

CRITERIA USED BY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
COACHES IN THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THEIR
SELECTION OF PROSPECTIVE
FOOTBALL PLAYERS

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Physical Education
Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by
Ernest M. Koy
August, 1973

CRITERIA USED BY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
COACHES IN THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THEIR
SELECTION OF PROSPECTIVE
FOOTBALL PLAYERS

by

Ernest M. Koy

A THESIS

Approved:

Harold J. Fischer, Chairman

John R. Burton

Approved:

Billy R. Tidwell

Bascom Barry Hayes
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Koy, Ernest M., Criteria Used by College and University Coaches in the State of Texas in their Selection of Prospective Football Players, Master of Arts (Physical Education), August, 1973. Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the methods and procedures that collegiate coaches used in recruiting prospective football players in the state of Texas. The study was involved with three specific phases: (1) physical qualifications; (2) academic merits; (3) moral and ethical traits.

Method

The method used to acquire the data was a questionnaire sent to all forty junior colleges, colleges, and universities in the state that maintain intercollegiate football programs. Each coach chosen to complete the questionnaire was head of the football program at that particular school.

Findings

1. Height and weight were not criteria for recruiting football players by the majority of the schools. However, three of the six colleges that had height and weight requirements were

conference champions, which perhaps indicates that there may be a relationship between height and weight requirements and successful football teams.


2. Speed was a factor that was considered in recruiting.

3. Academic standing was considered by college coaches when selecting athletes for scholarship.

4. In addition to talking with the athlete, other people were consulted by the recruiting coach in judging a player for scholarship.

5. Physical appearance was important at initial meetings between the recruiter and the prospective athlete.

Approved:



Harold J. Fischer
Supervising Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Harold J. Fischer, Professor and Head of the Department of Physical Education for Men and chairman of the committee; Dr. John R. Burton, Associate Professor of Physical Education for Men; and Mr. Billy R. Tidwell, Associate Professor of Physical Education for Men; for their invaluable aid, guidance, and encouragement.

My sincere thanks are given to Coach Allen Boren for the opportunity to continue my education.

Grateful acknowledgment is expressed to the coaches in the state of Texas who cooperated and returned the questionnaire.

Special thanks are due to my wife Mrs. Barbara Koy, whose encouragement and assistance helped to make this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Delimitations of the Study	9
Definitions of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Physical Attributes	11
Academic and Physical Attributes	26
III. PROCEDURE	30
IV. INTERPRETATION OF DATA	39
V. SUMMARY	64
Conclusions	69
Recommendations	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	71

	PAGE
APPENDICES	75
Appendix A. Letter to the Coaches	76
Appendix B. Follow-up Letter	78
Appendix C. Junior Colleges, Colleges, and Universities in the Survey	80
Appendix D. Questionnaire	83
VITA	89

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	A Comparison of the Average Minimum Height Requirement in Inches for each Defensive Position	42
II.	A Comparison of the Average Minimum Height Requirement in Inches for each Offensive Position	43
III.	A Comparison of the Average Minimum Weight Requirement in Pounds for each Defensive Position	46
IV.	A Comparison of the Average Minimum Weight Requirement in Pounds for each Offensive Position	47
V.	The Average Desired Time in Seconds for Defensive Players to Run the Forty-Yard Dash . . .	51
VI.	The Average Desired Time in Seconds for Offensive Players to Run the Forty-Yard Dash . . .	52
VII.	The Slowest Average Time in Seconds a Defensive Player Could Run the Forty-Yard Dash and Still Receive a Scholarship from a College in Texas	54
VIII.	The Slowest Average Time in Seconds an Offensive Player can Run the Forty-Yard Dash and Still Receive a Scholarship from a College in Texas	55
IX.	Entrance Tests Used and Lowest Score a Player can Receive and Still be Eligible for a Scholarship	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Football recruiting is directed toward discovering players with a talent for this sport and to help them pursue a college education. In the early years of college football in the United States, players sought out their own college teams. Later alumni assumed the role of recruiters and offered sundry inducements to promising college prospects. In many cases these individuals personally provided financial help to the student-athletes. Athletic officials, mostly business managers and athletic directors, joined the alumni and more actively involved themselves in recruiting athletes around the year 1921. It was not until much later that the coaches took over the entire job and initiated scholarships which they could offer to prospective athletes (25).

The college coach's job has changed immeasurably since the first intercollegiate football game in America was played between Princeton and Rutgers on November 6, 1869 (17). Early football has been described as "semi-organized mass mayhem" (25). It was a game whose rules were little known or lightly treated. Teams were unrestricted and about equal in talent. Gradually the

teaching of the game became more scientific and better disciplined. Full time career coaches replaced faculty members who tutored teams in their spare time (25).

With the added ability and knowledge of the career coach came a greater emphasis on victory. The focus shifted from "brawn to brain, from sheer size to speed and agility, from destruction to deception" (25). Whereas formerly in football mass play and brute force were stressed, it had now become an open game which required intelligence, endurance, and speed (17).

The years between 1893 through World War I were the formative years when football moved toward explicit rules and regulations, standards, leagues, and legislation. But from its very beginnings, the players were required to possess the fundamentals of courage, tenacity, desire, and dedication (25).

In Texas, football was played on any available field. The spectators would congregate along the sidelines on foot and in wagons or cars in order to get close to the action. Equipment was not standardized, and the players wore a variety of jerseys and shorts. If any pads at all were worn they were homemade. Helmets were not universally worn, as one was considered a "sissy" if he were wearing a headgear (21). Long hair was important to these early players because it afforded their only head protection.

The home team supplied the ball and its size was usually to this team's advantage.

The game itself consisted mostly of broken plays resulting in long runs and fourth down punts, since the Texas coaches at this time were teachers by profession and not thoroughly aware of techniques and strategy. Workouts consisted of falling on loose balls and covering punts. Tackling practice entailed grabbing the opponent by his jersey and throwing him to the ground (21).

The early college competition among rival schools was not noted for consideration of the spectator. Often one could not determine which team the players were on. "Colleges generally took the attitude that the players were recognizable without numbers to the students and the graduates, and it didn't matter whether the patrons of the games knew who they were" (21).

Before World War I, revenues from football started providing better uniforms and equipment. Dimensions of playing fields were standardized. Shoulder, knee, and hip pads began to be used for protection and helmets were now used more often. However, it was still common to see a player shed his helmet as a show of courage when making a decisive play.

After World War I, football became a major national attraction in the fall of the year. Enormous crowds brought large reserves of money which were used in part to construct college

stadiums costing from approximately \$500,000 into the millions. Schools could now afford to train their athletes with better equipment such as blocking sleds and tackling dummies. Athletes were united at mealtimes when the programs were able to initiate and support the "training table." Jobs were made available to players to help them finance their education (21).

The game was now being geared toward the spectators and the media and not just the student bodies of the competing schools. In 1925, the first game was broadcast on radio between the University of Texas (Austin) and Texas A & M by Colonel Ike Ashburn (25). Spring training was introduced to help prepare the athletes to make a better showing the following fall. Outstanding coaches were brought to Texas colleges to build winning teams for their schools. For example, in 1917, Dana X. Bible of Carson-Newman College in Tennessee went to Texas A & M and Bill Juneau of Wisconsin went to the University of Texas. Later in 1920, Berry Whitaker of Indiana followed Juneau to Texas. Players under these coaches eventually spread their knowledge of football by becoming coaches at other colleges. J. V. "Siki" Sikes and T. F. "Puny" Wilson, who played on the great teams at Texas A & M under D. X. Bible in the late 1920's, became coaches at East Texas State and Sam Houston State respectively (25).

For the duration of World War II, there was less public attention toward football. But as the country emerged from this period, stadiums again began to fill on Saturday afternoons. Coverage from the media increased as football moved into television. To cope with this growth, public relations departments within universities published spectator oriented information including preseason brochures and game programs. Football revenues at large schools steadily increased as a result of enlarged stadiums, higher ticket prices, and radio and television residuals (21).

About 1945, the NCAA began to place controls on recruiting and financial aid to athletes. In Dallas in 1951, the NCAA met and changed existing rules which for the first time allowed for full athletic scholarships. Today coaches compete to secure for their schools the most promising young student-athletes. The athletic scholarship offers to the prospective football players a means to further develop their athletic skills and continue their education (25).

An athletic scholarship in 1972 in an NAIA school was valued at approximately \$1,306 (32). The same scholarship in 1960 was worth \$892 (30); in 1940, \$325 (33); in 1915, \$175 (34). It is obvious that the cost of supporting the athletic program has steadily been increasing. However, even with the higher costs of scholarships, schools can still afford to have new stadiums and

athletic dormitories constructed, and put synthetic turf on existing fields.

This study is concerned with the criteria used in the selection of potential Texas intercollegiate football players. Prospective college players with intelligence, speed, and endurance are keenly sought after by recruiters on a local and national scale. As a team game, football demands physical conditioning, discipline, and spirit. Coaches need guidelines and standards to aid them in the selection of players to mold winning teams (25).

To date no one has designed a foolproof measure for judging an athlete for scholarship. Keller (16) stated that the ability to move quickly was one of the most important factors in athletic proficiency. Ebel (10), Manolis (19), and Miles (23) all agree speed was not everything, but it was a big fundamental factor in most athletic contests and especially in those which involved playing with a ball. In Brace's (4) study on football achievement tests, it was found that the single test found to show total achievement was the 50-yard dash. Carter (6) and Gray (12) noted that certain body weights and types were needed to play football and that there were significant size and somatotype differences between college football players at different levels of competition.

The criteria by which future college football players are judged for scholarship was the subject of this investigation. In

this study the researcher examined the characteristics of athletes as they were submitted from the college coaches at the different levels of football in the state of Texas.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to discover what criteria were used in selecting, judging, and appraising prospective football players by coaches at the college level in the state of Texas. The study was involved with three specific phases: (1) physical qualifications, (2) academic merits, and (3) moral and ethical traits.

First the physical qualifications such as height, weight, race, speed, strength, and appearance that coaches sought in future football players were discussed.

The second phase examined the academic qualifications an athlete must have to play at a particular level of competition. The standards that coaches relied upon to indicate the academic potential of football players was compared.

The third phase was a study of the moral and ethical traits an individual must possess to become a student-athlete in a particular level of competition. The researcher determined in this phase who evaluated the prospective players and what particular moral and ethical traits were judged.

The compiled information from the three phases offers a total picture of the type of football players that were recruited and the criteria used in evaluating them at different levels of collegiate competition in the state of Texas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the methods and procedures that coaches use in recruiting. Qualified athletes as well as good students are hard to find, and there is a great demand for them. Therefore, it behooves the coach to eliminate players who will not help the team and overall athletic program. This study will inform the different college coaches about the current trends in the selection, evaluation, and appraisal of young high school and junior college athletes in the state of Texas.

This information can filter down to the high school and junior high school athletes through the personal contacts of their coaches with college recruiters who are aware of the findings of this study. High school and junior high coaches can advise their players as to the type of schools that best suit their needs and abilities, and that accept players with their particular qualities. Specific goals can be established by coaches which athletes must try to attain if they want to be considered as prospects for collegiate football.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited in scope to the problem of establishing the criteria for the selection of young athletes to play football beyond the high school level in the state of Texas. The primary source of information for this study was derived from the questionnaire sent to the forty junior colleges, colleges, and universities in the state that maintain intercollegiate football programs. Each coach chosen to complete the questionnaire was head of the football program at that particular school.

Definitions of Terms

Athletic Scholarship

An agreement between the institution and the student-athlete, whereby the school agrees to pay room, meals, tuition, books, and laundry costs of the athlete in exchange for his services on the gridiron.

Coach

A member of the intercollegiate athletic program.

Ectomorph

Type of body build which is slender and narrow. An ectomorphic person is usually underweight and finds it difficult to gain weight.

Endomorph

Type of body build which is pudgy and rounded, with the abdomen predominating over the chest. The endomorphic person accumulates fat readily and becomes overweight very easily.

Mesomorph

Type of body build which is square and muscular, with broad shoulders and a heavyset chest. The mesomorphic person is often heavy with muscle but not with fat.

Prospective Football Player

An athlete who will be eligible to play the next fall at a college of the player's choice.

Somatotype

A classification of body builds developed by anthropometrist and physician Edward Sheldon that enables a comparative study of the structure, functions, and development of the human body.

Student-Athlete

A college athlete who is able to compete not only on the athletic field but also in the classroom.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The need for big, agile athletes to play football has been the concern of college coaches for many years. Knute Rockne (20) once said, "A coach and his system are just as good as his players--and not an iota better. Give me great players and they can win without a system. Bad ones can't win with the best tutoring in the world." The selection of qualified players has been and continues to be the most important chore.

Physical Attributes

There are many attributes that a champion athlete has, no matter what the sport. Some of these overlap from sport to sport. But former Notre Dame coach, Frank Leahy (18) looked for speed, self-confidence, intelligence, poise, ability to relax, competitive desire, endurance, strength, agility, size, and excellence in performing skills when looking for prospective football players. Coach D. X. Bible (2) advocated what he called the five S's; spirit, speed, skill, size, and savvy. Most of the attributes

which these two famous coaches looked for are hard to judge with a tape measure or a stop watch.

As far back as 1936, Gray (12) began to compare athletes as to weight, age, economic status, race, secular trends, and position on the team. It was concluded that football players during the years 1880-1919 were smaller than those of his day, 1936. In addition, it was concluded that the ends were no taller than the centers, the centers were lighter than the guards, and the tackles were heavier and taller than the team average. The data gathered for this study were taken from game programs, newspapers, and other documentary sources and should be interpreted with this in mind.

Di Giovanna (9) conducted a study to determine the relation of selected structural and functional measures to success in baseball, basketball, gymnastics, tennis, track, and football. For this study, 836 college students between the ages of 17 and 24 were tested. The football group was divided into backfield men and linemen. The backfield men were found to be superior to the normal individual in weight, chest breadth, chest depth, and arm girth; much stronger in leg force, back force, arm pull, and arm push; and scored higher on the vertical jump and physical capacity indices. Football linemen, as compared with the average individual, had greater superiority in weight, arm girth, arm pull, and total

strength, possessed much greater height, sitting height, shoulder breadth, chest breadth, chest depth, hip width, right grip, left grip, back force, leg force, arm push, and physical capacity. In other words, the backfield men were heavier, stronger, and more powerful and the linemen were taller, much heavier, stronger, and more powerful than the average student.

Since a precise body build or type needed to play football had not been clearly defined, Sheldon, Duperturis, and McDermott (29) tried to classify the ideal football body on a somatotype scale. Harold "Red" Grange and Jim Thorpe, who were considered to have ideal bodies for football, reached a three on the endomorphy scale, but were sevens in the mesomorphy scale. This rating described the "Rock-of-Gibraltar" athlete who had a sturdy frame but lacked the reach and long range striking power of a fighter. An athlete of this type had agility, could move quickly, and could run fast.

In 1964, Carter (6) conducted a study on the 35 lettermen who were members of the San Diego State championship football team. A definite body type was needed to play on a championship team. While the college student body included all somatotypes with a concentration around the central ones, football players were limited largely to the endomorphic-mesomorphic sector of the chart, with some overlapping into the sectors on either side. It was obvious that many somatotypes were unlikely to be found on a

good college team. The incidence of some somatotypes which were relatively rare in the general population was very high in the football sample. Within a college team there were significant differences between the backs and linemen. The backs were found to be 1.82 inches shorter and 33.06 pounds lighter than the linemen. But when the offensive backs were compared to the defensive backs, the ball carriers were found to be .43 inches taller and 11.17 pounds heavier. The offensive linemen were 1.96 inches taller and 9.57 pounds heavier than the defensive linemen.

Realizing that good athletes who play football possess certain attributes, different coaches and researchers began setting up tests to judge them. Brace (4) was one of the first to investigate the players' learning of gross body motor skills. These skills were similar to those that a player performs while engaged in a football contest. The subjects were the 65 varsity football candidates at the University of Texas that were invited to participate in spring training in 1940. The players were given the following tests:

1. Forward pass at a target. -- The target consisted of a canvas sheet hung from the crossbar between the goal posts, on which concentric circles of 2, 4, and 6 feet had been outlined in 2-inch-wide painted lines. The circles were centered 7 feet above the ground. The player stood at a point 15 yards away and opposite the target, took 3 steps to the right and passed at the target. Balls

hitting the center circle counted 3 points, hitting within the second circle 2 points and within the outer circle, 1 point.

2. Fifty-yard dash carrying a football. -- The dash was timed with a stop-watch.

3. Forward passing for distance. -- The test consisted of throwing a forward pass as far as possible, and was measured in yards.

4. Pull out. -- The player took a position on the end line midway between the goal posts, stepped back and charged around the goal post and across a line 5 yards away. The score was the number of seconds required from start to finish.

5. Blocking. -- This consisted of the time required to start from a line and block out three blocking dummies arranged at certain points and finish across another line.

6. Punting. -- The test was punting for distance and was measured in yards.

7. Dodge and run. -- Markers were placed so as to make the runner complete a complicated zig-zag run while carrying a football. The score was the time required to complete the run.

8. Charging. -- The test consisted of measuring the power with which a player could drive with the legs. The player placed one foot against the goal post and charged. A back and leg dynamometer was attached by a harness to the shoulders and then

fastened to the goal post. The score was the number of pounds registered.

The following information concerning the 65 football candidates was gathered:

1. Number of quarters played previously.
2. Number of letters earned in high school.
3. Number of games played in high school.
4. Player's average rating of the playing ability of each other.
5. The average of the three coaches' ratings of the playing ability of each player.

After the study was completed, Brace (4) found that the coaches' ratings were more reliable than the players' ratings showing that the coaches possessed a greater knowledge of each player. The 50-yard dash was reported as the best single test of total achievement. It was concluded that with additional treatment of data, a battery of tests could be worked out to measure general football ability possessed by football candidates. Measurements of this type would be of great assistance to coaches in selecting their players, since they have little objective knowledge of the players' abilities.

In 1950, Wilhelm (35) conducted a study to assess certain measurable traits that would indicate a successful football player.

The subjects for this study were 65 college freshman football players and 65 freshman nonfootball players enrolled in the physical education service program at Indiana University. These subjects were given 44 tests designed to measure physical, mental, and visual traits. The data were gathered by administering the tests to individuals, groups of individuals, and by collecting scores from the Counseling Center at Indiana University. Football players were compared with nonfootball players, and successful football players were compared with unsuccessful ones. Success was determined on the basis of the subjective judgment of the football coaches.

Wilhelm found the following traits to be significant at the .05 level or beyond in favor of the football players over the non-football players: right grip, left grip, arm push, arm pull, back lift, leg lift, total strength, weight, height of crotch, arm span, shoulder width, hip width, arm girth (flexed, relaxed, expanded), thigh girth, calf girth, power, ability, speed, kinesthetic sense, depth perception, and visual acuity. The only test which revealed a significant difference in favor of the nonfootball group was the American Council on Education Psychological Examination. This test was designed to measure one's aptitude for college work.

The traits which showed no significant difference between the football and nonfootball groups were: height, sitting height, foot length, hand length, trunk flexion, shoulder flexibility, balance,

reaction time, trunk extension, finger dexterity, mental (spatial relationships, logical reasoning, total), ankle flexibility, endurance (cardiovascular), near and far vision, and left peripheral vision.

The researcher found the following traits significant at the .05 level, or beyond, in favor of the successful football players over the unsuccessful players: right grip, left grip, arm push, arm pull, back lift, leg lift, total strength, calf girth, speed, and agility.

In summary, Wilhelm (35) stated that successful performers in the game of football were stronger in terms of dynamometric strength and possess greater speed and more agility than unsuccessful performers. On the average, the girth of the calf of the successful football performers was larger. Correlations of the significant test items with the criterion measure reveal that back lift, calf girth, and speed were the best items for distinguishing between successful and unsuccessful football candidates. A multiple correlation of .8073 was found between the test battery of back lift, calf girth, and speed with the criterion measure of football success.

Miller (24) investigated physical capacity and motor ability tests to select a battery of tests that would best segregate the players most likely to succeed as college football players. The State University of Iowa football squad, which consisted of 39

players, was used in gathering data for this research. The football candidates were first rated by their coaches on the following elements: power, agility, reaction, learning ability, accuracy, coordination, movement of extremities, endurance, balance, speed, timing, and strength. After the above ratings were obtained, the following 11 tests were selected and administered to the subjects:

1. Sargent jump. -- The athlete stood next to a wall and marked it as high as he could reach. Crouching down, the athlete then jumped, reached, and made a second mark on the wall. The difference in inches between these two marks was the score used.

2. Six second run. -- The test was running for distance and was measured in yards.

3. Iowa revision of the Brace Test. -- Brace had previously devised a physical fitness test but it did not take into consideration sex, weight, or age. A revised test was created incorporating these features and increasing the stunts from 20 to 39. The method of scoring remained unchanged. The athlete received two points if the stunt was done correctly, one point if another trial was needed, and no points for a failure.

4. Rogers' strength test (lung capacity excluded). -- This test indicated the strength of the large voluntary muscles of the body. It was used as a measure of general athletic ability. This six item test measured right and left grip, back lift, leg lift, and pushups.

5. Burpee. -- This activity was used to measure endurance, agility, and speed. The subject started in a standing position, squatted to a front leaning rest, then returned to an upright position. The score was the number of complete repetitions correctly executed in 30 seconds.

6. Jump reaction. -- Reflex test measuring correct movements as a result of a stimulus.

7. Arm strength. -- Arm curls were used to measure strength in pounds.

8. Classification index. -- This information was gathered to determine the experience of the athlete at playing football.

9. Physical fitness index. -- This was to indicate the level of condition that the athlete was in when the tests were given.

10. Accuracy of the lower extremity in fast movement. -- The test involved correctly placing the feet on certain spots while being timed.

11. Accuracy of the lower extremity in slow movement. -- The test involved correctly placing the feet on certain spots without being timed.

A test battery was then developed by Miller (24) which consisted of the six second dash, a test of the accuracy of the lower extremity in fast movement, Iowa Revision of the Brace Test, and the Sargent jump. This test battery had a multiple correlation of

.6265. The multiple correlation of the six second dash and the accuracy of the lower extremity in fast movement with the criterion measure was reported as .6190, this being about as good as the four item battery.

Brechler (3) constructed a test to determine potential ability in football. A list of attributes deemed essential for successful football players was included. His subjects were 37 college football players. Eighteen different types of test were given; from these data, a test was devised consisting of the following four elements: McClory's Classification Index II ($6 \times \text{Height} + \text{Weight}$), bar dips, squat-thrust, and the Iowa Revision of the Brace Test of Motor Educability. This test was designed to predict potential ability in football and had a reported multiple correlation of .770.

An investigation to see if football ability could be predicted on the high school level was conducted by Rhodes (28). From this study a Football Classification Index was constructed and it was divided into a Personal History Index and a Physical Test Index. The Personal History Index contained such information as:

1. Height. -- This was measured in inches.
2. Weight. -- The weight of the individual was measured in pounds.
3. Grade. -- The level in high school that the athlete had attained when taking the test.

4. Age. -- The exact age of the athlete in years and months.

5. Football experience. -- This was a list of the number of years the athlete had been on the high school squad and the number of letters won.

The Physical Text Index included the following information:

1. Fifty-yard dash. -- The dash was run from the goal line to the fifty-yard line or over any other properly marked location. Backs and ends carried a football while running and the score was measured in seconds.

2. Pull out. -- The player started between the goal posts on the end line, ran around the post on the right, and across the goal line.

3. Ten-yard start. -- The dash was run from the goal line to the ten-yard line or over any other properly marked location.

4. Zig-zag run. -- A course made of markers that form a rectangle ten yards long and five yards wide. The athlete was to weave his way around them against time.

5. Standing broad jump. -- The distance the subject could jump from a standing position was measured in inches. After a number of scores had been gathered, ranks were set up for the ten factors and divided into five equal step intervals. The rank value of one was given for a superior score, two for good, three for average, four for fair, and five for poor. The scores on each test

were then changed into rank values. From a sum of these ranks a range of ten to fifty was obtained for the index scores. The lower the index score the better was the chance for the candidate to succeed in football. The Football Classification Indices were found for each position. Rhodes (28) suggests the possibility of predicting a candidate's chances of being successful.

Not only skill tests were devised but also measuring devices were made to evaluate prospective football players. In 1925, Miles (23) developed a multiple chronoscope to measure the reaction time of individuals and groups of individuals in football charging. The subjects could be tested one at a time or up to seven at one time. The multiple chronoscope was placed so as to time the player or group of players from their stance until they made contact with the timer. A signal was given to simulate a snap count. The average reaction time for all 87 football players at the University of Stanford measured by this device was .389. The measure of 54 football participants taken on separate days, with at least two days between testing, revealed an initial mean reaction time of .390. A second measurement of .375 showed a moderate amount of improvement. A comparison by positions gave the following results in seconds: backfield men, .360; ends, .377; guards, .383; tackles, .395; and centers, .444. A definite correlation between reaction time and players starting lineup was established. In addition,

members of the squad that quit the team had a slower than average reaction time. The researcher suggested a need for scientific evidence to help coaches judge football players.

Manolis (19) used a similar device to that of Miller to record the response time in terms of executing a charge over a distance of 12 inches. The subjects were the 31 University of California football players. Each player was tested on 20 trials, following a warm-up period and five practice trials. The mean time for linemen was .386 seconds, with the guards having the fastest time of any position, .375. The backs had a mean time of .389. The statistical analysis of the data lead to the conclusion that within a group of experienced university football players, there were no correlations between speed of charging and blocking performance. Zero relationship existed between total time played in games and speed of response or blocking efficiency or blocking ability. Finally, there was no appreciable difference in speed of response in relation to position played.

Elbel and Wilson (10) hypothesized that the two most important factors of a successful football player were speed of charge and the force which can be exerted by the player during the charge. To test this theory, an apparatus was constructed for the purpose of measuring the speed of charge and the amount of horizontal force exerted by a football player. The apparatus consisted of a dummy

attached to a specially constructed scale by means of a beam. Also attached to the dummy was an electric clock to measure the speed of charge. After the study involving 45 members of the University of Kansas football team, no relationship could be found between body weight and speed of charge.

For measuring the inherent power of football players, Clevett (7) developed a dynamometer which was on wheels, and which could be utilized for measuring either pushing or pulling power. The pulling test, pulling the dynamometer 30 feet against time, revealed that the heaviest men scored highest in horsepower. There were a few of the middle weights that scored higher than men with a greater weight advantage. Of the 700 subjects tested at Purdue University, the average player, 155 pounds, developed a .95 horsepower. The lightest man, 110 pounds, developed a .70 horsepower while the heaviest man, 230 pounds, developed a 1.28 horsepower. Clevett used the following formula for determining the horsepower of the subject:

$$\text{Horsepower} = \frac{\text{Force X Distance}}{\text{Time X 550}}$$

An experiment to see if there was a relationship between body movement and athletic success was conducted by Keller (16) at the University of Minnesota. The subjects were 359 athletes and 277 non-athletes and it was found that a positive correlation existed between the ability to move quickly and success in athletics.

This was accomplished by devising a test that required the person to make responses to a signal with an arm, leg, or body. The time that was required to make this response was recorded. The ability to move quickly was more essential to baseball, basketball, track, and football than swimming, gymnastics and wrestling. A study by Burley (5), that tested athletes from all sports, substantiated Keller's findings in football that backs have a better reaction time than linemen.

Academic and Physical Attributes

In an effort to discover the relationship between athletes and non-athletes as to scholastic achievements, Di Giovanna (8) reported that there was no real difference. This study was conducted at Southern Illinois State Teachers College. Two hundred and ninety-five men between ages of 18 and 21 of the physical education classes acted as subjects. From the testing it was concluded that regardless of a college man's intelligence quotient (IQ) the subject may be a good, bad, or indifferent athlete. Conversely, regardless of a college man's athletic attainments, the athlete may place anywhere in an IQ rating scale.

In a later study, Johnson (14) examined 310 college freshmen to judge the relationship that existed between physical skills and general intelligence. The students were first given the American

Council of Educators Test for College Freshmen to measure academic status on two levels, linguistic and quantitative. Next they were given the Johnson Physical Skill Test for Sectioning Classes into Homogeneous Units. This test consists of a series of 10 exercises performed upon a chart 15 feet in length, which was placed upon a gymnasium mat. The elements of strength, speed, and endurance were unnecessary to successfully pass the test; skill alone was the factor considered. After comparing the academic score with the physical skill score of the students, it was found that no significant relationship existed between the two scores.

A more recent study by Schafer and Armer (26) examined the records of 585 boys attending two midwestern senior high schools. During the summer of 1964, complete high school records of the subjects were evaluated to determine if athletes were inferior students. During the last year in junior high school, each athlete was matched with a non-athlete for the purpose of the investigation. Factors such as intelligence-test scores, occupations of fathers, curriculums, and grade point average for the final semester of junior high school were taken into consideration when matching the subjects. After the boys' high school records were evaluated, it was found that athletes had a better scholastic average than their non-athlete matches. There were fewer high school drop outs among the athletes and more of them expressed the desire to attend college.

Likewise, Austin (1) was one of the first to show that athletes during the season had higher marks and attained more credits than when they were not playing a sport. This study was based on the records of 224 high school boys from the classes of Wichita High School North in Kansas.

In a study to evaluate why players attained better grades during the athletic season, Jerome and Phillips (13) compared academic achievement and interscholastic participation in Canadian and American schools. It was found that a positive relationship existed between the two and can best be explained by the special rewarding experiences in and from the school and community. Athletes, "like all other creatures, appeared to become positively attached to sources of rewarding experiences," in this case the school. The high prestige that students obtained from sports participation gave them "a better self-concept, resulted in a more positive attitude toward themselves and their abilities--both athletic and scholastic." However, the researchers concluded that without the presence of a differential reward structure favoring athletics, one cannot expect athletes, as a group, to excel in school work to a greater degree than other students.

The use of ergogenic aids in an attempt to improve performance in sports has been pondered by coaches, trainers, and physicians for many years. A paper was delivered on this subject

at the Ninth National American Medical Association Conference on the Medical Aspects of Sports, November 1967, in Houston, Texas by Fowler (11). It was found that whether the aids were nutritional, physical, or pharmacological, there was little evidence that a significant beneficial effect on physical performance was achieved. Furthermore, the use of many of the substances, such as drugs, resulted in undesirable and often dangerous side effects. The legal and ethical implications of athletes using drugs in the quest for advantage in sports cannot be disregarded.

Walter Byers (31), NCAA Executive Director, stated that examinations for the use of drugs in the collegiate football programs will soon be conducted on a national scale. An athlete that had used an unauthorized drug that could "endanger his health or give him an unfair competitive edge," could be ruled ineligible. The NCAA planned to give a urinalysis drug test before championship events in the fall of 1973.

It is evident from this review of the literature that progress is being made toward differentiating between successful and unsuccessful football candidates, but more research in this area is needed. There is a particular dearth of information in the area of moral attributes of successful players. It is hoped that this study will contribute to a better understanding of the attributes looked for in prospective football players and that further investigation will be stimulated.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The game of football has grown in popularity over the years so that it is now one of the most fascinating and distinctive of all American sports (17). Millions every weekend pour into the nation's stadiums, while millions more watch games on television or listen to play-by-play descriptions on radio. "Indeed, a mere autumn cannot contain the real fan's interest. By late August, football begins to push baseball aside in sports headlines; . . . " (22).

With so much interest and publicity on football, the competition among college coaches to find competent athletes has become more keen. No longer is football a game of random organization as it was 80 years ago. Then, the makeup of teams was unpredictable and "coaching often ad libbed" (25). Coaching has improved since the early days, but ultimately it is the mental and physical reactions of the individual team members on the playing field which determine the outcome of a particular game.

Coaches are anxious to find young men who can compete both on the playing field and in the classroom. The player,

representing his school at the contests and while traveling with the team, should be of good moral character. With these ideals in mind, the researcher decided to analyze and compare standards used by college coaches in Texas when recruiting football players for their institutions.

The selection of the schools for this study among junior colleges, colleges, and universities gave a true picture of all levels of Texas college football competition. These schools were members of the Texas Junior College Football Federation (TJCFF), National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), or National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Texas was chosen for the study because there was ample football competition on all levels in this state.

According to the 1972-73 Texas Sports Guide of High Schools and Colleges (27), there were 40 schools with intercollegiate football programs in Texas, 9 junior colleges and 31 colleges and universities. In Texas, the larger schools' athletic programs were financed by gate receipts, television residuals, and postseason bowl games. Their athletic budget was much larger and their football squads were bigger in number than the smaller schools. The Lone Star Conference schools were limited to a sixty man roster with most of their money coming from student activity fees and various school funds. The Texas Junior College

teams were financed by the student fees and school funds with the total squads limited to 33 members. A coach, therefore, must be highly selective in filling his quota in order to insure the athletic and academic success of his players.

To gather this information, a questionnaire (Appendix D) was sent to each of the 40 head football coaches that were listed in the 1972-73 Texas Sports Guide of High Schools and Colleges (27). They were sent during January because at this time coaches were involved in recruiting prospective players.

The questionnaire was designed to gather information from the coaches in areas of physical, academic, and moral standards. The prospective player must have the athletic talent to play the sport, adequate academic ability to pursue college work, and moral characteristics to represent the school in a wholesome manner. The questionnaire was constructed in such a way that the coaches' responses would indicate the standards at their schools.

Since the questionnaire was sent out during the recruiting season, it had to be one that was short, easy to answer, and came right to the point. To answer it, the coach was asked to read the question beside each number and check "yes" or "no" as it applied. If the question did not apply, the answer was "no" and the coach proceeded to the next numbered question. But if the answer was

"yes," the coach was asked to qualify the response by answering the questions that were listed underneath that particular number.

From questions one through four, the minimum and maximum height and weight were determined. The coach was asked if these factors were taken into consideration from a whole team point of view or by each position. Positions were broken down into defensive, offensive, and kicking specialists.

Question five was included to determine how a coach evaluated the prospective player's speed. What type of uniform, what running distance covered, and who timed the player were all asked to give a true picture of the athlete's speed. In question six, the coach was to indicate the optimal speeds for the distance given in question five. In question seven, the coach was to give the slowest time a player could have and still be recruited at that school. This would give the minimum qualifications for speed.

From a survey of the literature it was noted that there were many ways of evaluating strength. Question eight required the coach to tell how strength was evaluated in prospective players. In question nine the coach had the opportunity to describe any particular test that was administered to the young athlete.

The tenth question was included to determine if the player's present coach was to supply any information. A blank was left for any pertinent information that may have been asked of the present coach.

Since hair length and other physical characteristics were subjects of controversy in sports, question eleven asked the coach if these factors were taken into consideration. Also the college recruiter was to list the physical features that were looked for in an athlete at their first introduction. The twelfth question gave the coach an opportunity to indicate any of the physical factors that might have been omitted in the survey.

Racial preferences were examined in question thirteen. The coach was asked if the football squad was kept at a certain ratio, i. e., Latin to white; or if a certain race was recruited for a certain position on the team, i. e., blacks recruited for running backs; or were players of a particular race not recruited for certain positions, i. e., quarterback.

Questions fourteen through eighteen were constructed to discover how a coach evaluated the athlete's academic ability. The coach could have considered IQ or in what quarter of the graduating class the player finished. If the college entrance examination score was the criterion for academic judgment, the coach was asked to state the score an athlete needed to attain to enter school. Since the coach was asked for an athletic evaluation of the prospective player the researcher considered that the athlete's teachers might be asked for an academic evaluation. Therefore, the seventeenth question was included.

Some of the schools that play football are church affiliated, such as Texas Christian University and Southern Methodist University. Question nineteen was added to see if coaches from these schools considered religion when recruiting players. The twentieth question was included to see if church attendance was considered when judging a prospective athlete.

The use of drugs in our society makes the news nearly every day. Questions twenty-one and twenty-two were included to determine if a player who had previously had a prison record or had been arrested by the police could be considered for scholarship.

Questions twenty-three through twenty-five were constructed to determine to what extent a coach checks into a player's moral character. In these questions, the coach was asked if evaluation of the players' home life, parents, brothers, and sisters was made. The coach was to supply information regarding other moral criteria used in evaluating the player. Question twenty-six was added to allow the coach the opportunity to give any other type of criteria used to evaluate a player for scholarship that was not covered by the questionnaire. This was to be expressed in the blank provided.

The last question asked whether the coach wanted a copy of the results of this study. This information was made available to all coaches participating in the survey.

For advice regarding different areas of concern in recruiting prospective players and the construction of questions to cover this information, the researcher asked for assistance from coaches Bill O'Neil and Monte Driskell. These coaches at Sam Houston State University were active in the selection of athletes to play football for that school.

The questionnaire was printed on the campus of Sam Houston State University at Huntsville, Texas, along with the instructions and a letter from the researcher (Appendix A). In the letter it was explained what the study hoped to accomplish and that the coach's participation was appreciated. A list of all the coaches and institutions (Appendix C) to which the questionnaire was sent was included in the packet. This information was mailed on January 26, 1973 along with a self-addressed stamped envelope. A period of four weeks was allowed and 19 returns were received. A follow-up letter (Appendix B) along with the questionnaire was mailed a month later to all those who had not responded.

On March 10, 1973, twelve long distance calls were made to the coaches who had not yet sent in either of the questionnaires. It was from this last inquiry that it was learned why some had not returned the questionnaire. Northwood of Texas and Wiley College had eliminated intercollegiate football from their athletic program. After talking to Coach Warren Woodson at Trinity University in

San Antonio, it was learned that no recruiting of football players was in progress. The school voted to no longer support football from their funds, but agreed to honor all scholarships that were held by the players presently attending the school. The majority of the players will have to come from the student body and receive no financial aid if Trinity is to play any future football. Since these three schools did not recruit football players, they were not included in the survey.

Bishop College's coach, Dwight H. Fisher, said that the questionnaire would be returned, but no scholarships were given at his school. The school team plays a schedule and does not give any financial aid to its participants.

After talking to each of the 12 schools which did not return either of the questionnaires, nine stated they would make an attempt to return one. At the conclusion of this study, five of these nine schools returned the questionnaire. The four schools that did not respond were not included in this survey, one junior college and three colleges. This study encompassed eight junior colleges and twenty-five colleges.

The method of scoring this questionnaire was based on the totals, percentages, and averages of each of the questions asked. Results were shown for a number of questions in the form of charts.

The minimum physical, academic, and moral characteristics one must have to be recruited for college football in Texas were described.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The increased national attention on college football has brought pressure upon coaches at this level to develop winning teams consisting of competent athletes who can maintain academic, athletic, and moral standards while representing their institutions. Throughout the country there are thousands of young men playing high school and junior college football. College coaches must evaluate players and choose from this group those which they think will play winning football at their schools. The researcher selected the state of Texas in which to conduct this study aimed at determining the criteria used by coaches in their schools to judge prospective football players.

In Texas, football was played on every level of competition from grade school through the professional ranks.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the coaches of colleges and universities look for different physical qualities in prospective football players. The secondary purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which grades, religion, race, and police record influence coaches preferences.

Coaches and players can determine from this study what criteria were important in recruiting throughout the state. The minimum requirements of a prospective football player in the state of Texas was asked of each recruiting coach.

The head coach of each school in this survey was to complete the questionnaire and return it in a self-addressed stamped envelope. It was suggested that the coach remain cognizant of the type of football player that usually qualified for a scholarship at that institution, and the criteria which the coach used in judging a player for scholarship. In filling out the questionnaire, the coach was to read the question beside each number and check "yes" or "no" as it applied. If the answer was "no", it was asked that the response be qualified by answering the questions listed underneath that particular question.

Totals and percentages were determined for all the schools participating so recruiting criteria could be determined. Results were compiled and tabulations completed for each level of competition. All schools which requested the results of this survey were informed at its conclusion.

The questionnaire was sent to nine junior colleges, eight of which were members of the Texas Junior College Football Federation (TJCFF). The ninth was an independent junior college.

One of the eight TJCFF colleges did not return the questionnaire and was therefore not included in the study.

The questionnaire was also sent to thirty-one four-year institutions which are listed in the 1972-73 Texas Sports Guide of High Schools and Colleges (27). Three of these thirty-one no longer recruit for football and three others did not return the questionnaire. Therefore, the study included twenty-five four-year institutions.

The results of the study were tabulated with all schools being classified according to certain divisions. The Junior College Division was composed of seven responding schools of the TJCFF, and one independent. The NAIA Division was composed of the nine Lone Star Conference schools, two independent schools, and one Big State Conference school. The NCAA Division contains eight Southwest Conference schools, two Missouri Valley schools, and one Southland Conference school. The all-school total was comprised of all thirty-three schools in this study.

The first twelve questions of this questionnaire related to the player's physical attributes. Maximum and minimum height requirements were examined in questions one and two. Of the thirty-three schools in the survey only seven placed a minimum requirement on height. These seven schools indicated a height requirement by position rather than an overall team height as seen in Tables I and II. One university did not include figures for

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE MINIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT
IN INCHES FOR EACH DEFENSIVE POSITION

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have minimum height	Tackle	End	Back	Linebacker
Junior College	8	1	74	74	71	72
NAIA: Lone Star Conf.	12	2	73	73	71	71
NCAA	13	4 ^a	74.3	73.7	72	72
Southwest Conf.	8	2 ^a	74	74	71	72
All School	33	7 ^a	73.8	73.5	71.4	72

^aOne Southwest Conference school stated that a minimum height was used but preferred not to give the heights.

TABLE II

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE MINIMUM HEIGHT REQUIREMENT
IN INCHES FOR EACH OFFENSIVE POSITION

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have minimum height	Tackle	Guard	Center	End	Back	Quarter- Back
Junior College	8	1	73	72	72	72	69	70
NAIA: Lone Star Conf.	12	2	73	73	73	73	71	72
NCAA	13	4 ^a	73.3	73.3	73	73.7	72	71
Southwest Conf.	8	2 ^a	74	74	74	-	-	-
All School	33	7 ^a	73.2	73	72.9	73.5	70.7	71.2

^aOne Southwest Conference school stated that a minimum height was used but preferred not to give the heights.

minimum height by position in the response. The defensive tackle in all divisions required the most height. The average for all schools at this position was 73.8 inches (ranging from 72 to 75 inches). The NCAA schools' average height requirement was the highest of all divisions, 74.3 inches. Quarterback, defensive back, and offensive back required the least height of all positions in all divisions. The shortest position was found to be the offensive back at the junior college level with a height of 69 inches. In all cases there was no minimum height requirement for the kicking specialists.

Of all the schools, only one junior college had a maximum height requirement on prospective football players. Again it was not an overall team height but a maximum height by position. The junior college gave 74 inches as a maximum height for linebackers and defensive backs. Defensive tackles had a maximum height of 75 inches and defensive ends were the tallest players on the team with a height of 78 inches. The junior college listed the offensive back and center with maximum heights of 74 inches. The quarterback along with the guards could not be taller than 75 inches. Offensive ends had a height of 76 inches and offensive tackles were the tallest offensive players at 77 inches.

Maximum and minimum weight requirements were examined in questions three and four of the questionnaire. Seven schools maintain a minimum weight requirement, however one of

these seven did not submit the figures by position. A comparison of the average minimum weight for defensive positions are shown in Table III, while Table IV reports the offensive positions minimum weight. The overall defensive average of the six schools which submitted figures was 197.2 pounds, while the offensive average was 198.3. These schools indicated a weight requirement by position rather than an overall team weight. The offensive tackle in all divisions required the most weight. The average for all schools at this position is 219.2 pounds (weight ranged from 200 to 230 pounds). The Lone Star Conference schools average weight requirement was the heaviest of all divisions, 227.5 pounds. Quarterback was the lightest of all positions with a minimum weight indicated at 171.7 pounds at the junior college level. Only one junior college placed a minimum weight requirement on the kicking specialist, 170 pounds.

Of the thirty-three schools in the survey, only one junior college had maximum weight requirements on prospective players. The heaviest defensive player was the tackle at 220 pounds followed by the defensive end, 200 pounds. The maximum weight for linebacker was 190 pounds. Defensive backs were the lightest members on the team with a maximum weight of 165 pounds. The lightest offensive player was the quarterback at 170 pounds followed by the running backs at 180 pounds. Centers and ends have maximum

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE MINIMUM WEIGHT REQUIREMENTS
IN POUNDS FOR EACH DEFENSIVE POSITION

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have minimum weight	Tackle	End	Back	Linebacker
Junior College	8	3	216.7	198.3	173.3	196.6
NAIA: Lone Star Conf.	12	2	210	210	190	205
NCAA: Southwest Conf.	13	2 ^a	200	200	-	200
All School	33	7 ^a	211.6	201	177.5	200

^aOne Southwest Conference school stated that a minimum weight was used but preferred not to give the weights.

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE MINIMUM WEIGHT REQUIREMENTS
IN POUNDS FOR EACH OFFENSIVE POSITION

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have minimum weight	Tackle	Guard	Center	End	Back	Quarter- back
Junior College	8	3	220	215	200	193.5	181.7	172
NAIA: Lone Star Conf.	12	2	227.5	215	220	212.5	180	-
NCAA: Southwest Conf.	13	2 ^a	200	200	200	-	-	-
All School	33	7 ^a	219.2	212.5	204	201	181.3	172

^aOne Southwest Conference school stated that a minimum weight was used but preferred not to give the weights.

weights of 200 pounds and guards, 215 pounds. The offensive tackle was the heaviest man on the team with a maximum weight of 230 pounds.

Another junior college stated that in regards to height and weight, there was not necessarily any preference. This school studied film to see if the athlete was "a player" and mainly recruited according to speed. One Lone Star Conference school stated: "We decide whether he can play winning football in our conference."

In question five the results indicated that a future player's running speed was judged when selecting him for scholarship in all schools in each division with the exception of one Lone Star Conference school which stated that this practice was against conference rules.

All schools that judged speed used the forty-yard dash as criterion, with the exception of one Southwest Conference school which stated that they watched film on the athlete or attended a game or workout. In addition to the forty-yard dash, three schools also used the one hundred-yard dash, two schools used the fifty-yard dash, and one the twenty-yard dash.

Twenty-four schools indicated a type of uniform was preferred when the player was timed. Shorts and cleats or football shoes were mentioned by all schools. Two schools preferred full

football uniform, but these schools did not have an active scholarship program.

Of the twenty-two schools responding to the question concerning the type of field or track on which they preferred the players running speed to be judged, nineteen schools indicated a grass turf or football field. One coach mentioned astroturf and another did not specify, but stated that the type of field or track was considered in his evaluation.

One-half of the eight junior colleges answered "yes" to the question of whether they personally timed the player. Two of the NAIA and NCAA schools also responded affirmatively. The remainder did not time players personally and two mentioned that this practice was against conference rules.

All NCAA and NAIA schools answered that they accept a time given to them by the player's coach. Three junior colleges did not use these times as a true measurement of a player's speed.

Fifteen schools in the survey did not adjust in any way the time given to them by the prospective player's coach. Of the thirteen that adjust the time in some way, three stated that it depended upon the person who provided the time. Another consideration given by two coaches was the judgment of films and comparison with given time. Five responses showed that one or two-tenths of

a second were added to the player's time as given by his present coach. One coach stated that the extra fast times were questioned.

In question six of the questionnaire the coach indicated the desired time for his players to have for the distance mentioned in question five. Thirty responding coaches gave speeds in terms of the forty-yard dash. Average desired times for defensive players are shown in Table V. Table VI reports the desired time for offensive positions. Two Lone Star Conference schools and one Southwest Conference school did not submit times. The slowest players were recruited for offensive and defensive tackle with average times of 5.04 seconds and 5.02 seconds respectively (times ranged from 4.8 to 5.4 seconds). The slowest average time for an offensive tackle was 5.16 seconds reported by the Lone Star Conference coaches. The fastest average time was required of offensive and defensive backs with times of 4.63 seconds and 4.65 seconds respectively (times ranged from 4.5 to 5.0 seconds). The Junior College Division had the fastest average for offensive backs at 4.6 seconds. Only one school reported a desired speed of 5.00 seconds for kicking specialists. Another school indicated that a kicking specialist should be a player who "is fast enough to kick the ball before it is blocked."

Coaches were asked in the following question to give the slowest time a player could have for each position and still be

TABLE V

THE AVERAGE DESIRED TIME IN SECONDS FOR DEFENSIVE
PLAYERS TO RUN THE FORTY-YARD DASH

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have desired time	Tackle	End	Back	Linebacker
Junior College	8	8	4.98	4.83	4.63	4.78
NAIA	12	10	5.07	4.95	4.69	4.86
Lone Star Conf.	9	7	5.05	4.95	4.68	4.88
NCAA	13	12	5.01	4.89	4.64	4.80
Southwest Conf.	8	7	4.97	4.84	4.62	4.76
All School	33	30	5.02	4.89	4.65	4.81

Only one school, a junior college, submitted a time for a kicking specialist.
This time was 5.00 seconds.

TABLE VI

THE AVERAGE DESIRED TIME IN SECONDS FOR OFFENSIVE
PLAYERS TO RUN THE FORTY-YARD DASH

	Number of schools in survey	Number that have desired time	Tackle	Guard	Center	End	Back	Quarter- back
Junior College	8	8	5.00	4.96	4.94	4.66	4.60	4.76
NAIA	12	10	5.12	5.00	5.08	4.80	4.68	4.82
Lone Star Conf.	9	7	5.16	5.04	5.09	4.79	4.68	4.79
NCAA	13	12	5.01	5.00	5.02	4.70	4.62	4.73
Southwest Conf.	8	7	4.98	4.98	4.99	4.66	4.63	4.71
All School	33	30	5.04	4.99	5.01	4.72	4.63	4.77

recruited. Twenty-five schools submitted figures for this question. Table VII shows the slowest average time a defensive player could run the forty-yard dash and still receive a scholarship. Table VIII reports the slowest times for offensive positions. Two schools' times depended on the size, the quickness, and the courage of the particular player involved. Offensive and defensive tackles could have the slowest average times of any positions, 5.28 seconds and 5.25 seconds respectively (times ranged from 5.00 to 5.60 seconds). The slowest average time in any division was submitted by the Lone Star Conference schools for the offensive tackle position, 5.37 seconds. The fastest time was still required of offensive backs. The average time that all schools gave for this position was 4.82 seconds (times ranged from 4.8 to 5.0 seconds).

Seventeen of the thirty-three schools judged the future football player's strength when selecting one for scholarship. Nine of the seventeen schools used weights as a means of judging. The two lifts judged were the bench press and military press. Other ways of judging strength were by use of films, coaches' information and body structure of the prospective athlete.

From the review of literature, the researcher discovered a number of tests available to coaches for judging football players. The results of question nine showed that none of the schools avail themselves of the existing tests. One NAIA school indicated that

TABLE VII

THE SLOWEST AVERAGE TIME IN SECONDS A DEFENSIVE PLAYER
COULD RUN THE FORTY-YARD DASH AND STILL RECEIVE A
SCHOLARSHIP FROM A COLLEGE IN TEXAS

	Number of schools in survey	Number that sent slow times	Tackle	End	Back	Linebacker
Junior College	8	7	5.17	4.97	4.80	4.93
NAIA	12	10	5.31	5.18	4.92	5.05
Lone Star Conf.	9	7	5.30	5.19	4.90	5.06
NCAA	13	8	5.26	5.17	4.86	5.00
Southwest Conf.	8	4	5.20	5.03	4.80	4.90
All School	33	25	5.25	5.11	4.86	4.99

TABLE VII

THE SLOWEST AVERAGE TIME IN SECONDS AN OFFENSIVE PLAYER
CAN RUN THE FORTY-YARD DASH AND STILL RECEIVE A
SCHOLARSHIP FROM A COLLEGE IN TEXAS

	Number of schools in survey	Number that sent slow times	Tackle	Guard	Center	End	Back	Quarter- back
Junior College	8	7	5.21	5.16	5.07	4.83	4.79	4.96
NAIA	12	10	5.33	5.22	5.26	5.01	4.87	5.02
Lone Star Conf.	9	7	5.37	5.27	5.27	4.98	4.85	5.03
NCAA	13	8	5.31	5.27	5.27	4.90	4.81	4.94
Southwest Conf.	8	4	5.23	5.20	5.20	4.88	4.80	4.90
All School	33	25	5.28	5.22	5.20	4.91	4.82	4.97

they did have a means of measurement or test that they administered to the young athlete in order to judge him for scholarship. This school, however, declined to describe the test. Another school stated that no test was given and tryouts were not legal in that conference.

Question ten indicated that all but five schools asked the player's coach to rate the player's performance in some way. The information that was expected of the coach in most cases concerned attitude, primarily, then ability, and speed. Other traits included physical measurements, strength, character, and the player's desire to play.

Thirty-one of all the schools considered the player's physical appearance when first meeting him, as seen from the responses to questions eleven and twelve. The length of hair had an effect on whether or not a scholarship was granted in seven cases. The majority of the coaches added height, muscular appearance, body build, or frame as additional features looked for when first meeting an athlete personally. Seven coaches noted eye contact when speaking face to face as an important quality for a future athlete. Other features included weight, width of shoulders, neck, hips, size of hands, feet, and legs. All three coaches who considered the criteria of weight, judged it in proportion to waist measurement. Additional criteria included firm hand shake,

manners, courteous answers, general look of intelligence, neatness in appearance, and the growth potential depending on the size of the parents of the athlete.

Twenty-seven schools in the survey stated that the player's race was not a factor considered when recruiting athletes for football teams. Of the six schools in which race was a factor, five indicated that squads were kept at a certain ratio of white to non-white athletes. One NCAA school answered that race was not a factor but indicated that their squad was kept at a certain ratio. None of the teams recruited a certain race for a particular position on the team or excluded any player from certain positions because of race.

The next five questions dealt with the evaluation of the athlete's academic merits. Coaches were asked if a prospective athlete's IQ was considered when selecting him for a scholarship. Sixteen considered it, but only two gave a minimum requirement. One junior college required 112, while a Lone Star Conference school required an IQ of 90. Two universities required no minimum IQ for a player being considered for scholarship, but considered study performance along with IQ.

Thirteen schools responded affirmatively to question fifteen which asked if it mattered in what quarter of the high school class the prospective football player finished. Five of these schools

accepted as low as third quarter ranking and two would accept fourth quarter graduates, but preferred not to consider them for scholarship. Two schools required the athlete to graduate in the upper half of his senior class or have a second quarter ranking. Four schools indicated that it did not matter in which quarter the athlete finished, and accepted fourth quarter graduates for scholarship aid.

The schools were asked if they considered scores on college entrance tests. There were only two junior colleges which considered scores on entrance tests. One required 18 on the American College Testing Program (ACT) and 800 on The College Board Test (SAT), the other required a minimum of 8 on the ACT. Of the four-year colleges only four did not consider college entrance test scores when recruiting. All the rest of the schools in the survey used one of the standard entrance tests as a basis for judging future football players. The schools that submitted minimum test scores are listed in Table IX.

In question seventeen, all the junior colleges in this survey stated that an athlete's teachers were not asked to supply an academic evaluation of the prospective player. Of the NAIA schools, fifty per cent asked for a teacher's evaluation. Two of these schools sought information from the athlete's teachers concerning the player's capacity to do college work. One asked for the athlete's progress in class on a bi-monthly report. Six of the thirteen

TABLE IX

ENTRANCE TESTS USED AND LOWEST SCORE A
PLAYER CAN RECEIVE AND STILL BE
ELIGIBLE FOR SCHOLARSHIP

School	ACT	SAT	Other tests
Angelo State	15		
Austin College	16	800	
Baylor University	16	a	
East Texas State U.	12		
Lamar University		610	
North Texas State U.		600	
Sam Houston State U.	10		
Southern Methodist U.	a	a	CEEB for SMU
Southwest Texas State		800	
Stephen F. Austin	12		
Sul Ross	9		
Texas, U. of (Austin)	15		
Texas, U. of (El Paso)		800-700	
Texas A & I	11	610	
Texas Christian U.	c	c	
Texas Luthern	15	700	
West Texas State	b		

^aTest required but scores were not sent.

^bDepends on class rank.

^cDetermined by admissions office.

NCAA schools which conferred with the athlete's teachers wanted information concerning test scores and the teacher's evaluation of the player's capability to do college work. Coaches also were interested in attitude, interest span, and motivation. One Southwest Conference school listed, "courses in progress, types of courses, and strength of units" as other criteria used in evaluating the player.

To the question of whether a player's religious denomination was considered when recruiting, all schools in the survey answered negatively. However, one Southwest Conference school considered church attendance and they "would like him to develop a faith in God." A junior college and a NAIA school encouraged church attendance, while a NCAA university preferred "players who show a Christian background."

The question was asked whether or not an athlete who had been arrested by the police could receive a scholarship. Only twenty-nine schools answered this question. One coach commented that: "the problem is too complex for a simple yes or no answer." Others stated that the problem had never been considered; that it depended on the circumstances; and that it also depended upon individual discretion. However, of the twenty-nine that answered the question, twenty stated that a scholarship could be received even though the player had been arrested by the police. All but one junior college said that a player could receive a scholarship under

these circumstances. Two schools from the Lone Star Conference also excluded from scholarship players who had been arrested. From among the twelve NCAA schools, five did not give scholarships to young men who had been arrested by the police.

Under the above question the coaches were asked if a convicted felon could receive a scholarship. Of the twenty that answered this question, eight replied yes, seven replied no, and five gave no response to part A. Schools that offered scholarships to convicted felons were four TJCFF colleges, two NAIA schools, and four NCAA schools. All these schools, with the exception of one junior college, accepted athletes who had served a prison term.

If a player was suspected of drug abuse, eligibility for scholarship was denied at twenty-five schools. Five NCAA and NAIA colleges would recruit an athlete that was caught using drugs. Only one indicated that a known addict could receive a scholarship, but added that the decision would be left to the coach's discretion.

In question twenty-three, coaches were asked if the athlete's family was a factor taken into consideration. Seventeen of all thirty-three schools considered this aspect. Separated or divorced parents were a factor considered in two schools. One of these schools replied that "this depended on how responsible the boy was." The number of brothers and sisters a player had was only considered by one junior college. Additional family information

given in the response to the survey included: type of home life, family interest, background of youngster in regard to parental control, family attitude toward athletics, guidance, character, discipline, and Christian authority in the home was "a big thing."

In some cases persons other than school officials were asked to evaluate a player's family, character, and morals. One junior college checked with the pastor of the athlete's church and asked about character traits and moral standards. One Lone Star Conference school spoke with people who knew the player intimately. An NCAA college sought insight into the player's character by checking with people in the community who knew the player. A Southwest Conference coach sought information about attitude and character from the player's minister. "Only when applicable," another NCAA school asked persons other than school officials about the prospective player. A church affiliated university asked ex-students and "the church" for information regarding the player's background. Friends of the player's family and the school's graduates were sometimes consulted by recruiters. One NCAA college conferred with friends of the prospective player, another asked for character references, and one conferred with the admissions office concerning academic standing, family background, and desire of the athlete to receive an education.

A junior college mentioned drinking, smoking, and conduct with girls as other criteria used in evaluating players. Two colleges stated that a player with a bad character, or one whose morals were seriously questioned, would not likely be considered for a scholarship.

In addition to the criteria used to evaluate a player for scholarship covered by this questionnaire, film and an overall faith in others who had knowledge concerning a prospect were used to evaluate a player for scholarship.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

College football coaches each year must embark upon the search for athletes who can contribute to the success of their football programs. The evaluation of the abilities and qualifications of the prospects varies with individual coaches at different institutions. With the ever-increasing sophistication of the game of football, special qualities along with general football ability are important to the composition of a winning team.

Of prime importance is the academic ability of the prospective players. The athletes must be able to perform in the classroom as well as on the field. As a representative of the school, an athlete receives public attention and coaches may therefore be concerned about the moral and ethical conduct of the individual team members.

The attention given to college football competition by the public has greatly increased with the advent of radio broadcasting and television transmission of games across the nation. In 1951, the first college football game was telecast in color, and thereafter

television audiences have been able to savor the excitement, action, and color of fall's greatest sport (15).

During the early years of college football, mass play and brute force were emphasized by coaches. Gradually football has evolved into a specialized game demanding intelligence, speed, and endurance (17). Enlarged stadiums, higher ticket prices, and radio and television residuals have resulted in higher revenues at large schools. Schools could afford to offer athletic scholarships to the most promising student-athletes as a means to further develop their athletic skills and to continue their education (25).

The problem of this study was to examine the criteria used by college coaches in the state of Texas when evaluating prospective football players for scholarship. Texas was selected for this study because all levels of collegiate football were played in this state. A questionnaire was constructed as the evaluation instrument. The researcher determined this means to be the most efficient in order to collect data in the area of college recruiting.

A major purpose in conducting this study was to create a better understanding of attributes college recruiters seek in prospective football players and to make this information available to people who are responsible for recruiting.

The questionnaire was sent to the 40 junior colleges, colleges, and universities that were listed in the 1972-73 Texas Sports

Guide of High Schools and Colleges (27) that maintained football programs. After a period of one month, follow-up letters and an additional questionnaire were sent to those schools which had not yet responded. A span of one additional month was allowed, and then the researcher placed long distance phone calls to the delinquent coaches.

The survey was conducted on thirty-three of the forty schools who received questionnaires. Of the seven schools excluded from the survey, three have abandoned their football programs and the remaining four did not return either questionnaire.

Factors included in the evaluation were the physical, academic and moral characteristics of prospective football players. At the conclusion of the study the results were made available to the responding coaches who had indicated a desire to receive the findings.

The findings of this investigation were as follows:

1. Twenty-six of the 33 Texas schools that recruited football players do not have a minimum height or weight preference. However, three of the six that had height and weight requirements were conference champions. From the schools that had minimum physical requirements, the tackles were the tallest and heaviest, and the backs were the shortest and lightest.

2. The distance used to judge the speed of prospective football players was forty yards. The players were timed on grass turf or football fields while wearing shorts and cleats or football shoes. The players were timed by their high school coaches and the majority of recruiting coaches accepted this time. The tackles had the slowest time given and the backs were the fastest.

3. Coaches that examined an athlete's strength by weight training procedure used the military press and the bench press.

4. From the review of literature it was noted that tests such as Brace's (4) and Rhodes' (28) were available for judging prospective football player's abilities and skills. These tests were not mentioned or used by the college coaches in this survey.

5. Attitude, speed, and ability of the prospective player were the three areas of most concern to college recruiters when questioning high school coaches.

6. The prospective athlete's physical appearance was considered by most coaches at initial meetings.

7. Length of hair was a factor at seven schools when judging an athlete for scholarship.

8. When meeting the athlete for the first time the recruiting coach noted the athlete's height, size, and whether or not the player looked him in the eye.

9. At five of the six schools that considered race a factor in recruiting, a ratio of white to non-white players on the team was maintained.

10. Six of the schools in this survey did not consider the athlete's IQ, graduating class rank, college entrance tests, teachers' evaluation, or any other academic criteria when judging players for an athletic scholarship. These six schools were all junior colleges.

11. IQ was not a major concern when judging athletes since only two colleges submitted minimal requirements.

12. Class ranking was not considered by any of the schools in the survey when evaluating the prospective football players.

13. In judging an athlete academically, standardized college entrance tests received the most attention from recruiters.

14. Teacher evaluations of an athlete's academic ability were not found to be significant as a criteria for scholarship.

15. The athlete's church attendance and religious denomination were not found to have a bearing on the recruiter's decision to grant a scholarship.

16. A police record generally did not prohibit a player from receiving a scholarship. However, if the prospective athlete was caught using drugs, scholarship in most cases would be denied.

17. An athlete's family was taken into consideration by 17 of the 33 coaches. Recruiters were interested in the attitudes of the family toward athletics and toward the particular school.

18. Persons other than school officials who were asked to evaluate the players were pastors of churches, friends, alumni, and people of the community who knew the players.

19. Additional moral criteria used in evaluating players were drinking, smoking, conduct with girls, personal interviews, and coaches' opinions.

20. Judgment of films was mentioned as another means of evaluating players for scholarship.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study the following conclusions seem apparent:

1. Height and weight are not criteria for recruiting football players by the majority of the schools. However, three of the six colleges that had height and weight requirements were conference champions, which perhaps indicates that there may be a relationship between height and weight requirements and successful football teams.

2. Speed is a factor that is considered in recruiting.

3. Academic standing is considered by college coaches when selecting athletes for scholarship.

4. In addition to talking with the athlete, other people are consulted by the recruiting coach in judging a player for scholarship.

5. Physical appearance is important at initial meetings between the recruiter and the prospective athlete.

Recommendations

In view of the fact that college football recruiting is not uniform throughout the state of Texas, this investigator recommends further study in order to establish which of the existing recruiting standards reflected in this study are the most efficient and conducive to the selection of successful student-athletes. If coaches strive to establish standards for selecting players suitable to their particular program, it is likely that the chances for a successful team will be enhanced.

A further study of the actual physical, moral, and academic attributes of the players participating in football programs on the different levels of collegiate competition is encouraged. Such a study might indicate what recruiters want ideally and the types of players which in reality comprise the teams.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Austin, Lindsey W. "Do Athletes Sacrifice High Grades?" The Athletic Journal, 13:42-44, 1932.
2. Bible, Dana X. Championship Football. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947.
3. Brechler, Paul W. "A Test to Determine Potential Ability in Football." Master of Arts thesis, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1940.
4. Brace, D. K. "Validity of Football Achievement Tests as Measures of Motor Learning and as a Partial Basis for the Selection of Players." Research Quarterly, 14:372-377, 1943.
5. Burley, Floyd R. "A Study of the Angles in the Measurement of the Leg Lift." Research Quarterly, 15:232-239, 1944.
6. Carter, Lindsay J. E. "Somatotypes of College Players." Research Quarterly, 39:476-481, 1968.
7. Clevett, M. L. "Power Tests for Football Players." The Athletic Journal, 17:7-9, 1937.
8. Di Giovanna, Vincent. "A Comparison of the Intelligence in Athletic Ability in College Men." Research Quarterly, 8:96-106, 1937.
9. Di Giovanna, Vincent. "The Relation of Selected Structural and Functional Measures to Success in College Athletics." Doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, 1942.
10. Elbel, Edwin R. and Wilson, Donald. "Measuring Speed and Force of Charge of Football Players." Research Quarterly, 23:295-300, 1952.
11. Fowler, William M. "The Facts About Erogonic Aids and Sports Performance." Journal of Health Physical Education Recreation, 40:37-41, 1969.

12. Gray, Horace. "Body-Build in Football Players." Research Quarterly, 7:47-57, 1936.
13. Jerome, Wendy C. "The Relationship Between Academic Achievement and Interscholastic Participation: A Comparison of Canadian and American High Schools." Journal of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 37:18-21, 1971.
14. Johnson, Granville B. "A Study of the Relationship that Exists Between Physical Skill as Measured, and the General Intelligence of College Students." Research Quarterly, 13: 57-59, 1942.
15. Kane, Joseph Nathan. Famous First Facts. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1964.
16. Keller, Louis F. "The Relation of Quickness of Body Movement to Success in Athletics." Research Quarterly, 13: 146-155, 1942.
17. Killinger, W. G. Football. New York: The Ronald Press Company, Inc., 1939.
18. Leahy, Frank. Notre Dame Football - The "T" Formation. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.
19. Manolis, Gus G. "Relation of Charging Time to Blocking Performance in Football." Research Quarterly, 26: 170-175, 1955.
20. Menke, Frank G. Encyclopedia of Sports. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1944.
21. Menke, Frank G. Encyclopedia of Sports. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1953.
22. Miers, Earl Schenck. Football. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1967.
23. Miles, W. R. "Studies in Physical Exertion II - Individual and Group Reaction Time in Football Charging." Research Quarterly, 2:5-13, 1931.

24. Miller, Henry G. "The Contributions of Physical Capacities and Abilities, as Measured by Motor Tests." Master of Arts Thesis, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1938.
25. Tips, Kern. Football - Texas Style. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.
26. Schafer, Walter E. and Armer, J. Michael. "Athletes are not Inferior Students." Trans-action, 6:21-26, 61-62, 1968.
27. Towne, Eugene M., editor. Texas Sports Guide of High Schools and Colleges. El Paso, Texas: Craftsman Publications, Inc., 1972.
28. Rhodes, William Jack. "The Construction of Scales for Predicting Ability to Play Interscholastic Football." Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, 1950.
29. Sheldon, W. H., Dupertuis, C. W. and McDermott, Eugene. Atlas of Men. New York: Harper and Brother, 1954.
30. The Eighty-First Annual Catalogue 1960-61, Sam Houston State Teachers College, 50:48-54, 1960.
31. The Houston Post, June 20, 1973, Sec. D, p. 5, col. 4.
32. The Ninety-Fourth Annual Catalogue 1973-74, Sam Houston State University, 63:18-24, 1973.
33. The Sixty-First Annual Catalogue 1940-41, Sam Houston State Teachers College, 30:24-30, 1940.
34. The Thirty-Six Annual Catalogue of Sam Houston Normal Institute for the School Year, 1915-16, Bulletin, No. 22, 22-23, 1915.
35. Wilhelm, Arnold William. "The Relationship of Certain Measurable Traits to Success in Football." Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1951.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO THE COACHES



SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS 77340

DEPARTMENT OF ATHLETICS & PHYSICAL
EDUCATION FOR MEN

January 18, 1973

Dear Coach,

I know this is a busy time of the year for you, but I would appreciate it very much if you would help me.

After retiring from professional football last year, I enrolled at Sam Houston State University as a graduate assistant. This year I plan to write my Masters Thesis and I need some information from you in order to do so.

This questionnaire is being sent to all the junior colleges, colleges, and universities that play football in the State of Texas. From it I hope to find the type, size, and speed of football players that are recruited at your school and all other schools in the State.

I would be happy to make this information available to you, if you so desire. There is a place on the questionnaire where you may indicate whether or not you would like a copy of the results sent to you.

Your prompt attention to this questionnaire would be greatly appreciated, as I hope to complete my degree this spring.

Sincerely,

Ernie Koy
Graduate Assistant

EK:bs
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER



SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS 77340

DEPARTMENT OF ATHLETICS & PHYSICAL
EDUCATION FOR MEN

February 12, 1973

Dear Coach,

On January 26, 1973 a questionnaire was mailed to you concerning the characteristics of the athletes you recruit at your school. At this point the response is encouraging, but as you probably know, a study of this nature is statistically dependent upon as complete a return as possible.

As yet, I have not received a response from you. I am sending this additional copy in case the original was misplaced or lost in the mail. Please disregard it if you have recently mailed the original.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Ernie Koy
Graduate Assistant

EK:bk
Enclosure

APPENDIX C
JUNIOR COLLEGES, COLLEGES, AND
UNIVERSITIES IN THE SURVEY

JUNIOR COLLEGES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

Coach Ben Boehnke
Blinn College
902 College Avenue
Brenham, Texas 77833

Coach Ace Prescott
Cisco Junior College
Cisco, Texas 76437

Coach Bob Lee
Henderson County Junior College
Cardinal Drive
Athens, Texas 75751

Coach Charles Simmons
Kilgore College
2200 Broadway
Kilgore, Texas 75662

Coach Don Duncan
Navarro Junior College
West 7th Avenue
Corsicana, Texas 75110

Lt. Larry G. Dilling
Peacock Military Academy
2811 West Ashby
San Antonio, Texas 78284

Coach Carlos Mainord
Ranger Junior College
College Circle
Ranger, Texas 76470

Coach Bill Andrews
Tyler Junior College
Tyler, Texas 75701

Coach Jesse Castete
Wharton County Junior College
911 Boling Highway
Wharton, Texas 77488

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

Coach Wally Bullington Abilene Christian Sta ACC Abilene, Texas 79601	Coach Don King Northwood of Texas Box 58 Cedar Hill, Texas 75104	Coach Billy Tohill Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129
Coach James Cameron Angelo State ASU Station San Angelo, Texas 76901	Coach Hoover Wright Prairie View A & M Prairie View, Texas 77445	Coach Jim Wacker Texas Lutheran Seguin, Texas 78155
Coach Duane Nutt Austin College 900 N. Grand Avenue Sherman, Texas 75090	Coach Al Conover Rice University 6100 Main Houston, Texas 77001	Coach Rod Paige Texas Southern University 3201 Wheeler Avenue Houston, Texas 77004
Coach Grant Teaff Baylor University Box 6427 Waco, Texas 76706	Coach Dave Smith Southern Methodist Dallas, Texas 75222	Coach Jim Carlen Texas Tech University Broadway at University Lubbock, Texas 79409
Coach D. H. Fisher Bishop College 3837 Simpson-Stuart Road Dallas, Texas 75241	Coach Bill Miller Southwest Texas San Marcos, Texas 78666	Coach Warren B. Woodson Trinity University 715 Stadium Drive San Antonio, Texas 78284
Coach Ernest Hawkins East Texas State University Commerce, Texas 75428	Coach Richard Harvey Sul Ross Alpine, Texas 79830	Coach Gene Mayfield West Texas State P. O. Box 869 Canyon, Texas 79015
Coach Bill Yeoman University of Houston 3855 Holman Houston, Texas 77004	Coach Buddy Fornes Tarleton State Stephenville, Texas 76401	Coach John W. Tankersley Wiley 711 Rosbrough Springs Marshall, Texas 75670
Coach Dean Slayton Howard Payne Center Avenue Brownwood, Texas 76801	Coach John Symank University of Texas at Arlington Arlington, Texas 76010	Coach John Levra Stephen F. Austin Raguet Street Nacogdoches, Texas 75961
Coach Vernon Glass Lamar University P. O. Box 10038 Beaumont, Texas 77705	Coach Darrell Royal University of Texas Austin, Texas	
Coach Hayden Fry North Texas State University P. O. Box 13917 NT Station Denton, Texas 76203	Coach Tommy Hudspeth University of Texas at El Paso El Paso, Texas 79968	
	Coach Gil Steinke Texas A & I Santa Gertrudis Kingsville, Texas 78363	
	Coach Emory Bellard Texas A & M College, Station, Texas 77843	

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

Everyone would like to have fast durable backs to carry the ball and big strong linemen to open the holes. But unfortunately not everyone can recruit these for scholarship at their particular school. This questionnaire is designed to see if there are any similarities in ball players recruited by the different schools in the State of Texas.

When filling out this questionnaire, keep in mind the type of ball player that usually gets a scholarship at your school. Also keep in mind the criteria which you use in judging a player for scholarship, and things you look for in a future ball player at your school.

1. Read the question beside each number and check "yes" or "no" as it applies to you.
2. If your answer is "no", go to the next number.
3. If your answer is "yes", please qualify your response by answering the questions that are listed underneath that particular question.
4. After you have finished, please place the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope and mail it to me.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is any minimum height requirement placed on future football players? yes no

a. Is it an over-all team minimum height? yes no

What is the over-all height? _____

b. Or is your minimum height requirement by position? yes no

What is the minimum height for each position?

_____ Defensive Tackle	_____ Offensive Tackle
_____ " End	_____ " Guard
_____ " Back	_____ " Center
_____ " Linebacker	_____ " End
_____ Kicking Specialist	_____ " Back
	_____ Quarterback

2. Is a maximum height requirement placed on prospective football players? yes no

a. Is it an over-all team maximum height? yes no

What is the over-all height? _____

b. Or is your maximum height requirement by position? yes no

What is the maximum height for each position?

_____ Defensive Tackle	_____ Offensive Tackle
_____ " End	_____ " Guard
_____ " Back	_____ " Center
_____ " Linebacker	_____ " End
_____ Kicking Specialist	_____ " Back
	_____ Quarterback

3. Is any minimum weight requirement placed on future players? yes no

a. Is it an over-all team minimum weight? yes no

What is the over-all minimum weight? _____

b. Or is your minimum weight requirement by position? yes no

What is the minimum weight for each position?

_____ Defensive Tackle	_____ Offensive Tackle
_____ " End	_____ " Guard
_____ " Back	_____ " Center
_____ " Linebacker	_____ " End
_____ Kicking Specialists	_____ " Back
	_____ Quarterback

4. Is a maximum weight requirement placed on prospective football players? yes no

a. Is it an over-all maximum team weight? yes no

What is the over-all maximum weight? _____

b. Or is your maximum weight requirement by position? yes no

What is the maximum weight for each position?

_____ Defensive Tackle	_____ Offensive Tackle
_____ " End	_____ " Guard
_____ " Back	_____ " Center
_____ " Linebacker	_____ " End
_____ Kicking Specialists	_____ " Back
	_____ Quarterback

5. Is the future ball player's running speed judged in any way, when selecting one for a scholarship? ☐ yes ☐ no

a. At what distance do you judge his speed:

<input type="text"/> 40 yard dash	<input type="text"/> 440 yard dash
<input type="text"/> 50 yard dash	<input type="text"/> Mile run
<input type="text"/> 100 yard dash	<input type="text"/> 12 minute run for distance

If some other distance is used, please name.

b. What type of uniform do you prefer the player to be in, when he is timed?

c. On what type of field or track do you prefer the player to be timed?

d. Do you personally time the player? ☐ yes ☐ no

e. Do you accept a time given to you by the player's coach? ☐ yes ☐ no

f. Do you adjust this time, that is given to you by another person, in some way? ☐ yes ☐ no
Please explain:

6. From the method of judging running speed in number (5), what is the time you would like for your ball players to have for the distance?

<input type="text"/> Defensive Tackle	<input type="text"/> Offensive Tackle
<input type="text"/> " End	<input type="text"/> " Guard
<input type="text"/> " Back	<input type="text"/> " Center
<input type="text"/> " Linebacker	<input type="text"/> " End
<input type="text"/> Kicking Specialist	<input type="text"/> " Back
	<input type="text"/> Quarterback

7. From the method of judging in number (5), what is the slowest time a boy could have and still be recruited by your school?

<input type="text"/> Defensive Tackle	<input type="text"/> Offensive Tackle
<input type="text"/> " End	<input type="text"/> " Guard
<input type="text"/> " Back	<input type="text"/> " Center
<input type="text"/> " Linebacker	<input type="text"/> " End
<input type="text"/> Kicking Specialist	<input type="text"/> " Back
	<input type="text"/> Quarterback

8. Is the future ball player's strength judged when selecting one for scholarship? ☐ yes ☐ no
What measurement of strength is used?

9. Is there any particular measurement or test that is administered to the young athlete, such as having him jump on one foot for a period of time, that you use when judging the athlete for scholarship? ☐ yes ☐ no
Please describe the test:

10. Is the player's coach asked to rate the boy's performance in some way? ☐ yes ☐ no
What information do you expect him to supply?

11. Is the boys physical appearance considered by you when you first meet him?
 ___yes ___no
- Does the length of his hair have any effect on whether he gets a scholarship or not? ___yes ___no
 - What are some physical features that you look for when you first meet the athlete personally?
12. Are any other physical criteria used in evaluating the player? ___yes ___no
- Please state.
13. Is the player's race a factor that is considered? ___yes ___no
- Is keeping your squad at a certain ratio, i.e., Latin to white, considered when recruiting players? ___yes ___no
 - Is a certain race recruited for a certain position on the team, i. e., blacks recruited for running backs? ___yes ___no
 What race is recruited for the different positions? _____
 - Is there some position, i. e., quarterback, on the team where a race is not recruited? ___yes ___no
 Please state the race and the position.
14. Is a prospective athlete's IQ considered when selecting him for a scholarship?
 ___yes ___no
- What is the lowest IQ a boy can have and still be considered for scholarship?

15. Does it matter in which quarter of his high school graduating class the football player finishes? ___yes ___no
- What is the lowest quarter that an athlete can be in and still be considered for scholarship? _____quarter.
16. Are the scores on the college entrance tests considered? ___yes ___no
- What tests are used?
 _____ American College Testing Program (ACT)
 _____ College Board Test
 Please name the test if another is used. _____
 - What is the lowest score a boy can make and still receive a scholarship?
 _____ American College Testing Program (ACT)
 _____ College Board Test
 _____ Score on the other test used
17. Are any of the athlete's teachers asked to evaluate him as a student? ___yes ___no
 What information do you ask them to supply?

18. Are any other academic criteria used in evaluating the player? ☐yes ☐no
Please state.
19. Is a prospective football player's religious denomination considered? ☐yes ☐no
What church should he attend?
20. Is his attendance in church considered? ☐yes ☐no
How often should he attend?
21. Could an athlete receive a scholarship if he had been arrested by the police?
☐yes ☐no
a. Could he receive one if he was a convicted felon? ☐yes ☐no
b. Could he receive one if he had a prison record? ☐yes ☐no
22. Could a football player receive a scholarship if he is suspected of using drugs?
☐yes ☐no
a. Could he receive one if he had been caught using drugs? ☐yes ☐no
b. Could he receive one if he is a known addict? ☐yes ☐no
23. Is the athlete's family taken into consideration? ☐yes ☐no
a. Are separated or divorced parents a factor in considering players?
☐yes ☐no
b. Are the player's number of brothers and sisters a factor? ☐yes ☐no
c. What other family information is considered?
24. Are persons other than school officials asked to evaluate the boys family, character, and morals? ☐yes ☐no
a. Who is the person or persons? _____
b. What information is expected from each?
25. Are any other moral criteria used in evaluating the player? ☐yes ☐no
Please state.
26. Are any other type of criteria used to evaluate a player for scholarship that are not covered by this questionnaire? ☐yes ☐no
Please state.
27. Do you wish a copy of the results of this questionnaire sent to you? ☐yes ☐no
If so, please write your address on the back of this questionnaire.

Vita was removed during scanning