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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to examine what effect Proposition 48 has had on black representation on NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football teams. A one-page questionnaire was mailed to the compliance coordinator at each of the 106 colleges and universities participating in men's basketball and football at the NCAA Division IA level from 1985-86 to 1990-91. The questionnaire contained two charts and one open-ended question. The questionnaire was designed to identify any change in black representation on football and basketball teams since the inception of Proposition 48. This was done by comparing the final year prior to the introduction of Proposition 48 with each of the 5 succeeding years. Responses were received from 45 of the colleges and universities. However, due to incomplete information, and several declinations the data was computed on only 19 responses. The data was analyzed through a statistical test of differences between two populations at a .05 confidence level. Analysis indicated only a total of 4 significantly positive Z scores out of a possibility of 205 scores. This confirmed the belief of the researcher that Proposition
48 did not have a significantly negative effect on the representation of black student athletes participating in football and basketball at NCAA Division IA colleges and universities.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the early 1980's the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the governing board of college athletics, became the subject of much public scrutiny. The focal point of this criticism was a concern that institutions of higher learning were jeopardizing the academic integrity of their universities in pursuit of the financial rewards of commercialized college football and basketball. Indicative of public sentiments were comments from Howard Cosell, a sportscaster, and Roger Noll, an economist. Cosell stated that "many of our college athletes are illiterates parading as college students" (Cosell, 1991, p.ii). In the book 'Rethinking College Athletics', Noll was quoted as having said "the problems of intercollegiate athletics are fundamentally economic in character. Division IA football and Division I basketball are big businesses" (Andre & Janez, 1990, p.197). Meanwhile, educators also began to express their concerns that the NCAA governing board was encouraging its member institutions to establish two separate sets of academic standards; one for the regular student body and another less demanding one for student-athletes (Underwood, 1984).

Abysmally low graduation rates were being publicized, most notably for athletes participating in the revenue producing sports of basketball and football. According to the 1988, Academic Compilation Report by the NCAA, approximately 1/4 of the NCAA Division IA football programs and nearly 1/2 of the NCAA IA basketball programs were reportedly graduating athletes at an alarming rate of 25% or less (U.S.GAO, 1989). According to former professional basketball player and Congressman Tom McMillen, the current situation facing college athletics is not unlike
the situation confronted in 1905, by President Theodore Roosevelt who appointed an advisory council, which evolved into the NCAA, to address the alarming problem of football related injuries and deaths. At that time President Roosevelt threatened to abolish football unless the existing problems were corrected. (Congressional Hearings, Opening statement Tom McMillen) Similarly, today Congressman McMillen stated that "too many athletes are leaving college without the proper training and education to compete in the world marketplace." (McMillen, 1992, p. 81) He also stated that if the NCAA membership is unable to ensure that athletics are kept in a proper perspective, congress would intervene by enacting legislation to correct the problem (McMillen, 1992). Congressmen have proposed bills such as the Student-Athlete Right to Know Act and the Collegiate Athletic Reform Act aimed at legislating college athletics if the NCAA governing board is incapable of reforming the current status quo of college athletics.

Concerned with the inadequate academic preparation and performance of the student athletes attending their member institutions, the NCAA director decided to form a committee to address these problems. The NCAA director then appointed a presidents' council to review the NCAA's current policies, to make suggestions in order to correct the existing problems, and to reform college athletics. As a result of their investigation into the NCAA's governing policies, the presidents' council recommended an increase in the academic eligibility requirements. Thus, at their annual conference in San Diego, in 1983, the NCAA governing body voted to adopt a highly controversial piece of legislation known as proposition 48 or Bylaw 5-1-(j) (Crowl, 1983). Proposition 48 declared that, beginning in 1986, in order to qualify for athletic aid and competition in their freshman year, athletes would be required to meet
a list of academic eligibility standards according to NCAA rules. Among these standards was a fixed score on a standardized college entrance exam. This qualification immediately gained intense criticism from black educators, who labeled the legislation as "patently racist" (Crowl, 1983).

Opponents of Proposition 48 have also gone so far as to indicate that since blacks virtually dominated college basketball between the years of 1976 to 1983, that this legislation was enacted to ensure that whites would again dominate the basketball courts in 1986 (Lapchick, 1988). Presidents of primarily black institutions stated that black athletes would not be able to meet the established standard. Black supporters claimed that standardized test, such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Test (ACT), are culturally and racially biased and do not accurately predict the academic success of college students. In fact, Gregory Anrig, the president of the Educational Testing Service has even voiced his concern, claiming that "the use of a fixed cutoff score on the national standardized tests will have effects that may not have been fully realized before this decision was reached" (Zingg, 1983, p.8).

According to an NCAA study released in 1991, if the proposition requirements had been imposed on the 1984-85 freshman class, 62.5% of the black athletes would have been ineligible due to standardized test scores as opposed to only 11.2% of white athletes (Lederman, 1991).

Research also indicates that 58% of black football and basketball players score between 400-752 on the SAT while only 19% of non black football and basketball players score in this same range (NCAA, 1989). Similarly, 57% of black football and basketball players score between 0 -14 on the ACT, whereas only 22% of non blacks score in this same range (NCAA, 1989). Also in support of racism, the opponents of
proposition 48 pointed to the fact that all the members of the panel chosen to establish the standards for proposition 48 were white.

On the other hand, proponents of proposition 48 such as Don Canham, Athletic Director at the University of Michigan, claim that measures had to be taken in order to reform college athletics. Canham accepts the concerns of black officials over the inequality of standardized test scores, but views proposition 48 from a different perspective. He begins by pointing out that proposition 48 does not prevent non-qualifiers from attending school, it merely prohibits them from playing as freshmen. Canham also comments that "they're assuming the black athlete can't meet a challenge, I think most of them will" (Shook, 1983).

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect proposition 48 has had on black representation on NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football teams.

Research Question

1. Did the introduction of Proposition 48 lead to a decrease in the representation of black student athletes on NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football teams?

Research Hypothesis

Based on the recent studies and existing literature, a hypothesis for the research question was proposed. This hypothesis was:

1. HO: The institution of Proposition 48 did not have a significant effect on the representation of black student athletes. The black representation in the 1985-86
school year did not differ significantly from black representation in the 5 years immediately following.

Significance of the Study

Upon enactment of Proposition 48 at the 1983 NCAA convention, black educators immediately began denouncing the new legislation establishing the minimum requirements on standardized test. Several claimed racism, and indicated that Proposition 48 was nothing more than a move by administrators and alumni of predominantly white colleges and universities to reduce the number of black participants in intercollegiate sports (Hansen, 1983).

In an attempt to determine what effect Proposition 48 has had on black representation in men's basketball and football at NCAA Division IA institutions, this study compared black representation in men's basketball and football one year prior to the institution of Proposition 48 with the 5 years immediately following the new rule.

Assumptions

An inherent risk with the use of a questionnaire as a measuring instrument for collecting data is the sincerity, honesty, and accuracy of the responses given by the respondents.

Limitations

The NCAA, through its policies and procedures limits the total number of scholarships its membership colleges and universities can offer per sport, 95 for football and 15 for basketball. This therefore reduces the total number of potential subjects in the study. Similarly, the number of schools competing in both men's
basketball and football at the NCAA Division IA level is limited due to certain standards and classifications established by the NCAA.

**Delimitations**

This study comprised only those 106 institutions offering an NCAA Division IA football and basketball program.

This study was restricted to only scholarship athletes participating in men's basketball and football.

**Summary**

Upon the commencement of Proposition 48 a wide variety of projections were made as the potential effects of the new legislation. Many have since been validated, others have proven to be inconclusive, while others appear to have been inaccurate suppositions of Proposition 48.

This study attempted to statistically analyze the claim that proposition 48 would reduce black representation in men's basketball and football and ensure an increase in the white representation in these sports.

This study was designed to obtain raw data through the use of a questionnaire. The data obtained was processed and statistically analyzed to determine the extent to which Proposition 48 has effected black representation in men's basketball and football programs at the NCAA Division IA level.
Chapter 2

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to establish a premise for the origins of Proposition 48 and to provide a comprehensive analysis of the controversy and debate surrounding it. The chapter begins with a brief introduction to the purpose and structure of the NCAA, succeeded by an array of alarming and objectionable statistics that prompted the introduction of Proposition 48. The chapter concludes with a thorough explanation of Proposition 48 and a critical examination of the steadfast viewpoints and arguments of its most adamant proponents and opponents.

Review of Literature

The NCAA was derived from the American Council on Education (ACE) appointed in 1905, by then President Theodore Roosevelt in order to correct the existing problems in intercollegiate football. The primary purpose of this ACE was to establish a proper perspective for college football by implementing a systematic structure of self governance or accountability. Since that time the primary mission and governing responsibilities of the NCAA have not changed too dramatically. In fact, in the 1990-91 NCAA policy manual the fundamental policy of the NCAA remains that:

"A basic purpose of this Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body and, by so doing, retain a clear line of demarcation between intercollegiate athletics and professional sports." (NCAA Manual, 1990, p. 1)
Although the primary purpose of the NCAA has not changed dramatically, the governing regulations and membership have changed and grown immensely. The NCAA has become the largest athletic organization that administers intercollegiate sports programs, currently presiding over 1,000 members (USGAO, 1989, p.10).

In order to account for the vast differences in the NCAA membership institutions, specifically the disparity in size and athletic offerings, the NCAA has established different levels of competition. In accordance with Article 20 (division membership) in the NCAA Manual "each active member institution and member conference is designated as a member of Division I, II, III for certain legislative and competitive purposes" (NCAA, 1990, p. 279). For the purpose of this study I will concentrate only on the 106 institutions currently participating in NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football.

The reason for this myopic focus is two fold. First, basketball and football are the most widely publicized and visible collegiate sports; and secondly, these two sports are the primary revenue producing sports and the most commercialized of all intercollegiate sports.

In order to gauge the public's demand for college athletics broadcast networks rely on television ratings. As evidence of the increasing popularity and visibility of college athletics, sports business writer Keith Dunnavant notes that "in 1983 there were 24 college football games on television and in 1986 there were 66 games on television" (Sperber, 1990, p. 52). Also, in 1986 CBS sports president Peter Lund was quoted as saying that he saw "no end to the proliferation of televised college basketball in the near future" (Sperber, 1990, p.56). According to Murray Sperber (1990) the 1988 Rose Bowl was seen in nearly 15,000,000 homes nationwide (p.45).
Recently the Columbia Broadcast System estimated that 51.4 million people watched all or part of the 1994 NCAA basketball championship game, which tied it as the seventh highest rated basketball telecast ever (Press, 1994).

In direct proportion to increased public demand and television appearances are the revenues generated by NCAA Division IA colleges and universities. Due in part to the revenues generated through television appearances, NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football teams have become the primary sources for generating revenue within intercollegiate athletics programs at their respective institutions. According to an article in U.S. News and World Reports "many schools rely on football and basketball teams to earn enough revenue to pay for virtually all of their sports programs" (Sanoff & Johnson, 1986, p.63). Roger Noll, a noted economist, in the book Rethinking College Athletics, indicates that "the profit from football and men's basketball cover the administrative cost of the department of athletics, the deficits of other intercollegiate sports, the cost of intramural programs, and some academic activities related to sports" (Andre & Janez, 1990, p.204).

In a report detailing the current financial problems existing in intercollegiate athletic programs by Thelin and Wiseman (1990), they indicated that the average state university competing in NCAA Division IA basketball and football would possess a 15 million dollar operating budget in fiscal year 1988-89. Not surprisingly, basketball and football programs would be the primary revenue producers, generating nearly 75% of the revenues (11 million dollars). Further indication of universities' reliance on the revenues produced by football and basketball was reported by Thelin and Wiseman (1990) who state that the university expected their football program alone to fund 80% of the entire varsity sports program.
In order to gain national exposure and to receive television revenues athletic departments must field competitive football and basketball programs and achieve a certain level of success. Statistics indicate that this has lead colleges and universities to have a general tendency toward lowering the college acceptance standards for student athletes participating within these revenue producing sports. This ultimately translates into lower graduation rates for football and basketball players when compared to student athletes participating in other intercollegiate sports.

A report released by the American Institute ResearchCenter indicates that between 1/4 and 1/2 of all Division IA football and basketball players enrolling in the fall of 1985 had a composite score between 400 - 752 on the SAT or between 0 - 14 on the ACT (AIRC, 1989). In addition a 1987-88 study of Academic Performance by Lang and Rossi indicated that being a male student athlete participating in a more competitive NCAA Division I conference have a significantly increased likelihood of being in a low academic performance group (Lang & Rossi, 1991).

A further analysis of acceptance standards and academic performance shows a significant difference between white and black athletes. The mean SAT score for black football players is 740 and the mean ACT score is 14, whereas the mean SAT score for whites was 890 and the mean ACT was 19 (AIRC, 1989). In the year prior to the institution of Proposition 48 it is estimated that about 45% of the current black football and basketball players in predominantly white division I institutions scored below 700 on the SAT while 54% scored below 15 on the ACT (AIRC, 1989). Another result of the Lang and Rossi (1991) study indicated that being black (versus white) and competing in intercollegiate football and basketball (versus other sports)
significantly increased the likelihood of being in the low academic performance group and decreased the likelihood of being in the high academic group.

Lower academic performance ultimately translated into lower graduation rates, as reflected in two separate studies, one conducted by USA Today which indicated NCAA Division I institutions graduated only 36% of minority players (Brown, 1991). In a report covering student athletes entering college during the 1982-83 school year the United States General Accounting Office reported that nearly 1/2 of the Division IA institutions reported graduation rates of less than 25% for basketball, while nearly 3/4 of the schools reported graduation rates for football players of under 50%. Athletes participating in all other intercollegiate sports graduated at a rate of approximately 55 percent (USGAO, 1989). They also noted that two major competitive conferences reported graduation rates of an abysmal 13 and 14% (Brady, 1991).

Due to these unflattering statistics which existed in intercollegiate athletics, university presidents began to express their concern for the academic values and the integrity of their institutions. This concern led ACE to form an Ad Hoc Committee for the purpose of reestablishing academic integrity within college athletics. In its approach to reforming intercollegiate athletics, the ACE committee decided to focus mainly on the establishment of minimum academic standards for participation in intercollegiate athletics. After two meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee decided to seek NCAA rule changes which would make initial eligibility more difficult for high school seniors to attain. At the NCAA conference in January 1983, the majority of the NCAA Division IA membership institutions voted to accept Rule 5-1-J (Proposition 48) to go into effect August 1, 1986. Proposition 48 stated that in order for any
student-athlete to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate sports at any NCAA Division IA school they must first meet the following criteria:

1. Graduate from high school with at least a 2.0 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale) in a core curriculum of 11 academic courses including at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science, and two in natural or physical science.

2. Have attained a 700 combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or a 15 on the American College Test (ACT) (NCAA Manual, 1990).

The adoption of Proposition 48 established a virtual dichotomy. Athletes, coaches, and administrators either endorsed Proposition 48 or they abhorred it. The most adamant and outspoken in opposition of Proposition 48 were administrators of historically black colleges and universities. Perhaps the harshest and most critical comments were made by Joseph Johnson, the president of Grambling University, who suggested that "it is a racist rule that was instituted by racist people intent on denying black kids an education" (Farrell, 1987, p.44) and Jesse Stone, former dean of the Southern Law School in Baton Rouge, who referred to the new standards as being "patently racist" (Greene, 1984, p.112). In support of their argument against Proposition 48, opponents based their case on three basic charges: (1) that a standardized test requirement would have a disproportionate affect on blacks, (2) that no blacks were involved in the decision making process, and (3) that this was a concerted effort to minimize the black representation on athletic fields.
Edward Forte, the chancellor at North Carolina A&T, expressed most candidly the primary complaint of black educators regarding Proposition 48 claiming "that because supporters of higher standards had insisted on including test scores, the question had unfortunately become a black-white issue" (Crowl, 1983, p.20). Mr. Forte, referring to the minimum requirement set on the standardized tests (SAT and ACT), also stated that "there is evidence that students from upper income families sometimes score 100 points higher on these tests than those from disadvantaged backgrounds" (Jesudason, 1989, p.14). The objectivity of standardized tests has always been questioned, and suspected of being racially biased. In fact Mr. Anrig, the president of the Educational Testing Service, the service that develops and administers both the SAT and ACT, opposed the requirement of minimum standardized test scores. He claimed that "prop 48 has an impact that is especially adverse to black students" (Anrig, 1985, p.5). Frederick S. Humphries, the president of Tennessee State University, also concurs with Anrig by claiming that "test scores established by Proposition 48 excludes a disproportionate number of black athletes from first year eligibility. Fifty-five percent of the black males who take the SAT score below 700 and seventy percent score below 15 on the ACT" (Humphries, 1983, p.3).

According to the College Testing Board the average combined verbal and math scores of white high school students between 1976 and 1982 ranged from 924 to 944, while the average combined verbal and math scores for blacks during the same period ranged from 686 to 707 (Farrell, 1983). In a 1987 survey conducted by the NCAA, of 424 athletes who met the core point average and core curriculum requirements but fell short on standardized test scores, 104 were white and 299 were black (Jesudason, 1989). Tom Osborne, the head football coach at the University of Nebraska, with a
Ph. D in educational psychology, explains such disparity in scores by pointing out that a student from a culturally impoverished environment will tend to score 100 points lower than a student of the same intelligence who comes from a more affluent background. (Staff, 1986, p.6) John Warfield proclaims his similar perspective of standardized test by stating "that college entrance examinations are nothing more or nothing less than measure's of ones socio-educational experience" (Warfield, 1984, p.3). According to a report by the American Institute for Research Center there is extensive research literature indicating that socioeconomic status can have a strong effect on a student's performance on college entrance exams as well as a student's success in college (AIRC, 1989). In addition to questions of cultural bias, there are many educators and administrators who do not view standardized test scores as valid predictors of academic success. After analyzing athletes at the University of Michigan Timothy Waters and Donald Smith reported that "the only predictor of college success and a weak one at that, is a high GPA of 2.0 or better" (Walter, 1986, p.41).

On the other hand, are proponents of Proposition 48 like H. D. Perkins claims "it is an insult to blacks to complain about test bias" (Perkins, 1983). It his belief that blacks can meet the requirements of the new proposition 48. In echoing similar sentiments Clarence Pendleton, the late chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, responds to the claims of racism by commenting "that every time there is talk about raising standards, someone cries racism, as if its unthinkable that black students could respond to new standards. I know that athletes are capable of meeting academic requirements" (Pendleton, 1988, p.3). In his assessment of the racial overtones of Proposition 48, Eddie Johnson the head football coach at Grambling, goes even further by stating that "athletes have had three years to meet the new
standards. Also they are not banned for life, just until they meet the academic standards" (Pendleton, 1988, p.3). In addition, Penn State University head football coach Joe Paterno suggests "that black athletes are being sold short by critics of the new rules, and that the effective date of the new rules will give black athletes who desire to participate in college athletics an opportunity to bring themselves into compliance with the new requirements" (Greene, 1984, p.120). Both Johnson and Paterno believe that rather than leave black athletes ineligible, Proposition 48 will motivate blacks to rise to the challenge, and virtually negate the disproportionate effects that existed prior to August, 1986. In support of their decision to institute minimum standardized test scores the NCAA cited their own study which indicated that equally weighted combination of core grade-point averages and test scores provide the single best prediction of graduation regardless of race (NCAA, 1991).

The second issue that irritated black administrators and coaches regarding proposition 48 was the disregard for black representation and input into the process of development of proposition 48. Joseph Johnson was quoted as saying "it was thrust upon us; none of us were included in any of the debates about the proposition" (Staff, 1988, p.4). According to Linda S. Greene, an associate law professor at the University of Oregon, there seems to be no dispute that the Ad Hoc Committee had no black representation while it formulated the proposals for the NCAA convention. Apparently the president of a historically black college was admitted to the committee two weeks prior to the NCAA convention. It appears as though the late invitation to the president of a historically black college indicates it could have been an afterthought of the committee to insure black representation (Greene, 1984). Jesse Stone claims he had first learned of the new proposals a couple of months prior to the
NCAA convention and complained to ACE and the NCAA. He claims ACE sent a representative to the black colleges' convention to explain the proposals. At the convention black colleges expressed their opposition to the new proposals and offered suggestions of alternatives, which resulted in no change. Jesse Stone claims that the Ad Hoc Committee must have known "the effects of an arbitrary rule like the SAT along racial lines in advance" (Greene, 1984, p.117). He believed that disregard for the knowledge of the disproportionate effect standardized tests have historically had on blacks and their inaction to address it leads him with no other alternative than to conclude that the new proposal was motivated by racism.

In their explanation of the development of the proposal committee, co-chairman Bok and Peltason categorically deny charges of racism and stress academic integrity as justification for the proposal. According to Sheldon Hackney, a member of the committee and president of the University of Pennsylvania, "the Ad Hoc Committee thought about the differential effect on black schools and knew there would be those who would charge that the proposal was a racist proposal, so the committee felt very carefully about doing something that would elicit that charge and felt that it was good for everybody and it was worth going through the argument" (Greene, 1984, p.118). Also in defense of the proposal, Dr. Loyd Hackley, a former chancellor of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, in contradiction to his black college colleagues stated that "this action is long overdue and does not go far enough" (Clark, 1986, p.166). According to Hackley, "whenever a student-athlete is admitted to a Division I school and has not demonstrated the academic competencies normally predictive of academic success for Division I student-athletes, then that student athlete
should not participate in athletics, particularly in the freshman year" (Clark, 1986, p.166).

In their third and seemingly most untenable claim, black educators and administrators view proposition 48 as an attempt to eliminate black domination of college sports. In the words of Jesse Stone, "proposition 48 is an attempt to soothe a white conscious who wish to return college athletics to a white dominated sport by using academic standards" (Stone, 1983, p.13). Due to the circumstances surrounding the institution of Proposition 48, it is Jesse Stone's belief that colleges and universities are simply mandating academic requirements as a sunscreen to shield their ultimate goal of eliminating blacks from college athletics. Joseph Johnson expressed a similar opinion by stating that "a message has been sent to black athletes across this country... there's just too many of you on America's athletic teams" (Greene, 1984, p.118). Edward Forte even became more explicit and specific in his assessment or description of the general purpose of Proposition 48 when he commented that "the bottom line is the color of the majority of the kids who take the floor in the final four" (Greene, 1984, p.117).

Preliminary reports support the claim that a disproportionate number of blacks have been effected. According to a report released by the NCAA of the 424 student athletes effected by proposition 48 in its initial year (1986) 299 were black and 104 were white (Farrell, 1987). Other NCAA reports indicate that in 1984-85 blacks comprised nearly 42% of the NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football programs as opposed to 36% in 1986. Meanwhile white males comprised nearly 58% of the same population in 1984-85 and 64 percent in 1986 (NCAA, 1993). William Allen, a professor of government, views these disproportionate effects of Proposition.
48 as lost opportunities for blacks. He states that "if a superb athlete, otherwise a weak student, gained nothing more than opportunities for mobility and networking he would otherwise missed altogether, his college career would have been a net benefit" (Allen, 1988, p.22). Mr. Allen is not alone in his belief, Joseph Johnson also believes "that a person will benefit even if he or she spend only one day on a college campus" (Staff, 1988, p.19). In direct response to the claim of lost opportunities is the testimony of several black college athletes who were ineligible to participate in college athletics their freshman year due to proposition 48 requirements. DePaul basketball player Curtis Jackson expresses his views of proposition 48 positively by stating, "I have grown a lot; I'm hungry and the experience has been positive" (Lapchick, 1989, p.17). Rumeal Robinson was "initially crushed and that he thought of not playing basketball competitively for the first time since seventh grade", but then went on to have a successful college career (Lapchick, 1989, p.17).

Summary

The NCAA governing body felt compelled to address a disturbing trend developing in intercollegiate athletics that was in conflict with NCAA policies. A plethora of statistical data began to surface indicating that student-athletes competing in the revenue producing sports of football and basketball at the larger NCAA member institutions were enrolling athletes with little regard for their academic qualifications. Graduation rates for basketball and football players at major institutions were appallingly low and universally lower than the graduation rates of all other college sports teams. In an attempt to correct this disturbing trend, the NCAA governing board adopted Proposition 48, establishing initial eligibility standards. Due to the
inclusion of minimum scores on standardized test, Proposition 48 came under intense scrutiny. Opponents claimed the new legislation would have a disproportionate effect on blacks, a concern that was validated by the statistics that indicated that blacks do historically score lower on standardized test than whites, primarily due to their socio-economic status. Opponents also argued that Proposition 48 was thrust upon them without their input. In review of the developmental stages of the new legislation indicates that blacks were in fact excluded. In their final argument opponents claimed that Proposition 48 would eliminate blacks from participating in intercollegiate athletics. The preliminary reports indicate that black participation in intercollegiate athletics has dropped, and the purpose of this study is to further deliniate to what extent Proposition 48 has effected black participation in intercollegiate athletics.
Chapter 3
Methodology
Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine what effect "Proposition 48" had on black representation on NCAA Division IA men's basketball and football teams.

Subjects

My subjects consisted of the 106 colleges and universities participating in men's basketball and football at the NCAA Division I A level from 1985-86 to 1990-91. (Appendix A)

Instrument

The measuring instrument used to determine the enrollment patterns of the universities was a one page questionnaire (Appendix B). The questionnaire was sent to each of the 106 NCAA Division IA Universities participating in men's basketball and football (Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of two charts and one open-ended question. The first chart includes a race differentiated chart of an annual total of scholarship athletes participating in men's basketball and football on year prior to the institution of Proposition 48, and the five years immediately following. The second chart was a race differentiated chart of the total number of non-qualifying student-athletes enrolled in each of the five years following the introduction of Proposition 48. The open-ended question was used to understand any variances among universities in the total number of scholarships offered. Data was obtained through a direct mailing questionnaire. The direct mailing questionnaire was used since it was the most cost effective and feasible means of collecting the data necessary to complete the study. The questionnaire was sent directly to the compliance coordinator at each institution.
because they are responsible for monitoring the eligibility status of scholarship athletes at their respective institutions.

Procedure

A questionnaire was mailed to the compliance coordinator at each of the 106 colleges and universities, along with a cover letter (Appendix C), and self addressed stamped envelope. Anonymity was guaranteed to each of the universities, but each of the questionnaires was numbered for the sole purpose of follow up mailings. After a three week period of time a follow up postcard was sent to all those universities that had not responded (Appendix D). Following an additional three week period of time a second follow up letter and survey was sent to all of those universities not responding (Appendix E).

Data Analysis

The data collected from the questionnaire was analyzed in the following manner. In regard to the total number of scholarships offered (question #1), the raw data was initially totaled according to sport, race and year. The sports were then analyzed separately, and remained independent throughout the analysis due to the vast difference in total scholarships (basketball 15 and football 95). The raw data was first converted to percentages by race, sport and year. Once the data was converted to percentages, the data was statistical analyzed through a formula used to determine difference between two populations. The year prior to the institution of Proposition 48 (1985-86), served as the base group to which each of the following 5 years of data were compared, (ie. the total number of blacks participating in football in 1986-87 was compared to the total number of blacks participating in football in 1985-86) for each of the individual respondents.
The second question regarding the number of Proposition 48 non-qualifiers (obtained in question three of the questionnaire) were interjected into the individual respondents percentages to identify any significant differences. The third question was used only to explain any variance in scholarship totals from year to year.

Results

A total of 45 responses were received from the 106 Division IA colleges and universities that were solicited through a mail questionnaire. The responses varied from full cooperation, to incomplete data, to institutional policy prohibiting participation in the study. Nineteen of the responses received were properly completed and another six were partially completed. The remaining twenty responses were incomplete due to the following reasons: 14 - insufficient data or records regarding ethnicity prior to 1991, 5 - decline to participate based on institutional policies prohibiting the release of such information, 2 - difficulty accessing information, 2 - military academies offer only academic scholarships. The following analysis will be based on questionnaires received from 19 to 22 responses. The variance in analysis is due to an incomplete set of data for the base year. Therefore, statistical analysis requiring reference to a base year was computed on 19 for football and 22 for basketball. Data containing strictly percentages was computed from data obtained from 19 responses.

The formula used to analyze the statistical significance of the data in this study was a Test of Differences Between two Populations.

Test Statistic: \( Z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}}} \)
In order to determine the significance of this study at a .05 confidence level the determined Z-score critical point of reference was 1.65. Therefore, any computed Z-score of less than or greater than 1.65 would be considered a significant difference. A Z-score was computed for 19 football responses and 22 basketball responses for each of the 5 years following the inception of Proposition 48. This presented a total of 95 potential Z-scores for football and 110 potential Z-scores for basketball. Since the chosen confidence level is .05 the probability of chance alone indicates that approximately 5 out of 100 Z-scores tested will differ from the reference point.

An analysis of football data shows very little difference in the percentages of black participants in the years succeeding the inception of Proposition 48. The total number of Z-scores that differed from the reference point was 13. This indicates that only 13 of the 95 football percentages compared differed significantly from the base year. A more indepth analysis indicates that 10 of the Z-scores were negative, meaning that the percentage of blacks was higher in the years following the introduction of Proposition 48. Conversely, this indicates that only 3 out of the 13 significant scores were a result of a decline in black representation in the 5 years succeeding Proposition 48.

An examination of the basketball data also indicates very little difference in percentage of black participants in each of the 5 years following the introduction of Proposition 48. The total number of Z-scores that proved to be significant in basketball was 9. This provides even less evidence of any negative effect Proposition 48 has had on black representation in basketball. In fact further examination of the the Z-scores shows that 8 of the 9 significant differences were negative, indicating that there is currently a greater representation of blacks than before 1985-86.
A combine 22 significant Z scores out of a potential 210 total Z scores appears to confirm the null hypothesis of this study, which indicates that the institution of Proposition 48 did not have a significant effect on the representation of black student athletes at NCAA Division IA football and basketball programs. In fact, the results indicate that if Proposition 48 had any effect on black representation in football and basketball it was a positive, rather than a negative as originally projected.

An aggregate overview of the percentages also indicates that the percentage of black participants in football basically remained consistent with the base year at 42%, but then increased to 43 and 45% over the final two years. (represented in Appendix F) The percentage of black participants in basketball on the other hand, experienced an incremental increase every year beginning at 54% prior to the inception of Proposition 48 and ending at a high of 63% in 1990. (represented in Appendix G)

Discussion

Due to the limited response to this study, similar reports and literature were sought for comparison purposes. In a review of the literature it is apparent to this researcher that Proposition 48 has had a more profound effect on the percentage of blacks participating in the non-revenue sports than it has on football and basketball. The NCAA reports findings indicating that proposition 48 did have a negative affect on black student athletes. They indicate that "In the last pre-proposition 48 class, the percentage of black participants was 27 percent, and dropped to 23.5 percent with the first Prop 48 class. The most recent report shows the percentage of black participants at 23.4 percent" (NCAA, 1994, p. 16). However, these slight changes in percentages of black participants seems not to appear in the revenue producing sports of football and basketball. This study indicated that there were no significant changes in the
number of black participants in football or basketball in any of the five years immediately following the institution of proposition 48. In fact the percentages of black participants in the years succeeding Proposition 48 exceeded the base percentages within two years of its inception and either continued to increase or remain steady.

In concurrence with the data derived from this study is a review of the raw data pertaining to an asimilar group of colleges and universities from the 1992, 1993, and 1994 NCAA Division I Graduation Rates Reports. These studies provide the enrollment data for the number of student athletes participating in each sport by sex, race and ethnicity. Upon examining the data blacks comprised 47 percent of the football players enrolled in 1991, 49 percent in 1992, and 50 percent in 1993. In basketball there is even a greater representation of blacks, comprising nearly 62 percent of the basketball players enrolled in 1991, 64 percent in 1992, and 63 percent in 1993.

Conclusion

This study began as a quest to determine the true effects of a highly controversial and debateable piece of legislation. When Proposition 48 was introduced in 1983, highly respected educators and intellectuals publicly offered their far differing concerns and projections regarding its potential effect on intercollegiate athletics. Prior to the introduction of Proposition 48, one of the primary arguments made by opponents of the legislation was in regard to its disproportionate negative effect on blacks. Based on the results of this study and others presented, it appears as though many of the concerns regarding Proposition 48 were minimized, while many of the benefits are beginning to be noticed. In regards to the concerns, perhaps a Sports
Illustrated columnist most accurately summarizes the findings of this study by stating that: "Blacks who did not meet Prop 48 requirements were being replaced by blacks who did" (Swift, 1994, p. 88). More importantly though, are the overall positive trends that have begun to take place since the inception of Proposition 48. The academic expectations and performance standards for student athletes were raised and student athletes from all races are meeting the challenge.
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Appendix A

1. University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325
2. University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487
3. University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
4. Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2505
5. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701
6. Arkansas State University, State University, Arkansas 72467
7. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama 36849-5113
8. Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306
9. Baylor University, Waco, Texas 76798
10. Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167-3934
11. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
12. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602
13. University of California, Berkeley, California 94720
14. University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024
15. California State University, Fresno, California 93740-0048
16. California State University, Fullerton, California 92634-9480
17. Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 4885
18. University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
19. Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina 29631
20. University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309
21. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523
22. Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706
23. East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina 27858-4353
24. Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197
25. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32604
26. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306
27. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30613
28. Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332
29. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822-2370
30. University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77204
31. University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820
32. Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405
33. University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242
34. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011
35. University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045
36. Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506
37. Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242
38. University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0032
39. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
40. Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana 71272
41. University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292
42. University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20740
43. Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee 38152
44. University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124
45. Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056
46. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1340
47. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824
48. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
49. University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677
50. Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762-5509
51. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65211
52. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0419
53. University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154
54. University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89557
55. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
56. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003
57. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
58. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7001
59. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois 60115
60. Northwestern University, Evanston Illinois 60208
61. University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
62. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210
63. Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701
64. University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019
65. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
66. University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403-1226
67. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
68. University of the Pacific (California), Stockton, California 95211
69. Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
70. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
71. Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907
72. Rice University, Houston, Texas 77251
73. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
74. San Diego State University, San Diego, California 92182
75. San Jose State University, San Jose, California 95192
76. University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208
77. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089
78. Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275
79. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39406-5001
80. University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana 70506
81. Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305
82. Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244
83. Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
84. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996
85. University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712
86. University of Texas, El Paso, Texas 79968
87. Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843
88. Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas 76129-0001
89. Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas 79409
90. University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606
91. Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
92. University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104
93. U.S. Air Force Academy, USAF Academy, Colorado 80840-5461
94. U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York 10996
95. U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland 21402
96. University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
97. Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37212
98. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
99. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
100. Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109
101. University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195
102. Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99164
103. West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
104. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-5134
105. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
106. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming 82071
(Appendix B)

Questionnaire

1. Please complete the following chart listing the total number of scholarship athletes (Black or non-Black) participating on your intercollegiate football and basketball teams during each of the respective years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did your institution accept student-athletes (non-qualifiers) who do not meet the proposition 48 requirements? yes no
   If yes, please list the number of non-qualifiers accepted for each of the years from 1986-1991.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Have either your men's basketball or football total scholarships offerings been restricted due to NCAA imposed penalties or probation between 1985-1991. yes no
   If yes, please describe the sport affected, how it was affected and for what period of time it was affected.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please return to the following address by September 8, 1994.
Warren H. Bair II
735 Locust St.
Mt. Wolf, PA 17347
Dear Compliance Coordinator:

I am writing to request your cooperation and assistance in the collection of data that is necessary in order for me to complete the research component of my graduate thesis.

The purpose of this study is to examine the actual effects Proposition 48 has had on black participation in the revenue producing sports of men's basketball and football at the 106 colleges and universities currently participating at the NCAA Division I A level.

Enclosed you will find a brief one page questionnaire, regarding Proposition 48 and your particular university. Contained in the questionnaire are specific questions pertaining to the total number and race of the scholarship athletes participating in your men's basketball and football programs by years.

For your convenience I have enclosed a self addressed stamped envelope. I can assure you that any information received from your university will remain completely confidential and anonymous. Each of the questionnaires has been number coded for the sole purpose of eliminating unnecessary follow up mailings.

Your prompt and accurate attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated. If you would like to receive a copy of the results from this study please indicate on your questionnaire and I will gladly forward them to you upon completion of the study.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Warren H. Bair II
Graduate Student
735 Locust St.
Mt. Wolf, PA 17347
(717) 266-2288
(Appendix D)

Postcard

Dear Compliance Coordinator:

I am writing in regard to a study I am conducting to analyze the racial impact of Proposition 48 on the revenue producing sports of football and basketball at the 106 NCAA Division I A institutions. Approximately three weeks ago, you should have received a brief questionnaire soliciting information relevant to the scholarship student athletes at your university. According to my records, as of October 9, I had not yet received your completed questionnaire. This is a reminder that in order to make valid assumptions regarding the effects of Proposition 48, it is important to receive clear and concise data with full representation of each and every Division I A institution. If you have already returned your questionnaire, please disregard this notice and thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Warren H. Bair II  
Graduate Student  
735 Locust St.  
Mt. Wolf, PA 17347
Dear Compliance Coordinator:

I am writing once again to solicit your assistance and cooperation in the collection of data in order to complete a study concerning the racial impact of proposition 48 on NCAA Division IA basketball and football programs. Imperative to the success of any research is thorough and complete data collection.

It is for this reason, and my dedication to receiving information and representation from all institutions, that I have enclosed another questionnaire. In case you were unable to complete or misplaced your initial questionnaire. If you have any questions or would like further information regarding my study please feel free to contact me at the number listed below.

I will be compiling data beginning November 20. I look forward to receiving your data in the near future. Your prompt attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Warren H. Bair II
Graduate Student
735 Locust St.
Mt. Wolf, PA 17347
(717) 266-2288
Appendix F
Percentage of Blacks in Football
(Sample = 19)
Appendix G
Percentage of Blacks in Basketball
(sample = 19)
Vita

Warren H. Bair II was born March 5, 1962 in York, Pennsylvania and raised in the small rural community of Saginaw, Pennsylvania, population 500. I attended Northeastern High School and graduated in 1980. I then went onto matriculate at East Stroudsburg University, where I received my Bachelors Degree in Recreation Management in 1984. Upon graduation I worked various jobs, most notably as the Assistant Director / Director of the Ferranti International corporate fitness center in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. In 1990 I enrolled in the Sports Management graduate program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia in order to pursue my goal of working in college athletics.