason to see them personally."¹ The method and procedure used were derived from information contained in Parten's book concerning mail surveys.²

The questionnaire (containing a cover letter), one page of related questions, a rating scale, and a self-addressed return envelope were mailed out to each athlete who would be entering one of the six participating universities in the Fall of 1971. After approximately three to four weeks, a follow-up post card was sent to that segment

¹Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941), p. 325.

²Mildred Parten, Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1966), pp. 216-218.

of the population which had not responded to the questionnaire. A final request, that included a note and another copy of the questionnaire, was sent to the non-respondents just prior to their departure from their homes for the universities. The questionnaires were coded for record purposes so only the non-respondents were contacted for follow-up. It was important that the athlete complete the questionnaire before arriving on the campus so that the bias factor of being present on and influenced by the campus could be controlled. The mailing of the questionnaire and follow-up procedures took place during the months of May, June, July, and August of 1971. A detailed summary is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
QUESTIONNAIRE MAILING RECORD

University	Mailed	Follow-up	Final
A	6/7/71	6/26/71	7/29/71
B	6/22/71	7/11/71	7/26/71
C	6/2/71	6/24/71	7/15/71
D	7/26/71	. .	8/14/71
E	5/28/71	6/24/71	7/15/71
F	6/15/71	6/27/71	7/15/71

The difference in the mailing dates is accounted for by the fact that the questionnaires were mailed out as the names and addresses of the athletes were received. Due to the late mailing date of the questionnaire, no follow-up post card was sent to the athletes from University D.

When the completed questionnaires were received they were checked for completeness and recorded.

The data was then punched on IBM cards utilizing the IBM/29 Keypunch Machine at the State University College, Fredonia, New York Computing Center. The IBM cards were then prepared and organized for the One-Way Analysis of Variance Program. The program was run on the IBM/360/20 Computer at Fredonia with terminal connection to the State University of New York at Buffalo CDC 6400 Computer.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A total of 234 athletes who accepted football scholarships to the six participating universities were asked to complete a questionnaire and rating scale. Of the 234 athletes who were mailed the questionnaire a total of 213 completed and returned them. Table 3 includes a summary of the number of questionnaires that were mailed and returned.

TABLE 3

DATA FOR QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED AND RETURNED

University	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percentage of Returns
A	43	38	88.4
B	37	34	91.1
C	38	35	92.1
D	36	32	88.9
E	45	42	93.9
F	35	32	91.4
Totals	234	213	91.0

Questionnaire Results

The information collected on the first page of the questionnaire was evaluated to determine if any pattern was apparent for any specific university. The results were

examined for evidence of data that might indicate need for further study. The results of the questionnaire are reported in the tables that follow. They are reported by the averages of the responses as indicated by the students for each university. Tables 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 are the actual responses received and not averages. After each table comments are presented concerning the observable data reported.

TABLE 4
HEIGHT, WEIGHT, AGE OF RESPONDENTS

University	Average Height	Average Weight	Average Age
A	73.3"	201.3	17.8
B	73.9"	206.4	18.5
C	74.8"	208.3	17.5
D	74.0"	203.2	17.9
E	74.1"	205.6	17.8
F	73.0"	197.9	17.8

It is evident by the averages presented that University C has the tallest, heaviest, and youngest athletes. University B has the next heaviest and oldest athletes. University F has the shortest and lightest athletes. The range of height for the six universities is from 73.0" to 74.8". The average weight of the athletes starts at 197.9 and goes up to 208.3 pounds. The age span is from 17.5 years to 18.5 years.

TABLE 5

AVERAGE DISTANCE OF RESPONDENTS' RESIDENCE
FROM SELECTED UNIVERSITY

University	Average Miles
A	194.7
B	507.8
C	433.6
D	660.0
E	408.0
F	218.9

Universities A and F have the lowest average miles. University D recruited from the greatest distances. The extremes of 194.7 and 660.0 indicate a significant difference in the recruiting patterns of the various universities.

TABLE 6

PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF RESPONDENTS

University	*In State	**Out of State
A	26	12
B	17	17
C	15	20
D	9	23
E	21	21
F	20	12

*In state refers to the state in which the university is located.

**Out of state refers to states in the United States other than the state in which the university is located.

It is evident from the data presented that Universities A and F recruited more athletes in their home state than out of state for the 1971 season. Universities C and D recruited more athletes out of state than in their home state in 1971. It is interesting that Universities B and E recruited an equal number in state and out of state.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE NUMBER OF FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP OFFERS RECEIVED

University	Big Eight Offers	Overall Offers
A	2.8	13.7
B	2.4	15.4
C	2.5	10.1
D	2.1	14.1
E	2.6	*25.2
F	1.8	8.5

*The reason this figure is high is that three of the respondents reported scholarship offers of 120, 113, and 350. Without these three figures the average would be 11.5 and in line with the others.

The lowest number of offers received from the Big Eight and from all colleges were the athletes from University F. The athletes at University A received the greatest number of offers from Big Eight Universities. The athletes with the greatest number of overall offers attended Universities B and E.

TABLE 8

MAJOR ACADEMIC FIELD SELECTED BY RESPONDENTS
AS THEIR FIRST CHOICE*

University	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Business	11	5	11	11	12	10	60
Physical Ed.	0	4	4	3	5	2	18
Medicine	7	2	0	3	2	3	17
Education	2	2	1	0	1	5	11
Law	2	2	0	1	1	1	7
Engineering	2	0	2	1	2	0	7
Sociology	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Mathematics	0	3	0	0	3	0	6
Biology	0	0	4	0	0	1	5
Dentistry	3	0	0	0	2	0	5
Phy. Therapy	1	0	0	2	1	0	4
English	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
Veterinary Med.	0	1	2	0	0	1	4
Political Sci.	0	1	0	1	2	0	4
Conservation	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Psychology	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
History	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Architecture	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Liberal Arts	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Agriculture	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Journalism	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Science	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Economics	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Industrial Arts	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Speech	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Social Science	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Music	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Government	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 8--Continued

University	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Financing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Accounting	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Forestry	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Marketing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Fine Arts	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Computer Sci.	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Undecided	4	5	3	4	1	4	21
Totals	38	34	35	32	42	32	213

*The numbers indicate the number of respondents who selected the academic major listed.

The academic area an athlete is interested in studying does not appear to be a major factor for any specific university. As a first choice business received the most attention with sixty of the 213 athletes indicating that this area would be their first choice. The other first choices of major interest were physical education with eighteen, medicine with seventeen, and education with eleven. These four academic areas accounted for almost half of the total first choices. Twenty-one of the athletes were undecided concerning their first choice of study.

TABLE 9

MAJOR ACADEMIC FIELD SELECTED BY RESPONDENTS
AS THEIR SECOND CHOICE*

University	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Business	6	5	5	5	13	5	39
Physical Ed.	3	5	9	5	4	2	28
Law	3	1	0	0	6	0	10
Education	2	0	2	3	0	1	8
History	1	0	2	3	0	0	6
Journalism	1	0	1	1	2	1	6
Engineering	0	1	0	2	0	1	4
Sociology	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
Architecture	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Political Sci.	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Economics	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Psychology	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
Biology	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Philosophy	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
Chemistry	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Recreation	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Agriculture	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Liberal Arts	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Government	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Accounting	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Forestry	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Geology	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Fine Arts	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Medicine	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dentistry	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Radio	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
English	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

TABLE 9--Continued

University	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Mathematics	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Social Sci.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Veterinary Med.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Public Relations	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Pharmacy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Conservation	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Zoology	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Undecided	14	13	5	8	8	12	60
Totals	38	34	35	32	42	32	213

*The numbers indicate the number of respondents who selected the academic major listed.

For second choices thirty-nine of the athletes chose business, and twenty-eight indicated that physical education would be their second choice. Ten athletes chose law as a second choice, followed by education with eight. These areas appeared to receive the greatest interest as a second choice. Sixty athletes did not indicate a second choice.

TABLE 10

AVERAGE NUMBER OF SIBLINGS OF RESPONDENTS

University	Number in Family
A	2.2
B	3.8
C	2.4
D	3.4
E	2.6
F	3.2

The data presented reveals that University B athletes come from the largest families and the athletes from University A come from the smallest families. There does not appear to be a pattern or other indication for further study concerning the number of brothers or sisters an athlete has.

TABLE 11
ORDINAL POSITION OF BIRTH OF RESPONDENTS

Position	University					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
1st	15	14	13	8	10	8
2nd	15	7	9	11	18	12
3rd	3	7	8	4	7	9
4th	2	3	4	5	6	2
5th	1	1	1	0	1	0
6th	1	2	0	1	0	0
7th	0	0	0	0	0	0
8th	0	0	0	2	0	0
9th	1	0	0	1	0	0
10th	0	0	0	0	0	0
11th	0	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	38	34	35	32	42	32

An interesting observation is that the athletes who were recruited by Universities A, B, and C were predominantly first born, and the athletes recruited by Universities D, E, and F were mostly second born. It is also interesting that the majority of the athletes recruited by University A

were first and second born.

TABLE 12

ENTERING CLASS AND MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

University	Class	Married	Single
A	38 Freshman	2	36
B	34 Freshman	0	34
C	35 Freshman	1	34
D	32 Freshman	1	31
E	42 Freshman	1	41
F	32 Freshman	2	32

The question concerning the entering class was included to establish that all respondents were entering the Freshman Class. Five of the universities recruited athletes who were married, but the majority of athletes were single. The above information does not appear to reveal any pattern for a specific university.

Rating Scale Results

The One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to determine if the fifty-five factors were significant or not significant in influencing an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university.

The first null hypothesis tested was:

H_{01} - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships at the six specific

universities in the Big Eight Conference.

The factors that achieved the .05 level of significance were accepted as being significant, and important in influencing an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university. The factors that did not achieve the .05 level of significance were evaluated to be not significant and not important in influencing the athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university. Table 13 includes the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance. The results are reported by factor number, the factor, the mean for each university, the significant level (if significant) and "N.S." if the factor was not significant. The complete data from the One-Way Analysis of Variance Computer Program is reported in the Appendix.

TABLE 13
MEAN AND SIGNIFICANT LEVEL FOR EACH FACTOR

	Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	Level
1.	The facilities available.	3.10	3.26	3.57	3.31	3.64	3.15	.02
2.	The need for a player in my position.	2.42	2.32	2.66	2.22	2.19	2.53	N.S.
3.	The prestige of a degree from this university.	3.16	3.44	2.91	3.13	3.71	2.94	.02
4.	Desire to win the National Championship.	4.13	3.41	3.74	3.84	3.60	3.12	.02
5.	Desire to play on a winning team.	4.39	3.74	4.26	4.06	3.98	3.69	.02

TABLE 13--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	Level
6. Desire to play here because brother played here.	1.05	1.08	1.11	1.06	1.07	1.13	N.S.
7. My parents' persuasion.	1.29	1.47	1.54	2.03	1.48	1.44	.004
8. A friend of the university influenced me.	1.24	1.47	1.43	1.63	1.69	1.63	N.S.
9. The academic program for my area of interest.	3.18	3.26	3.37	3.03	3.33	2.91	N.S.
10. Would like to play here because some relative played here.	1.03	1.12	1.17	1.00	1.10	1.03	N.S.
11. The football schedule of opponents.	2.32	3.12	3.03	2.59	2.79	2.53	.01
12. The impression made by the head coach.	3.47	3.88	3.97	3.72	3.60	3.72	N.S.
13. The players I talked to on my visit to campus.	3.37	3.59	3.63	3.34	3.29	3.41	N.S.
14. The beauty of the campus.	2.50	3.12	2.94	2.63	2.98	2.69	N.S.
15. The past record of this team.	3.39	2.15	2.57	3.53	2.62	1.81	.0001
16. The tradition of football here.	4.13	2.68	3.03	4.00	2.88	2.66	.0001
17. The follow-up letter I received after my visit to campus.	2.00	2.24	1.89	2.44	2.24	1.88	N.S.
18. Desire to be recognized nationally by playing here.	3.08	2.85	3.14	3.13	2.83	2.50	N.S.
19. A friend plays on this team.	1.42	1.76	1.40	1.91	1.48	1.34	N.S.

TABLE 13--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	Level
20. My dad played at this university.	1.08	1.26	1.06	1.00	1.10	1.03	N.S.
21. The close relationship between the coaches and players.	3.55	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.40	3.75	N.S.
22. The literature I received from the coach.	2.34	3.06	2.74	2.69	2.48	2.19	.01
23. One of my relatives is a graduate of this university.	1.00	1.21	1.17	1.13	1.07	1.06	N.S.
24. My visit to the campus.	3.32	4.18	3.69	3.63	3.55	3.75	.03
25. My girl friend will be attending this university.	1.11	1.35	1.43	1.13	1.24	1.47	N.S.
26. The national ranking of this team.	3.26	2.00	2.57	3.47	2.07	1.56	.0001
27. The location of this university.	2.68	2.53	2.40	2.63	2.55	2.25	N.S.
28. The type of defense used by this team.	1.74	1.76	1.91	1.91	2.38	2.09	N.S.
29. The offer of a full scholarship.	3.68	4.03	4.17	4.34	4.19	4.00	N.S.
30. The chance of my getting to play here.	3.60	3.91	3.91	3.90	3.88	4.06	N.S.
31. The academic reputation of the university.	3.45	3.85	3.14	3.13	3.83	3.13	.002
32. The friendliness of the university community.	3.11	3.79	4.09	3.56	3.21	3.75	.0006
33. My parents and friends can see me play.	2.89	3.06	2.66	2.78	3.17	2.59	N.S.

TABLE 13--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	Level
34. My desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.	2.68	1.56	1.40	1.81	1.88	1.75	.0006
35. This was the only school in the Big Eight that offered me a scholarship.	1.21	1.94	1.60	1.94	1.74	2.13	N.S.
36. The prestige of being a football player at this university.	3.21	2.97	2.83	3.13	3.19	2.59	N.S.
37. A friend will attend this university.	1.32	1.74	1.37	1.81	2.05	1.38	.008
38. The excellence of the coaching staff.	3.79	4.21	4.11	4.38	3.80	3.91	.04
39. An alumnus of the university influenced me.	2.13	1.50	2.06	1.56	1.93	1.91	N.S.
40. Desirability of the weather in the university area.	1.92	1.68	1.69	1.28	1.71	1.56	N.S.
41. The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.	3.11	2.21	2.09	2.94	2.67	1.56	.0001
42. A friend will play on this team.	1.61	1.68	1.63	1.94	1.95	1.19	.03
43. My high school coach played at this university.	1.13	1.00	1.11	1.03	1.07	1.16	N.S.
44. The personal challenge of making the team at this university.	4.00	3.86	4.03	4.06	3.83	3.59	N.S.
45. One of my parents is a graduate of this university.	1.05	1.00	1.06	1.00	1.07	1.03	N.S.

TABLE 13--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F	Level
46. The food available at the training table.	3.05	2.59	2.77	2.63	3.38	3.06	N.S.
47. The high morale and closeness of the team.	3.52	3.65	3.83	3.81	3.64	3.59	N.S.
48. The distance from my home.	2.34	2.29	2.37	2.09	2.48	2.25	N.S.
49. The type of offense used by this team.	2.60	2.68	3.00	2.84	2.74	3.03	N.S.
50. My desire to play out of my home area.	1.95	2.29	2.20	2.06	2.10	1.88	N.S.
51. My visit with an assistant coach.	3.50	3.91	3.54	3.53	3.57	3.50	N.S.
52. An academic counselor is available for assistance.	3.05	3.38	2.86	2.78	3.43	2.56	.02
53. A friend played on this team.	1.18	1.59	1.23	1.25	1.36	1.44	N.S.
*54. The coaches at this university really seemed interested in <u>me</u> .	3.66	4.00	4.06	3.94	4.07	4.13	N.S.
55. The "social life" of this university.	2.39	2.97	2.91	2.88	3.00	2.84	N.S.

*The original factor 54 ("My high school persuaded me.") was eliminated from the results due to the ambiguity of its content. Factors 55 and 56 were moved up for the results of this study.

As a result of the statistical evaluation the first null hypothesis was rejected due to the fact that some of the factors were significant and differences did appear for the reasons athletes selected certain universities. Nineteen

factors (See Table 13) were significant. Factors thirty-five and forty-six, although failing to achieve significance, did nevertheless approach it. Factor thirty-five was rejected at .0532 and factor forty-six at .0531. Thirty-six of the factors (See Table 13) were not significant.

The second null hypothesis tested was:

H₀² - There is no significant difference in the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university, as compared to the overall factors for the six Big Eight universities.

The factors that proved not significant as determined by the One-Way Analysis of Variance were also accepted as being not significant for the purpose of testing the second null hypothesis. The nineteen factors that were significant as determined by the One-Way Analysis of Variance were tested by using the Scheffe' method.¹ This method was used to determine if the factors were significant for all of the universities. Each factor that was significant was evaluated by testing the highest mean against the other five means for each factor and for each university.

The .05 level of significance was used to determine significance according to the levels listed in Ferguson for

¹George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis In Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 296-297.

the critical values of F in Table D.¹

Table 14 reflects the total number of factors that were significant and not significant as determined by the Scheffe' method for each university when compared against the total factors for the six universities. The data is reported by university and the total number of factors that were significant and not significant.

TABLE 14
TOTAL OF SIGNIFICANT AND NOT SIGNIFICANT
FACTORS BY UNIVERSITIES

University	Significant	Not Significant
A	13	6
B	14	5
C	16	3
D	12	7
E	14	5
F	19	0

The results of the Scheffe' method for each of the nineteen factors that were determined to be significant by the One-Way Analysis of Variance Computer Program are included in Table 15. The results are reported by factor number, the factor, the significant level for each university, or "N.S." if the factor was not significant.

¹Ibid., pp. 408-411.

TABLE 15

SIGNIFICANT LEVEL OF FACTORS FOR EACH UNIVERSITY
AS DETERMINED BY SCHEFFE METHOD

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
1. The facilities available.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01	N.S.	.01
3. The prestige of a degree from this university.	.01	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01
4. Desire to win the National Championship.	N.S.	.01	.05	N.S.	.05	.01
5. Desire to play on a winning team.	N.S.	.01	N.S.	.05	.01	.01
7. My parents' persuasion.	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
11. The football schedule of opponents.	.01	N.S.	N.S.	.01	.01	.01
15. The past record of this team.	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01	.01
16. The tradition of football here.	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01	.01
22. The literature I received from the coach.	.01	.05	.05	.05	.01	.01
24. My visit to the campus.	.01	.05	.01	.01	.01	.05
26. The national ranking of this team.	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01	.01
31. The academic reputation of the university.	.05	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01
32. The friendliness of the university community.	.01	.05	.05	.01	.01	.05
34. My desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01

TABLE 15--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
37. A friend will attend this university.	.01	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01
38. The excellence of the coaching staff.	.01	N.S.	.05	N.S.	.01	.01
41. The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.05	.01
42. A friend will play on this team.	.05	.05	.05	N.S.	N.S.	.01
52. An academic counselor is available for assistance.	.05	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01

The results of the Scheffe' method as reported in Table 14 revealed that differences do exist between some of the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university and the overall factors for the six universities; therefore, the second null hypothesis is rejected.

Analysis of the Questionnaire Data

An analysis of the data collected by the use of the questionnaire revealed the following information:

Question 1: What is your height, weight, and age?

This data did reveal that one of the universities recruited the tallest, heaviest, and youngest players. Before any conclusions can be made from this information, a

study would have to be made over a period of years against won-lost records and conference standings to determine the extent of the success or failure of the specific university. This year's factor might have occurred by chance.

Question 2: Approximately how many miles from the above campus is your permanent residence located?

Two of the universities recruited within 194.7 and 218.9 miles of their campuses. This could be a pattern and should be investigated by the specific universities over a period of years to determine if the quality of athletes in the area and the caliber of football played by the high schools is worthy of the limited recruiting area. The other four universities that recruited athletes from a greater distance and area should also investigate the immediate area surrounding their institutions for an evaluation of the athletes and quality of football played at the high school level. This aspect of recruiting should be compared over a period of years against the won-lost record for each university to determine if a pattern exists, either for success or failure.

Question 3: In what state is your permanent residence?

The number of athletes recruited from within the university's state and from out of state varied for each institution. This phenomenon could have happened by chance. The recruiting programs should be compared to determine what

the ratio has been during the past years for each university.

The data collected from the first three questions has important potential for the success or failure of the football program of specific universities and should be investigated in the future.

Question 4: How many football scholarship offers did you receive from universities in the Big Eight Conference?

The responses indicated that the athletes were offered approximately the same number of scholarships from the Big Eight Universities. There does not appear to be a pattern or other indication for further study concerning the number of offers an athlete receives from the Big Eight Conference.

Question 5: Please circle the total number of football scholarship offers you received this year. (including the Big Eight Conference)

University F athletes received the lowest number of scholarship offers. University E athletes received the greatest number of offers. (When three of the respondents are eliminated due to the large number of offers reported, the university is in line with the rest. Two of the athletes from University E justified the large number by stating that they were offered the scholarships for more than one sport.)

It appears from the data collected that most of the universities recruit the same caliber of athlete with the

exception of University F. This situation could have occurred by chance this year. More investigation is required in this area before any conclusions can be made.

Question 6: In what academic field do you plan to major?

The academic field of study does not appear to be a factor for any specific university. Most of the respondents indicated that business would be their first choice with medicine and physical education second and third choices. Twenty-one of the athletes had not determined their academic pursuit. Education was the only other area that received significant interest by the athletes. All of the other areas of study received some attention and no pattern appeared to be prevalent for any particular university.

The athletes indicated that the business curriculum was their second choice, followed closely by physical education and the study of law. Sixty of the athletes indicated that they did not have a second choice. The rest were evenly divided as listed in Table 9.

Question 7: How many brothers and sisters do you have?

The data collected for this question did not appear to form a pattern for any particular university. The athletes from University B came from the largest families while the athletes from University A came from the smallest families. This information does not appear to be significant or relevant for conclusions.

Question 8: Which child were you born?

The ordinal position of birth was included to determine if any pattern developed for any particular university. The pattern that did develop was probably due to chance and more study is required before definite conclusions can be made. It is interesting that University A recruited predominantly first and second born athletes. Universities B and C recruited mostly first born athletes. Universities D, E, and F athletes were mostly second born. It should be noted that of the seven athletes who were married, six were first born children. This could be an indication of a pattern and should be investigated in future studies. University B recruited all single athletes. Universities A and F had two married athletes and Universities C, D, and E had one married athlete each. Other than the six married athletes being first born children, no pattern or indication for further study was apparent.

Question 9: Please check your status on the two statements below: Entering Class: Freshman____ Junior____
Marital Status: Married ____ Single____

This question was included as a check to insure that all respondents were entering the university indicated for the first time, and to check on their marital status. It was confirmed that all athletes were entering the freshman class. Seven of the athletes were married and 206 single.

Analysis of Rating Scale

The rating scale consisting of fifty-five factors was tested by using the One-Way Analysis of Variance. This was used to determine if the factors were significant or not significant in influencing an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university.

The findings revealed that thirty-six of the factors were not significant in influencing an athlete to select a specific university. Nineteen factors were significant and influenced the athlete in making his decision concerning the university he would attend. (See Table 13)

Eleven of the factors that were not significant concerned the influence of having a brother, friend, relative, dad, girl friend, alumnus, or high school coach associated with the university. If the athlete did not have any such connection, these factors would not be important in selecting a specific university.

Factors that were associated directly with playing on the team and not significant in influencing an athlete were the need for a player in a certain position, the desire to be recognized nationally, the chance of getting to play, the prestige of being a football player, the personal challenge of making the team, and the type of offense or defense used by the team.

The following nine factors that were not significant

were associated with the university and the football team. These included the academic program, the beauty of the campus, the location of the university, the offer of a full scholarship, parents and friends being able to see the athlete play, the desirability of the weather in the university area, distance from home, desire to play out of home area, and the social life of the university.

Additional factors that were not significant and did not influence the athlete in his decision to attend a specific university were related to the athlete's visit with the head coach, the players talked to on a visit to the campus, the follow-up letters received, the close relationship of players and coaches, the morale and closeness of the team, a visit with an assistant coach, and the interest shown by the coaches of the university in the athlete.

Two of the factors approached significance and should be evaluated more thoroughly before any conclusions are reached concerning their importance to the recruiting process: This was the only school that offered me a scholarship and the food available at the training table.

The factors that have been mentioned were not significant in influencing an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a specific university in the Big Eight Conference. These factors do not appear to be important when an athlete is evaluating a university.

Nineteen factors were significant in influencing the

athlete to select a specific university. (See Table 13)

These factors should receive the attention of coaches when recruiting athletes and were concerned with the facilities available, the prestige of a degree from the university, the desire to win a national championship and to play on a winning team, the parents' persuasion, the football schedule of opponents, the past record of the team, the tradition of football at the specific university, the literature received from the coach, the athlete's visit to the campus, the national ranking of the team, the academic reputation of the university, the friendliness of the university community, the desire to attend and play football at the specific university since childhood, a friend attending the university, the excellence of the coaching staff, the appearance of the team in post-season bowl games, a friend playing on the team, and the availability of an academic counselor.

These factors that were significant should be evaluated by the coaches to ensure that they are included in their recruiting programs.

When the nineteen factors that were evaluated to be significant by the One-Way Analysis of Variance results were tested by the Scheffe' method (See Table 15) it was revealed that some differences do exist between factors in influencing athletes to accept a football scholarship to a specific university and the overall factors for the six universities.

Six factors were determined to be significant for all

six universities. These factors were parents' persuasion, the literature received from the coach, visit to the campus, the friendliness of the university community, desire to attend this university and play football since childhood, and a friend will attend this university. These six factors should receive the coaches' attention. They are important to an athlete when he is making a decision concerning the university he will attend.

The findings from the Scheffé method are reported in Tables 16 and 17.

The factors that were determined to be significant for each university when compared to the overall factors for the six universities are listed in Table 16. They are reported by factor number, the factor, and an "X" under the specific university to denote that this factor was important to the athletes that selected this university.

TABLE 16

FACTORS THAT WERE SIGNIFICANT FOR SPECIFIC UNIVERSITIES

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
1. The facilities available.	X	X	. .	X	. .	X
3. The prestige of a degree from this university.	X	. .	X	X	. .	X
4. Desire to win the National Championship.	. .	X	X	. .	X	X
5. Desire to play on a winning team.	. .	X	. .	X	X	X

TABLE 16--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
7. My parents' persuasion.	X	X	X	X	X	X
11. The football schedule of opponents.	X	. .	. .	X	X	X
15. The past record of this team.	. .	X	X	. .	X	X
16. The tradition of football here.	. .	X	X	. .	X	X
22. The literature I received from the coach.	X	X	X	X	X	X
24. My visit to the campus.	X	X	X	X	X	X
26. The national ranking of this team.	. .	X	X	. .	X	X
31. The academic reputation of the university.	X	. .	X	X	. .	X
32. The friendliness of the university community.	X	X	X	X	X	X
34. My desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.	X	X	X	X	X	X
37. A friend will attend this university.	X	X	X	X	X	X
38. The excellence of the coaching staff.	X	. .	X	. .	X	X
41. The appearance of the team in postseason bowl games.	. .	X	X	. .	X	X
42. A friend will play on this team.	X	X	X	. .	. .	X
52. An academic counselor is available for assistance.	X	. .	X	X	. .	X

The factors that were not significant for each university when compared to the overall factors for the six universities are reported in Table 17. The factors are reported by number, the factor, and an "X" under the university to denote that this factor was not important in influencing the athlete to accept a football scholarship to the specific university.

TABLE 17

FACTORS THAT WERE NOT SIGNIFICANT
FOR SPECIFIC UNIVERSITIES

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
1. The facilities available.	. .	. .	X	. .	X	. .
3. The prestige of a degree from this university.	. .	X	. .	. .	X	. .
4. Desire to win the National Championship.	X	. .	. .	X	. .	. .
5. Desire to play on a winning team.	X	. .	X	. .	. .	. .
11. The football schedule of opponents.	. .	X	X	. .	. .	. .
15. The past record of this team.	X	. .	. .	X	. .	. .
16. The tradition of football here.	X	. .	. .	X	. .	. .
26. The national ranking of this team.	X	. .	. .	X	. .	. .
31. The academic reputation of the university.	. .	X	. .	. .	X	. .
38. The excellence of the coaching staff.	. .	X	. .	X	. .	. .
41. The appearance of the team in postseason bowl games.	X	. .	. .	X	. .	. .

TABLE 17--Continued

Factor	A	B	C	D	E	F
42. A friend will play on this team.				X	X	. .
52. An academic counselor is available for assistance.	. .	X		. .	X	. .

It should be noted that University F did not have a factor that was not significant. All of the nineteen factors were significant and important in influencing the athletes that accepted football scholarships to this university.

The findings from the One-Way Analysis of Variance and the Scheffé method indicate that certain factors do influence an athlete in his choice of a university. Coaches should stress these significant factors when planning or re-evaluating their recruitment program. The non-significant factors revealed in this study are of less importance to the athlete and should be given less attention in the program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships to universities in the Big Eight Conference were investigated by the use of a questionnaire and rating scale. The questionnaire and rating scale were developed and tested for reliability and validity. A total of 234 questionnaires were mailed to athletes who had accepted full football scholarships to the six participating universities in the Big Eight Conference. The athletes completed and returned 213 questionnaires for a 91 percent return. The information and data were evaluated by the One-Way Analysis of Variance and the Scheffe method to determine the significance of the results.

As a result of this study it was determined that certain factors did influence athletes in their acceptance of football scholarships to the six participating universities during the 1970-71 year.

It was also revealed that athletes were motivated by different factors when the factors for specific universities were compared to the overall factors for the six universities.

The data collected on the questionnaire sheet revealed

that the six participating universities recruited athletes of different heights, weights, and ages. Also different was the distance from the specific campuses of the athletes recruited. The number of athletes recruited from within the state and from out of state by specific universities was different. The number of scholarship offers received by the athletes from universities in the Big Eight Conference and overall was significantly different for some of the universities. The academic field of study appeared to be the same for universities with minor exceptions. The number of brothers and sisters in each family and the ordinal position of birth was different for each university. The marital status of the athletes was not noticeably different for each university.

This study revealed through the use of the One-Way Analysis of Variance that the following nineteen factors influenced the athletes to accept football scholarships to the six universities in the Big Eight Conference:

- The facilities available.
- The prestige of a degree from the specific university.
- The desire to win the National Championship.
- The desire to play on a winning team.
- The persuasion of parents.
- The football schedule of opponents.
- The past record of the team.
- The tradition of football at the university.
- The literature received from the coach.
- The athlete's visit to the campus.
- The national ranking of the university.
- The academic reputation of the university.
- The friendliness of the university community.
- The desire to attend the particular university and play football there since childhood.

A friend attending the same university.
 The excellence of the coaching staff.
 The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.
 A friend starting to play on the team at the same time as the athlete.
 An academic counselor being available for assistance.

The study also revealed that the following factors did not influence the athletes to accept a football scholarship to one specific university over another during the 1970-71 year:

The need for a player in my position.
 Desire to play here because brother played here.
 Influenced by a friend of the university.
 The academic program for area of interest.
 Would like to play here because some relative played here.
 The impression made by the head coach.
 The players talked to on visit to campus.
 The beauty of the campus.
 The follow-up letter received after visit to the campus.
 Desire to be recognized nationally by playing here.
 A friend plays on this team.
 Dad played at this university.
 The close relationship between the coaches and players.
 A relative is a graduate of this university.
 Girl friend will be attending this university.
 The location of this university.
 The type of defense used by this team.
 The offer of a full scholarship.
 The chance of getting to play here.
 Parents and friends can see athlete play.
 This was the only school in the Big Eight that offered a scholarship.
 The prestige of being a football player at this university.
 Influenced by an alumnus of the university.
 Desirability of the weather in the university area.
 High school coach played at this university.
 The personal challenge of making the team at this university.
 One of parents is a graduate of this university.
 The food available at the training table.
 The high morale and closeness of the team.

The distance from home.
 The type of offense used by this team.
 Desire to play out of home area.
 Visit with an assistant coach.
 A friend played on this team.
 The coaches at this university really seemed
 interested in me.
 The "social life" at this university.

When the significant factors that influenced an athlete to accept a scholarship to a specific university were compared by the Scheffé method to the overall factors for the six universities the following factors were significant.

Students who accepted scholarships at University A indicated the following factors to be significant:

The facilities available.
 The prestige of a degree from this university.
 Parents' persuasion.
 The football schedule of opponents.
 The literature received from the coach.
 Visit to the campus.
 The academic reputation of the university.
 The friendliness of the university community.
 Desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.
 A friend will attend this university.
 The excellence of the coaching staff.
 A friend will play on this team.
 An academic counselor is available for assistance.

Students who accepted scholarships at University B indicated the following factors to be significant:

Desire to win the National Championship.
 Desire to play on a winning team.
 Parents' persuasion.
 The past record of this team.
 The tradition of football here.
 The literature received from the coach.
 Visit to the campus.
 The national ranking of this team.
 The friendliness of the university community.
 The facilities available.

Desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.
 A friend will attend this university.
 The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.
 A friend will play on this team.

Students who accepted scholarships at University C indicated the following factors to be significant:

The prestige of a degree from this university.
 Desire to win the National Championship.
 Parents' persuasion.
 The past record of this team.
 The tradition of football here.
 The literature received from the coach.
 Visit to the campus.
 The national ranking of this team.
 The academic reputation of the university.
 The friendliness of the university community.
 Desire to attend this university and play football here since childhood.
 A friend will attend this university.
 The excellence of the coaching staff.
 The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.
 A friend will play on this team.
 An academic counselor is available for assistance.

Students who accepted scholarships at University D indicated the following factors to be significant:

The facilities available.
 The prestige of a degree from this university.
 Desire to play on a winning team.
 Parents' persuasion.
 The football schedule of opponents.
 The literature received from the coach.
 Visit to the campus.
 The academic reputation of the university.
 The friendliness of the university community.
 Desire to attend this university and play football here since childhood.
 A friend will attend this university.
 An academic counselor is available for assistance.

Students who accepted scholarships at University E

indicated the following factors to be significant:

- Desire to win the National Championship.
- Desire to play on a winning team.
- Parents' persuasion.
- The football schedule of opponents.
- The past record of this team.
- The tradition of football here.
- The literature received from the coach.
- Visit to the campus.
- The national ranking of this team.
- The friendliness of the university community.
- Desire to attend this university and play football here since childhood.
- A friend will attend this university.
- The excellence of the coaching staff.
- The appearance of this team in post-season bowl games.

Students who accepted scholarships at University F

indicated the following factors to be significant:

- The facilities available.
- The prestige of a degree from this university.
- Desire to win the National Championship.
- Desire to play on a winning team.
- Parents' persuasion.
- The football schedule of opponents.
- The past record of football here.
- The tradition of football here.
- The literature received from the coach.
- Visit to the campus.
- The national ranking of this team.
- The academic reputation of the university.
- The friendliness of the university community.
- Desire to attend this university and play football here since childhood.
- A friend will attend this university.
- The excellence of the coaching staff.
- The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.
- A friend will play on this team.
- An academic counselor is available for assistance.

The Scheffé method indicated the following factors were not significant for the specific universities when the nineteen significant factors were compared to the overall

factors for the six universities:

Students who accepted scholarships at University A indicated the following factors to be not significant:

- Desire to win the National Championship.
- Desire to play on a winning team.
- The past record of this team.
- The tradition of football here.
- The national ranking of this team.
- The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.

Students who accepted scholarships at University B indicated the following factors to be not significant:

- The prestige of a degree from this university.
- The football schedule of opponents.
- The academic reputation of the university.
- The excellence of the coaching staff.
- An academic counselor is available for assistance.

Students who accepted scholarships at University C indicated the following factors to be not significant:

- The facilities available.
- Desire to play on a winning team.
- The football schedule of opponents.

Students who accepted scholarships at University D indicated the following factors to be not significant:

- Desire to win the National Championship.
- The past record of this team.
- The tradition of football here.
- The national ranking of this team.
- The excellence of the coaching staff.
- The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.
- A friend will play on this team.

Students who accepted scholarships at University E indicated the following factors to be not significant:

- The facilities available.
- The prestige of a degree from this university.

The academic reputation of the university.
A friend will play on this team.
An academic counselor is available for assistance.

For students accepting scholarships at University F there were no non-significant factors.

The findings in this study provide an indication of what factors are important and not important to an athlete when he is making a decision concerning the university he will attend on a full football scholarship.

Conclusions

It can be concluded from the findings of this study that certain factors do influence athletes in their selection of one university over another. Of the fifty-five factors, nineteen did significantly influence the athletes while the other thirty-six were not significant.

The nineteen significant factors that were tested by the Scheffé method revealed that six factors were significant for all six universities. Coaches should start with these six factors that were important to the athlete (parents' persuasion, literature received from the coach, visit to the campus, friendliness of the university community, desire to attend the university and play football since childhood, and a friend will attend this university) when planning programs for recruiting, keeping in mind that differences between individual athletes may make other factors important.

Traditionally, coaches have assumed that certain

factors influenced athletes to accept scholarships to their universities. The findings of this study can be utilized to reevaluate the assumptions concerning factors that influence athletes and to add new information to present programs of recruitment.

The conclusions that have been derived from the data presented in this study can only be accepted for the athletes who were recruited during the 1970-71 year and started their studies at the six participating universities in August, 1971.

Recommendations

The findings of this study indicate a need for further research concerning the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships. It is recommended that:

1. The won-lost record of the specific universities should be studied in comparison with the height, weight, and age of the athletes recruited to determine if there is a relationship.
2. A study of the success of a specific university with the athletes recruited from the immediate area of the university as compared to the out of state athletes should be conducted to determine if this is a factor for a successful team.
3. A study of the factors that influence junior college transfers to accept scholarships at specific universities should be conducted to determine if they are

the same factors as those that influence freshman athletes.

4. A study should be conducted for a period of years to determine if the factors discovered as influencing in this study are valid each year.
5. This study should be repeated to determine if the data collected on the questionnaire form a pattern for a specific university year after year.
6. The influence of the high school coach and the guidance counselor should be included as factors on the rating scale.
7. This study should be conducted on a sample of independent universities and other conferences participating in major college football programs to determine if the factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships to the independent universities and in other conferences are the same as those discovered in this study.

Along with the findings of this study, further research on the recommendations should provide meaningful information for the coaches who are concerned with developing a sound program for the recruitment of athletes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allport, Gordon W. "Attitudes," A Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by Carl Murchison. Worcester: Clark University Press, 1935.
- Big Eight Conference. Rules and Regulations Governing Athletics 1970-71. Kansas City, Missouri: Big Eight Conference, 1970.
- Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1960.
- Dixon, W. J., ed. Biomedical Computer Programs X-series Supplement. Berkeley: University of California, 1970.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Finn, J. D. NYRMUL. Buffalo, New York: Computing Center Press, 1969.
- Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, Douglas E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954.
- Holmes, Mickey. 1971 Big Eight Conference Spring Football Prospectus. Kansas City: Big Eight Service Bureau, 1971.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Miller, Richard I. The Truth About Big-Time Football. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1953.
- Moore, J. W. The Psychology of Athletic Coaching. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1970.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. 1970-71 NCAA Manual. Kansas City, Missouri: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1970.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. Official Collegiate Football Guide 1970. Phoenix: College Athletics Publishing Service, 1970.
- Ostrander, Raymond H. and Dethy, Ray C. A Values Approach to Educational Administration. New York: American Book Company, 1968.
- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1966.
- Savage, Howard J. American College Athletics. Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1929.
- Snygg, Donald, and Combs, Arthur W. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- Thistlethwaite, Donald L. Recruitment and Retention of Talented College Students. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1963.

Articles

- Rooney, John F. "A Geographic Analysis of Football Player Production in Oklahoma and Texas." Proceedings Oklahoma Academy Science. 1970, pp. 114-120.

Unpublished Materials

Hagg, Adeline M. "Importance of Selected Factors in Choosing a College." Dissertation Abstracts International. Vol. 31, No. 1-2, 1970. p. 148A.

Hanchey, Karlos W. "Factors Influencing Occupational Choice and Educational Plans of High School Students with Implications for Changes in the Role of the Secondary School." Dissertation Abstracts International. Vol. 30, No. 7-8, 1970. p. 2756A.

Martinelli, Fred M. "A Brief History of Subsidization and a Follow-up Study Comparing Grant-In-Aid Athletes at the Ohio State University 1957-1962." Dissertation Abstracts International. Vol. 30, No. 7-8, 1970. p. 157A.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER, QUESTIONNAIRE AND RATING SCALE

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO COACHES

SAMPLE OF FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

SAMPLE OF FINAL FOLLOW-UP LETTER

COVER LETTER, QUESTIONNAIRE AND RATING SCALE

Dear Athlete,

The attached questionnaire is part of a study that is being made to determine the factors that influence an athlete to accept a football scholarship to a university in the Big Eight Conference. The results of this study will be of value to the football coaches. This study has been approved by the Big Eight Conference, and the Head Football Coach at the university you will be attending.

Please read the directions and each question carefully before answering. DO NOT SIGN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. Upon completion of the questionnaire please return it in the self-addressed envelope.

Your answers and prompt reply to this questionnaire are very important for the success of this study.

Good luck as you start your college career, and participation in Big Eight Football.

Sincerely yours,

Patrick R. Damore
Doctoral Candidate

FOOTBALL SCHOLARSHIP IN THE BIG EIGHT CONFERENCE

Institution _____

Please answer the following questions in the space provided :

1. What is your : Height _____ Weight _____ Age _____
2. Approximately how many miles from the above campus is your permanent residence located ? _____
3. In what state is your permanent residence ? _____
4. How many football scholarship offers did you receive from universities in the Big Eight Conference ?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
(Circle One)

5. Please circle the total number of football scholarship offers you received this year. (Including the Big Eight offers)

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

If more than eighteen offers write number here _____

6. In what academic field do you plan to major ?

First Choice _____

Second Choice _____

7. How many brothers or sisters do you have ? (Circle One)
(Total number - brothers and sisters)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. Which child were you born ? (When you were born in your family were you the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc., child)

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th
(Circle One)

9. Please check your status on the two statements below :

Entering Class : (Check One) Freshman _____ Junior _____

Marital Status : (Check One) Married _____ Single _____

Below are some factors which might have influenced your decision to accept a football scholarship to this institution.

Directions : Place a check mark (☒) in one box , after each factor, under the heading you feel expresses the strength of that factor in your decision to accept a football scholarship to this university.

<u>Headings</u> :	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>
	This factor was not important in my decision.	This factor was only slightly important.	This factor was important in my decision.	This factor was very important in my decision.	This factor was extremely important in my decision.

Example :

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>
1. The team is number one.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Extremely</u> <u>Important</u>
1. The facilities available. (Dorms, Stadium, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The need for a player in my position. (Ex. This team needed a guard etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The prestige of a degree from this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Desire to win the National Championship.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Desire to play on a winning team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Desire to play here because brother played here.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. My parents persuasion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. A friend of the university influenced me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Extremely Important</u>
9. The academic program for my area of interest.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Would like to play here because some relative played here. (Other than brother)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. The football schedule of opponents.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. The impression made by the head coach.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. The players I talked to on my visit to campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. The beauty of the campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. The past record of this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. The tradition of football here.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. The follow-up letter I received after my visit to campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Desire to be recognized nationally by playing here.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. A friend plays on this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. My dad played at this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. The close relationship between the coaches and players.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. The literature I received from the coach.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. One of my relatives is a graduate of this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. My visit to the campus.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Extremely Important</u>
25. My girl friend will be attending this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. The national ranking of this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. The location of this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. The type of defense used by this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. The offer of a full scholarship.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. The chance of my getting to play here.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. The academic reputation of the university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. The friendliness of the university community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. My parents and friends can see me play.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. My desire to attend this university and play football since childhood.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. This was the only school in the Big Eight that offered me a scholarship.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. The prestige of being a football player at this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. A friend will attend this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. The excellence of the coaching staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. An alumnus of the university influenced me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Desirability of the weather in the university area.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Extremely Important</u>
41. The appearance of the team in post-season bowl games.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. A friend will play on this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. My high school coach played at this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. The personal challenge of making the team at this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45. One of my parents is a graduate of this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. The food available at the training table.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. The high morale and closeness of the team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. The distance from my home.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. The type of offense used by this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. My desire to play out of my hometown area.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. My visit with an assistant coach.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. An academic counselor is available for assistance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53. A friend played on this team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. My high school persuaded me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. The coaches at this university really seemed interested in me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. The "social life" of this university.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Thank you for taking your time to assist with this study.

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES

Iowa State University

Conference :	Big Eight
Location :	Ames, Iowa
Enrollment :	21,000
President :	Dr. W. Robert Parks
Director of Athletics :	Lou McCullough
Football Coach :	John Majors
Stadium :	Williams
Capacity :	35,000
Nickname :	Cyclones
Colors :	Cardinal, gold

Reference - The 1971-72 National Directory of College
Athletics

Kansas State University

Conference : Big Eight
Location : Manhattan, Kansas
Enrollment : 13,847
President : Dr. James McCain
Director of
Athletics : Ernie Barrett
Football
Coach : Vince Gibson
Stadium : KSU
Capacity : 42,000
Nickname : Wildcats
Colors : Purple, white

University of Kansas

Conference : Big Eight
Location : Lawrence, Kansas
Enrollment : 18,500
Chancellor : Dr. E. Laurence Chalmers, Jr.
Director of
Athletics : Wade R. Stinson
Football
Coach : Don Fambrough
Stadium : Memorial
Capacity : 51,500
Nickname : Jayhawks
Colors : Crimson, blue

University of Nebraska

Conference : Big Eight
Location : Lincoln, Nebraska
Enrollment : 20,000
President : (Open)
Director of
Athletics : Bob Devaney
Football
Coach : Bob Devaney
Stadium : Memorial
Capacity : 66,000
Nickname : Cornhuskers
Colors : Cream, scarlet

University of Oklahoma

Conference : Big Eight
Location : Norman, Oklahoma
Enrollment : 22,000
President : Dr. Paul F. Sharp
Director of
Athletics : Wade Walker
Football
Coach : Charles Fairbanks
Stadium : Owen Field
Capacity : 61,826
Nickname : Sooners
Colors : Crimson, cream

Oklahoma State University

Conference :	Big Eight
Location :	Stillwater, Oklahoma
Enrollment :	18,500
President :	Dr. Robert B. Kamm
Director of Athletics :	Floyd Gass
Football Coach :	Floyd Gass
Stadium :	Lewis Field
Capacity :	40,000
Nickname :	Cowboys
Colors :	Orange, black

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO COACHES

May , 1971.

Mr. (Name)
(University)
(Location)

Dear Coach :

I would like to thank you for granting permission to include (University) in the study concerning factors that influence athletes to accept football scholarships in the Big Eight Conference.

In order to start this study, I will need a list of the names and addresses of all your incoming high school and junior college athletes that have been awarded full football scholarships. Please forward the list to the below address. This information will be held in strict confidence.

You recently received a copy of the questionnaire that will be forwarded to each of your incoming athletes. This survey will be conducted only on the incoming athletes, and not the present members of your squad.

When the study has been completed, I will forward a copy of the results.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Patrick R. Damore
Doctoral Candidate

Please send list to:
Wadsack Dr.
Norman , Oklahoma 73069

SAMPLE OF FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

Dear Athlete,

On (Date Questionnaire Sent) a questionnaire was forwarded to all (Name of University) Football Players.

We are still missing (Number) questionnaires.

If you have not returned yours would you please do so immediately?

Thank you,

Pat Damore
(Address)

SAMPLE OF FINAL FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Athlete,

Please find enclosed another copy of the questionnaire concerning factors that influenced your decision to accept a football scholarship.

We are still missing a few copies of the completed questionnaire.

If you have not returned yours, please do so immediately. We need your return for 100 per cent.

We have set July 27, as the completion date for this study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Patrick R. Damore

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DATA

<u>Cell</u>	<u>N</u>
1	38
2	34
3	35
4	32
5	42
6	32

OBSERVED CELL MEANS

University

	1	2	3	4	5
1	3.105263	2.421053	3.157895	4.131579	4.394737
2	3.264706	2.323529	3.441176	3.411765	3.735294
3	3.571429	2.657143	2.914286	3.742857	4.257143
4	3.312500	2.218750	3.125000	3.843750	4.062500
5	3.642857	2.190476	3.714286	3.595238	3.976190
6	3.156250	2.531250	2.937500	3.125000	3.687500

	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.052632	1.289474	1.236842	3.184211	1.026316
2	1.088235	1.470588	1.470588	3.264706	1.117647
3	1.114286	1.542857	1.428571	3.371429	1.171429
4	1.062500	2.031250	1.625000	3.031250	1.000000
5	1.071429	1.476190	1.690476	3.333333	1.095238
6	1.125000	1.437500	1.625000	2.906250	1.031250

	11	12	13	14	15
1	2.315789	3.473684	3.368421	2.500000	3.394737
2	3.117647	3.882353	3.588235	3.117647	2.147059
3	3.028571	3.971429	3.628571	2.942857	2.571429
4	2.593750	3.718750	3.343750	2.625000	3.531250
5	2.785714	3.595238	3.285714	2.976190	2.619048
6	2.531250	3.718750	3.406250	2.687500	1.812500

	16	17	18	19	20
1	4.131579	2.000000	3.078947	1.421053	1.078947
2	2.676471	2.235294	2.852941	1.764706	1.264706
3	3.028571	1.885714	3.142857	1.400000	1.057143
4	4.000000	2.437500	3.125000	1.906250	1.000000
5	2.880952	2.238095	2.833333	1.476190	1.095238
6	2.656250	1.875000	2.500000	1.343750	1.031250

	21	22	23	24	25
1	3.552632	2.342105	1.000000	3.315789	1.105263
2	4.000000	3.058824	1.205882	4.176471	1.352941
3	4.000000	2.742857	1.171429	3.685714	1.428571
4	3.750000	2.687500	1.125000	3.625000	1.125000
5	3.404762	2.476190	1.071429	3.547619	1.238095
6	3.750000	2.187500	1.062500	3.750000	1.468750

	26	27	28	29	30
1	3.263158	2.684211	1.736842	3.684211	3.605263
2	2.000000	2.529412	1.764706	4.029412	3.911765
3	2.571429	2.400000	1.914286	4.171429	3.914286
4	3.468750	2.625000	1.906250	4.343750	3.906250
5	2.071429	2.547619	2.380952	4.190476	3.880952
6	1.562500	2.250000	2.093750	4.000000	4.062500

	31	32	33	34	35
1	3.447368	3.105263	2.894737	2.684211	1.210526
2	3.852941	3.794118	3.058824	1.558824	1.941176
3	3.142857	4.085714	2.657143	1.400000	1.600000
4	3.125000	3.562500	2.781250	1.812500	1.937500
5	3.833333	3.214286	3.166667	1.880952	1.738095
6	3.125000	3.750000	2.593750	1.750000	2.125000

	36	37	38	39	40
1	3.210526	1.315789	3.789474	2.131579	1.921053
2	2.970588	1.735294	4.205882	1.500000	1.676471
3	2.828571	1.371429	4.114286	2.057143	1.685714
4	3.125000	1.812500	4.375000	1.562500	1.281250
5	3.190476	2.047619	3.809524	1.928571	1.714286
6	2.593750	1.375000	3.906250	1.906250	1.562500

	41	42	43	44	45
1	3.105263	1.605263	1.131579	4.000000	1.052632
2	2.205882	1.676471	1.000000	3.852941	1.000000
3	2.085714	1.628571	1.114286	4.028571	1.057143
4	2.937500	1.937500	1.031250	4.062500	1.000000
5	2.666667	1.952381	1.071429	3.833333	1.071429
6	1.562500	1.187500	1.156250	3.593750	1.031250

	46	47	48	49	50
1	3.052632	3.526316	2.342105	2.605263	1.947368
2	2.588235	3.547059	2.294118	2.676471	2.294118
3	2.771429	3.828571	2.371429	3.000000	2.200000
4	2.625000	3.812500	2.093750	2.843750	2.062500
5	3.380952	3.642857	2.476190	2.738095	2.095238
6	3.062500	3.593750	2.250000	3.031250	1.875000

	51	52	53	54	55
1	3.500000	3.052632	1.184211	3.657895	2.394737
2	3.911765	3.382353	1.588235	4.000000	2.970588
3	3.542857	2.857143	1.228571	4.057143	2.914286
4	3.531250	2.781250	1.250000	3.937500	2.875000
5	3.571429	3.428571	1.357143	4.071429	3.000000
6	3.500000	2.562500	1.437500	4.125000	2.843750

OBSERVED CELL STANDARD DEVIATION

University

	1	2	3	4	5
1	.763685	1.265586	1.151411	.991070	.789782
2	.827879	1.248529	1.283725	1.373287	1.109431
3	.814779	1.235334	1.291862	1.244821	.816840
4	1.090649	1.263236	1.211504	1.221035	1.105339
5	.821107	1.131330	.994760	1.210916	.949662
6	.574140	.983226	1.045343	1.518701	1.203154
	6	7	8	9	10
1	.324443	.611064	.541979	1.182194	.162221
2	.378806	.706476	.960912	1.238494	.409338
3	.676123	.700540	.698137	1.139807	.746983
4	.353553	1.092035	.941858	1.062085	0.000000
5	.462910	.740405	.923622	.954237	.484367
6	.707107	.759350	.793116	1.058281	.176777
	11	12	13	14	15
1	1.042483	1.202179	1.076055	1.033232	1.174952
2	.913359	1.094468	1.208998	1.249599	1.018982
3	.890661	.923093	.942016	.968409	1.118973
4	1.187553	1.373349	1.180743	1.070122	1.015505
5	1.179825	1.083345	1.153694	1.070402	.854040
6	1.046788	1.142560	1.011526	.859013	.895779
	16	17	18	19	20
1	1.044187	1.065427	1.343283	.858395	.486664
2	1.173459	1.156243	1.209366	1.074747	.963228
3	1.124218	1.050810	1.191708	.976187	.338062
4	1.135924	1.075759	1.313700	1.399525	0.000000
5	.967833	1.143583	1.247762	.833391	.484367
6	1.207754	1.128802	1.319824	.601577	.176777

	21	22	23	24	25
1	1.131786	.814607	0.000000	1.164921	.388307
2	1.015038	1.229466	.538202	.626224	.917254
3	1.000000	1.010034	.706512	1.078436	.814779
4	1.436842	1.176038	.421212	1.184578	.707107
5	.989198	1.173656	.341650	1.233721	.790478
6	1.047270	.965117	.245935	.983739	1.046788

	26	27	28	29	30
1	1.155111	1.068094	1.155111	1.416224	1.174352
2	1.348400	1.186676	1.046171	1.114241	1.055079
3	1.170362	1.310590	1.268891	1.175378	.950895
4	1.163542	1.385408	1.117583	1.003522	.995453
5	.921104	1.040694	1.248460	1.194256	1.016987
6	.759350	1.047270	1.146084	1.295152	.981687

	31	32	33	34	35
1	1.057722	1.060073	1.180689	1.678243	.776614
2	.957660	.977920	1.229466	1.159707	1.516399
3	1.088519	.781079	1.186762	.735647	1.062738
4	1.039541	1.189673	1.313316	1.330474	1.501343
5	1.010111	1.116084	1.267159	1.382863	1.326273
6	1.070122	1.135924	.945597	1.016001	1.497309

	36	37	38	39	40
1	1.118829	.701553	.874809	1.436419	1.049622
2	1.218178	1.136417	.808268	.961375	1.093246
3	1.360919	.770245	1.050810	1.258918	.932152
4	1.288911	1.378112	.906962	.800705	.522671
5	1.041530	1.103263	.916997	1.090823	.944450
6	1.073414	.906962	.928383	1.027348	.948258

	41	42	43	44	45
1	1.351465	1.027710	.664589	1.090500	.324443
2	1.297536	1.093246	0.000000	.925476	0.000000
3	1.336621	1.002518	.529785	.954424	.338062
4	1.268413	1.242721	.176777	1.014015	0.000000
5	1.242866	1.034818	.462910	1.124379	.341650
6	.948258	.470929	.514899	1.131923	.176777

	46	47	48	49	50
1	1.250889	1.224454	1.191781	1.366382	1.250889
2	1.157784	.917254	1.314935	1.551550	1.337782
3	1.139807	.923093	1.190297	1.371989	1.323987
4	1.408500	1.203154	1.253624	1.346666	1.216486
5	1.267846	.983310	1.273330	1.344538	1.428107
6	1.293595	1.160072	1.107161	1.425219	1.237844

	51	52	53	54	55
1	1.108932	1.354619	.456500	1.168883	1.197734
2	1.137985	1.073502	1.047874	1.073087	1.359262
3	1.066684	1.417181	.770245	1.027357	1.245496
4	1.106706	1.288519	.567962	1.105339	1.211504
5	1.171675	1.062506	.905846	.947213	1.104315
6	1.391217	1.189673	.877588	1.008032	1.194325

VARIANCE USED FOR SCHEFFE METHOD

(Error Term for Analysis of
Variance Within Cells)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Variance</u>
1	.683597
2	1.422723
3	1.353257
4	1.589859
5	.995693
6	.252819
7	.600445
8	.675781
9	1.224736
10	.174214
11	1.108552
12	1.299667
13	1.211390
14	1.102736
15	1.037022
16	1.219218
17	1.220553
18	1.616652
19	.957461
20	.260166
21	1.224704
22	1.146603
23	.186913
24	1.152654
25	.632864

26	1.210480
27	1.376743
28	1.369909
29	1.467862
30	1.070317
31	1.076225
32	1.105445
33	1.431729
34	1.605182
35	1.681605
36	1.400738
37	1.039997
38	.841123
39	1.266219
40	.882427
41	1.569874
42	1.020997
43	.211875
44	1.094991
45	.065386
46	1.572856
47	1.151915
48	1.502308
49	1.960515
50	1.707959
51	1.358336
52	1.525794
53	.635918
54	1.114005
55	1.480730

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>	<u>Level of Significance</u>
1	2.6586	.0237
2	.8334	.5273
3	2.6807	.0227
4	2.6657	.0233
5	2.7564	.0196
6	.1149	.9890
7	3.5839	.0040
8	1.5786	.1675
9	.9124	.4739
10	.8447	.5195
11	3.0195	.0119
12	.9337	.4601
13	.5787	.7163
14	1.8539	.1039
15	14.8282	.0001
16	12.6884	.0001
17	1.4160	.2198
18	1.2558	.2845
19	1.8031	.1137
20	1.1153	.3534
21	1.7462	.1256
22	2.8999	.0149
23	1.1093	.3566
24	2.4979	.0320
25	1.2943	.2676
26	15.9691	.0001

27	.6152	.6884
28	1.6514	.1479
29	1.2579	.2836
30	.7515	.5859
31	4.0397	.0017
32	4.6257	.0006
33	1.2865	.2710
34	4.5825	.0006
35	2.2248	.0532
36	1.4346	.2132
37	3.2534	.0076
38	2.3332	.0435
39	1.8429	.1060
40	1.7290	.1294
41	7.3596	.0001
42	2.6056	.0261
43	.5859	.7108
44	.9250	.4657
45	.5035	.7735
46	2.2251	.0531
47	.4425	.8184
48	.3923	.8538
49	.5388	.7468
50	.4796	.7913
51	.6316	.6759
52	2.7436	.0201
53	1.2665	.2798
54	.9393	.4565
55	1.2702	.2781