

BLACK ATHLETES ON A  
PREDOMINANTLY WHITE CAMPUS

by

ARTHUR S. EVANS

B.A., Delaware State College, 1973

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1975

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

LD  
2668  
T4  
1975  
294  
C.2  
Document

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	i
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
A Theory of Dominant-Minority Relationships . . . . .	1
History of the Black Athlete . . . . .	3
PROBLEM STATEMENT	5
The General Context of Racism in American . . . . .	7
The Specific Context of Racism in Sports. . . . .	9
THE RELEVANT FOUR SOCIAL PROCESSES	12
Recruitment . . . . .	12
Intercollegiate Competition and Team Associations . . . . .	13
Education and Social Activities on Campus . . . . .	16
Termination of College Education. . . . .	17
METHODS	20
Characteristics of the Sample . . . . .	20
Methods Used to Obtain Data . . . . .	22
Concepts. . . . .	24
Methods of Analysis . . . . .	25
RESEARCH FINDINGS	26
Recruitment . . . . .	26
Performance of the Athlete in High School . . . . .	26
The Experiences Athletes Had During Recruitment. . . . .	33
Intercollegiate Competition and Team Associations . . . . .	43
Off-Field Social Relationships of Athletes. . . . .	50
Education of the College Football Player. . . . .	53
Termination of the Athletes' College Education . . . . .	55
DISCUSSION . . . . .	57
CONCLUSION . . . . .	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	67
APPENDIX I . . . . .	70
APPENDIX II . . . . .	85
ABSTRACT . . . . .	121

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since this thesis is the result of the efforts of many people, special appreciation must be extended to:

My wonderful family, who gave me encouragement and love so that I could complete this work; Dr. Wayne Rohrer, for the many hours he spent assisting and encouraging me in this task; Dr. Lowell Brandner, for his valuable help in editing this thesis; Dr. George Peters, who took time from his enormously busy schedule to read and critique the manuscript; Dr. Henry Camp for his assistance and support throughout this paper; Drs. Jan and Cornelia Flora, who displayed a continuing and persistent interest in this work; the members of the Kansas State University football team, who gave valuable time to participate in this study; Tony Graber and Dennis Gatlin, who gave moral encouragement; Gloria Belton, who took time to type this manuscript; and Annette Mirocke, whose love and patience surpassed understanding, and whose ideas are always helpful and brilliant.

To all these people, and to many other unnamed persons who have contributed to this work, I am very grateful.

# LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE 1 - Percentage of Athletes by Race and Their High School Football Experiences , . . . . .	28
TABLE 2 - Mean, Speed, Height, and Weight of Athletes in High School. .	29
TABLE 3 - Recognition Won by Black and White Football Players Now At Kansas State University While They Were in High School. . . .	30
TABLE 4 - Race of Roommate and Escort During Recruitment. . . . .	35
TABLE 5 - Social Activities of Football Players During Recruitment. . .	36
TABLE 6 - Athletes and dating During Recruitment. . . . .	40
TABLE 7 - Athletes' Ranking of Their Learning About Kansas State University During Recruitment . . . . .	41
TABLE 8 - Athlete's Assessment of Recruitment . . . . .	42
TABLE 9 - Reception and Type of Scholarships. . . . .	44
TABLE 10 - Team and String Played On . . . . .	45
TABLE 11 - Central and Non-Central Offensive and Defensive Positions in High School and College . . . . .	47
TABLE 12 - Positions Athletes Were Recruited to Play . . . . .	49
TABLE 13 - Athletes' Opinions of How Much Racial Integration Occurred Between Team Members Off the Field. . . . .	51
TABLE 14 - How Often Black and Whites Sat Together While Eating. . . . .	52
TABLE 15 - Grade Point Averages and ACT Scores of Athletes . . . . .	54
TABLE 16 - Academic Performance of Athletes by Sport . . . . .	56



## Introduction

Professional sports are an avenue of social mobility for blacks in the U.S.A. Because blacks are appearing in collegiate and professional athletics, many people believe athletic teams are racially integrated. This thesis examines that belief by comparing black athletes attending Kansas State University with comparable nonblack students. This chapter includes discussions of theoretical, general, and specific considerations of black-white relations as observed in members of the 1974 KSU football team.

## A Theory of Dominant-Minority Relationships

Dominant groups treat racial and cultural minorities as alien and set them apart from the dominant group. Kramer (1970: 3) calls race relations the associations of strangers. Members of minority groups are treated not as individuals with personal attributes, but as belonging to categorical groups whose individual members behave according to dominant stereotypes. The visibility and categorical treatment of minority groups both separate and identify them as subordinate to dominant whites in this country (Kramer, p.4). Because of their differences, members of the minority group are not allowed to rise to dominant positions. Members of racial minorities are regarded as inferior and unequal, and are treated by whites as unequals (Kramer, pp. 4,5). The subordination of blacks is compelling.

Social institutions permit talented individuals of the dominate group to rise up the ladder of power, but those institutions do not allow the same movement of minority individuals -- black or brown people are not allowed access to positions of power (Greer, p. 74).

Individuals of a minority group are identified by their ascribed status -- one is a black baseball player, black student, black manager (Kramer, 8). She states that a person's skin color, unlike cultural characteristics, is always present and relevant. When persons see each other as representing racial categories and not as individuals, the ascribed status of the minority person is primary and other qualities or abilities are secondary (p. 7). Though minority groups as a whole are visible to dominant persons, minority individuals are invisible because they are categorically treated. Even if minority groups share values with the dominant group, conflict and exclusion may arise because those who are not white are classified as ineligible for equality (Kramer, 1970: 8).

Banton (1967: 71) remarks that minority racial groups do not have the same privileges as do those of dominant status. Minority people lack privilege and power to do anything about their own status.

Because values and attitudes of the dominant group reign, members of the minority learn to live with their powerless situation (Kramer, 1970: 5). Kramer explains that uncertainties that minority groups face lead them to be confused by dominant persons' behavior -- for example, they do not know if their being excluded is personal or categorical. When dominant persons coerce and categorically treat minority persons, the minority persons so treated lose motivation to aspire to high goals and become helpless to do anything about their subordinate, powerless situation (pp. 10-16).

Dominated racial groups face the possibility of being permanently lower class. For example, black, Chicanos, and Indian-Americans work at the least desirable occupations in the U.S.A. If low paid, unskilled work is passed from one generation to the next in a minority group, then members of the group are on the way to being

permanently located in the lower class. However, Blalock (1962: 241) notes that occupations having too few qualified dominant workers will open their doors to minority persons. There are occupational situations in which access is allowed to minority individuals. Even in those instances of opening employment to the formerly excluded, Blalock explains that if minority persons agree to work for lower wages than their dominant counterparts receive then they will be hired (p.243). Particularly black athletes have been used since World War II because they are qualified athletically and have demonstrated their competitive abilities in contests.

The mobility of a few minority individuals does not erase stereotypes of their group that are held by the dominant group. Inferring from Mannheim (1940: 69-70) even an unprejudiced white individual would think stereotypically of a black athlete because so many whites and groups the unprejudicial individual belongs to would stereotype black people. Thus, Jackie Robinson was a good black ballplayer, Mickey Mantle was a good ballplayer. Ascribed status was brought to bear in the case of the black, but not in the case of the white. Lottman and Reitzes (1952: 242) explain that dominant persons define interests and behavior of minorities, but most dominant persons do not manifest their private feelings toward these groups. By such a process, dominants define and accept a collective perspective of the minority group's status. The dominant group defines the roles and self-conceptions of the minority. Thus, when individual members of the minority group acquire positions in the dominant society, from which their group had formerly been excluded, they will be inferior and unequal.

### History of the Black Athlete

Recently, collegiate athletics have become a means of upward mobility for black Americans. Administrators of both collegiate and professional sports

became concerned in the period between 1945 and 1960 that their teams were not adequately staffed by using only members of the dominant group, and that including persons of minority group membership would be prosperous and exciting. This thesis explores relations between black and white athletes on a college football team in 1974, but first let us observe the impact racism has had on black participation in organized sports.

Blacks were barred from organized sports in much the same way they had been excluded from other occupations. Racism and discrimination forced blacks to organize their own athletic teams and leagues (Edwards, 1973: 34). For instance, before 1920 blacks formed a tri-state tennis association, baseball association, and a professional golf organization. Edwards found little evidence that any variable other than race kept blacks out of white sports (pp. 35-36). In 1947, white Branch Rickey signed black Jackie Robinson to play baseball for the Brooklyn Dodgers. That introduction of blacks into professional baseball in a major league paved the way for minorities into other professional sports (Rhodes and Butler, 1975: 922-23).

In 1954, the United State Supreme Court declared desegregation of public education to be in the public interest. That ruling gave a basis to white coaches to recruit black athletes. Intercollegiate athletic teams became racially integrated and only admittedly segregationist schools let black athletes pass them by (Edwards, 1973: 41-42). Coincidentally, collegiate football and basketball teams became large-scale business enterprises and competition for talented players increased substantially in the 1950's and 1960's. Only a few southern universities still follow the color line in recruiting players for their teams.

## Problem Statement

Scholarly investigations of sports have not kept pace with the significant place sports occupies in contemporary life. The sociology of sports has been neglected. Empirical data provided in this thesis describing and comparing black and white football players attending Kansas State University will be at least a small contribution to the sociology of sports. The thesis will add to the knowledge sociologists have describing college life and will provide new knowledge concerning collegiate athletics.

Collegiate athletes experience four social processes during their years of college: (1) Recruitment, (2) Intercollegiate competition and team associations, (3) Education and social activities on campus, and (4) Termination of college career.

The collegiate athletes studied in this thesis are especially recruited to play football. Athletes share the third and fourth processes with all college students but differ from nearly all other students in being subjected to unusual regimens and living conditions while athletes. Because they are recruited primarily as athletes and not as students, athletes learn early that the athletic role has priority over academic and other roles and that their success is judged more by performance in athletics than in classrooms or on campus. To be successful means that the athlete must be willing to "pay the price" by subordinating other activities and commitments to the demands of the athletic career. For example, it is not unusual for coaches to direct and channel athletes' lives by telling them where to live, when to sleep, eat, study, work out, and what courses and curricula to take.

This thesis concentrates on the first and second social processes because they distinguish between collegiate athletes and other students. It proposes that white and black athletes travel through the social processes differently while attending predominantly white institutions. The problems of black athletes on predominantly white campuses stem from two contexts: the general problem of blacks in America, and the specific problem of being a black athlete in a nearly all white school.

Edwards (1973: 179) explained that in all societies certain roles individuals play conflict with other roles. Katz and Kahn (1966: 184) suggest that such inter-role conflict occurs whenever the expectations for one role conflict with those for another role to be played by the same person. The inter-role conflict exists in the objective environment of the individual. For example, a college athlete as a student is encouraged to study and to participate in school activities. However, in athletic contests, and in other training programs, the time spent on the practice field leaves an athlete with little time for activities other than his sport. That causes conflict between role demands of the student and role demands of the athlete. Nearly all football players experience that conflict or dilemma.

However, black athletes experience additional role conflict that results from their ascribed status. For example, a black athlete is expected to do school work as well as any other student but, because blacks often receive poor pre-college education, many are not prepared to do well in college.

Race is the ascribed role considered in this thesis. To be black and to be a collegiate athlete involves contradiction between ascription and achievement. On one hand, able athletes are honored and esteemed but, on the other hand, they occupy a low status position because they are black (Edwards, 1973: 179-182).

Their ascribed role disesteems them, as their achieved role accords them esteem. Thus, the ascribed status overshadows achievements and results in inconsistent cognitions. Such dissonance is psychologically uncomfortable (Shaw and Costanzo, 1970: 208). The existence of dissonance leads the individual to attempt to reduce or eliminate it (Shaw and Costanzo: p. 209). That likely explains why blacks tend to isolate themselves in white settings. When blacks are among their own, they are not ashamed of their experience, nor do they have to explain themselves to other blacks.

Edwards reported that problems black athletes face are more complex than are problems confronting white athletes. Racial segregation and discrimination are two problems blacks encounter that make their situations more complex than those a white collegiate athlete faces (Edwards, 1973: 181-182). The difficulties experienced by black athletes stem from two sources: The general problems of being black in the U.S.A. and the specific problem of being a black athlete at a predominantly white school.

#### The General Context of Racism In America

Advocates of assimilation proposed that immigrants to the U.S. eventually integrated into the American mainstream. Many white immigrants did. But, assimilation of black, brown, red, and yellow peoples has been extraordinarily slow or prevented (Berry, 1954: 169). Racial assimilation has not generally occurred. Situations like those presented by collegiate and professional sports where integration has become usual are particularly useful to explore because sports are unlike the general society.



The general problem confronting blacks reflects contemporary social, political, and economic situations and value priorities of the dominant society. Pinckney (1969) argues that because of high infant mortality and short life expectancies blacks do not fairly share in life itself. Broom and Glenn (1961: 10) showed that blacks suffered more from discriminatory employment and being excluded from on-the-job training than from educational deficiencies. Thus, blacks are over-represented in low paying, unskilled jobs.

Not only are jobs for blacks of the unskilled, manual variety with low pay, but, as Liebow (1967: 50-63) stated, their jobs are dead-end jobs that lead only to the same poor pay, low skills, and irregular employment. Broom and Glenn concluded that the occupational gap between blacks and whites narrowed little during World War II. Blacks' incomes, like whites' incomes and purchasing power, rose between World War II and the mid-1960's, but the increases merely reduced the wide gap. Average income of blacks today is less than two-thirds of the white average income (Miller, 1968: 58-59).

The occupational deficits characterizing black communities correlated with educational deficits. Jencks and Riesman (1966: 65-85) reported that the median educations of blacks and whites are much closer together than they were in earlier generations, but the best and worst-educated thirds of the black and white male populations were farther apart in the generation born in 1930 than in the generation born in 1910. Coleman (1966) indicated blacks scored below whites on intelligence or entrance tests. Thompson (1974: 68-69) argued inferior education of blacks results from their living in segregated areas and from white definitions of black schools as inferior schools. Blacks score lower on tests than whites do because whites make up and standardize the tests. For example, recent studies show white Ph.D.'s failed tests that black grade school children passed. These tests dealt with black realities (Knowles and Previtt, 1969: 16-17).



The general context of racism and discrimination against blacks in America provides an overview for the specific context of the black football player attending a predominantly white university.

### The Specific Context of Racism in Sports

Many people argue that blacks are slowly achieving integration by participating in sports. That myth is supported by the mass media and many testimonial dinners where black athletes speak on "what sports have done for me." Sports figures are well known in black communities as successful, well-paid individuals who have "made it," who demonstrate by their life style and heralded sports success that sports can be an avenue for upward mobility. Many black high school students receive scholarships each year to attend institutions that would otherwise be beyond their reach.

Sports or entertainment are open to blacks and interest them because many jobs are not open to them. Edwards (1973: 43) stated that the two major factors contributing to racial inequality in America are white racism and a substantial lack of black expertise and serious black analytical perspectives. The black citizen, like his white counterpart, has largely accepted integrated sports as a boon to the development and enfranchisement of black people. Moreover, Loy and McElvogue (1968) and Olsen (1968) independently noted that generally existing racism specifically influences U.S. sports. Edwards (1973: 143) described sport organizations as using quota systems to slot blacks on the roster to a few "black" positions. But black and white athletes do not have equal access. Central positions stressing leadership such as quarterback, coach, or manager tend to be filled by whites in professional teams and in teams of predominantly white colleges.

Loy and McElvogue (1968) found black baseball players on professional teams predominantly in the outfield, while few black football players on professional teams occupy central positions either defensively or offensively.

Rosenblatt (1967: 51-53) hypothesized that it is difficult for blacks to be in leadership positions (such as pitcher or quarterback) because in face-to-face confrontations with whites, blacks in leadership positions may create a situation that would initiate racial conflict. Pascal and Rapping (1972) concluded that segregation occurs in playing position, and blacks are excluded from key decision-making positions because blacks cannot be trusted with responsibility. These authors also suggested that leadership positions require more coaching and experience, and managers and coaches prefer not to interact with blacks. Blacks attempting to play such positions would be disadvantaged. Alternatively, they suggested that segregation by position may come about because of the importance of role models. Black youth concentrated on positions in which black stars are more visible (Pascal and Rapping: pp. 119-156). Brower (1972) noted that blacks are found in specific positions because of stereotypes they hold and because of white decision-makers. McPherson (1975) argued that involvement in sports by members of minority groups may be accounted for by differential socialization experiences in early life, and subsequent occupation in specific sports results from self-induced learning rather than overt discrimination.

Edwards (1973: 205) stated that over-representation of blacks in certain positions results from stacking, i.e., black football players usually being restricted to running backs, defensive backs, and ends, therefore only six to ten positions are reserved for blacks, but many more positions are available for

whites. While a few blacks become highly visible stars because of stacking, the stacking restriction reduces the number of black athletes recruited.

Rhodes (1975) explained that the black youngster who elects to ride the wave of his ability at the expense of serious academics is in for a rude awakening when he arrives in professional training camp and finds that he must compete against equally talented blacks for the same position. In training camp pay is equal for equal work, but opportunity for equal ability is unequal.

In their study of football, Eitzen and McClendon (1975) suggested that blacks were represented in all playing positions but they remained disproportionately under-represented in some positions (center, kicker, quarterback, offensive interior lineman, and linebacker), and over-represented in other (defensive lineman, receiver, running back, and defensive back). They concluded that white ball players not only disproportionately occupy central positions, but that as blacks move from high school to professional teams in their football careers they are more subject to change from central to noncentral positions. The number of white players in central positions increases as whites progress through the different playing levels. That phenomenon may be a function of coaches holding stereotyped beliefs about blacks so the coaches place blacks in positions with the fewest intellectual and leadership demands (Eitzen and McClendon (1975)).

The general and specific contexts of black athletics are saturated with racism and discrimination. Edward's (1971) and Olsen's (1968) descriptions of black athletes' lives on a predominantly white campus are considered according to the social process model. I hypothesized that blacks differ from whites in each stage, so I expected to find the lives of black athletes on white campuses no different from the lives of 24 million black Americans living in white America: that is, both being discriminated against.

## The Relevant Four Social Processes

### Recruitment

Recruitment involves a two-way process. First, there must be a decision by representatives of a college or university to recruit an athlete. Second, the athlete must be willing to be recruited by that school. Different college coaches use different recruiting practices. However, I selected some common practices most college coaches use in recruiting high school athletes.

Initially, college coaches ask high school coaches to give them information about "top" ball players on the high school coach's team, or on teams his team played. Then representatives of the college contact high school athletes whose names were collected. College coaches visit or contact the best prospects by telephone or mail. The recruit is asked his size, weight, strength, speed, and academic ability. After viewing films of the high school's games, college coaches invite those high school athletes who have a chance to make the college squad to visit the campus.

Athletes learn about the school on a recruiting visit. They are shown the campus by other athletes. Edwards (1969) noted coaches select a day when an important athletic event is scheduled. Typically, the day concludes with a dance with dates arranged for recruits.

White recruits are shown around by white athletes and experience the true "college spirit of the campus." However, the black recruit's campus visit differs from that of the white's. Black prospects are escorted by black athletes, but the similarity between white and black visitors' experiences ends there. Black athletes do not have access to many fraternities or sororities on a predominantly white campus; it is not so easy to arrange a black date for the black recruit or

to escort him to dances and after-game activities that might be scheduled for that night. Edwards notes that the coaches usually give the black recruit's escort ten or fifteen dollars each and "bids them farewell until the next day." The money, Edwards reports, is spent at a movie or cheap restaurant. "The black athlete will return early to his dorm room hoping that the next day will never come because it promises more of the same." The different collegiate experiences of white and black athletes are apparent during their introductions to a campus (Edwards: pp. 1-21).

Green, McMillan, and Gunnings (1972: 1-14) explain that black athletes perceive recruiters as lying to them, of not presenting an honest picture of what they will encounter in a predominantly white university. In their study, black athletes believed that black players were purposely kept away from black recruits so they would not hear the realities of the university. Although recruits may be escorted by athletes of their color, as Edwards noted, recruits are not exposed to all members of the team. Recruits believed that they would be getting a four-year contract if they signed a contract with the school. However, four-year contracts are nonexistent; all contracts are renewable on a year-to-year basis. The authors concluded that ways scholarships are awarded are unfair because the athlete on term tender is constantly unsure of his financial status.

#### Intercollegiate Competition and Team Associations

Most college coaches adhere to the American sports creed that claims sports develop good character, fortitude, loyalty, physical fitness, mental alertness; that sports generate altruism, and social or self control; prepare athletes for life, provide opportunities for individual advancement, and support educational achievement. Those claims, in general, support the Protestant Work Ethic:

hard work will achieve success. Most middle class white American males support the claims of the dominant sports creed. But, as Edwards pointed out, most blacks are unaffected by such claims (1973: 312). He noted racism and discrimination existed in sports, are ubiquitous on the team, and reduce the applicability of these creeds.

Olsen (1968) found white racist teammates make life hard for blacks, and Edwards (1969: 207-214) noted the question asked of a black athlete is -- can he perform? That question is perhaps more compellingly asked about blacks than whites. At any rate, Yetman and Eitzen's (1971) conclusion that blacks are over-represented among stars suggests that black performances are less left to chance than are white athletes. Perhaps the black's athletic ability is more responsible for his being at the college than is his white teammate. Also, according to Edwards (1969: 214) a black athlete is a commodity, which makes him unhuman and lower than a slave. Football is to be his best friend and utmost concern. Edwards noted that blacks cannot afford to make mistakes or to perform at a mediocre level. If they do, they will not play. Blacks are expected not to get tired; if one becomes exhausted, coaches consider him not to be in shape. It appears that coaches practice a dual standard along those lines -- whites can be legitimately tired; blacks cannot.

Yetman and Eitzen (1971) found that black college athletes outperform their counterparts. The data of their study revealed that between 1958 and 1970, as high as three fourths of the black collegiate basketball players were starters. Black players consistently appeared in starting positions and were more than twice, and often three times, as likely as whites to be starters. The data suggest that blacks must be overqualified; that is, better than whites to succeed in sports.

Rosenblatt (1967: 52) demonstrated that discriminatory hiring practices are still in effect in sports, but the overly qualified black is not subject to discrimination by position because he is able to help the team win. Brower (1973: 23-24) noted that football is dominated and controlled by whites at the collegiate level, and is infused with traditional white middle class values. Assertive blacks who want equality don't always fit easily into a system of traditional team values. With little knowledge of black experience, white coaches' prejudices can color their judgments about black athletes. In white coaches' views blacks can be "accommodating Negroes" or "individualists." Black individualists tend to be evaluated more unjustly than whites.

Brower explains that the black ghetto way of life is misinterpreted and found offensive to whites in football. Everyday patterns of black expressions such as "playing the dozens" and gait may be seen as socially offensive and rebellious. White coaches often perceive blacks in terms of the coaches' stereotype, so they repeat plays and quiz only blacks to make sure they got the message.

Black and white athletes live separate lives off the field. Athletes usually have roommates of the same race. Evidence suggests that segregating roommates by race is a preference of coaches. On the other hand, many blacks find it uncomfortable to eat with whites. One rationalization of this anti-social behavior was that blacks feel more comfortable with members of their own race. It becomes difficult to communicate, i.e., blacks must explain in detail to whites things that are known or take only a few words to explain to other blacks (p. 26).



### Education and Social Activities on Campus

Edwards (1969: 211) described vast areas of campus life closed to black athletes. Most fraternities and sororities are off-limits. From personal experience, Edwards illustrated the ironies of the black athlete on a predominantly white campus: "Many of the black athletes' white teammates may, and usually do, belong to the racist clubs (fraternities). I can recall clearly how puzzled and enraged I became when white teammates of mine at San Jose State, after kidding me all week and closing their fraternity doors in my face still could have the nerve to talk about team spirit on Saturday." Brower (1970:26) found that on weekends blacks and whites go their separate ways to bars, parties, or forms of entertainment that are exclusively for members of their respective races. On weekends more blacks than whites remain in dormitories because blacks have no place to go in a town because most entertainment spots cater to whites.

Dating is problem that concerns black athletes. Olsen and Edwards agree that black men must be prudent about talking to white girls and that dating whites is generally taboo. Olsen discussed athletes who had difficulties with teammates because they had been seen with a white girl (Olsen p. 27). Edwards stated: "White team members will slander white females who date black athletes. In America it has been the custom for white men to think that any woman who dates a black is obsessed with the myth that blacks are sexually better" (Edwards: p. 14). Campus life differs depending on your color.

Edwards concluded: "Outside the athletic arena, then, the life of the black athlete is lonely, monotonous, and unrewarding, even before he enrolls at the white schools. He may be a big hero on the field or the court but in his street clothes, and even in the team locker room he is just another nigger." Perhaps white athletes are also derogated as "jocks" but a black athlete, as a nigger, is even set aside from jocks (Edwards: 214).



Both Olsen and Edwards described black athletes as academic failures.

Olsen says coaches are responsible for their failure (Olsen: 23). Edwards thinks the courses blacks take are to keep them eligible but have little or no educational merit (Edwards: 18-19).

Johnson (1972) studied the importance of and the conflicts between roles as blacks, as athletes, and as students. Every athlete reported that coaches expect them to receive degrees. Seven of ten reported that their white teachers, coaches, and students expect them to be weak scholastically. Such evidence suggests that black students who are athletes are seen as being primarily athletes and not students. Johnson concluded that schools severely punish black athletes for missing practice, but have little concern if they are not present in their classes.

Green, McMillan, and Gunnings (1972: 2-7) found that in Big Ten universities athletic departments control the counseling of athletes. Black athletes are encouraged to enroll in athletic or physical education curriculums. Black athletes are told to take courses from certain professors who are sports fans, who will give them good grades. Thus, many black athletes have the number of hours to graduate but not the courses required to graduate. After four years, and with no eligibility remaining, they have neither the money nor the academic standing to finish school.

#### Termination of College Education

Few black athletes graduate from predominantly white schools in the four year time span. A smaller percentage of black athletes than white athletes obtain degrees (Shapiro, 1970). Among those completing college, white athletes take an average of fifteen terms to get a degree while black athletes take an average of 16.4 terms. Nowak (1968) found that only 33.3 percent of black athletes who

should have graduated in four years received degrees then; 53 percent graduated in four or more years. Green, McMillan, and Gunnings (1972) conclude that black athletes have a low expectation of their scholastic abilities. So, not graduating results in a self-fulfilling prophecy. Some black athletes graduate in six to ten years, but most never graduate, according to Edwards. Yet, completing higher education likely means more to blacks than to whites because a diploma may be the black's best bet for a job, whereas a white can be well placed occupationally without a diploma.

The data suggest that educational institutions are partly responsible for exploiting black student athletes by admitting academically unqualified black athletes, by exploiting their athletic ability without properly emphasizing education, and by discarding the athletes when their eligibility has expired.

The life of a black athlete on a predominantly white campus has been synthesized, from the above authors' descriptions. This thesis will determine the validity of their arguments and assumptions because data are not available from published sources. The thesis is based on data collected from football players during the 1974 season at Kansas State University, a university that has recruited black football players for more than a decade.

The literature reviewed in this section suggests that blacks and whites in sports are treated differently because of race. Edwards (1973), Rosenblatt (1967), Pascal and Rapping (1972), Brower (1972), and McPherson (1975) described sport organizations as stacking blacks into specific playing positions. Central and leadership positions (e.g., quarterback, center, coach, manager, etc.) tend to be filled by white ball players. Eitzen and McClendon (1975) and Yetman and Eitzen suggest that blacks must perform better athletically than whites to make the team. Thus coaches recruit only blacks that are certain to make the starting

teams. Green, McMillan, and Gunnings (1972), and Edwards (1973) explain that black athletes receive differential treatment during recruitment.

Edwards (1969) and Brower (1970) showed that black and white players do not mix socially off the field. Edwards (1969) and Johnson demonstrated that black athletes have lower academic grades than white ball players. Edwards (1969) and Johnson (1972) noted that coaches perceive blacks in stereotyped terms and channel them into certain academic areas. Green, McMillan, and Gunnings' (1972) data showed that fewer black players than white players graduated in four years. In view of those comments, the extent to which race influences the differential treatment of athletes on a predominantly white campus is tested in the following hypotheses:

1. Black athletes performed better in high school than their white counterparts.
2. Black athletes experience discrimination while being recruited.
3. Black players are proportionately overrepresented as stars and white players are proportionately overrepresented as nonstars.
4. Blacks occupy nonleadership and noncentral positions on the team.
5. Black and white football players socially segregate off the playing field.
6. Black athletes are scholastically weaker than their white counterparts.
7. Black athletes are found in special academic curriculums.
8. Black athletes are less likely to complete college than are white athletes.

## METHODS

Questionnaires and documentary analyses were used to gather data for this thesis. The respondents were 90 football players on varsity and junior varsity teams at Kansas State University. All respondents lived within the city limits of Manhattan, a community of approximately 27,000 people in north-central Kansas. This chapter deals with; (1) characteristics of the sample, (2) methods used to obtain data, (3) concepts and indices, and (4) methods of analysis.

### Characteristics of the Sample

Collegiate football in the beginning was strictly a form of athletic competition. It since has been transformed into a million-dollar business enterprise. Kansas State University's football program is no exception. Kansas State University is a member of the Big Eight Football Conference, which has has many top ranked teams over the decades. Football in the Big Eight is responsible for producing approximately seventy percent of the athletic department's revenue, which supports other nonrevenue-producing sports. It is assumed the subjects selected for this study are similar to football players of other conferences in the United States.

At the onset of the 1974 season, Kansas State University had 123 football players. The Director of Athletics and Head Football Coach were asked independently to submit a football team roster. The two rosters were identical. The name and address of each player was included on the roster. The roster became inaccurate as the 1974 season progressed because some players dropped from the program, some were never available to complete questionnaires, and a few refused to provide information.

Most of the players lived on campus in an athletic dormitory. The football team was composed of 41 freshmen, 32 sophmores, 21 juniors, and 15 seniors. Blacks made up twenty-six plus percent of the team; whites, seventy-three plus percent.

The composition of the football team was unlike the total Kansas State University student population. Blacks made up twenty-six percent of the football team, but only two percent of the student body; ninety-seven percent of football players lived in a dormitory while only forty-three percent of the students resided in dorms; twenty-four percent of athletes were from Kansas, but eighty percent of students were from that state; the mean grade point average of football players was 2.0, while the mean for the student population was 2.7.

Also, football players had special privileges in contrast with the student body. Privileges of athletes included being admitted to all athletic events free of charge; receiving fifteen dollars monthly; receiving free school supplies and tutors; receiving free school rings at the end of their senior year on the team; and getting academic credit for playing sports. Playing football has its negative aspects also: They include being subject to fines for breaking training rules; having financial support based on athletic performance; and missing classes because of athletic contests. The special attention athletes receive indicate that they are treated differently from other college students.

This study was conducted at the end of the 1974 football season. Controversial issues raised in the questionnaire and Kansas State University's losing football season might have made it difficult or impossible to conduct earlier, particularly if it were interpreted by coaches as detrimental to the team. I was granted permission by members of the football coaching staff to conduct the study. Several football players were asked where and when it would be appropriate to administer the questionnaire. It was suggested that most players would be in the

dorm during dinner. Questionnaires were distributed to subjects during the evening meal hour for two weeks. Instructions were given on completing questionnaires and questions respondents had concerning questionnaire items were answered. Athletes who live off campus were mailed questionnaires, and asked to return them.

Of the 123 players selected, 33 did not complete questionnaires; one refused; sixteen had dropped from the football program and could not be located; and sixteen, more than expected, on the team could not be located. One unsubstantiated reason given for that high attrition was that many athletes leave the dorm to live with friends when the season is over. All nonrespondents were compared with respondents by major grade point average, year in school, race, and score of entrance examination. The nonrespondents resembled respondents in all respects with differences not large enough to bias data collected.

#### Methods Used to Obtain Data

Two methods were used to obtain data, questionnaires and documentary analysis. The questionnaire was developed and revised jointly by the researcher and his advisors. The questionnaire was pre-tested with basketball players at Kansas State University.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information about three areas affecting the lives of collegiate athletes: (1) high school football playing career, (2) introduction and recruitment to Kansas State, and (3) team experiences at Kansas State. Section one was designed to determine:

The player's performance in high school; i.e., how many years he had played varsity in high school; how many years on the first string team, his height, weight, time in the forty-year dash, position in high school, recognition received in high school, and how high his high school team finished in his state.

Section two was designed to describe recruiting procedures used to secure high school athletes: what coach contacted what player, times a player was contacted, what was discussed during contacts; whether or not the recruit had a roommate while visiting the university, race of the athlete's roommmate; did the athlete have a date on his visit to the university, if so, her race; other activities during his visit to university; finally, did the athlete think he was shown the true picture of the college on his visit, and if he could do it over, would he return.

Section three was designed to describe what is is like to be a member of a football team: is the athlete on a football scholarship; the race of his roommmate; was he selected for team honors; does he have friends of a different race; do athletes of different races socialize, and why he plays football.

The questionnaire contained both multiple choice and open-ended responses. (Appendix I). In the former, respondents were presented answers to choose, and asked to use the answer that best described their attitude or situation. The open-ended questions let respondents make any response they wished.

Before filling out questionnaires, players were asked to sign an informed consent sheet, which indicated that all information given would be treated confidentially, and all information was given voluntarily.

I distributed and collected all questionnaires. Respondents were provided with a letter of introduction and instructions for filling out the questionnaires.

All subjects had as much time as necessary to complete the questionnaire. If a respondent could not be contacted during the two-week data gathering period, he was placed in the nonrespondent category.

Documentary analysis was used to get information not attainable through the questionnaire. Permission was granted by Kansas State University officials to use university files on the subjects. The information from the files included



subjects taken, major stated before enrollment, present major, grade point average, class reached, and scholastic aptitude test scores. That information was used to ascertain academic standings and scholastic characteristics of those athletes for whom data were available.

### Concepts

Stacking refers to placing black athletes in a few positions on athletic teams while denying them access to others (Edward 1973: 205). Data concerning stacking was gathered on three levels of the athlete's career: his position in high school, the position he was recruited to play, and position he played in college.

Overlyqualified means that blacks must be better than whites to make the team or to be recruited. It is assumed that coaches recruiting blacks seek only those who are almost certain to be starters. Thus, the black who is capable but not outstanding is likely to be overlooked, while a capable but not outstanding white is not overlooked. Operationally, I defined overlyqualified by the athlete's physical abilities in high school, his recognition in high school, and the quality of the athlete's high school team. White and black players at KSU in 1974 are compared in those terms.

Overrepresented in the star category is defined as blacks disproportionately on intercollegiate teams in starring roles and more likely to be outstanding than their white counterparts. Questions asked concerning the athlete's status while on the college team included; type of scholarship, team (i.e., varsity or junior varsity), string played, team honors received, and if red shirted (held from competition when eligible so as to improve before any eligibility time was used).



Differential treatment refers to the amount of segregated social life between black and white football players, both during recruitment and while on the college team.

Termination of college education was determined by using Corbin's (1974) data on athletes at Kansas State University.

### Methods of Analysis

The theoretical problem this study poses is that black athletes differ from white athletes while attending a predominately white university. The sample involves football players at Kansas State University. I believe the sample represents other universities that recruit and use black and white athletes. The problem is to determine if black and white athletes differ while passing through the four stages of the processual model constructed.

Data were evaluated by the chi square test of significance, considered the most appropriate measure because some categories were mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, and each observation was discrete. In some cases, nominal variables were dichotomized. The +- test was used for continuous variables to test the differences between the means of two independent samples.

## Research Findings

This chapter is divided into four sections presenting data comparing black and white collegiate football players attending a predominately white university. The first section presents data on recruiting athletes. The second section analyzes the relationship of intercollegiate competition and team associations of athletes. The third section deals with educational aspects of athletes' college careers, and the fourth examines terminations of athletes' college education.

### Recruitment

Two subsections here are on performances of athletes in high school, and their experiences while being recruited.

### Performance of the Athlete in High School:

Generally, athletic performances of high school players bring them to the attention of college coaching staffs. The literature (Chapter I) suggests that coaches practice a dual standard when recruiting black and white athletes. That they recruit only overly qualified blacks, while whites are less qualified. On the basis of the literature reviewed, I hypothesize that:

1. Black athletes performed better in high school than their white counterparts did.

Performances of collegiate athletes in high school are shown in Table 1, where more blacks played three or four years of varsity football, played more years on the first team, and more earned letters as compared with their white team mates. When control variables were introduced the data showed that blacks from larger high schools had more playing experience than whites who had graduated from large high schools. This difference disappeared when controlling for smaller high schools. However this may be attributed to the fact that most of

the black athletes came from larger urban areas than whites. Further, whites who had lesser experience (one to two years) on high school teams were recruited by more colleges and contacted by the K.S.U. coaching staff in more ways than their black counterparts. However, blacks who had more experience (three to four years) on high school teams were recruited by more colleges and contacted by the K.S.U. coaching staff in more ways than their white counterparts (See Appendix II, Page 115), but these differences were not significant. The reliability of the CH:-Square is questionable because the numbers in each cell decreased when controls were used. However, these findings give support to hypothesis #1.

Table 2 shows that blacks run the forty yard dash significantly faster than whites. However, when heights and weights are compared, there is little difference between the races.

The recognition won by college athletes on all-star teams in high school is shown in Table 3. Slightly more blacks than whites won recognition for playing football in high school. Blacks reported receiving more recognition on Little All-American, All-State, All-Conference, and All-City or All-County teams than whites. Blacks also reported playing more often on the first string all-star teams than whites. Only one portion of Table 3 yielded a statistically significant difference between reported recognition received by black and white athletes.

A slight difference was found between black and white football players in comparing the class of competition at which their high school teams played (these data are not reported in table form). Athletes of both races came from similar kinds of high school backgrounds. There were also no differences in the rank at the finish of the season of the high school teams on which black or white football players had played. More blacks reported their teams finished the season in the state among the top ten teams, while more whites reported their schools finished below that rank. However, the differences between ranking of high school teams was not statistically significant.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF ATHLETES BY RACE AND THEIR HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL EXPERIENCES

## A. Number of Years Played on Varsity

<u>Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	8.0	29.2	23.3
3-4	<u>92.0</u>	<u>70.8</u>	<u>76.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(65)	(90)

## B. Number of Years Played on First Team

<u>Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	28.0	47.7	42.2
3-4	<u>72.0</u>	<u>52.3</u>	<u>57.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(65)	(90)

## C. Number of Years Lettered on Varsity Team in High School

<u>Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	12.0	43.1	34.4
3-4	<u>88.0</u>	<u>56.9</u>	<u>65.6</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(65)	(90)

A.  $X^2=3.44$ ;  $P=.06$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=2.12$ ;  $P=.01$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=6.40$ ;  $P=.01$ ;  $df=1$

TABLE 2

MEAN SPEED, HEIGHT, AND WEIGHT OF ATHLETES IN HIGH SCHOOL

## A. Speed

<u>Variable</u>	<u># of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>*2-Tailed Probability</u>
Black	25	4.6	1.626	0.325	-4.26	84	0.000
White	61	4.8	2.472	0.316			

\*These are pooled variance estimates of T since the F ratio were  $\leq$  .05.

## B. Weight

<u>Variable</u>	<u># of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>*2-Tailed Probability</u>
Black	25	179.12	40.381	8.076	-1.48	88	0.143
White	65	188.75	21.112	2.619			

\*These are pooled variance estimates of T since the F ratio were  $\leq$  .05.

## C. Height

<u>Variable</u>	<u># of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>*2-Tailed Probability</u>
Black	25	71.8000	2.693	0.539	-0.52	88	0.602
White	65	72.2461	3.909	0.485			

\*These are pooled variance estimates of T since F ratio were  $\leq$  .05.

Table 3

RECOGNITION WON BY BLACK AND WHITE FOOTBALL PLAYERS  
NOW AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY WHILE THEY WERE IN HIGH SCHOOL

## A. Recognition in High School

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Recognition	96.0	90.6	92.1
Did Not Receive Recognition	<u>4.0</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>7.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(64)	(89)

## B. Recognition as Little All-American

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Recognition	28.0	12.1	16.5
Did Not Receive Recognition	<u>72.0</u>	<u>87.9</u>	<u>83.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## C. Recognition on All-State Team

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Recognition	80.0	57.6	63.7
Did Not Receive Recognition	<u>20.0</u>	<u>42.4</u>	<u>36.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## D. String Made on All-State Team

<u>What String</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete	
		<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
First	68.4	55.3	59.6
Second	10.4	5.3	7.0
Third	0.0	7.9	5.3
Honorable Mention	<u>21.1</u>	<u>31.6</u>	<u>28.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(19)	(38)	(57)

## E. Recognition on All-Conference Team

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete	
		<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Recognition	68.0	75.8	73.6
Did Not Receive Recognition	<u>32.0</u>	<u>24.2</u>	<u>26.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## F. String Made on All-Conference Team

<u>What String</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete	
		<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
First	100.0	77.6	83.1
Second	0.0	10.2	7.7
Third	0.0	2.0	1.5
Honorable Mention	<u>0.0</u>	<u>10.2</u>	<u>7.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(16)	(49)	(65)

## G. Recognition to All-City or All-County Teams

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Recognition	72.0	51.5	57.1
Did Not Receive Recognition	<u>28.0</u>	<u>48.5</u>	<u>42.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## H. String Made on All-City or All-County Teams

<u>What String</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
First	94.1	63.6	74.0
Second	5.9	18.2	14.0
Third	0.0	18.2	12.0
Honorable Mention	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(17)	(33)	(50)

- A.  $X^2=0.17$ ;  $P<.68$ ;  $df=1$   
 B.  $X^2=2.26$ ;  $P<.13$ ;  $df=1$   
 C.  $X^2=3.03$ ;  $P<.08$ ;  $df=1$   
 D.  $X^2=2.86$ ;  $P<.41$ ;  $df=3$   
 E.  $X^2=0.23$ ;  $P<.62$ ;  $df=1$   
 F.  $X^2=4.32$ ;  $P<.22$ ;  $df=3$   
 G.  $X^2=2.32$ ;  $P<.12$ ;  $df=1$   
 H.  $X^2=5.71$ ;  $P<.05$ ;  $df=3$



Control variables (size of the athletes' high school, rank in graduating class of the athletes as students, number of schools that tried to recruit the athletes, and number of ways athletes were contacted by the K.S.U. coaching staff) involving the recognition of players were tested, but they yielded little differences.

#### The Experiences Athletes Had During Recruitment:

Promising high school athletes are invited to visit colleges to learn what the school offers athletically, socially, and academically. The literature suggested that blacks and whites receive differential treatment during recruitment. I hypothesize that:

2. Black athletes experience discrimination while being recruited.

Many whites learn about the college through family members, but most blacks attain their information while visiting the college. There was a small difference in the number of persons who influenced the athletes to attend K.S.U. However, whites were influenced by more people to sign an athletic contract than blacks. The majority of both black and white athletes reported coaches initially contacted them by a visit or phone call. Other persons also helped coaches to recruit athletes; ex-football players, alumni, and friends tried to persuade athletes to sign a contract with K.S.U. The data showed that both black and white athletes were equally contacted by these kinds of persons.

Football, social life, and academics are important topics coaches discussed when they recruit athletes. With regard to the football discussion, coaches emphasized chances of making the team more often with blacks than whites. Some white players reported discussing the positions they would be playing on the football team, whereas no blacks talked about this. Coaches were also more likely to talk about the social life aspects of college with whites than blacks. The

academic aspects of college were discussed almost equally with both groups.

Blacks and whites equally reported they were invited to visit the college campus before signing a football contract. The college sponsored the visit for both black and white athletes, and they were generally met by an assistant football coach. However, more blacks than whites were met by K.S.U. ex-athletes.

Both black and white recruits were equally given roommates during their stay; Table 4 shows that most athletes were given roommates of the same race. However black recruits reported they were escorted around the campus by members of either race, but, overwhelmingly, the majority of whites were escorted about the campus by whites.

Black and white athletes equally met faculty, visiting athletes, administrators, and alumni during their stay on campus.

The social experience for black recruits was somewhat bleaker than for whites. Table 5 shows that the majority of whites participated in social activities, but that most blacks did not; the majority of whites went to Aggieville (bars near the college campus that differentially cater to white students) while only a few blacks did so; more whites than blacks attended dances or went to parties off campus. Whites also went on plane rides, hunted, visited parks, and even enrolled in school while being recruited. While only a small percentage of whites engaged in these activities, no blacks did so.

Table 4

RACE OF ROOMMATE AND ESCORT DURING RECRUITMENT

## A. Race of Roommate

<u>Race of Roommate</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black	88.9	4.9	29.0
White	<u>11.1</u>	<u>95.5</u>	<u>71.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(18)	(44)	(62)

## B. Race of Escort of Athlete During Recruitment

<u>Race of Escort</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black	50.0	5.9	17.4
White	<u>50.0</u>	<u>94.1</u>	<u>82.6</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(18)	(51)	(69)

A.  $\chi^2_2=40.10$ ; P-.00; df=1  
 B.  $\chi^2=15.08$ ; P-.00; df=1

TABLE 5

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES OF FOOTBALL PLAYERS DURING RECRUITMENT

## A. Participation in Social Activities During Recruitment

<u>Participation</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Did Participate	44.0	59.1	54.9
Did Not Participate	<u>56.0</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>45.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## B. Athletes That Went to Aggieville During Recruitment

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Went to Aggieville	20.0	63.6	51.6
Did Not Go To Aggieville	<u>80.0</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>48.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## C. Athletes That Went Off Campus to Dances During Recruitment

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Went Off Campus	24.0	37.9	34.1
Did Not Go Off Campus	<u>76.0</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>65.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

## D. Athletes That Went to Parties During Recruitment

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Went to Parties	20.0	36.4	31.9
Did Not Go to Parties	<u>80.0</u>	<u>63.6</u>	<u>68.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

Table 5 (Continued)

- A.  $X^2=1.11$ ;  $P=.29$ ;  $df=1$
- B.  $X^2=12.13$ ;  $P=.001$ ;  $df=1$
- C.  $X^2=0.99$ ;  $P=.31$ ;  $df=1$
- D.  $X^2=1.54$ ;  $P=.21$ ;  $df=1$

Fewer blacks than whites expected dates for social activities, and fewer had dates (Table 6). Some blacks had white dates, but no white athletes had black dates. Other variables (offensive and defensive positions in high school, recognition received in high school, and the number of schools that tried to recruit an athlete) may have had some effect on what an athlete experiences during recruitment. However, these variables were controlled, and little differences were found.

Blacks rated their social experiences during recruitment as fair to poor; whites' social experiences were excellent to good. Some of the comments from blacks about social experiences are: "I didn't learn a thing;" "They tried to put up a good front;" "Very few people of my race were at the social activities I engaged in;" "There were too many whites on campus;" Whites' comments were different from blacks. Some whites' comments are: "I was very impressed;" "I saw everything;" "I had been here already, and knew about the college campus;" "It was the parties and social life that made the decision for me to come very easy;" "I learned what college life was all about."

The majority of whites evaluated their learning about academic programs as good or better. Some of the white respondents' comments about the aspects of learning about the academics are: "I found out what major I was interested in;" "I was able to talk to other administrators of the school to learn what I wanted to major in;" "Coaches told me everything I wanted to know." On the other hand, most blacks rated learning about academic programs as fair or poor. Some of the black respondents' comments are: "They didn't elaborate;" "They only wanted to discuss football;" "They never talked much about academics."

Black and white recruits differed in what they learned about the football program: Whites said they thought the football aspect of recruitment was from good to excellent, but blacks said it was fair to good (See Table 7). Some of

the white respondents' comments are: "I found out the attitudes of the players;" "I found out about practice and games;" "Coaches made all points very clear;" "All coaches were very informative." Some of the black respondents' comments are: "Coaches didn't discuss football;" "Coaches didn't tell about the bad things all freshmen football players must go through;" "The coaches told me things that were not true;" "As of today, I still don't know about this football program." Although the data in this table are not uniformly statistically significant, the directions are generally consistent -- blacks were less satisfied than were whites concerning their knowledge of K.S.U. gained on their campus visit. The athletes' major in college, positions, year in college, and recognition he received in high school were given consideration but did not appear to influence how athletes rated their learning experiences while visiting.

Table 8 shows that three of four blacks were not presented a true picture of what to expect as a member of the football team as compared to about two of five whites feeling that way. Some of the blacks' comments are: "The only thing I saw were the sports aspects of college;" "They showed me everything but the social life, and even that was a good front;" "The football team was not like coaches said it would be;" "Nobody said how lonely it would be playing for this school;" "They only showed me things to make me happy;" "No one told me about the true life on campus;" "This was not what I was used to;" "Everything was one sided, and only the best things were told;" "I didn't get along with those white people around here then, and I don't get along with them now." Black football players evaluated recruitment as less satisfactory than did the whites.

TABLE 6  
ATHLETES AND DATING DURING RECRUITMENT

A. Expected to Have A Date During Recruitment

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Felt a Date Was Needed	32.0	65.2	56.0
Did Not Feel A Date Was Needed	<u>68.0</u>	<u>34.8</u>	<u>44.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

B. Had A Date During Recruitment

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Had A Date	28.0	60.6	51.6
Did Not Have A Date	<u>72.0</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>48.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

C. Race of Athlete's Date During Recruitment

<u>Race of Date</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black	62.5	0.0	10.0
White	<u>37.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>90.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(8)	(42)	(50)

A.  $X^2=6.79$ ;  $P=.001$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=6.46$ ;  $P=.01$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=22.63$ ;  $P=.001$ ;  $df=1$



TABLE 7

ATHLETES' RANKING OF THEIR LEARNING ABOUT  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY DURING RECRUITMENT

A. Athletes' Evaluation of Their Social Experiences During Recruitment

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race of Athlete White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Good to Excellent	23.8	75.0	60.8
Fair to Poor	<u>76.2</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>39.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(21)	(52)	(71)

B. Athletes' Evaluation of Learning About Academics During Recruitment

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race of Athlete White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Very Good to Excellent	15.8	30.8	26.8
Good	31.6	26.9	28.2
Fair	42.1	30.8	33.8
Poor	<u>10.5</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>11.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(19)	(52)	(71)

C. Athletes' Evaluation of Learning About Football During Recruitment

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race of Athlete White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Very Good to Excellent	33.3	45.3	41.9
Good	14.3	32.1	27.0
Fair	42.0	11.3	20.3
Poor	<u>9.5</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>10.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(21)	(53)	(74)

TABLE 8

ATHLETE'S ASSESSMENT OF RECRUITMENT

<u>Assessment</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
True Picture	24.0	59.1	49.5
Not A True Picture	<u>76.0</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>50.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=7.58$ ;  $P=.001$ ;  $df=1$

### Intercollegiate Competition and Team Associations:

This section includes comparative characteristics of black and white football players on the university's team, and of their social relationships.

The literature suggests that black athletes outperform their white counterparts while on the college team. I hypothesize:

3. Black players are proportionately overrepresented as stars, and white players are proportionately overrepresented as non-stars.

In spite of their nonstarring roles, whites tend to occupy more central and leadership positions than blacks. I hypothesize:

4. Blacks occupy non-leadership and non-central positions on the team.

Annual scholarship awards depend on athletes' performances. If an athlete, for example, is a top ball players, he receives a full athletic scholarship. Average athletes hold partial scholarships. Players who do not perform well or are not considered helpful to the team receive no aid.

All but one black received a scholarship, five of six whites received scholarships. All blacks on scholarships had full awards, and eight of nine scholarships won by whites were full. (See Table 9)

Table 10 indicates blacks were much more likely to play on the varsity team than were whites, but more whites play first string. Both tabulations are statistically significant. The majority of blacks who played on the varsity team in college also had more experience on their high school teams than their white counterparts. (See Appendix II, Page 115) Other controls (rank on high school teams, number of schools that recruited the athlete, year of college, and position in college) were used but no differences were found.

TABLE 9  
RECEPTION AND TYPE OF SCHOLARSHIPS

A. Athletes That Received Scholarships

	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Scholarships	96.0	83.3	86.8
Did Not Receive Scholarships	<u>4.0</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>13.2</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

B. Type of Scholarships Given

<u>Type</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Full	100.0	89.5	92.6
Partial	<u>0.0</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>7.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(24)	(57)	(81)

A.  $X^2=1.55$ ;  $P=.21$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=1.40$ ;  $P=.23$ ;  $df=1$

TABLE 10  
TEAM AND STRING PLAYED ON

A. Team Played On

<u>Team</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
		<u>White</u>		
Varsity	83.3	51.6		60.5
Junior Varsity	<u>16.7</u>	<u>48.4</u>		<u>39.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0		100.0
Total Number	(24)	(62)		(86)

B. String Played On

<u>String</u>	<u>Black</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
		<u>White</u>		
First	41.7	68.9		61.2
Second	45.8	18.0		25.9
Third	8.3	11.5		10.6
Fourth	<u>4.2</u>	<u>1.6</u>		<u>2.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0		100.0
Total Number	(24)	(61)		(85)

A.  $X^2=6.01$ ;  $P=.01$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=7.85$ ;  $P=.04$ ;  $df=3$

The data showed that whites occupy central and leadership positions more than blacks during high school and college (See Table II). For example, more whites were quarterbacks, centers, guards, linebackers, middle guards, punters, and kickers than were blacks in high school and college. However, the percentage of blacks who played offensive or defensive leadership and central positions slightly increased between high school and college. But, white percentages increased for offensive positions and decreased in defensive positions. No differences were found in central and leadership positions when other variables (major, year in school, and the recognition the athlete received in high school) were controlled for. (See Table 12)

TABLE 11

CENTRAL AND NON-CENTRAL OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE POSITIONS  
IN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

---

A. Central and Non-Central Offensive Positions in High School

<u>Type of Position</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Central	8.7	31.3	25.3
Non-Central	<u>91.3</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>74.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(23)	(64)	(87)

B. Central and Non-Central Defensive Positions in High School

<u>Type of Position</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Central	15.0	37.5	31.6
Non-Central	<u>85.0</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>68.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(20)	(56)	(76)

C. Central and Non-Central Offensive Positions in College

<u>Type of Position</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Central	11.1	46.9	39.0
Non-Central	<u>88.9</u>	<u>53.1</u>	<u>61.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(9)	(32)	(41)

Table 11 (Continued)

## D. Central and Non-Central Defensive Positions in College

<u>Type of Position</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Central	26.7	30.0	28.9
Non-Central	<u>73.3</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>71.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(15)	(30)	(45)

A.  $X^2=3.44$ ;  $P=.06$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=2.49$ ;  $P=.11$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=2.42$ ;  $P=.11$ ;  $df=1$

D.  $X^2=2.05$ ;  $P=.35$ ;  $df=1$



TABLE 12  
POSITIONS ATHLETES WERE RECRUITED TO PLAY

A. Offensive Positions

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Tackle	21.7	15.6	17.2
Guard	0.0	12.5	9.2
Center	0.0	4.7	3.4
Tight End	4.3	17.2	13.8
Wide Receiver	17.4	3.1	6.9
Quarterback	8.7	14.1	12.6
Tailback	34.8	12.5	18.4
Fullback	<u>13.0</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>18.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(23)	(64)	(87)

B. Defensive Positions

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
End	20.0	19.6	19.7
Tackle	20.0	23.2	22.4
Noseguard	0.0	5.4	3.9
Linebacker	15.0	32.1	27.6
Halfback	<u>45.0</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>26.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(20)	(56)	(76)

A.  $X^2=16.77$ ;  $P=.01$ ;  $df=7$

B.  $X^2= 6.30$ ;  $P=.17$ ;  $df=4$

### Off-Field Social Relationships of Athletes:

Kansas State University has an athletic dormitory. Such dormitories bring players together because coaches assume that when players live in one residence hall they are well integrated and will perform well. I suggest that integration occurs on the playing field and that blacks and whites segregate socially when not involved in sports. I hypothesize:

5. Black and white football players are socially segregated when off the playing field.

All but one of the players contacted lived in the athletic dormitory. The black respondents roomed with blacks, and all but three whites had white roommates. One white player roomed alone, one had a Chicano roommate, and one roomed with a black according to these data.

Whites reported more racial integration off the playing field of team members than did black players. But, most of both blacks and whites agreed that the two races came together for little or almost no social interaction. (See Table 13). Both groups also agreed that there was little or no interaction between the races in the dining room. (See Table 14) Positions in college and the academic standing of players were used as controls, however, they had no effect on what players reported.

TABLE 13

ATHLETES' OPINIONS OF HOW MUCH RACIAL INTEGRATION OCCURRED  
BETWEEN TEAM MEMBERS OFF THE FIELD

---

<u>Rate of Integration</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Often to Very Often	20.0	35.9	31.4
Little	40.0	39.1	39.3
Almost Never	<u>40.0</u>	<u>25.0</u>	<u>29.2</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(64)	(89)

$\chi^2=3.94$ ;  $P=.26$ ;  $df=2$

TABLE 14

HOW OFTEN BLACK AND WHITES SAT TOGETHER WHILE EATING

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Often to Very Often	12.0	17.2	15.7
Little	52.0	46.9	48.3
Almost Never	<u>36.0</u>	<u>35.9</u>	<u>36.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(64)	(89)

$\chi^2=1.34$ ;  $P=.71$ ;  $df=2$

### Education of the College Football Player:

The education of students is supposed to be the utmost concern to all colleges. However, the literature suggested that collegiate sports is so important that the athletic role takes precedence over the student role of athletes. It was also suggested (Chapter 1) that black athletes have special educational problems that do not confront white athletes; that coaches stereotype blacks and are unconcerned with their academic success. In view of these findings, I hypothesize:

6. Black are scholastically weaker than their white counterparts;
7. Black athletes are found in special academic curriculums.

Most whites and blacks indicated the reason they played football was to receive a college education. Collegiate athletics is a means to an end for most players. The grade point averages and ACT scores (Table 15) indicate significant scholarly differences between black and white football players. Whites earn better grades in college, and entered college with better records. However, caution must be used in interpreting the ACT scores because these scores were available for less than one half of the respondents.

Major Field of Study indicates that whites were spread evenly over many curricula, except education, but blacks were concentrated in the arts and sciences, business and general curriculum. Because of the dispersion and incomparability of data on majors, these are not tabulated. The differences between blacks and whites in academics were not a function of other variables (size of high school, rank in high school, positions in high school and college, or the academic year of the athlete).

TABLE 15  
GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND ACT SCORES OF ATHLETES

A. Grade Point Averages of Athletes

<u>Variable</u>	<u>#of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>2-Tail Probability</u>
Black	24	1.8	5.599	1.143	-2.81	84	0.005
White	62	2.2	6.170	0.784			

B. ACT Scores of Athletes

<u>Variable</u>	<u># of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>2-Tail Probability</u>
Black	7	11.2857	6.601	2.495	-2.02	37	0.006
White	32	22.0313	13.644	2.412			

### Termination of the Athletes' College Education:

The literature suggests that a four-year, athletic scholarship does not insure the player a degree, and that smaller numbers of black athletes obtain college degrees than do whites. In view of the literature reviewed, I hypothesize:

8. Black athletes are less likely to complete college than are white athletes.

To secure information about the graduation of athletes at K.S.U., I used work done by Corbin (1974). Corbin studied all athletes at K.S.U. in the years 1969-1973 inclusive to learn how many graduated. His study did not take account of racial differences, but racial implications of these data will be discussed in the following chapter.

Some of Corbin's data are reproduced in Table 16. Corbin notes: Almost all athletes appear to enroll in the class Varsity Sport zero credit, or a varsity sport for one credit hour every semester for four years, some for five. It is clear that varsity sports and techniques classes are used to "inflate" GPA's of athletes. Football players earn more A's in these courses than other athletes yet they have significantly lower GPA's than athletes participating in other sports. In general, football and track and to a lesser extent, gymnastics and baseball, have poorer academic performance. Athletes with the poorest academic performance (football in particular) were more likely to enroll in and receive "A" in classes taught by their own coaches or other coaches.

In another part of Corbin's study, he writes: "Most athletes end up taking many more hours than required for graduation. The average senior has 13 hours more than necessary. 33.8 percent are enrolled in school for more than four years. Of those that actually receive the B.S. the percentage is higher. 67.6 percent of all athletes do not graduate in four years. Forty percent have not graduated one to three years after their class has graduated."

TABLE 16  
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF ATHLETES BY SPORT

<u>SPORT</u>	<u># In Each Sport</u>	<u>Overall GPA</u>	<u>B.S. Received In 4 Years</u>	<u>B.S. Received</u>
Football	106	2.29	19.9%	49.1%
Basketball	20	2.65	65.0%	80.0%
Baseball	18	2.41	44.5%	67.0%
Track	27	2.45	29.7%	70.4%
Wrestling	12	2.89	33.3%	75.0%
Gymnastics	9	2.57	44.5%	67.0%
Golf	5	2.42	20.0%	100.0%
Tennis	4	2.68	75.0%	75.0%
Overall Total	216**	2.46	33.0%	60.0%
<hr/>				
Significance	*	*	*	*

\* The asterisk indicates that significant differences existed between sports on this variable.

\*\* Fifteen athletes had missing data concerning sport of participation.



## DISCUSSION

This section discusses the data found in Chapter III. The discussion will follow the social process model established in the first chapter.

Recently, predominately white colleges have sought black athletic talent because of increasing inter-collegiate competition and a shortage of good white athletes. In the first chapter, it was suggested that minority individuals are accepted into dominant settings because they possess some quality that is in short supply in the dominant group. In other words, in predominately white settings, only those blacks with extraordinary talents are allowed the opportunity to represent their race. The case of Jackie Robinson should make this point clear. Branch Rickey knew that the first black who entered professional baseball had to be extraordinarily competent. Therefore, Robinson was unlike most white ball players in being overly qualified and he did not resemble the majority of black ball players because he was playing major league baseball. Not only did Robinson have to be more qualified than whites athletically to enter professional sports, but he was more educated and more restrained in his conduct than other players. Almost three decades have passed since Robinson entered professional sports; however, recent literature suggests that blacks are still expected to be more qualified than whites when entering sports in a predominately white setting.

This phenomenon is particularly prevalent in collegiate sports. It appears that the differences in the athletic performance of blacks and whites in white settings result from preferences of the coaching staff. Coaches practice a dual standard when recruiting black and white athletes, i.e., blacks in high school must be more qualified than whites to be considered for the college team. The

hypothesis -- Black athletes perform better athletically in high school than their white counterparts -- was tested by comparing individual performances, physical characteristics, and recognitions received while playing sports in high school.

The data presented appear to be consistent with hypothesis #1. Blacks played longer on varsity teams, more likely started, and received more varsity letters than whites. Perhaps because blacks play longer on varsity teams they have a considerable edge over white players. It is commonly alleged that the best coaches, facilities, and training are given to varsity teams in high schools because most of the interest in athletics is centered on those who perform on the top team. Therefore, more blacks than whites in this study had longer exposure to better coaches and training facilities.

Blacks played first string on varsity teams more than did whites. Athletes on first teams play more minutes in athletic contests than do individuals on second and third teams. The actual game experience gives a player training useful for college football. Playing on the first team also gives the athlete opportunities to be recognized by college coaches and sports writers. Even football practice focuses around the first string team; first stringers benefit most from being on the team.

An indication of what coaches think of their high school athletes is a cloth letter given for their performance. Blacks in this study earned more varsity letters in high school than whites. Comparing the individual performance of athletes on high school teams it appears that blacks outperform whites as was predicted in hypothesis #1. Therefore, blacks in high school appear to be individually more overqualified than whites.

Speed, weight, and height are important characteristics coaches look for when recruiting high school football athletes. Blacks ran significantly faster in high school than whites. However, whites were slightly taller and heavier than blacks.

The data on physical characteristics were mixed and did not appear to be consistent with hypothesis #1. However, care should be taken when analysing that data. One explanation of why whites were taller, weighed more, and were slower than blacks is that blacks were recruited to play positions stressing speed (halfback, fullback, linebacker, and defensive back) while whites were recruited to play positions stressing weight and height. For example, positions such as interior lineman require tall and heavy players who are not as fast as halfbacks or ends (See Appendix II).

Most black and white athletes playing for K.S.U. received all-star recognition for their high school performance. Though both groups received recognition on all-star teams, blacks were significantly more likely to be on the first string team. The data suggests that whites are good ball players, because they received recognition on all-star teams, but blacks are better because they made the first string of that same squad. In view of the data presented, I retain the hypothesis that -- Black athletes perform better athletically in high school than their white counterparts.

Many athletes labored hard in high school for the once in a lifetime opportunity represented by being recruited by a college. Activities coaches planned for recruits are generally instrumental and expressive. Instrumental activities pertain to achieving a goal (e.g., placing emphasis on football and academics) while expressive activities center around the individual's emotional satisfaction (e.g., emphasis on social life). Instrumental activities are stressed to all athletes since football and school are the main concerns during the visit. However, expressive activities, involving as they do social life, are not equally available to members of dominant and minority groups. Social activities in dominant settings are generally geared to the dominant group, and since minority groups are regarded as unequal they may not be encouraged to participate in these. For instance, a

black recruit may be encouraged to meet with members of the faculty and coaching staff, but is discouraged from dating white college women.

The recruiting of athletes at K.S.U. includes the initial contacting of athletes, athlete's visit to the campus, and what athletes learn while visiting the campus. I hypothesized -- Black athletes experience discrimination while being recruited.

The data showed that black and white athletes were equally contacted by coaches. Coaches talked equally to blacks and whites about their chances of playing football and the academics of K.S.U.. But, most blacks reported that coaches did not discuss the social life of college with them, whereas the majority of whites reported the opposite. The data presented leans in the direction of hypothesis #2. Two possible explanations for coaches de-emphasizing the social life aspects of college with blacks are apparent. First, all K.S.U. coaches responsible for recruiting athletes were white. Perhaps they had little or no knowledge of what blacks expected socially at a predominately white institution. The second argument is that coaches want to present a good image of their school, and, therefore, they avoid controversial topics. Further, instrumental activities are not as difficult to explain to athletes as are expressive functions. All athletes must play football and take courses, but not everyone attends a dance given by a fraternity.

The recruits did not differ as to who they met and talked with during recruitment. However, when the time of socializing arrived most whites engaged in social activities whereas the majority of blacks did not. The majority of blacks reported that they did not expect dates for their social activities, but most whites said they expected one. The perceptions about needing a date were apparently correct because fewer blacks than whites actually received a date. In a few cases, blacks reported dating white girls but no white athletes dated black girls.

The data presented were consistent with hypothesis #2. It appears that the closer contacts between the races, the more discrimination: Individuals are more intimate with dates and roommates than they are with faculty and escorts.

White recruits that room with white football players perhaps get a realistic view of the school because athletes engage in social activities in the institution, and show recruits the school. Black recruits visiting predominantly white universities do not experience social activities because these universities are not structured for black students.

Black athletes are a large percentage of the black population at K.S.U., and black males outnumber black females approximately four to one. This presents a dating problem for black males. Perhaps coaches simply could not find enough black dates for their black athletes. It appears that coaches consider white women second when finding a date for the black recruit. Though a few blacks had white dates, it appears that this was not positively sanctioned by the coaching staff. At least one well-known professional football player who attended K.S.U. reported that black athletes here were not supposed to date white women. The black integrates into a white situation and never the reverse. These data also appear to be consistent with hypothesis #2.

The majority of whites evaluated their social experiences better than the blacks evaluated theirs. Blacks and whites evaluated their academic experience similarly. However, black and white recruits differed in rating what they had learned about the football programs; the majority of blacks said coaches did not present a true picture of what to expect at K.S.U., but most whites reported that they learned what to expect as a team member. Because blacks are shifted more often and occupy only certain positions on the team, coaches may have a harder time concretely discussing where they will fit on the team. It will be recalled that coaches discussed positions on the team with white recruits, but did not

discuss positions with blacks. It is assumed that when coaches discuss certain positions to be played, that the athletes are being recruited to play them. Coaches talk generally and vaguely about football to black athletes; specifically and clearly to whites. Hypothesis #2 -- Black athletes experience discrimination while being recruited -- is retained.

Two aspects of a college athlete's football career are examined now: The quality of the athlete and the relationship of the individual and the team.

It is argued by many naive individuals that blacks perform naturally better than whites in athletic contests. I do not propose this racist doctrine. Black athletes appear to be better because coaches recruit only top quality black athletes, and they must perform exceptionally well if they are to remain on the team. I hypothesize that -- Black players are proportionately overrepresented as stars, and white players are proportionately overrepresented as non-stars. All blacks were awarded full football scholarships, but 10.5 percent of whites reported receiving only partial scholarships. Significantly more blacks than whites were on the varsity team. However, more whites than blacks reported playing first string. The next section provides evidence that blacks have access to fewer playing positions. Because more positions are available to whites their chances of playing on the first string are enhanced.

The indicators used to test hypothesis #3 are somewhat obscure because some positions in football do not allow players to become stars, and positions are evaluated differently. Sportswriters watch players who handle the ball. Therefore, a quarterback acquires a better reputation than does a tackle. The indicators suggest coaches perceive black ball players as better than whites because they receive more full scholarships. While blacks exceed whites in being on the varsity team, many whites are on first string. On balance, I retain hypothesis #3 that blacks are overrepresented as stars and whites overrepresented as non-stars.



In the U.S. most of those persons who lead and control are white. In football, leadership positions are central therefore leadership and centrality are coincidental. Central players initiate interactions with others. One should expect to find whites in leadership positions in sports that have central responsibility. I hypothesize that -- Blacks occupy non-leadership and non-central positions on the team.

The data suggest that blacks played fewer leadership and central positions than whites did in high school and college. The data appears strong when controlling for offensive positions but is less pronounced when examining defensive positions. Additional data on these positions was collected in the course of the research. For example, the K.S.U. football team plays a 6-2 defense. This means that six men form the defensive line of scrimmage, with a right and left linebacker playing behind them. In this case, coaches generally give the right linebacker leadership of the defensive team. In 1974, both a black and a white played right linebacker. Black players reported to the researcher that the white linebacker called defensive plays when in the game, but the black player called plays that came from the bench. This dual standard of treatment also applied to the offensive leadership. Black players reported the black quarterback did not call plays in the game, but white quarterbacks called plays while they played.

Perhaps some might expect members of a football team to be well integrated socially since sports generates friendship. However, I hypothesize that -- Black and white football players socially segregate when off the playing field. Both black and white football players claimed that there was little off the field contact between the races. Even in the dining room, black and white tended to segregate.

Some may believe that to segregate roommates by their race is natural. However, at Delaware State College (an all black college) when I played, roommates were

assigned according to the positions they played. However, in a setting involving two or more races and discrimination racial territories are marked off. The way players seated themselves in the dining hall perpetuated racial segregation. A cafeteria island separates the dining hall into two areas: blacks on one side and whites on the other. I retain hypothesis #5 that black and white football players socially segregate when off the playing field.

For the most part, the literature suggests that black athletes who enter a predominately white college do not have the academic foundation to cope with college life. I hypothesized that -- blacks are scholastically weaker than their white counterparts, and black athletes are in special academic curriculums.

The data reveal that black athletes fall considerably behind white players in academic ability and that blacks had lower grade point averages and college entrance examinations. Moreover, black athletes fell below the whole student body in these areas. The college entrance examination score is used by university officials to determine students qualifications to attend. Officials overlooked the scores for more black athletes than for whites in admitting them to college. Black athletes fall below white players and the total student body in academics. I retain the hypothesis that blacks are scholastically weaker than their white counterparts.

The data do not allow us to test hypothesis #7. However, inferences can be drawn. White athletes were spread evenly throughout all majors except in business administration. On the other hand, blacks majored only in the arts and sciences, business and general curriculums. Coaches may realize a black's educational disadvantage and advise him to pursue a general curriculum instead of a specific curriculum like pre-veterinary medicine. The evidence is not clear that blacks are placed in special courses. However, whites' majors are diffused, blacks are concentrated.



Corbin indicated that athletes enroll in Varsity Sports zero credit and Varsity Sports for one credit hour to inflate their G.P.A.'s; the average senior athlete has thirteen hours more than he needs to graduate; football players have poorest records of all athletes; only a small percentage of football players receive their degree in four years; some return to school to finish, but most never return. Taking into consideration the above and that black football players perform poorer academically than whites in college, it can be assumed that most blacks do not receive their degrees in four years. Hypothesis #8 is supported by indirect evidence.

## Conclusion

This thesis has compared black and white football players at Kansas State University. Sports is an American institution involving many of the core values and predominating beliefs of the society. It is expected that any black who enters a predominately white setting will experience discriminatory treatment similar to those studied. This study does not consider professional sports. The racial barrier in sports was first broken in professional leagues. One might suspect that the treatment afforded black athletes because of race is less in professional sports than in collegiate sports. Also, what this study implies about sports having fixed zones is unknown. In sports without fixed zones (basketball, hockey) players must depend on each other. It would be good to do research exploring the effect of discrimination in sports having fixed or nonfixed zones.

Black athletes enter collegiate life and athletics with enjoyment and enthusiasm, but they quickly learn that because they are black they receive unequal treatment. The cards are stacked against the black athlete.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banton, Michael  
1967, Race Relations, New York.: Basic Books
- Berry, Brewton  
1954, Race and Ethnic Relations, Houghton Mifflin Co: Boston, Mass.
- Blalock, H.M.  
1962, "Occupational Discrimination: Some Theoretical Propositions,"  
Social Problems, 9, Winter
- Broom, Reanard, Glenn, Norval  
1961, The Transformation of the Negro American, Harper and Row Publishers: New York.
- Brower, Jonathan J.  
1972, "The Racial Basis of the Division of Labor Among Players in the NFL as a Function of Stereotypes," paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association, April.  
  
1973, "Whitey's Sport," Human Behavior, November: 22-27.
- Butler, Johnny S., and Rhodes, Lodis  
1975, "Sport and Racism: A Contribution to Theory Building In Race Relations?," Social Science Quarterly, Spring: 919-925.
- Coleman, James  
1966, Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.
- Corbin, Charles B.  
1974, "The Academic Performance of Scholarship Athletes," Kansas State University, unpublished paper.
- Degler, Carl  
1971, "Neither Black Nor White -- Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States," The MacMillan Company, New York, New York.
- Edwards, Harry  
1973, Sociology of Sport, The Dorsey Press: Chicago, Ill.  
  
1969, The Revolt of the Black Athlete: The Free Press, New York.  
  
1973, "20th Century Gladiators for White America," Psychology Today (November): 43-52.
- Green, Robert L., McMillan, Joseph M., and Gunnings, Thomas  
1972, The Status of Blacks In The Big Ten Athletic Conference: Issues and Concerns: Paper submitted to the Big Ten Conference.

- Green, Colin  
1972, The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education, New York: Basic Books
- Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David  
1966 "Class in America," The Public Interest (Winter): 65-85.
- Johnson, L.T.B.  
1972, "The Interaction of Soul, Mind, and Body -- A Study of the Role Computability, Role Conflict, and Role Resolutions of Black Student Athletes on a Predominantly White University Campus," Unpublished master's thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.
- Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert  
1966, The Social Psychology of Organizations, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.: New York.
- Knowles, Louis and Previtt, Kenneth  
1969, Institutional Racism in America, Prentice Hall: N.J.
- Kramer, Judith R.  
1970, The American Community, New York.: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Liebow, Elliot  
1967, Tally's Corner, Little Brown, and Co.
- Lohman, Joseph, Reitzes Dietrich C.  
1952, "Note on Race Relations in Mass Society," The American Journal of Sociology, 53, November.
- Loy, J.W. and McElvogue, J.F.  
1970, "Racial Segregation in American Sport," International Review of Sport Sociology, 5: 5-24.
- Lyman, Stanford M.  
1972, "The Black American in Sociological Thought: New Perspectives on Black America," G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
- Mannheim, Karl  
1940, Man and Society, New York.: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- McPherson, Barry D.  
1975, "The Segregation By Playing Position Hypothesis in Sport; an Alternative Explanation," Social Science Quarterly: Vol 55, No. 4, March.
- McClendon, McKee J. and Eitzen, Stanley  
1975, "Interracial Contact On Collegiate Basketball Teams: A Test of Sherif's Theory of Superordinate Goals," Social Science Quarterly Vol 55, No. 4, March.

Miller, Herman

1968, Rich Man Poor Man, Signet Books: N.J.

Nowak, W.S.

1968 "Black Athlete Under Tender: An Investigation of the Sociological Background of the Negro Football Player at a Midwest University," Unpublished senior honor's thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Olsen, Jack

1967, "Black Is Best -- The Riddle Of Cassius Clay," G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

1968, "The Black Athlete -- A Shameful Story," Sports Illustrated, 29 No. 1, July.

Paschal, Anthony H. and Rapping, Leonard A.

1970, Racial Discriminations in Organized Baseball, Rand Corporation: California.

Pinckney, Alphonso

1969, Black Americans, Prentice Hall, Inc.: Englewood, N.J.

Rhoden, Bill

1975, "Are Black Athletes Naturally Better" Ebony, March 1975.

Robinson, Jackie and Duckett, Alfred

1972, "I Never Had It Made," G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Rosenblatt, Aaron

1967, "Negroes in Baseball: The Failure of Success," Transaction, 4 September, pp 51-53.

Shapiro, B.J.

1970, "The Black Athlete at Michigan State University," Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Shaw, Gary

1972, "Meat on the Hoof," Dell Publishing Co, Inc., New York, New York.

Shaw, Marvin E. and Costanzo, Philip R.

1970, Theories of Social Psychology, McGraw-Hill Book Company: New York.

Thompson, Daniel

1974, Sociology of the Black Experience, London: Greenwood Press.

Yetman, Norman and Eitzen, Stanley

1971, "Black Athletes on Intercollegiate Basketball Teams: An Empirical Test of Discrimination," paper presented at a meeting of the American Sociological Association (August 30, 1971), Denver, Colorado.

## APPENDIX I

### STRUCTURE USED TO GATHER DATA

Division of Continuing Education  
Office of the Director  
301 Umberger Hall  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506  
Phone: 913 532-5566

December 1974

Dear Athletes:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Sociology conducting my master's thesis research on Kansas State University football players. This study concerns the types of experiences and conflicts that student athletes have. I am interested in what has happened to you as a student-athlete from the time you were recruited to the present.

Your participation in this study is important to me in two ways. First, very little is known about how difficult it is to be a student and an athlete. Most people know only what they see on Saturday afternoons. They do not see or understand the problems, pressures, and difficulties you have in other aspects of your lives. You are in a unique position to provide such information. One goal of this study is to describe in a fuller way what the life of the student athlete is like. Second, and more personally, your participation is crucial if I am to complete my graduate work at KSU.

Although I greatly need and desire your answers to questions in the study, your participation is completely voluntary. You have my promise that any information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence. In no way will individual responses to questions be identified in the study or the thesis.

Attached to this letter is a questionnaire. I would greatly appreciate it if you would answer the questions asked. It is important that you answer the questions as frankly and completely as you can. Some of the questions may have more than one answer. Please circle or write as many responses as are appropriate in your case.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

I appreciate your taking the time from a busy schedule to complete the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Arthur S. Evans

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire is divided into three sections. Section I is concerned with your high school football career. Section II deals with how you were introduced to K-State and recruited to play football here. Section III requests information about your experiences on the football team at K-State.

There are two types of questions asked in this questionnaire. One type of question asks that you circle the response or responses which best apply to you. A second type of question requests that you write a brief description of your experiences as a college athlete. Both types of questions will require your careful consideration.

Please read all instructions and questions carefully.



SECTION I

The following questions ask about your high school athletic experiences. Some of these questions concern the high school team you played on, and some concern you as a player on the team. Please answer all the questions that apply by circling the appropriate response or responses or by filling in the blank spaces.

A. YOUR PLAYING EXPERIENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL

1. How many years did you play varsity football in high school?
  1. One year
  2. Two years
  3. Three years
  4. Four years
  5. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many years on the varsity football team were you first string in high school?
  1. One year
  2. Two years
  3. Three years
  4. Four years
  5. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many years did you receive a varsity letter in football while in high school?
  1. One year
  2. Two years
  3. Three years
  4. Four years
  5. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
4. What was your average playing weight while in high school? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What was your height while in high school? \_\_\_\_\_ ft. \_\_\_\_\_ inches
6. What was your best clocked time in the forty yard dash in high school?  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. What position or positions did you play during your senior year in high school? (please list all positions played)
  1. Offensive Positions \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Defensive Positions \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Special Teams \_\_\_\_\_

8. Did you ever receive any special recognition for playing football in high school? (for example, All State, All Conference, All City, etc.)
1. Yes
  2. No

If response to question #8 was "yes", please answer question #9.

9. What recognition did you receive? Please circle all honors that you received.

1. Little All American \_\_\_\_\_
2. All State \_\_\_\_\_
3. All Conference \_\_\_\_\_
4. All City \_\_\_\_\_
5. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Now will you look again at each of the honors you received and write on the space provided whether that was:

First Team  
 Second Team  
 Third Team  
 Honorable Mention  
 Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

#### B. YOUR HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

10. Where did your high school team finish in your conference at the end of your senior year?

- |              |              |                         |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 1. 1st place | 4. 4th place | 7. 7th place            |
| 2. 2nd place | 5. 5th place | 8. 8th place            |
| 3. 3rd place | 6. 6th place | 9. lower than 8th place |

11. How many teams were in your high school conference? \_\_\_\_\_

- 12a. List the number of groups or classes of competition in your state. \_\_\_\_\_

- 12b. Taking the response to (12a) as the highest level of competition, at what level did your conference participate? \_\_\_\_\_

13. Where did your high school rank in your state at the end of your senior year?

1. Top five teams
2. Top ten teams
3. Top twenty teams
4. Below the top twenty teams

SECTION II

The questions which follow request information on three aspects of recruitment to play football at KSU. In Section A below, we ask you how you learned about K-State. Section B asks if and how you were recruited to come to K-State. Section C asks about your visit to K-State and how you finally decided to come here.

A. LEARNING ABOUT K-STATE

1. As best as you can remember, will you describe how you learned about K-State and began to think about it as a place to come to school?

---



---



---

2. As best as you can remember, when specifically did you begin to think about coming to K-State?

1. Before going to high school
2. During my freshman year in high school
3. During my sophomore year in high school
4. During my junior year in high school
5. During my senior year in high school
6. After graduation from high school

B. RECRUITMENT

3. How many schools (other than K-State) tried to recruit you to play football?

- |          |         |          |                    |
|----------|---------|----------|--------------------|
| 1. one   | 4. four | 7. seven | 10. ten            |
| 2. two   | 5. five | 8. eight | 11. eleven         |
| 3. three | 6. six  | 9. nine  | 12. twelve or more |

4. Was there a specific person who influenced your thinking about coming to K-State to play football?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Remember

If "yes", that person was:

1. high school coach
2. coach at K-State
3. an alumni of K-State
4. ex-K-State coach
5. a friend
6. ex-K-State athlete
7. other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
8. number of "yes" responses in 1-7 above

5. Were you recruited to play football at K-State in any of the following ways?

1. Received a visit from K-State coach
2. Received a telephone call from K-State coach
3. Contacted by K-State football player
4. Contacted by ex K-State athlete
5. Contacted by alumni of K-State
6. Contacted by friends at K-State
7. Received written material from K-State (please indicate nature of the material) \_\_\_\_\_

58 ( )      59 ( )      60 ( )      61 ( )      62 ( )      63 ( )  
 64 ( )      65 ( )      66 ( )      67 ( )

8. Contacted in other ways (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. I was not contacted in any way

If you did not receive a visit by a K-State coach, please skip to question #11.

If you were not contacted in any way, please skip to Section III.

6. If you were visited by a K-State coach, who was that coach? \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many times did a coach from K-State visit you?

1. Once
2. Twice
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. More than four times

8. In any of your contacts with coaches, were the aspects of football discussed? (position, hour of practice, etc.)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

If so, specifically, what was discussed? \_\_\_\_\_

Did anyone else besides the coaches ever discuss this with you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

If yes, who was that? \_\_\_\_\_

9. In any of your contacts with coaches were the aspects and advantages of social life at K-State discussed? (Aggieville, parties, etc.)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

What specifically was discussed? \_\_\_\_\_

Did anyone else ever discuss this with you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

If yes, who was that? \_\_\_\_\_

10. In any of your contacts with coaches, were your specific academic and career interests discussed?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

What specifically was discussed? \_\_\_\_\_

Did anyone else ever discuss this with you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't remember

If yes, who was that? \_\_\_\_\_

11. What positions were you recruited to play? (List all positions that apply)

1. Offensive positions \_\_\_\_\_
2. Defensive positions \_\_\_\_\_
3. Special teams \_\_\_\_\_

C. YOUR VISIT TO K-STATE

12. Did you visit the K-State campus before deciding to come to school here?

1. Yes
2. No

13. Were you invited to the K-State campus before signing a letter of intent to play football here?

1. Yes
2. No

If "no", skip to Section III.

14. Did K-State pay your way?

1. Yes
2. No

15. Were you met by anyone from K-State upon your arrival?

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes", who was this person?

1. Head coach
2. Assistant coach
3. Athlete from K-State
4. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

16. Did you have a roommate during your stay?

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes", this person was:

1. K-State athlete
2. K-State coach
3. Ex-K-State athlete
4. Another visiting athlete
5. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

What was the race of this roommate?

1. Black
2. White
3. Brown

17. What was the race and sex of the person or persons who showed you around K-State the majority of the time during your stay?

- |           |          |
|-----------|----------|
| 1. Male   | 3. Black |
| 2. Female | 4. White |

18. Who did you meet during your stay? (circle all that apply)

1. Faculty members
2. Other athletes
3. Gibson girls
4. Coaches
5. Administrators of university (deans, for example)
6. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

19. What activities did you engage in during your visit to K-State?

1. Attended a collegiate game
2. Went to Aggieville
3. Attended a dance (indicate where) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Movies
5. Party (indicate where) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

20. Did any of these activities involve a date?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, were you provided with a date?

1. Yes
2. No

What was her race?

1. Black
2. White
3. Brown

21. How long did your visit last?

1. One day
2. Two days
3. Three days
4. Four days
5. More than five days

22. How would you evaluate your stay at K-State in terms of learning about social life on this campus?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

23. How would you evaluate your stay at K-State in terms of learning about academic programs on this campus?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

24. How would you evaluate your stay at K-State in terms of learning about the football program on this campus?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor

Comment \_\_\_\_\_

25. Do you feel that what you were shown of K-State while you were visiting the campus represents the true picture of school life as you see it now?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, why not? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

26. If you could do it over again, would you come to K-State?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, why not? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### SECTION III

The following questions ask what it is like to be a member of the K-State football team. Section A requests information about your team experiences. Section B is concerned with relations among members of the K-State football team.



A. YOUR TEAM EXPERIENCES

1. Are you on a football scholarship?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, what type of scholarship is it?

1. Full
2. Partial

2. What team do you play on?

1. Varsity
2. Junior Varsity

3. What string do you play?

1. 1st string
2. 2nd string
3. 3rd string
4. 4th string

4. What position do you play? (list all that apply)

1. Offensive positions \_\_\_\_\_
2. Defensive positions \_\_\_\_\_
3. Special team \_\_\_\_\_

Is that the position you want to play?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, why is this? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Have you been selected this year for a team honor? (outstanding offensive or defensive player of the week, etc.)

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, describe \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Were you ever redshirted while at K-State?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, why was that? \_\_\_\_\_

B. RELATIONS WITH TEAMMATES

6. Where do you live while going to school?

1. Athletic dormitory
2. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7. What race is your roommate?

1. Black
2. White
3. Brown

8. Did you have any choice in selection of your roommate?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, why not? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Generally, do members of the K-State football team get together just to have fun? (for example, double dating, parties, etc.)

1. Very Often
2. Often
3. Little
4. Almost Never

10. Generally, do blacks and whites on the team get together with other team members just to have fun?

1. Very Often
2. Often
3. Little
4. Almost Never

11. Do blacks and whites usually sit together while they eat?

1. Very Often
2. Often
3. Little
4. Almost Never

12. Is there anyone on the team you would consider to be a very close friend?

1. Yes
2. No

13. How many people on the team do you consider your very close friends?  
\_\_\_\_\_
14. Are any of your very close friends on the team members of a different race than your own?
1. Yes (if so, how many? \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
15. If you have trouble with finances is there anyone on the team to whom you go to talk this problem over with?
1. Yes (if so, that is: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
16. Is that person a member of your own race?
1. Yes
  2. No
17. If you have a personal problem is there anyone on the team to whom you go to talk this problem over with?
1. Yes (if so, that is: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
18. Is there anyone on the team that you especially respect or admire?
1. Yes (if so, he is: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
- Is that person a member of your race?
1. Yes
  2. No
19. Overall, how well do you get along with members on the team of the opposite race?
1. Excellently
  2. Very Well
  3. Good
  4. Fair
  5. Poor
20. Have you ever been invited by alumni, civic groups, or coaches to speak to a group about football at K-State?
1. Yes (if so, indicate where: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No

21. Have you ever been invited to dinner with a coach?
1. Yes (if so, indicate where: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
22. Have you ever been invited to dinner with an alumni of K-State?
1. Yes (if so, indicate where: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
23. Have you ever been invited to dinner at any club or organization near Manhattan?
1. Yes (if so, indicate where: \_\_\_\_\_)
  2. No
24. Please rank in order of importance to you why you are playing football at K-State. Mark 1 for the most important reason, 2 for the next most important reason, and so on. We want your personal reasons and not how you believe you should answer. You should place a number beside all of the blank spaces. You should not have the same number for any blank.

Playing football at K-State:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Provides an opportunity to get an education.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Provides an opportunity to get specialized training for a job when I graduate.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Provides an opportunity to get drafted into the pros.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Provides an opportunity to travel.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Provides an opportunity to meet important people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Allows me to participate in a sport I enjoy.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

25. If it were not for football, would you have gone to college?

1. Yes
2. No

Please comment \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

26. What is your race?

1. Black
2. White
3. Brown

## APPENDIX II

## DATA TABLES FOR FINDINGS SUMMARIZED IN CHAPTER III

NUMBER OF GROUPS OF COMPETITION

<u>Number</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
0-3	13.0	13.1	13.1
4-8	<u>87.0</u>	<u>86.9</u>	<u>86.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(23)	(61)	(84)

$\chi^2=0.12$ ;  $P=.72$ ;  $df=1$

NUMBER OF TEAMS BETTER THAN THE RESPONDENTS' TEAM

<u>Number</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
0-1	66.7	62.7	63.8
2-8	<u>33.3</u>	<u>37.3</u>	<u>36.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(21)	(59)	(80)

$\chi^2=0.00$ ;  $P \leq .95$ ;  $df=1$

RANK OF TEAM AT END OF SENIOR YEAR

<u>Rank</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Top Ten	62.5	48.4	52.3
Below Top Ten	<u>37.5</u>	<u>51.6</u>	<u>47.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(24)	(62)	(86)

$X^2=0.87$ ;  $P \leq .35$ ;  $df=1$

HOW ATHLETES ATTAINED INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL

<u>How Attained Information</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Family Members	25.0	42.9	38.6
During Recruitment	<u>75.0</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>61.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(20)	(63)	(83)

$X^2=1.35$ ;  $P=.24$ ;  $df=1$



SUMMARY OF PEOPLE THAT INFLUENCED ATHLETES TO ATTEND COLLEGE

<u>Number of People</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
One	62.5	69.4	68.2
Two	37.5	13.9	18.2
Three	0.0	11.1	9.1
Four	0.0	2.8	2.3
Five or More	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>2.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(8)	(36)	(44)

$X^2=3.38$ ;  $P\leq .49$ ;  $df=4$

ATHLETES VISITED BY COACHES

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Visited	80.0	80.3	80.2
Not Visited	<u>20.0</u>	<u>19.7</u>	<u>19.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=0.068$ ;  $P=.79$ ;  $df=1$

PHONE CALLS BY COACHES TO ATHLETES

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Called	80.0	85.7	84.4
Not Called	<u>20.0</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>15.6</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(15)	(49)	(64)

$\chi^2=0.016$ ;  $P=.89$ ;  $df=1$

ATHLETES CONTACTED BY FOOTBALL PLAYERS

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contacted	24.0	36.4	33.0
Not Contacted	<u>76.0</u>	<u>63.6</u>	<u>67.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=0.75$ ;  $P=.38$ ;  $df=1$

ATHLETES CONTACTED BY ALUMNI

	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Contacted	32.0	50.0	45.1
Not Contacted	<u>68.0</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>54.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$X^2=1.70$ ;  $P=.19$ ;  $df=1$

ATHLETES CONTACTED BY FRIENDS

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contacted	20.0	42.4	36.3
Not Contacted	<u>80.0</u>	<u>57.6</u>	<u>63.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=3.03$ ;  $P=.08$ ;  $df=1$

ATHLETES RECEIVING WRITTEN MATERIAL

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Received Written Material	52.0	66.7	62.6
Did Not Receive Written Material	<u>48.0</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>37.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=1.09$ ;  $P<.29$ ;  $df=1$

SUMMARY OF WAYS ATHLETES WERE CONTACTED FOR RECRUITMENT

<u>Number of Ways</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
1-4	63.6	51.7	54.9
5 or more	<u>36.4</u>	<u>48.3</u>	<u>45.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(22)	(60)	(82)

$\chi^2=0.51$ ;  $P \leq .47$ ;  $df=1$



NUMBER OF TIMES VISITED BY COACHES

<u>Number</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
1-3	55.0	35.2	40.5
4-5	<u>45.0</u>	<u>64.8</u>	<u>59.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(20)	(54)	(74)

$\chi^2=1.62$ ;  $P \leq .20$ ;  $df=1$

DISCUSSION OF FOOTBALL BY COACHES WITH ATHLETES DURING RECRUITMENT

	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Football Was Discussed	68.2	76.8	74.4
Football Was Not Discussed	13.6	14.3	14.1
Do Not Remember	<u>18.2</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>11.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(22)	(56)	(78)

$X^2=1.33$ ;  $P \leq .51$ ;  $df=2$

TOPIC OF COACHES' FOOTBALL DISCUSSION

<u>Topic</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Chances of Playing	100.0	73.0	78.3
Position of Play	<u>0.0</u>	<u>27.0</u>	<u>21.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(9)	(37)	(46)

$X^2=1.72$ ;  $P=.18$ ;  $df=1$

DISCUSSION OF SOCIAL LIFE DURING RECRUITMENT

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Social Life Discussed	38.1	51.9	48.0
Social Life Not Discussed	52.4	38.9	42.7
Do Not Remember	<u>9.5</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>9.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(21)	(54)	(75)

$$X^2 = 1.24; P \leq .53; df=2$$

DISCUSSION OF ACADEMIC ASPECTS DURING RECRUITMENT

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Academic Aspects Discussed	72.0	74.2	73.6
Academic Aspects Not Discussed	20.0	24.2	23.1
Do Not Remember	<u>8.0</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>3.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=2.46$ ;  $P \leq .29$ ;  $df=2$

WHETHER ATHLETE VISITED CAMPUS BEFORE SIGNING CONTRACT

	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Visited Campus	76.0	80.3	79.1
Did Not Visit Campus	<u>24.0</u>	<u>19.7</u>	<u>20.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=0.02$ ;  $P=.87$ ;  $df=1$

WHETHER ATHLETES WERE INVITED TO VISIT CAMPUS

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Were Invited	80.0	80.3	80.2
Were Not Invited	<u>20.0</u>	<u>19.7</u>	<u>19.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2=0.06$ ;  $P=.79$ ;  $df=1$

WHETHER ATHLETE WAS MET BY ANYONE ON ARRIVAL

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Met By Someone	80.0	81.8	81.3
Not Met By Anyone	<u>20.0</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>18.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$\chi^2 = 0.01$ ;  $P = .91$ ;  $df = 1$



WHO MET ATHLETE ON ARRIVAL

<u>Person That Met Athlete</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Head Coach	10.0	11.1	10.8
Assistant Coach	70.0	77.8	75.7
An Ex-Athlete	20.0	9.3	12.2
A College Player	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>1.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(20)	(54)	(74)

$X^2=1.88$ ;  $P \leq .59$ ;  $df=3$

ATHLETES GIVEN ROOMMATES

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Given a Roommate	72.0	65.2	67.0
Not Given a Roommate	<u>28.0</u>	<u>34.8</u>	<u>33.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

$X^2=0.13$ ;  $P=.71$ ;  $df=1$

IDENTITY OF ROOMMATE

<u>Type of Roommate</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
KSU Athlete	72.2	60.5	63.9
KSU Coach	0.0	2.3	1.6
Ex-KSU Athlete	0.0	2.3	1.6
Another Visiting Athlete	22.2	32.6	29.5
Do Not Remember	<u>5.6</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>3.3</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(18)	(43)	(61)

$\chi^2=1.97$ ;  $P=.74$ ;  $df=4$

SEX OF ESCORT OF ATHLETE DURING RECRUITMENT

<u>Sex of Escort</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Male	84.2	86.5	85.9
Female	<u>15.8</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>14.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(19)	(52)	(71)

$\chi^2 = 0.01$ ;  $P = .89$ ;  $df = 1$

WHO ATHLETES MET DURING RECRUITMENT

A. Athletes That Met Faculty During Recruitment

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Met Faculty	48.0	59.1	56.0
Did Not Meet Faculty	<u>52.0</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>44.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

B. Athletes Who Met Other Visiting Athletes During Recruitment

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Met Other Athletes	76.0	80.3	79.1
Did Not Meet Other Athletes	<u>24.0</u>	<u>19.7</u>	<u>20.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

C. Athletes That Met Coaches Of Other Sports During Recruitment

	Race of Athlete		
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Met Other Coaches	68.0	75.8	73.6
Did Not Meet Other Coaches	<u>32.0</u>	<u>24.2</u>	<u>26.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

D. Athletes That Met Administrators During Recruitment

	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Met Administrators	48.0	57.6	54.9
Did Not Meet Administrators	<u>52.0</u>	<u>42.4</u>	<u>45.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

E. Athletes That Met Alumni During Recruitment

	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Met Alumni	12.0	27.3	23.1
Did Not Meet Alumni	<u>88.0</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>76.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(66)	(91)

A.  $X^2=0.51$ ;  $P\leq .47$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=0.02$ ;  $P\leq .87$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=0.23$ ;  $P\leq .62$ ;  $df=1$

D.  $X^2=0.34$ ;  $P\leq .55$ ;  $df=1$

E.  $X^2=1.59$ ;  $P\leq .20$ ;  $df=1$

RESIDENCE OF ATHLETES

<u>Type of Residence</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Athletic Dorm	100.0	98.4	98.9
Private Home	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(64)	(89)

$X^2=0.24$ ;  $P\leq .62$ ;  $df=1$

ROOMMATES

<u>Race of Roommate</u>	<u>Race of Athlete</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Black	100.0	1.6	28.2
White	0.0	95.2	69.4
Brown	0.0	1.6	1.2
No Roommate	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>1.2</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(23)	(62)	(85)

$X^2=80.14$ ;  $P \leq .00$ ;  $df=3$



HOW ATHLETES RATED EDUCATION AS A REASON FOR PLAYING FOOTBALL

<u>Rating</u>	Race of Athlete		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
First	79.2	53.2	60.5
Second	4.2	25.8	19.8
Third	16.7	11.3	12.8
Fourth	0.0	6.5	4.7
Fifth	0.0	1.6	1.2
Sixth	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>1.2</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(24)	(62)	(86)

$\chi^2=8.73$ ;  $P=.12$ ;  $df=5$

MAJORS OF ATHLETES

<u>Major</u>	Race of Athletes		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
Agriculture	8.0	23.0	18.6
Professional	4.0	21.3	16.3
Arts & Sciences	44.0	24.6	30.2
Education	4.0	0.0	1.2
Business	20.0	14.8	16.3
General	<u>20.0</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>17.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(25)	(61)	(86)

$\chi^2=10.47$ ;  $P \leq .06$ ;  $df=5$

Percentage of Athletes By Race and Their High School Football Experiences

A. Number of Years Played on Varsity at Large Schools (Graduating class 490-above)

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	8.3	38.1	31.5
3-4	<u>91.7</u>	<u>61.9</u>	<u>68.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(12)	(42)	(54)

B. Number of Years Played on First Team

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	16.7	54.8	46.3
3-4	<u>83.3</u>	<u>45.2</u>	<u>53.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(12)	(42)	(54)

C. Number of Years Lettered

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	30.0	50.0	38.9
3-4	<u>70.0</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>61.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(10)	(8)	(18)

A.  $X^2=2.57$ ;  $P=.10$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=4.02$ ;  $P=.04$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=7.82$ ;  $P=.001$ ;  $df=1$

Team Athletes Played on at K.S.U.  
Controlling for Years Played on Varsity, First Team,  
and Years Lettered in High School

A. Three-Four Years on Varsity

<u>Team Played On</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Varsity	81.8	52.3	62.1
Junior Varsity	<u>18.2</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>37.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(22)	(44)	(66)

B. Three-Four Years on First Team

<u>Team Played On</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Varsity	82.4	54.5	64.0
Junior Varsity	<u>17.6</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>36.0</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(17)	(33)	(50)

C. Three-Four Years Lettered

<u>Team Played On</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
Varsity	81.0	52.8	64.3
Junior Varsity	<u>19.0</u>	<u>45.7</u>	<u>35.7</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(21)	(35)	(56)

A.  $X^2=4.25$ ;  $P=.03$ ;  $df=1$

B.  $X^2=2.65$ ;  $P=.10$ ;  $df=1$

C.  $X^2=2.98$ ;  $P=.08$ ;  $df=1$

Percentage of Athletes by Race Who Were Recruited by K.S.U.  
and Other Colleges  
and Number of Ways They Were Recruited

A. Number of Years Athletes Played on Varsity in High School, Controlling for Number of Schools that Recruited Them

1. One-Eight Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	14.3	31.4	28.6
3-4	<u>85.7</u>	<u>68.6</u>	<u>71.4</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(7)	(35)	(42)

2. Nine-Twelve Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	5.9	22.2	15.9
3-4	<u>94.1</u>	<u>77.8</u>	<u>84.1</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(17)	(27)	(44)

B. Number of Years Athletes Played on Varsity in High School, Controlling for Number of Ways They Were Recruited

1. One-Four Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	0.0	22.6	15.6
3-4	<u>100.0</u>	<u>77.4</u>	<u>84.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(14)	(31)	(45)

## 2. Five-Eight Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	12.5	37.9	32.4
3-4	<u>87.5</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>67.6</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(8)	(29)	(37)

## C. Number of Years Athletes Played on First Team in High School, Controlling for Number of Schools that Recruited Them

## 1. One-Eight Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	14.3	45.7	40.5
3-4	<u>85.7</u>	<u>54.3</u>	<u>59.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(7)	(35)	(42)

## 2. Nine-Twelve Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	35.3	48.1	43.2
3-4	<u>64.7</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>56.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(17)	(27)	(44)

D. Number of Years Athletes Played on First Team in High School, Controlling for Number of Ways They Were Recruited

1. One-Four Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	21.4	35.5	31.1
3-4	<u>78.6</u>	<u>64.5</u>	<u>68.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(14)	(31)	(45)

2. Five-Eight Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	27.5	65.5	59.5
3-4	<u>62.5</u>	<u>34.5</u>	<u>40.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(8)	(29)	(37)

E. Number of Years Athletes Lettered in High School, Controlling for Number of Schools That Recruited Them

1. One-Eight Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	0.0	45.7	38.1
3-4	<u>100.0</u>	<u>54.3</u>	<u>61.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(7)	(35)	(42)

## 2. Nine-Twelve Schools

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	17.6	37.0	29.5
3-4	<u>82.4</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>70.5</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(17)	(27)	(44)

## F. Number of Years Athletes Lettered in High School, Controlling for Number of Ways They Were Recruited

## 1. One-Four Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	0.0	32.3	22.2
3-4	<u>100.0</u>	<u>67.7</u>	<u>77.8</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(14)	(31)	(45)

## 2. Five-Eight Ways

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Race</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Total</u>
1-2	37.5	58.6	54.1
3-4	<u>62.5</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>45.9</u>
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(8)	(29)	(37)

- A. 1.  $X^2_2=0.21$ ;  $P=.64$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=1.03$ ;  $P=.30$ ;  $df=1$   
 B. 1.  $X^2_2=2.22$ ;  $P=.13$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=0.87$ ;  $P=.35$ ;  $df=1$   
 C. 1.  $X^2_2=1.26$ ;  $P=.26$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=0.27$ ;  $P=.59$ ;  $df=1$   
 D. 1.  $X^2_2=0.35$ ;  $P=.55$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=1.04$ ;  $P=.30$ ;  $df=1$   
 E. 1.  $X^2_2=3.41$ ;  $P=.06$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=1.06$ ;  $P=.30$ ;  $df=1$   
 F. 1.  $X^2_2=4.09$ ;  $P=.04$ ;  $df=1$   
 2.  $X^2_2=0.43$ ;  $P=.50$ ;  $df=1$



BLACK ATHLETES ON A  
PREDOMINANTLY WHITE CAMPUS

by

ARTHUR S. EVANS

B.A., Delaware State College, 1973

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1975

This thesis explores relations between and compares situations of black and white football players at Kansas State University during the 1974 playing season. It proposes that white and black athletes go thru predominantly white colleges differently. Black athletes on such campuses have different experiences from whites because of two contexts; the general problem blacks experience in the U.S.A.; and specific problems blacks experience in predominately white schools.

Collegiate athletes experience four social processes during their years of college through receiving a bachelor's degree; (1) recruitment, (2) inter-collegiate competition and team associations, (3) education and social activities on campus, and (4) termination of the college career. Concentration is centered on the first and second social processes because these distinguish between collegiate athletes and other college students.

It was found that black and white athletes differed in each stage. For example, black recruits appeared to be more qualified for college football than were whites; white visitors to the campus engaged in more social activities than did blacks; as members of the football team, blacks were overrepresented as stars, but occupied fewer leadership and central positions than did whites; black and white football players were socially segregated when off the playing field. Finally, blacks were scholastically weaker than whites.