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ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES HELD BY JUNIOR COLLEGE FOOTBALL COACHES IN CALIFORNIA TOWARD THE VOLUNTARY INTER-CONFERENCE LETTER OF INTENT

by

Gary Edward Torgeson

Master of Arts in Physical Education

January, 1969

The study was undertaken to determine the attitudes held by the junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent. The head football coaches of the seventy-four junior colleges that participate in football were asked to respond to questions concerning selected attitudes held about the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

The attitudes selected for the questionnaire were determined by a review of the related literature, a pilot study, inquiry letters, rules governing the recruiter, the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent format, and personal conferences with football coaches.

Each junior college football coach was mailed a packet of information including an explanatory letter, a copy of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, the questionnaire, and a post-paid self-addressed return envelope. Sixty-seven of the seventy-four coaches contacted responded by returning a completed
questionnaire.

Each response was tabulated and identified with one of four areas of concern. Examination of this data suggested that the respondents were generally dissatisfied with the present letter of intent and felt that a more comprehensive national letter of intent could be developed.

On the basis of the findings and within the limitations of this study, the following general conclusions appeared justified: (1) junior college football coaches in California have recruiting problems that are different from those reported by high school coaches; (2) there appears to be a need for a letter of intent designed specifically for the four year college that will service only the junior college athlete; (3) this letter of intent should include a section that explains the athlete's financial aid; and (4) the letter should be enforced by a national organization such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of competitive sports in colleges and universities in the United States, athletes with the most ability and winning potential have been sought after by school representatives. The manner by which these athletes have been encouraged to play for a particular school has changed drastically over the years.

In the early days the managers of college teams simply invited athletes, who were already attending the college, to compete for the school. The recruiting was done within the school and the team managers were the ones who spent time watching intramural contests and recreational play to find the best athletes.

Today the outstanding athletes are recruited from all over the world, and the recruiting is done in a highly organized manner by a virtual army of school representatives including coaches, assistant coaches, players, students, alumni, and anyone else who has an interest in a particular school's athletic program.

This increased emphasis on recruiting caused many problems as schools tried to outdo other schools in the race for outstanding athletes. Charges and countercharges of illegal procedures gradually came into the picture and by the end of the 1940's the whole recruiting issue became a national controversy (3:205).

The charges were certainly not unfounded. Schools used many
questionable techniques in their zealous recruiting drives, such as transporting the prospective athletes to the campus for a weekend of fun and enjoyment, holding 'try-outs' in the same fashion as a regular professional team, making outlandish offers of financial aid, and taking up so much of an athlete's time that other schools were prevented from contacting him. These practices were felt to be illegal by many high school and college faculties, and they urged the National Collegiate Athletic Association and some of the member conferences to establish rules and regulations limiting recruiting practices and the amount of financial assistance a school could give an athlete. The National Collegiate Athletic Association did this in 1948 and referred to it as the 'Sanity Code' (3:205). In spite of these new regulations, it was impossible to control illegal and/or unethical practices used by colleges to obtain athletic talent.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's several college conferences tried a new implement in an attempt to curb some of these questionable techniques. This implement amounted to a contract, or letter of intent as it was known. If signed by the student athlete, it assured the college that no other participating school could attempt to recruit that particular high school athlete (7). The purpose of this device was to shorten the period of time the athlete was being recruited, and thus aided both the athlete and the school. The school could save money and effort as well as plan its scholarships more efficiently. The athlete could be relieved of bothersome recruiters who often adversely affected his studies and his life.

It soon became apparent, however, that in order to be
effective all colleges needed to accept this restrictive measure. Thus the concept of the national letter of intent was derived. This idea was presented to the National Collegiate Athletic Association convention for two consecutive years, 1961 and 1962, and on each occasion the proposal was defeated and placed in committee for further study and revision (34). It is interesting to note that during this period there was a trend toward more and more conferences adopting their own letter of intent.

At present, many college conferences and major independent colleges subscribe to a letter of intent which parallels the format of a national letter concept except that participation in it is voluntary in nature (33). The schools that use the voluntary-inter-conference letter of intent must abide by the stipulations established by the controlling committee which is made up of representatives from several conferences. Nevertheless, the letter still has some major points of confusion that require clarification before it can become as effective as its founders had intended.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the present attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

Design of the Study

A questionnaire relating to the letter of intent concept was
distributed to the seventy-four junior college head football coaches in California. From the questionnaires returned, an attempt was made to ascertain attitudes toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study were: (1) the population surveyed included the head football coach at each of the junior colleges in California that participates in football; and (2) the yes or no type of question was used to assure a greater response.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions of this study were: (1) all participants in the survey answered the questions carefully and truthfully; (2) the junior college football coaches were familiar enough with the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent to provide reliable responses; and (3) the questions used provided enough information on the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent to be properly evaluated.

**Importance of the Study**

This study was designed to help answer some of the questions which have arisen in the past few years concerning the feasibility of having a national letter of intent which would be sanctioned by
the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Today many colleges and universities adhere to the stipulations of the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, but a great portion of them are still opposed to it in principle or refuse to submit to its jurisdiction.

A perusal of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent found it to be unilateral in nature. That is, the letter of intent is a one-party contract committing only the student-athlete, not the college, to its stipulations. The design of the letter also fails to consider the mid-year high school graduate and the junior college transfer, since the established date restricting the signing of the letter by these athletes is in May.

In order for the letter of intent to become the control implement it was designed to be, the letter must be adopted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. It is, therefore, apparent that further information and insight are needed for future revision of the letter of intent. This paper investigates one phase of the problem, that of analyzing the attitudes held by junior college football coaches toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

**Definition of Terms**

In so far as this study is concerned, the following terms are clarified:

**Attitude.** This refers to the position taken by the junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.
Football coach. This individual is the head football coach at any one of the seventy-four junior colleges which participate in the sport in California.

Junior college. This refers to a school which provides the first two years of college to individuals who seek further education beyond high school.

NCAA. The National Collegiate Athletic Association is one of the national controlling bodies for college athletics.

National letter of intent. This is a letter structured similar to the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, but with the controlling agency being the NCAA.

Voluntary inter-conference letter of intent. This is the letter presently utilized by certain colleges and universities to recruit student-athletes under controlled measures.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

The first chapter was designed to inform the reader of the importance and direction of the study. Chapter two reviews the related literature which was relevant to the study. In chapter three are found the procedures utilized to conduct the investigation. The findings are reported and discussed in chapter four. Chapter five summarizes the paper and offers conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this research was to study the attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

A review of the literature related to the problem is presented in this chapter. The review is divided into three basic areas. The first is concerned with recruiting problems. The second deals with athletic scholarships, and the third explains the development of the letter of intent concept. These three sections establish the necessary foundation from which the study was structured.

Recruiting Problems

Shortly after the Civil War, when interested students and faculty were struggling to establish athletic programs, it was natural for managers of the various sports to compete for the top athlete within the college complex. During this period, recruiting was limited to the college campus. It was not long, however, that intensive recruiting outside the normal college enrollment became a real problem (2:7).

As early as 1905 the recruitment practices of the colleges became so questionable that the college presidents met and formed the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States.
This organization, which subsequently was called the NCAA, had the purpose of "eliminating the evils and raising the standards of intercollegiate athletic competition" (3:205). This purpose was an attempt to improve the existing conditions. It proved ineffective since one school could have maintained high standards while others could continue to ignore the basic recommendations of the NCAA. In another attempt to establish closer supervision, conferences were formed, but they also failed to achieve the significant elimination of the recruiting problems (3:206).

In 1948 the NCAA, which is open to all colleges and universities in the United States, adopted a 'sanity code' as the strongest attempt to that date to curb the rapidly developing abuses and evils of collegiate athletics. Up to this time the association had sought to control intercollegiate athletics by persuasion and by appealing to reason. The intent of this 'sanity code' was to use the already existing rules and regulations of the NCAA, not as recommended practices, but as standards of conduct each school was obligated to follow. Failure to comply with these rules could result in expulsion and thus the disciplined school would not be able to schedule other member schools. This code was disliked by so many of the NCAA member schools that in 1951 it was not supported when brought to a test. However, by 1953 enough revisions had been made in the code that the NCAA was able to take action enforcing its policies and principles (2:16).

After the restructuring of the 'sanity code', the NCAA board members found that the 1905 statement of purpose was no longer
meaningful. The now-stated purpose of this organization has been summarized as follows: "the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States in order that the athletic activities of colleges and universities may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education" (3:206).

Another example of national concern for this problem was the objections raised at the 1950-51 meeting of the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations. A committee was appointed by this organization to review the recruiting practices being used by many college recruiters when attempting to secure athletes. The following objections were summarized in an article by Hughes:

1. Enrollment in a college or a university before high school graduation.
2. College and university representatives, usually members of the athletic staff, making appeals directly to the athlete.
3. Interference of regular school work of athletes through contacts on school time by college and university representatives.
4. Invitations to athletes to visit college campuses on school time.
5. Admission to college on athletic ability alone with no reference to scholarship or citizenship qualities.
6. Principal's recommendation not asked.
7. Frequency and wide range of contacts made by college and university representatives with top athletes. (21:27)

As a result of these objections, standard No. 10 was adopted in 1951. This standard or statement still appears in the 1967-68 National Federation of State High School Athletic Association Handbook:

The solicitation of athletes through tryouts and competitive bidding by higher institutions is unethical, unprofessional and psychologically harmful to the boy. It destroys the amateur nature of athletics, tends to commercialize the individual and the program, exploits athletic skill for gain and takes an unfair advantage of competitors. (9:27)
In still another organization a similar concern was apparent. At the 1951 meeting of the North Central Association Commission on Colleges and Universities Concerning Athletics, a special committee was established. This committee's assignment was to create rules which would eliminate so-called bad practices employed by colleges to secure and pay athletes. After three years of deliberation, the committee's suggested rules were defeated by the participating members. However, a set of recommended ethical practices were incorporated into the association's already present rules and regulations. Included was the stipulation that the commission had the prerogative to investigate any practices of the colleges within its jurisdiction pertaining to athletic recruitment (17:185-188).

The American Football Coaches Association adopted at their 1952 meeting a set of ethical standards directed toward athletic recruitment. These standards still can be found in the present handbook for American Football Coaches. They are as follows:

1. Coaches are entitled to the same rights and privileges as other faculty members, and must assume the same responsibilities as are imposed upon them in all student recruitment.
2. Institutional rules and regulations shall be strictly observed in all student recruitment.
3. Recruitment of students with athletic ability must follow the generally accepted pattern for all students. The first essential qualification is acceptable academic ability; the second, other desirable special abilities, including, in this case, skill in football.
4. In discussing the advantages of his institution to a prospect, the coach must confine his statements to an honest and forthright presentation of facts and shall refrain from making derogatory statements concerning other institutions and their officials. (6:9)

Many of the points discussed thus far have dealt with the ethical practices of the college recruiter. Within the context of
the NCAA Bulletin there are specific rules to which a member school must adhere when recruiting an athlete. The following is a brief summary of these rules.

1. Once an alumnus contacts an athlete, he represents the school and is subject to the same regulations.

2. The school cannot provide transportation between summer job and home.

3. No equipment or clothing can be given to the athlete.

4. A coach cannot use funds from alumni clubs or business firms to transport an athlete.

5. Tryouts are illegal.

6. Visitation must be to the campus and paid for by the school.

7. The school cannot pay for high school coaches' visits.

8. The school cannot pay for transportation costs of the student for purposes of enrolling.

9. Visits cannot be for longer than a 48 hour period.

10. It is not permissible for a member institution to pay all or part of the education costs of a student-athlete to attend summer school.

Throughout the literature reference is made to experiences of coaches who either have been personally involved in recruitment themselves or have been exposed in some manner to the practices employed by other recruiters.

One such example appeared in a recent issue of Sports Illustrated. Paul Bryant, the head football coach at the University
of Alabama, told of some of his experiences with recruiting in the early 1950's.

We used to hide boys out, what the pros called baby sitting now, and take them off places on boats and go hunting or ride them around and get them won, and we used to use every trick in the book...often a boy would be fussed over so much,...it would take a pretty solid kid to stand it. Then he gets to college and he finds out he is just another guy. (14:30)

Bryant also mentioned that it was common practice to conduct tryouts and award aid on the basis of performance. This was a great advantage to the school, but in actuality the coach was ignoring the intent of the rules recommended by the NCAA. When Bryant was coaching at Texas A & M University, the school was placed on athletic probation for paying its athletes in excess of the amount permitted by the NCAA (14:29-30).

Hart and Brown, both high school football coaches in Pennsylvania, felt that it was the responsibility of the high school coach to attempt to find a suitable college for the senior athlete to attend. They felt that a coach should encourage many college recruiters to contact his athletes with the contention this outside interest would motivate most athletes to excel (19:50-53). Baker, a high school coach, insisted that at no time should the college recruiter contact a player before talking with the athlete's coach (13:48). Hather, a former high school football coach, said that it is the coach's duty to select those athletes worthy of a scholarship, and then proceed to find a college for which they are eligible (1).

Phil Woolpert, the basketball coach at the University of San Diego and once one of the most successful coaches in America when he
coached at the University of San Francisco, believed that the 
crueler competition of all is in recruiting. In an article by 
Johnson in *Sports Illustrated*, Woolpert was quoted as stating:

If a coach wants to survive, he had better be out criss-
crossing the country, wheeling and dealing, coaxing and 
coddling, enticing to his school the kids who will produce...  
I think there is something wrong with these games we play 
when winning becomes a motivating factor of behavior beyond 
the game itself. Winning has gotten to be an ingredient that 
we can't do without in this country. We have come to believe 
that the only real measure of accomplishment comes in victory. 
It's the product of a bad system of values. Hell, it creates 
psychological problems where there shouldn't be any. I have 
no solution, but there must be a more rational approach than 
this overwhelming insistence on winning. (24:68)

Woolpert concluded by emphasizing that honest coaches do not 
intentionally attempt to recruit an athlete illegally, but rather 
are forced into doing so by the 'dollar pressure' placed on the 
athletic department by the college (24:67-80).

Adolph Rupp, who has the best won-loss record in college 
basketball history, said, "A limit of three visits to three schools 
by each high school prospect would end most of the excesses in 
recruiting" (12:6). He supported this suggestion by reporting, "I 
know personally of one boy and his family who visited seven univer-
sities and received expense money for each trip" (12:6). He felt 
that this type of practice must cease, and that the only solution 
is to adopt a national rule.

Educators are often quoted in the literature in reference to 
the problem of athletic recruitment. Lumly, a professor of Physical 
Education and athletics at Amherst College, maintained that any type 
of rule established by a conference is immediately examined for
loopholes by certain recruiters. He felt that controlling bodies of
the conference should attempt to enforce their rules with more
meaningful penalties (27:193-198).

Hyman, an educator, emphasized that many college coaches
today must be as concerned about the athletes' grades as about their
football ability. He thinks this concept of the student-athlete is
becoming more apparent as college entrance requirements become more
rigid, league eligibility rules are made more strict, and the game
of football becomes so complex that it requires a fairly intelligent
student to comprehend. Serious abuses do, however, still exist
which could multiply if not controlled soon. Hyman noted that the
NCAA suspension and probation penalties have succeeded in reducing
illegal recruiting practices, but not sufficiently to solve them
altogether (22:28-31).

Stoke, a past college president, said that high school athletes
are so fiercely pursued that they are often forced to use a mediator
to bargain for them so that they will be able to obtain the top
offer. He claimed that many conferences could control this problem
by preventing an athlete who has signed with one school from leaving
it to join another, even though he later discovers the advantages of
the second school. Stoke contended, however, that the most pressing
problem with college athletics is its association with education.
He urged that athletics should become a separate entity and there-
fore no longer be directly associated with education. This would
eliminate the association with the school, thereby placing the
recruiting problems strictly within the confines of the college
conferences (30:46-56).

Some of the more pertinent areas discussed thus far in the review were surveyed by Torgeson as a project for a graduate class at San Fernando Valley State College in the Spring of 1966. High school athletic directors, chosen at random from California and Arizona, were asked to respond. The findings of this study showed:

1. Thirty-three of thirty-nine surveyed reported that their school or district had a definite policy forbidding the college recruiter from contacting the high school athlete on campus.
2. Twenty-eight of the thirty-nine surveyed felt it was not a good practice to contact the athlete during the season of competition.
3. Thirty-one of the thirty-nine surveyed said they attempted to find scholarships for potential college athletes.

This section has attempted to present some of the facts and points of view concerning problems of recruiting athletes. The next section discusses a phase of recruitment which is most often criticized, the athletic scholarship.

**Athletic Scholarships**

It is difficult to discuss athletic recruitment and athletic scholarships separately because both are so interrelated. However, the athletic scholarship itself is only one of the many problems involved in the total area of recruitment.

Giddens, the President of Hamlin University, suggested that the recruitment of athletes has become so intense that the only concern of the athlete is how much he will receive. The recruiter no longer explains the academic advantages of his college, but
rather gets to the point of the amount of grant-in-aid the athlete expects. He felt that the athlete is generally being offered more than the NCAA allows. He stated the maximum permitted an athlete is tuition and fees, room and board, books and supplies and fifteen dollars a month (18:49-52).

Two examples of the above were reported by athletes who have been exposed to such practices. Jackson, a graduate of the University of Michigan and a former first string football player for that school, was very much opposed to college football on the present basis of competitive recruiting. He stated that the entire concept of an athletic scholarship can be misrepresented by the recruiter. If the athlete is convinced that his services are needed and the recruiter entices him with a grant-in-aid offer, he may decide to attend the school. Often the same athlete finds himself on the bench for four years when he could have attended a smaller college and played (23:27-33).

Another case demonstrates how a talented athlete found himself involved in what appeared to be illegal recruiting practices. Two colleges in the East were bidding so high for this athlete that he felt both schools were exceeding the NCAA limit for athletic scholarships. He ultimately decided to attend a school that had expressed an interest in him, but had not made such exorbitant offers. In a later investigation, both colleges involved admitted to the NCAA Rules Committee that they had employed illegal means to solicit the athlete (31:8).

Other opinions, both for and against athletic scholarships,
can be found within the literature. In the *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, Howes wrote that all scholarships and grants-in-aid should be awarded on the basis of academic ability and economic need. However, he further stated that the amount of time an individual spends on extra-curricular activities should also be of prime consideration (20:464-467).

Morris, in the *Phi Delta Kappan*, suggested that the colleges have become sport promoters, often without even realizing it. He reported, "Teams are recruited for the sole purpose of producing victories. Many of our subsidized athletes have no right even to be in school and many others have no desire to be in school for an education." (28:19) He thinks that colleges should reevaluate their purpose in awarding athletic scholarships (28:19-22).

Williams, a prominent physical educator, was against competitive athletics when the primary purpose was to pay students to participate. He felt that these commercial ends place the educational values of athletic participation in jeopardy (4).

Schweitzer, football coach at Luther College, felt that financial aid to students should be awarded only on the basis of academic promise and/or financial need, and that the athletic scholarship cannot be supported in this manner (29:4).

La Rue, ex-football coach at the University of Arizona, felt that if the scholar can be awarded aid because of his intellectual capabilities, the athlete should be given aid for his physical attributes. He made it clear, however, that athletic ability should not be the sole reason for receiving a scholarship. The athlete
must meet the entrance requirements established by the college. The athlete who desires a scholarship must, therefore, prove himself both in the classroom and on the field, whereas the scholar has only one area in which he must excel (25:15).

Murray, a sports writer for the Los Angeles Times, felt that athletes are over-sold on their importance in the college society. Supposedly the athlete acquires this distorted view when he is being recruited by either an alumnus of the college or the coach. The athlete is told he can 'have the world', and by the time he reaches the campus he is convinced of this misconception. If this attitude continues throughout the athlete's tenure at college, it is obvious one of the values of athletics has been seriously misrepresented (11:1).

In order for athletics to continue on a wholesome level, some changes must occur which will eliminate the problems reviewed in the first two sections of this chapter. The third and final section presents a plan that is designed to make such corrections.

Letter of Intent

On July 22, 1960, a committee was formed by the NCAA to investigate problems concerned with athletic recruiting and financial aids. It was found that many colleges were attempting to secure athletes by requiring them to complete enrollment papers and to forward deposits, which, in effect, represented earnest money. Furthermore, some athletic conferences were participating in a plan
called a letter of intent. Based on these and other findings, the report given at the NCAA convention the following year included a proposed national pre-registration service (7:7-8). This proposal suggested that: (1) all member schools honor the athlete's selection; (2) the student-athlete must be admissible to the college; (3) financial aid does not have to be awarded; and (4) the athlete must sign on or after June 15 of his enrollment year (7:8).

At both the 1961 and 1962 NCAA conventions, the proposal for a national pre-registration service was defeated. It was assumed by the major conference commissioners and the faculty athletic representatives from many of the colleges that the general body was against the mandatory nature of the proposal. According to Davis, they decided to form a group that would investigate the possibilities of a voluntary cooperative program (34).

The group suggested a simple plan which could operate through the conference offices and would also allow independent institutions to participate in the program. The following is a brief overview of this plan.

1. Subsequent to a specified date in May, the prospective student-athlete is permitted to sign a form designated as the interconference letter of intent.

2. The parent or guardian of the student and also the athletic director must sign the form.

3. The student is informed that other cooperating conferences and institutions will respect his decision and will not attempt to recruit him further.
4. The athlete is also made aware that if he elects to enroll at some other institution, his athletic eligibility will be limited.

5. All the agreements are subject to the student's qualifying for admission to the institution of his choice. In case he does not meet the admission requirements, the letter of intent is not binding (35).

The need for an inter-conference letter of intent rather than individual conference letters was suggested by La Rue. He said that it is dishonest for an athlete to sign a letter of intent and then break faith by going to another school. This is the major problem with the letter, because only a few conferences utilize this form of securing athletes, and in no way is it binding to the athlete except to other schools in that conference (26:1).

Feeling that the letter of intent is a reasonable solution to the recruiting problem, Doolittle, who is the football coach at Western Michigan University, listed two areas which are drawbacks to the passage of an amendment establishing the letter of intent as a national policy. These two areas are as follows:

1. There must be one hundred percent participation by all conferences.

2. The present date that the athlete must return the letter is too late, thus creating some of the same problems present before the letter was established. (16:3)

Davis, the Executive Director of the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent Project, had described the letter of intent as a tool that would bring about the cessation of some of the vicious recruiting
tactics in practice today. This belief was based on one of the proposed regulations of the letter. That is, athletic participation by the athlete would be limited to the college with which he signed (15:1).

In a survey by Torgeson of thirty-nine high school athletic directors, it was found that twenty-five did not favor the letter of intent plan (37).

Murray, the Executive Director of the American Football Coaches Association, stated that many of the coaches that belong to the organization have been quite active in the development of the letter of intent (36). In 1965 the rules committee of this association adopted an amendment to the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent program. The word voluntary was added by the organizing group for clarification purposes. This enabled the college to release an athlete from his scholarship after one year, if he was not productive. Thus an athlete could select another college even though he had signed the letter of intent previously (15:1). It should be noted the letter of intent and scholarship commitments are separate forms.

Since the conception of the letter of intent idea, many people have been misinformed as to the present status of the program. Davis stated the following:

1. There is no longer a need to pursue a national letter of intent because the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent has worked so well.

2. Originally the opposition for the plan came chiefly from smaller schools and non-conference members.
3. Now all major conferences have adopted the voluntary plan and several independents are added each year.

4. The problems of athletic recruitment have been solved through this voluntary plan which is working extremely well. (33)

In a speech to the Sports Writers Association, Davis outlined the administration of the program as follows: (1) it is handled by the commissioners of the various conferences; (2) independent institutions which participate in the plan work through the most appropriate conference commissioner, usually the one closest to the institution; and (3) each conference commissioner informs all other commissioners of the signatories, and all of the participating institutions receive lists of the signees (34).

In 1967 twelve major athletic conferences and twenty-one independent institutions participated in the voluntary interconference letter of intent program. Although a few problems of administration have developed, the success of the program depends largely on the voluntary cooperation of the participants and their willingness to abide by the spirit as well as the letter of regulations (34).

The literature reviewed in this chapter does not mention the involvement of the junior colleges with the voluntary interconference letter of intent. This was because of the lack of information available in this area. However, with the junior colleges becoming more prominent throughout the nation, athletes from these schools will be recruited and asked to sign letters of intent. Therefore, this study was designed to present the attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary interconference letter
of intent.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed the related literature pertaining to recruiting problems, athletic scholarship, and the development of the letter of intent concept.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this research is to study the attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent. This chapter presents the procedures utilized in the construction of the questionnaire and the processes involved in conducting this study. The areas of emphasis are initial investigations, construction and validation of instrument, and the sampling procedure.

Initial Investigations

The selection of attitudes used in the questionnaire was synthesized from a pilot survey, letters of inquiry, and a review of the related literature.

In the spring of 1966 a pilot survey was made of a random sample of high school athletic directors in California and Arizona. They were asked various questions pertaining to the recruitment practices of colleges and the value of the letter of intent concept. It was obvious from the answers received that the respondents were not familiar with the letter of intent, but that they were sure that something should be done to alleviate the apparent unethical and illicit recruiting practices of colleges (37).

One year after the pilot survey, a letter was sent to three
individuals who seemed to have current information concerning the letter of intent. Those contacted were the Executive Director of the American Football Coaches Association, the President of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Faculty Athletic Representative from Texas Tech. Four questions were asked of these individuals, with the hope their answers would provide further information from which the questions for this study could be evolved. The four questions were as follows:

1. For how many years has the national letter of intent been a concern?

2. Which conferences are presently using the letter of intent?

3. What are the determining factors of the letter of intent being accepted on a national basis?

4. What is the purpose behind creating a national letter of intent?

The responses received from the inquiry letters indicated a study in this area would be worthwhile since incomplete information was apparent.

Construction and Validation of Instrument

Refinement of the Questionnaire

After the initial questions had been formulated, they were sent to a jury of experts to critically evaluate them. This group was composed of nine coaches at San Fernando Valley State College who had a background in constructing a questionnaire and were familiar with the problems of recruiting. Their opinions and suggestions were
then applied in rephrasing some of the questions.

The rationale behind the study and the revised questionnaire was then presented to a colloquium of graduate students at the same institution. Their comments were also instrumental in the refinement process of the study. After numerous revisions, the questionnaire was processed and distributed, along with a letter of explanation and a copy of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, to the seventy-four junior college football coaches in California.

**Format of the Questionnaire**

The survey was constructed so that the respondents would have only two choices, yes or no, when selecting an answer to the questions. Fifteen of the nineteen questions could be answered in this manner. One of the questions required the respondent to answer a subquestion if the primary question was affirmative. Two of the questions provided the respondent five selections from which to choose. The final question was open ended, asking for further comments pertinent to the study. The intent of each question was to obtain information concerning the attitudes of junior college football coaches in California toward the inter-conference letter of intent.

**Survey Question Rationale**

The purpose of this section is to present each question selected for the survey. Each question had a definite objective, and questions with similar objectives were grouped together to make
the findings more meaningful. (A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A.)

The first group of questions was used to determine whether, in fact, serious recruiting problems do exist on the junior college level. Before any recommendation for changing the present regulations of the controlling agencies such as the NCAA is made, it should be determined that need is evident. The questions below were selected because they are the most frequently mentioned problem areas in the literature dealing with college recruitment of athletes.

2. Do recruiters attempt to take up an excessive amount of an athlete's time in order to inhibit recruiting efforts of other colleges?

3. To the best of your knowledge have any of your athletes received fringe benefits beyond the NCAA limits for an athletic scholarship?

4. Often an alumnus of a four year college makes the initial contact with an athlete for his school and coach. Is this a common practice at your school?

6. The NCAA permits one paid visitation per athlete to a school. In your experience has any four year school ever paid for more than one visitation to its campus for one of your athletes?

9. In your opinion, do colleges tend to go beyond the intent of the NCAA rules that govern recruiting?

14. An athlete must be admissible to a college before the letter of intent is valid. In general, do most four year college recruiters make an effort to check an athlete's grades before recruiting him?

The second group of questions was directed toward the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent which some colleges and universities honor. The intent of these questions was to determine if the California junior college football coaches felt that the structure of this letter was satisfactory to them. Each of the
questions inquired into areas of the letter of intent which appear to be controversial. They are as follows:

7. Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the athlete?

8. Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the four year college?

10. At present, the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent is directed to the June graduate because of the signing date designated. Should an additional clause be included which specifically applies to the mid-year junior college transfer?

17. In your opinion, should it be possible to void a signed Letter of Intent by mutual agreement of both parties - the athlete and the four year college?

18. If the athlete signs the Letter of Intent of one college and subsequently decides to attend another college, his eligibility is limited. In your opinion, is this a fair penalty?

The third group of questions was concerned with an obvious neglect of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent. In its present form the letter contained no reference to the type of financial assistance the athlete is to receive. The three questions below follow a progression which should be meaningful when evaluating the questionnaire returns. If a large percentage of athletes select a college for financial reasons, but do not feel the offer is clear and well-defined, then perhaps this is an area that should be included within the letter of intent structure. These questions are as follows:

5. In your experience, are contracts or offers for financial assistance by the colleges clear and precise so that the athlete understands exactly what he is to receive?

13. What percentage of your football players tend to select a college primarily for financial assistance?
15. As a part of the Letter of Intent, should the financial assistance offer by the four year college be specifically spelled out?

The fourth group of questions was chosen to determine if the junior college football coaches in California actually favored the letter at all. The entire format of the study was founded on the fact that a group of individuals and conferences established a voluntary inter-conference letter of intent after the NCAA vetoed the plan. These questions should indicate the present thoughts concerning this past attempt for national adoption by one group of coaches. They are as follows:

1. Do you feel there is a need for the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent?

11. What percentage of football players at your college eventually signed some type of Letter of Intent last year?

   a. 0%
   b. 1 - 25%
   c. 26 - 50%
   d. 51 - 75%
   e. 76 - 100%

12. If a National Letter of Intent were adopted, should the NCAA design a specific Letter of Intent to be utilized by four year colleges when recruiting the junior college athletes?

16. Would you like to see a National Letter of Intent which would be adhered to by all four year colleges?

The justifications provided in this section are further discussed in Chapter IV under Discussion of Findings.
Sampling Procedure

Selection of Region and Respondents

In recent years the junior college system has grown both in size and status. Continually more athletes are attracted from high school to the two year college rather than directly into the four year institution. The State of California has the largest number of junior colleges in the nation. For this reason, California junior colleges were selected. Also, because seventy-four of them conduct a football program, it was felt an investigation of recruiting practices with their athletes would be meaningful. The head football coach at each of these institutions was selected as a respondent. The selection of football coaches was based on this group's apparent interest and concern in application of the letter of intent concept.

Packet

A packet was compiled for the purpose of insuring a greater response. The packet included, in addition to the questionnaire, a letter describing the purpose of the study, a copy of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, and a self-addressed, postpaid envelope. These items were included so that the respondent would have a better understanding of the study and its relationship to the junior college program and to facilitate the return of the questionnaire.
Mailing

All packets of information were distributed to the seventy-four junior college football coaches by mail on April 1, 1968. The coaches were asked in the introductory letter to return the questionnaire by April 19, 1968, in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Follow-up Procedure

On April 19, 1968, a follow-up letter was sent to those coaches who failed to return the questionnaire thus far, urging them to do so immediately. The same information packet was again included in the event the first had been misplaced. Those respondents still not heard from on May 1, 1968, were given a telephone call. These methods resulted in a ninety per cent return from the schools contacted.

Summary

This chapter presented an overview of the procedures utilized in this study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The purpose of this research is to study the attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

This chapter is divided into two sections; the first reports the findings of the survey, and the second presents a discussion of these findings.

Presentation of Findings

On May 1, 1968, the study was terminated. At this time sixty-seven of the seventy-four questionnaires had been returned, which was a ninety per cent response. However, some of the respondents failed to answer all of the questions. In order to report an accurate accounting for each question, it was necessary to provide the total number of responses. In the presentation that follows, the percentage of yes and no answers is tabulated from this figure.

Question 1: Do you feel there is a need for the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Responses:</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of yes answers</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of no answers</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: Do recruiters attempt to take up an excessive amount of an athlete's time in order to inhibit recruiting efforts of other colleges?

Total No. of Responses: 63
% of yes answers : 20.6
% of no answers : 79.4

Question 3: To the best of your knowledge have any of your athletes received fringe benefits beyond the NCAA limits for an athletic scholarship?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers : 13.8
% of no answers : 86.2

Question 4: Often an alumnus of a four year college makes the initial contact with an athlete for his school and coach. Is this a common practice at your school?

Total No. of Responses: 67
% of yes answers : 26.9
% of no answers : 73.1

Question 5: In your experience, are contracts or offers for financial assistance by the colleges clear and concise so that the athlete understands exactly what he is to receive?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers : 61.5
% of no answers : 38.5

Question 6: The NCAA permits one paid visitation per athlete to a school. In your experience has any four year school ever paid for more than one visitation to its campus for one of your athletes?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers : 7.7
% of no answers : 92.3

a. If the answer to this question is yes, is this a common practice?

Of the 5 who answered Question 6 yes, all answered 6a no.
Question 7: Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the athlete?

Total No. of Responses: 62
% of yes answers : 51.6
% of no answers : 48.4

Question 8: Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the four year college?

Total No. of Responses: 64
% of yes answers : 71.0
% of no answers : 29.0

Question 9: In your opinion, do colleges tend to go beyond the intent of the NCAA rules that govern recruiting?

Total No. of Responses: 66
% of yes answers : 44.5
% of no answers : 55.5

Question 10: At present, the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent is directed to the June graduate because of the signing date designated. Should an additional clause be included which specifically applies to the mid-year junior college transfer?

Total No. of Responses: 63
% of yes answers : 55.5
% of no answers : 44.5

Question 11: What percentage of football players at your college eventually signed some type of Letter of Intent last year?

a. 0%
b. 1 - 25%
c. 26 - 50%
d. 51 - 75%
e. 76 - 100%

Total No. of Responses: 63
a. 26.5
b. 60.9
c. 4.7
d. 1.6
e. 6.3
Question 12: If a National Letter of Intent were adopted, should the NCAA design a specific Letter of Intent to be utilized by four year colleges when recruiting the junior college athletes?

Total No. of Responses: 63
% of yes answers: 77.8
% of no answers: 22.2

Question 13: What percentage of your football players tend to select a college primarily for financial assistance?

a. 0%
b. 1 - 25%
c. 26 - 50%
d. 51 - 75%
e. 76 - 100%

Total No. of Responses: 66
a. 6.5
b. 25.6
c. 18.1
d. 25.6
e. 24.2

Question 14: An athlete must be admissible to a college before the Letter of Intent is valid. In general, do most four year college recruiters make an effort to check an athlete's grades before recruiting him?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers: 98.5
% of no answers: 1.5

Question 15: As a part of the Letter of Intent, should the financial assistance offer by the four year college be specifically spelled out?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers: 98.5
% of no answers: 1.5

Question 16: Would you like to see a National Letter of Intent which would be adhered to by all four year colleges?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers: 73.8
% of no answers: 26.2
Question 17: In your opinion, should it be possible to void a Letter of Intent by mutual agreement of both parties - the athlete and the four year college?

Total No. of Responses: 65
% of yes answers : 80
% of no answers : 20

Question 18: If the athlete signs the Letter of Intent of one college and subsequently decides to attend another college, his eligibility is limited. In your opinion, is this a fair penalty?

Total No. of Responses: 66
% of yes answers : 68.2
% of no answers : 31.8

Discussion of Findings

The section on survey question rationale in Chapter Three explained the purpose of grouping the questions into four areas of concern. These areas were recruiting problems, the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, financial assistance, and a national letter of intent. They were selected to present the questions in logical divisions for discussion. This format is used in the following discussion of attitudes held by the junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

I. Recruiting Problems

Every item reviewed in the literature made reference to recruiting practices of four year colleges with respect to high schools. None of the material reviewed discussed the involvement of the junior colleges. Also the present voluntary inter-conference
letter of intent neglects to mention the junior college athlete who might be recruited during the middle of the school year. If recommendations are going to be made to include this level of athletic participation in the letter of intent plan, a need must be established. The responses to the questions below give some insight into this problem.

**Question 2**: Several sources report that recruiters attempt to spend as much time as possible with an athlete in order to keep other colleges from talking with him (19, 20, 23, 27). This seems to be only a minor problem with the junior colleges, but one that should be controlled in order to allow the athlete the opportunity to investigate as many colleges as he can before making his final decision.

**Question 3**: An even more pressing problem seems to be that of the scholarship offer to the athlete. Fourteen per cent of those responding felt that their athletes were receiving more than the NCAA limit. This finding would seem to indicate that the controlling organization should enforce this stipulation of limitation more rigidly.

**Question 4**: It is common knowledge that alumni often help coaches recruit. However, if they are not aware of their position as recruiters officially representing the college, their actions can cause problems for the college. Most of the junior college football coaches in California have not experienced alumni or other agents of the college contacting their athletes.
Question 6: The coaches responding to this question felt that their athletes were only receiving one paid visitation to a particular college campus. This would seem to indicate that four year colleges were abiding by the NCAA regulation which permits only one visit per school.

Question 2: When asked if they felt college recruiters go beyond the intent of the NCAA rules that govern recruiting, almost forty-five percent of those responding indicated it was their opinion that recruiters did. This would suggest problems are present on the junior college level, but need to be identified by the controlling organizations. It also appears that an obvious neglect has taken place when establishing and enforcing rules and regulations aimed at controlling recruiting problems on the junior college campus. There is also the possibility that the junior college football coach does not completely understand all of the NCAA regulations regarding recruitment.

Question 14: Junior college coaches reported that almost all of the four year college recruiters attempt to check the athlete's grades before recruiting him. This finding demonstrates that colleges must be concerned with the athlete's academic ability as well as his athletic ability.

II. The Voluntary Inter-Conference Letter of Intent

The interpretation of responses found in this section pertains to the structure of the letter of intent presently being used by many colleges and universities.
Questions 7 and 8: The responses received from the junior college coaches indicated that they felt the college is profiting more than the athlete from signing a letter of intent. This is even more apparent when it is known that some colleges and universities do not honor the letter. This suggests that the one possible benefit the athlete will receive, that is, no further contact by other colleges once the letter is signed, is not very meaningful. If the letter were under the control of the NCAA, this clause would be more binding.

Question 10: If the letter of intent is to be made applicable to the junior college athlete, the date of signing has to be changed or an additional clause added to the present form. Over half of the junior college coaches responding to this question felt an additional clause, applicable to the junior college athletes, should be inserted. This would make the letter valid to both parties. The mid-year junior college transfer who signs a voluntary inter-conference letter of intent in its present state apparently cannot be held to the agreement because it stipulates that an athlete cannot sign a letter before May 17.

Question 12: One of the provisions of the present letter is that if both parties agree, it would be permissible to void the contract. The junior college coaches felt this was a necessary part of the letter.

Question 18: The present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent stipulates that once an athlete signs the letter and then decides to attend another college that honors the letter, his
athletic eligibility will be limited. This is still another restriction the recruiting college has on the athlete and seems to be logical in nature. However, the college still has more to gain than the athlete. The junior college coaches appeared to be in agreement with this rule.

III. Financial Assistance

Throughout the literature coaches, athletes and educators discuss the value of the athletic scholarship (14, 23, 28, 29, 30). Many feel that this area is often misrepresented by the recruiter. Apparently in many cases the athlete is led to believe he will be given aid of an amount more than what he eventually receives. Others suggest that athletic ability should not be the sole criteria for receiving a scholarship. And still others think that the scholarship makes the athlete feel that the school owes him an education and, therefore, he attempts to get by with little or no effort.

The design of the present letter of intent used by many colleges and universities does not include a section which explains the exact scholarship the athlete will receive. It seems necessary to include such a section to help control the over-selling done by some recruiters and to show the athlete exactly what he will receive. Three questions on the survey were designed to determine if junior college football coaches felt such a section was needed.

Question 5: Over thirty-five per cent of the coaches responding felt that offers made by four year colleges did not appear to be clear and precise to their athletes. This then reinforces some of
the remarks made in the literature concerning the recruiter's approach to making an offer. If the athlete is going to enter into an agreement, he should be made aware of the college's responsibilities to him as well as his obligations to the college.

**Question 13:** It is important that the offer be concise and clear if the athlete is dependent upon the scholarship to attend the school. According to the findings on the survey, the junior college coaches felt that over fifty percent of the athletes select a college on the basis of the amount of financial assistance offered. This is additional support for including a section which presents the scholarship offer within the letter of intent.

**Question 15:** The responses to questions five and thirteen indicated that the recruiters' offers are often not clear and precise, and that over fifty percent of the junior college athletes attend a college because of financial assistance. Based on these findings, the response to question fifteen appears to be highly significant. Ninety-eight per cent of those answering this question felt that a section which specifically spells out the financial assistance be a part of the letter of intent. This finding alone should create enough interest to stimulate the letter of intent committee into investigating this possibility.

IV. A National Letter of Intent

In the early 1960's, the NCAA attempted to develop a pre-registration service that would eliminate many of the then present problems regarding the recruitment of athletes. This proposal
failed, but a group of interested people got together and designed a voluntary letter of intent which provided similar benefits. The primary difference is that it would be controlled by an independent group and that it would be voluntary in nature. However, even though this group does attempt to control the actions of the schools using this implement, not all colleges participate in the program. Thus its effectiveness is somewhat weakened. It is, therefore, assumed that a national letter of intent controlled by the NCAA would be more sound.

The four questions discussed in this section attempt to determine if there is a need for a letter of intent, how many athletes signed a letter last year, and if a national letter of intent should be adopted.

Questions 1 and 12: Junior college coaches felt there is a need for the letter of intent, and more specifically, one that is for junior college athletes. Based on these findings, just a restructuring of the present letter would not be sufficient. Rather a letter which is directed only to the junior college athlete would be more satisfactory. This change would make the letter an even more complete tool and its intent more binding.

Question 11: Only a small portion of those responding reported that their athletes signed a letter of intent last year. This seems to indicate that the assumption that all four year colleges ask junior college athletes to sign a letter of intent is false. However, those that are signing a letter cannot be held to it because of its present structure. If a new form were designed for the junior college athlete, it is possible that more would sign this letter.
**Question 16:** The chairman of the inter-conference letter of intent committee has stated that the present letter is sufficient and NCAA adoption is no longer necessary (33). However, almost all of the junior college football coaches in California are in favor of national control. The last time this plan appeared before the NCAA convention was in 1962. Since this time many revisions and improvements have taken place. It would seem that the inter-conference letter of intent committee should consider the possibility of again presenting this plan to the NCAA. Under NCAA jurisdiction, this plan would serve both the college and athlete in even greater depth.

The last question on the survey was not included within the areas of concern because it was an open-ended type of question which asked the respondents to make further comments pertinent to the study.

**Question 19:** Two comments appeared most frequently under this question.

1. A stipulation should be included within the letter of intent explaining what occurs when an athlete signs a letter and then would like to attend a junior college. Is he obligated to attend the school with which he signed or is he obligated to attend this college after junior college attendance?

2. Many junior colleges are within districts which are considered open by the state controlling agency; that is, several schools can compete for the same athlete. The respondents felt that the junior colleges should develop a letter of intent to curb this problem area before it becomes uncontrollable.
Summary of Major Findings

This chapter presented and discussed the data of the study. The first section was devoted to a question-by-question presentation of the percentage findings of the survey. The second section discussed the findings in relation to the four areas of concern as designated in Chapter III. The major findings within each of these areas are as follows:

1. The recruiting problems most mentioned as areas of difficulty did not seem to be affecting the junior colleges.

2. Almost half of those junior college coaches that entered into the survey felt that four year colleges tend to go beyond the intent of the NCAA rules that govern recruiting.

3. The present inter-conference letter of intent appears to favor the four year college, according to the junior college football coaches surveyed.

4. The junior college football coaches think the present letter of intent neglects their athletes.

5. A financial assistance section should be included within the letter of intent format.

6. Most of the junior college coaches felt there is a need for a national letter of intent that would be adhered to by all four year colleges.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study, the conclusion which the findings seemed to indicate, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

The study was undertaken to determine the attitudes held by junior college football coaches in California toward the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent. The seventy-four junior colleges that participate in football in California were selected to take part in the survey. These schools were chosen for three reasons: the growth of the junior college system in California; available information on these schools is lacking; and the present inter-conference letter of intent apparently neglects to mention the junior colleges.

The questions utilized in the questionnaire were carefully selected from an intensive review of the related literature, from an earlier pilot study, and from letters of inquiry to prominent persons. The eighteen yes or no questions which appeared on the survey form in random order were grouped into four areas of concern for reporting purposes. They are recruiting problems, the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, financial assistance, and the
national letter of intent.

The respondents were mailed a packet of information to insure a better response. It included a letter describing the purpose of the study, a copy of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent, the survey, and a self-addressed, post paid envelope. Ninety per cent of those contacted returned their completed questionnaire form.

The data of the study was reported and analyzed by the use of percentages. From this information each question was discussed as it related to one of the four areas of concern.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings and within the limitations of this study, the following general conclusions appear justified:

(1) junior college football coaches in California have recruiting problems that are different from those reported by high school coaches; (2) there appears to be a need for a letter of intent designed specifically for the four year college which will service only the junior college athlete; (3) this letter of intent should include a section that explains the athlete's financial aid; and (4) the letter should be enforced by a national organization such as the NCAA.
Recommendations

The letter of intent format is still being revised and, therefore, requires continued investigation before a comprehensive instrument can be utilized with confidence. The findings of this study suggest the following implications for further research.

1. An attempt should be made to study the legal implications of the present voluntary inter-conference letter of intent.

2. A survey should be conducted with the four year colleges that are presently participating in the voluntary letter of intent program.

3. The colleges which do not participate in the present letter of intent program should be questioned to determine their opinions on the subject.

4. The junior college athletes who signed a letter of intent should be questioned to determine their feelings toward this implement.

5. A similar survey should be conducted with the high schools.
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APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE
INTER-CONFERENCE LETTER OF INTENT
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE
FOOTBALL COACHES IN CALIFORNIA

RESPONDENT'S NAME: __________________________ SCHOOL ________

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING YES OR NO.

PLEASE NOTE: THESE QUESTIONS PERTAIN TO ATHLETES WHO HAVE PLAYED
FOR YOU.

YES NO 1. Do you feel there is a need for the Inter-Conference
Letter of Intent?

YES NO 2. Do recruiters attempt to take up an excessive amount
of an athlete's time in order to inhibit recruiting
efforts of other colleges?

YES NO 3. To the best of your knowledge have any of your athletes
received fringe benefits beyond the NCAA limits for an
athletic scholarship?

YES NO 4. Often an alumnus of a four year college makes the
initial contact with an athlete for his school and coach.
Is this a common practice at your school?

YES NO 5. In your experience, are contracts or offers for finan-
cial assistance by the colleges clear and precise so
that the athlete understands exactly what he is to
receive?

YES NO 6. The NCAA permits one paid visitation per athlete to a
school. In your experience has any four year school
ever paid for more than one visitation to its campus
for one of your athletes?

YES NO a. If the answer to this question is YES, is this a
common practice?

YES NO 7. Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference
Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the
athlete?

YES NO 8. Do the advantages of the present Inter-Conference
Letter of Intent outweigh the disadvantages for the
four year college?

YES NO 9. In your opinion, do colleges tend to go beyond the
intent of the NCAA rules that govern recruiting?
10. At present, the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent is directed to the June graduate because of the signing date designated. Should an additional clause be included which specifically applies to the mid-year junior college transfer?

11. What percentage of football players at your college eventually signed some type of Letter of Intent last year?

   a. 0%
   b. 1 - 25%
   c. 26 - 50%
   d. 51 - 75%
   e. 76 - 100%

12. If a National Letter of Intent were adopted, should the NCAA design a specific Letter of Intent to be utilized by four year colleges when recruiting the junior college athletes?

13. What percentage of your football players tend to select a college primarily for financial assistance?

   a. 0%
   b. 1 - 25%
   c. 26 - 50%
   d. 51 - 75%
   e. 76 - 100%

14. An athlete must be admissible to a college before the Letter of Intent is valid. In general, do most four year college recruiters make an effort to check an athlete's grades before recruiting him?

15. As a part of the Letter of Intent, should the financial assistance offer by the four year college be specifically spelled out?

16. Would you like to see a National Letter of Intent which would be adhered to by all four year colleges?

17. In your opinion, should it be possible to void a signed Letter of Intent by mutual agreement of both parties - the athlete and the four year college?

18. If the athlete signs the Letter of Intent of one college and subsequently decides to attend another college, his eligibility is limited. In your opinion, is this a fair penalty?
19. Please make any further comments pertinent to the study in the space below:
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO RESPONDENTS
Dear Coach:

I am a candidate for a Master of Arts Degree in Physical Education at San Fernando Valley State College in Northridge. The topic I have selected for my thesis is one which has been discussed by college football coaches for the past several years, "The Voluntary Inter-Conference Letter of Intent". As you know, when this letter is signed by an athlete, his athletic talents are committed to a particular school.

This study is designed to survey the eighty-two junior college head football coaches in California to determine general attitudes toward the letter of intent.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the voluntary inter-conference letter of intent and the questionnaire. Please take just a few minutes to read through the letter of intent and then complete the questionnaire.

I would appreciate the return of the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope by April 19, 1968. Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Gary E. Torgeson
Assistant Football Coach
San Fernando Valley State College
APPENDIX C

INTER-CONFERENCE LETTER OF INTENT
INTER-CONFERENCE LETTER OF INTENT REGULATIONS
AND PROCEDURES


2. By the signing of this Letter of Intent, the student-athlete certifies that he has not signed another Inter-Conference Letter of Intent.

3. After signing the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent with one institution, should a student-athlete elect to enroll at another institution which is a participant in the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent Plan, but not a member of the same Conference, the institution in which he enrolls may not be represented in athletic competition by that student-athlete until he shall have been in residence two years and in no case for more than two years of varsity competition in any sport. This restriction shall not apply to:

   (a) A student-athlete after one academic year of residence at the institution with which he signed an Inter-Conference Letter of Intent. However Conference and NCAA regulations governing transfers shall apply to a student-athlete who transfers after one academic year of residence.

   (b) A student-athlete who has not attended any senior college for at least one year after signing an Inter-Conference Letter of Intent, provided his request for the originally specified financial aid on a subsequent September date is not approved by the institution that signed him to the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent. In order to be relieved of this restriction, the student-athlete must file with the appropriate Conference Commissioner a statement from the original institution to the effect that such financial aid was not available to him on the requested September date.

4. After signing an Inter-Conference Letter of Intent with one institution, should a student-athlete elect to enroll at another institution which is a member of the same Conference, his athletic eligibility at the institution in which he enrolls will be limited in accordance with the regulations of that Conference.

5. This Inter-Conference Letter of Intent must be signed by the Athletic Director before submission to the prospective student-athlete and his parents for their signatures.

6. This form must be completed in triplicate, one copy to be retained by the prospective student-athlete and two copies returned immediately to the institution. It will be the responsibility of the institution to see that one of the copies returned to it is sent promptly to the appropriate Conference Commissioner.

7. The Commissioner of each Conference will notify promptly the Commissioners of all other Conferences upon receipt of the completed Letter of Intent, and they in turn will notify their member and affiliated institutions of the student-athlete's certification.

8. THE INTER-CONFERENCE LETTER OF INTENT IS NOT TO BE SIGNED BY STUDENT-ATHLETE AND PARENT PRIOR TO 8:00 A.M. LOCAL TIME ON MAY 22, 1968.