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ABSTRACT

PRACTICES IN ESTABLISHING AND IMPLEMENTING
GROOMING AND DRESS STANDARDS BY CALIFORNIA
JUNIOR COLLEGE BASEBALL COACHES

by

Terry Don Craven

Master of Arts in Physical Education

June, 1972

This study was undertaken to determine the prac-
tices in establishing and implementing grooming and dress
standards used by California Junior College baseball
coaches. The head baseball coach at each of the eighty-
five California Junior Colleges which offered inter-
collegiate baseball during the 1972 season was selected
as a respondent to the survey questionnaire.

The questions used in the questionnaire were the
result of a review of literature and careful analysis by
experts in physical education and athletics.

Each respondent was mailed a packet which included
an explanatory letter, questionnaire, and a postpaid
self-addressed return envelope. Eighty-four of the eighty-
five coaches contacted returned the questionnaire for a ninety-nine percent return.

Each response was tabulated and identified with one of six sections of concern. Examination of the data revealed that the respondents were using grooming and dress standards despite not being required to do so.

Standards used by the majority of California Junior College baseball teams are established by the Head Coach and the Team or by the Head Coach alone. The standards are implemented by the coach at a team meeting and handled by the coach through individual counseling when problems arise.

Based on the findings of this study, and within its limitations, it may be concluded that California Junior College baseball coaches are using grooming and dress standards which fit their desires and needs and are not encountering any significant problems.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the last ten years in intercollegiate athletics there has been an ever-increasing demand placed on college coaches to meet the more individual and specialized needs of their athletes. In the past the coach's problems were more involved with securing equipment, arranging for schedules and recruiting players. These problems continue to persist and, with increased demands for the All-American dollar, they may grow even larger. A new problem has recently emerged and poses an even larger threat to the individual coach. This problem is the individual rights and privileges being demanded by the modern college athlete.

Today's players are challenging the coach's presumed right to dictate the players' every move and the setting of guidelines for their behavior on and off the field. On one hand there are the youth with questioning and challenging views on tradition, dress and discipline, and on the other hand the traditional coach with his long established policies and rules and abhorrence for
long hair (53,74,75). Of course these examples represent the extremes. Not all athletes show up with shoulder length hair and not all coaches demand crew cuts and uniform dress. However, the extreme cases on each side have polarized the problem and caused many people to take stands in one direction or another (38,50,74,75).

The coach has found himself being regarded as the last stronghold of school control and a guardian of athletics. Delbert Oberteuffer writing on sportsmanship had this to say:

> It has been suggested that sports competition may be one of the last bastions of decency in our society. With the decline in the influence of the home and the church, sports may be called upon to assume more of the responsibility for the teaching of basic humanistic values . . . . (82)

The coach is hired by a school district or school board to conduct, organize and administer a learning experience which is expected to have an objective involving some physical achievement by his athletes. His teams are looked upon as being school and community representatives and not the coach's personal possession. Yet, he is expected to be the task master who makes the rules and sees that proper results, as judged by administrators, parents, students, and alumni, are gained from that experience (10,53,74).

This responsibility has increased the burden for
some coaches who have considered it necessary to increase their firmness in standards to maintain discipline and morale and to show firmness in enforcing these principles and standards (35,66). The coach is now being constantly challenged as to his position as sole determiner of these standards and as to what the principles are which he has used in establishing them. Many administrators have been forced to support either the coach or support the athlete and reject the coach in his position (10,74,75,76). In some instances coaches have been fired because their athletes have voiced unified opposition and issued grievances against the coach in regard to the standards and principles under which the coach expects his team to function (10,74,75,76). Many colleges have adopted the age-old professional sports world's practice of eliminating the coach rather than attempting to deal with the problem. This suggests that coaches' won-loss records or ideals are of much less importance than how they deal with or relate to their athletes.

Today, if the coach does not have the personality and drive of a Vince Lombardi (3) he would be foolish to impose his grooming and dress standards on a team without considerable time and reflection as to what those standards represent and why they are being asked. There are
no absolute rules for universal application in maintaining team discipline and morale through use of grooming and dress standards. Each situation must be assessed and individual determinations made.

College coaches should be learning from their own experiences and those of their colleagues in this area. Coaches will have to show more intelligence, understanding, and concern in their decisions in this delicate area (7,12).

This study was an attempt to examine the direction in which California Junior College baseball coaches are headed regarding the grooming and dress problem. An effort was then made to determine if the trends of this group reflect a general feeling held throughout the college coaching ranks. Finally, the data was examined in an attempt to show any future direction for those seeking answers to similar questions in this area.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem under investigation in this study was the changing attitudes and resulting demands of athletes today regarding grooming and dress standards imposed upon them by coaches and schools.
Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices involved in establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards used by California Junior College baseball coaches.

Delimitations

This study was concerned only with California Junior College baseball coaches. Additional delimitations include the fact that only the coaches responded to the questionnaire and only the grooming and dress standards were investigated.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were: (1) YES or NO type questions were used with some opportunity to make short explanatory statements, (2) individual interpretation of the questions may have influenced answers.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made: (1) the survey questionnaire was answered by all coaches in an honest, carefully thought-out manner, (2) the grooming and dress problem has been an area of concern and thought for these coaches, (3) the survey questionnaire asked questions
which provided answers to the information being sought.

**Importance of the Study**

This study was designed to help answer some of the questions which have resulted from challenges posed to coaches by athletes who ask, "Why, coach?" when given standards or directions to follow in matters of grooming and dress. A review of sports-oriented literature indicates many coaches are using standards because they have "always" been done that way and are not putting any other reasoning into decisions on grooming and dress. Individual cases are going to the courts and the coach's position to be "solely" responsible is threatened.

Some type of reasoning and logical understanding of the problem must take place between the coach and athlete. This study investigated one segment of the coaching population by analyzing what is happening at the Junior College level through a survey of California Junior College baseball coaches. The information obtained was used to assess current trends, practices, and implications for establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards in the future.
Definition of Terms

Insofar as this study is concerned, the following terms are defined:

**Authoritarian Coach.** One who advocates the principle of obedience to authority as opposed to individual liberty and needs (12).

**Baseball Coach.** The head baseball coach (as of February, 1972) at the eighty-five Junior Colleges in California which offer an intercollegiate baseball program.

**Discipline.** Guidance and control of behavior gained through obedience in conduct and action (6).

**Dress.** Attention given to clothing and shoes worn as an athlete/student, but not including the athletic uniform.

**First Amendment.** Freedom of Speech, of the Press, and of Religion guaranteed.

**Fourteenth Amendment.** No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

**Grooming.** Attention given to hair (head and face) and to maintaining body cleanliness.

**Humanism.** Coaching philosophy centering upon human or individual interests or needs.
Implement. To carry out or put into effect.

Junior College. California two-year college providing curriculum leading to an Associate of Arts Degree and/or transfer to a four-year college.

Morale. Positive mental condition of a team with respect to discipline and pride in striving toward a common goal.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this research was to study the grooming and dress regulations currently being used by California Junior College baseball coaches. The underlying principles involved in establishing and implementing these standards were examined and implications, conclusions, and recommendations made. In order to obtain a proper perspective from which to view the grooming and dress problem, literature related to this general area was examined.

The review of literature was presented in four areas. The first area is concerned with the start and growth of the current grooming and dress problem for athletes and coaches. The second area dealt with views and reactions as expressed by coaches. The third area presented views and reactions from athletes. The fourth area presented the legal aspects of the grooming and dress problem.
The Start and Growth

Today, athletes and coaches make constant referrals to various aspects of grooming and dress. Television viewers of athletic contests have watched the players' hair styles slowly but surely grow longer. An interesting sideline to the college football game on television is the pre-game introductions. As each athlete is presented, the various styles of hair, mustaches, sideburns and beards are shown. It often happens that there is a consistent style among members of one team, and a remarkable difference noted among members of another team. What is it that causes one squad to be close-cropped and cleanly shaven and the other to be very individual in their hair style? It is suggested that the athletes are reflecting their coaches' views on grooming and not necessarily their own (3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 17, 55). In the past this situation would hardly have been noticed, much less closely examined. This is not so today. What are the implications for athletes who are asked to follow a set of rules and, instead of complying, they question the rule and the authority from which it came. Today's athletes no longer feel they must resemble the Jack Armstrong image with a crew cut, cleanly shaven and conservatively dressed. In discussing
Anyone foolish enough to talk that way about today's athletes would be sued for defamation of character. The outspoken, power-conscious modern player no more accepts the daguerreotype than Muhammad Ali relates to Uncle Tom. In college and professional sports there are boycotts, strikes and lawsuits by players challenging the established order. Nothing is deader than the old locker-room adage that there is no "I" in T-E-A-M, or that coach equates with king. The free safety is now a freethinker. The inarticulate tackle of old now has his own talk show. The rangy country boy with the deadly hook shot has a lawyer, a business manager and a press agent to handle his manifold interests. Nothing symbolizes the swinging new athlete better than his dress - both on the field and off it (68:44).

When did this problem begin to take shape? Today, there is hair, as John Nordheimer of the New York Times stated:

... of all shapes, hair of all colors, hair falling over ears, creeping over collars, reaching for shoulders: the individual coiffure is the new fascination (70:10).

But is this new? Men had long hair before 1972 and pictures of the turn of the century teams show an ample supply of mustaches and sideburns. From the early 1900's up to the 1950's and early 1960's, athletes' hair styles went from an overabundance as exemplified by the handlebar mustaches and mutton-chop sideburns of the 1900-1920 era to the crew cut butch and no facial hair of the 1950's.

It has been said that the rock and roll singers of
the early 1960's brought hair and mod dress back into focus (70). But in the area of athletics the revolt of black athletes must be credited for bringing the grooming and dress issue to light (50,52,55). Some of the problems began before there was a black revolt; however, all athletes who are challenging the system can give credit to black athletes for helping to bring the problem into focus. By revolting against the special oppressions and exploitations, they (blacks) opened the whole subject up to the public. When talking about the black revolt, John Wooden of UCLA said, "I feel it is outside influences trying to use the Negro athlete" (67). Yet, Wooden was one of the first prominent coaches to recognize the black revolt and in order to maintain peace on his squad he allowed blacks to express their racial pride openly in natural haircuts, afro-dress and attitudes (67). Many athletes were quick to recognize the successes of the black athletes. The athlete who previously had not challenged the coach or school in its grooming and dress standards now saw hope. The 1960's were filled with protests of every type and for every reason. Athletic directors and coaches who worried over the possibility of interruption at athletic contests were now confronted with the effect of hairstyles on their
programs (35).

Critics began to doubt the value of discipline imposed by coaches and to question the leadership potential of young men whose lives were regulated by them. Harry Edwards, who organized the black boycott of the 1968 Olympics, asked, "How can a stable character develop in an artificial world where worth is dependent upon one thing—winning?" (79). Moreover, he charged that coaches and the paramilitary system of obedience they have developed automatically eliminates athletes whose personalities do not conform to the narrow ideas of the coaching fraternity (79). In his address to the American Football Coaches Association, former Marine Commandant General Lewis Walt supported Edwards' theory by stating:

There are in fact a lot of similarities between the training that makes a Marine and the training that makes a football player. . . . I believe that you, as a coach, and I, as a Marine officer, are trying to reach the same objective in our work with these young Americans (64:43).

Former El Camino Junior College baseball coach, S. H. Freeman, had this to say about athletic discipline:

It was once pointed out to me, in a rather distasteful manner, that a successful athletic team resembled a military operation. To the surprise of the accuser, I quite readily concurred. Without rules (one or rules for the entire squad), without sacrifice and self-discipline, a team would no longer be a team; but instead 20, 30, or 40 individuals going their separate ways.
Personality and individualism aren't stifled in this atmosphere. On the contrary, personalities take on a new luster, a new freshness, because of the nature of competition. The challenge to innovate is always present. . . . (44).

John Herbold, veteran baseball coach at Lakewood High in Long Beach, offered this:

For the benefit of those who haven't coached and who feel that it's their duty to protect the rights of those students in school, let us say now that a team is not a democracy - it's a semi-totalitarian dictatorship just as are most military groups. Players can't vote on whether they want to run or pass; bunt or hit away, or run on Friday so that they can have Saturdays off. . . . The fact that an athlete representing a school is asked to look like an athlete rather than a 'hippie' is in no way denying him his rights, culture, etc. If he doesn't want a haircut - okay - but he also doesn't have to play. This is more leniency than the military will give him. . . . (19).

Athletes were beginning to question and revolt against their coaches' rules regulating their dress, appearance and behavior, both on and off the field. They could no longer be considered a group of robots who would go out and fight for coach, school, country and God (in approximately that order). They were questioning, protesting and even walking out on the system entirely. It was, of course, largely individual and unorganized, but had to be considered a movement (64).

People asked why athletes were now revolting and
questioning ideas their fathers never did. Jack Scott, often called the guru of athletic revolution, offers this answer:

Because the institution of college athletics does not want to look at itself. The hypocrisy and corruption of the American university is nowhere made more clear than in a thorough examination of intercollegiate athletics. It is a system that victimizes the good athlete - a process that begins with lies during recruiting, extends through destroying whatever chance the athlete has to be a student by burdening him with impossible athletic requirements and ends by demanding a conformity of dress and thinking that ruins him as a person - and excludes the mediocre athlete, the one who needs the most attention of a coaching staff (10,64).

Scott has been supported in many of his attacks on the athletic system by such noted "dropouts" as Dave Meggyessy, Bernie Parish and Chip Oliver (5,8,10).

Today's athletes have joined the cultural revolution. They are no longer accepting authoritarian structures in sports (57). Their values are often not in agreement with their coach's. Researchers Ogilvie and Tutko state:

Hair length comes to mind. The coach sees hair as a problem of authority; he orders the athlete to get it cut and expects his order to be obeyed. In contrast, the athlete sees discipline as a peripheral, frivolous issue compared with his own struggle to find identity in the hair styles of his peers. Coach and athlete talk past each other (57).
As athletes seek to find more self-identity coaches are put under more and more pressure to meet their individualized needs. The grooming and dress problem has now come to the front and is being treated very delicately by coaches around the country.

This section has attempted to show how the problem has developed and that it is of major concern to all coaches. The next section focuses on the coach and what his reactions and philosophies have been in meeting the challenge of the grooming and dress problem.

The Coach

The role and function of the coach has been subject to question by those outside and within the coaching profession. The coach is guarding the interschool athletic programs and finds himself receiving the same pressures and demands placed on his sport. Team regulations are often the sole product of the coach and even when they are not he is expected to enforce and defend them. USC Physical Education professor Merrill Melnick says this about athletic regulations:

If it can be shown that the regulations assist the athlete in his pursuit of physical excellence or that the team's chance for winning is enhanced then the regulation can be justified. A regulation which contributes neither to the athlete's
nor to the team's performance should stand condemned. The coach's demand that his player shave off his beard and mustache has serious implication because it dramatizes the conscious or unconscious disregard that some coaches have for individual player's rights. If sport is to make its most valuable contribution to the educational process, then it should extoll the sanctity of the human personality rather than restrict its blossom with the establishment of choking, irrational and selfish regulations (53:33).

There is no greater motivation than the athlete's affection and respect for his coach (49:91). But such regard must be earned and coaches would do well to consider their team regulations in light of their function as a coach and teacher and the constitutional rights of their players (49,53).

If there are no universal rules for discipline then what are coaches doing and how do they feel about the grooming and dress philosophies in sports? At the 1971 American Football Coaches Association meeting, the following views were expressed (45):

Jim Sweeney, Washington State: All of us should realize that times are changing, and that the mode of dress that we adhered to when we were young might no longer be the thing. As a coach I am interested in having as many kids as possible participate in our programs. But I think that if we set a mode or a code that a kid could not live up to socially, then we possibly might chase him out of athletics and thus never be able to do anything for him. We want a whole lot of kids participating in athletics and learning the things we're trying to teach. But we cannot
teach them if we don't have them. To keep everybody participating, we should avoid rigidity in our thinking and standards.

John Bateman, Rutgers University: Education is not all book learning. It is the sum total of all of a person's experiences, and athletes undergo many experiences in football . . . . We cannot make up a set of rules and order anyone to live by them. We have to sell them on rules. We have to relate to the kids, keep the door open, accept the challenges, and answer the "whys"; why should my hair be short? why should my hair be any different from anyone else's? etc. . . . At the same time we must also relate to our faculty and administration and try to sell them on our program so that they will back us up whenever we have to drop a kid for failing to live up to the rules.

Dave Maggard, University of California: Coaching has changed. You no longer separate the athlete from the outside world. We don't have rigid rules, and we try to avoid extremes. We try to apply common sense and understanding, to be flexible and to build trust. I encourage the boys to discipline themselves. After all, that's what they're going to do when they get out of college. I'd like them to wear blazers when we travel, but they don't have to. And we have no curfews. I tell them to get their rest. I try to create a feeling of wanting to do, rather than having to do. But that doesn't mean our effort is an intramural thing, or recreation. We're always trying to excel.

Oregon freshman basketball coach, Frank Arnold, speaking about black "afros" said this after blacks had protested to Acting University President Charles Solomon, who ruled that haircuts have nothing to do with a student's right to participate in sports, "It is now clear to me that my requests for personal grooming were based on
Basketball coach Mel Cratsley speaking after he was fired for being "too inflexible" and "for not listening to his players" said this:

I was fired because I was too disciplined. I believe in discipline, in sacrifice, in motivation. Students today aren't interested in those things. The authority of the coach is questioned. The pendulum has swung too far the other way, allowing kids to dictate policy. If the trend continues it will kill intercollegiate athletics. . . . I think college administrators started it by not making decisions, by backing down. . . . It probably originated as a black problem, but today its not race. . . . I wanted my players to wear blazers, get haircuts, wear a tie, take a bath once in a while, be on time (74:70-72).

When he was at UCLA, Ram coach Tom Prothro had this to say:

... any assessment of the relations between coach and athlete has to take into consideration that there has always been a generation gap. But athletes have changed. . . . You've changed. I've changed. The whole world has changed. . . . Its no longer the autocratic society it was when I played where a Bob Neyland or a Wallace Wade would just say you do it because I say so. Now you have to explain yourself. The logic behind it. The philosophy (74:74).

Dee Andros of Oregon State has had several things to say in regard to grooming and dress. Among them are these quotes:

(In the Eugene Register Guardian): "My policies haven't changed in twenty years." (10:83).
(In the Los Angeles Times): It is essential for team morale and unity for each individual player to conform to the rules and regulations set up for the rest of his teammates. I guess I'm old-fashioned; I've always liked the Jack Armstrong,! all-American boy type of athlete. Although I believe in human rights and individual rights, when we become a member of an organization or a team, there are certain things we must give up. No individual can be put before the team (50:30).

Ara Parseghian of Notre Dame states his opinion this way:

The fad started with the hippies. I saw them in Haight-Ashbury. Wearing a beard or a mustache or long hair doesn't necessarily make anyone look like the scum I saw there but it gives an empathy for a movement that certainly is the direct opposite of what we strive for in college football . . . . (50:31).

Payton Jordan, track coach at Stanford and U. S. coach in the 1968 Olympics, invalidated the records set by Pat Morrison in the 100 and 220 yard dashes because Morrison wore his hair in a Beatle cut and refused to get it cut. Morrison lost his records and was kicked off the team despite the fact that all but one of the team members signed a petition requesting Morrison be allowed to remain on the team. Jordan said Morrison's hair endangered team morale (10,55).

William Davis, President of Idaho State, in a letter he sends to athletes and parents states:
In our University, the head coach in each sport has the prerogative of setting training rules and standards of behavior and discipline for his squad. This entails a clear understanding of what is expected by the player and the coach in terms of appearance and conduct because the administration fully intends to back the coach in carrying out the policies governing his sport as long as they do not conflict with institutional policy (31).

John McKay of USC adds this:

We don't really keep our players from growing hair. If they do, all that happens is we make them play without helmets. I like a little conformity on our team. If we permit players to grow long hair, what is the next step? (50:31).

Pete Newell, former athletic director and basketball coach at the University of California, has a slightly different view:

A coach now has to be more aware of social changes and adjust to them. What was true three or four years ago is not necessarily true now. Sure, it's a voluntary act when an athlete goes out for a team. It's something he has chosen to do. He is responsible for the rules of the scholarship and the coach's rules. If he doesn't like them he has the choice to say, 'thanks but no thanks'. But it's a two-way response. Coaches are vulnerable if they put rules on a team that are contrary to accepted, normal modes of dress, Times change. What wasn't acceptable before is acceptable now - meaning long sideburns, beards, and long hair. It is mandatory that a coach recognize these changes (50:31).

Perhaps the champion of all coaches who believed in his players' rights and views was George Davis, football coach at Willets High in northern California. Davis has
been a head coach for nine years and all of his players have decided what positions they wanted to play and, by vote, which of them would start.

Kids can handle responsibility and I think it makes better citizens of them. . . . You have to give kids a chance to make mistakes so they can find out what the problems are. It gets them involved, committed, which is very important today. . . . The coach's job is to foster ability, but even more to get out of the way of it. . . . I have faith in my boys' ability (21).

John Ralston's Stanford teams have won the last two Rose Bowls over two Big Ten teams and coaches which have training and dress rules that suggest preparation for a Holy War (16,17,25). Ralston took a relaxed approach to the 1971 Rose Bowl but it was not enough for his players who demanded, and got, more liberal rules for the 1972 game. Stanford had no curfew until three days before the game; ate breakfast only if they wanted to (on an individual basis) and had no dress or grooming code. They often dressed in Levis and their hair is very near being the shaggiest in college football (16,17).

Coach Ralston says this about his attitude:

There's nothing I can do about hair length. . . . For now, it doesn't make any difference to me . . . . I'm much more relaxed in my handling of players now. I appeal to their pride, rather than setting down hard and fast rules and demanding things. We have had no serious problems with players' violating anything this year (17).
Jim Kraus, baseball coach at Morton West High in Illinois has ordered players on his squad to be well-groomed and get rid of any shaggy hair (27). Appearance in baseball uniforms is a concern of coaches from the major leagues on down to Little League. A veteran Little League manager in Los Angeles says he has kids showing up with sideburns and mustaches painted on with shoe polish because they are trying to be like their "TV heroes" (33). The late Jim Reeder of Cal State Los Angeles felt it was pro baseball's job to set higher standards to create a better image for the young players (33). He said this:

It adds to morale to have a sharp, well-groomed team - and morale is important to winning. I allow no sideburns, long hair, beards, mustaches, natural hair do's, etc. and will rise or fall with my decision (33).

Art Reichle, UCLA baseball coach for almost thirty years, says this about grooming for baseball players:

If appearance is not important, why not let them come out in solid or striped socks, different colored sweatsnirts, different caps, etc., without any uniformity... We do not allow mustaches or hippy haircuts on the UCLA diamond (33).

Bob Bennett, Fresno State baseball coach, also feels the Major Leagues should initiate action to clean up the appearance of all baseball players:

Lack of concern for appearance and discipline appears to be growing. For coaches and pro club
owners to do nothing is not only a disservice to baseball but to the young people involved (33).

Ben Hines of La Verne feels this way:

My feeling about personal grooming is that it's an individual matter until it becomes extreme. Then I will take some action on it (32).

Washington State baseball coach Chuck Brayton issued a set of guidelines for his 1969 baseball team entitled "General Rules for Players and Managers." Included was a statement that "each Cougar, while representing Washington State University as a part of the Cougar Baseball Program, will be expected to be neat in appearance and carry on the 'All-American Boy' image." He said extra long sideburns and beards did not create this image. Coach Brayton is bald (31).

A poll of District Eight baseball coaches in 1969 was in accord with the decision by Major League Baseball General Managers to outlaw mustaches, sideburns and long hair (34).

Coaches have not been left alone in their struggle with the grooming and dress problem. The Gillette Company has even come out with an educational kit that includes a twelve-minute filmstrip; a teacher's script and guide; wall charts on shaving technique and body hygiene, a full size can of hair spray for men; forty-eight "Neat Is Not A
Dirty Word"

booklets and forty-eight cans of anti-
perspirant. The kit is being advertised in many coach-
oriented magazines (46).

The literature has revealed the start of current
problems in grooming and dress for athletes to have begun
concurrently with the black athletes' revolt. The coaches'
reactions and viewpoints have been mixed with both ex-
treme and moderate views demonstrated.

The Players

The modern athlete is not satisfied to do something
simply because his coach tells him to do it. He must be
shown the why and logical reasoning behind any order which
he feels is challenging to his individuality.

Bill Skinner, the top U.S. javelin man, was the
clean-shaven cover boy of the 1971 NCAA Track and Field
Guide. Skinner, 31, divorced, military veteran, and a
father, grew a mustache and refused to shave it off when
requested by the University of Tennessee track coach.
His challenge to the grooming regulations cost him his
scholarship and caused a great deal of embarrassment to
the department and the administration. Skinner felt it
silly that he should be told by the twenty-eight year old
football coach how to wear his hair or how to dress.
Skinner said this:

Don't take me for a radical or hippie. I'm just an athlete trying to get along. This all started over what I consider an invasion of privacy. Now its more than that. In a small way I'm challenging the department's false standards and misrepresentations, protesting against the fact that all athletes outside the football team are treated as second-class citizens (38).

On the depth of change now happening in athletics,

John Dobroth, former star high jumper at UCLA, says:

Professors and coaches are paid to teach, not insult. . . . If a 'soft' or insecure boy is intimidated by a strong-willed coach, he will feel guilt for not coming up to this strong figure's conception of an athlete and man. If the boy is perceptive he recognizes the absurdity of a system in which a man who is there to offer help and resources acts as an omniscient being. In what part of a young man's life is he free to fail? Are we sure we know the way for people to live, compete and dress? If we are, let's not pretend we believe in freedom or dissent (55).

Sam Cvijanovich, linebacker for Cal Lutheran's NAIA Champions, is the fellow with a shaved head and Fu Manchu mustache. He said this about his hair style:

I seem to play better with short hair because I wear this special helmet. I'm not very big so I have to hit people with my head. I had a good year when I was a sophomore. My hair was short then, too. Last year, when I was a junior, I let my hair grow long. And I stunk (22).

Defensive End Tommy Hart, who started a run on white cleats among the San Francisco 49ers, says gleefully, "We're psychedelic, man!" The Chicago Cubs' Joe Pepitone,
who favors lavender suede sashes and see-through paisley shirts, gets his kicks on the field by wearing a fluffy hairpiece. Cornerback Earsell Mackbee claims he was cut from the Minnesota Vikings for showing up one day in a red lace jumpsuit, a fake fur maxi vest and a slouch hat. "Freedom to express your own personality makes for a winning team," says the 49ers Ken Willard. Gene Washington of the 49ers, who grooves on $350 Oscar de la Renta suits, deplores traditional club rules. "Room checks at 11 p.m. is Cub-Scout stuff" (68).

Bill Seibert a little used forward for John Wooden at UCLA surprised everyone at the UCLA basketball dinner when he bitterly attacked the UCLA system as harboring double standards, unequal treatment for starters and substitutes, and a lack of communication between the players and coaching staff. During the speech he was shouted down and booed by alumni, but at its conclusion he received a standing ovation from his teammates (52).

The Harvard crew members backed the black athletes in their attempted boycott of the 1968 Olympics. They were called instigators and threatened, but they held firm in their stand (64).

Football players at the University of Maryland banded together and announced they would not play for
coach Bob Ward. Ward admitted slapping members of the squad during practice and offered no defense for his regulations and intense demands. Ward was asked to resign (64,75).

At Providence College, the track coach added another restriction to what the squad felt was already an inhumanely restrictive program - no television after 10 p.m. When three athletes were later kicked off the squad for minor infractions of the rules, the whole squad quit in protest. The coach was fired (64,75).

Will Hetzel, basketball star at Maryland was benched after being the team's leading scorer the previous year. The reason - the coach did not like the length of his hair or his attitude toward the game. He later turned down two pro contracts saying he was soured on playing basketball because the coaches had taken the fun out of it (64).

David Meggyesy, a $33,000 linebacker for the St. Louis Cardinals, quit the pros and wrote a book, Out of Their League, to proselytize other players to join him in his dissertation of the brutal game. He said, "football is antithetical to the way human beings should act toward each other" (5,37,64).

Chip Oliver, a $25,000 linebacker for the Oakland
Raiders, quit the game because he felt he was not con-
tributing to the world becoming a better place by taking
part in the dehumanizing game (56,64).

Bernie Parrish, an all-pro cornerback for the
Cleveland Browns, claims he was blacklisted out of foot-
ball because he challenged the owners and the commissioner
through his position as vice-president of the Player's
Association. In his book, They Call It A Game, he exposes
the ruthless treatment of players by the owners and des-
cribes the puppet-like action of Pete Rozell, who was
"put-in" to serve the owners (8,39).

Curt Flood exposes the way athletes are handled as
just a piece of merchandise and how little control or say
they have over their careers in the lawsuit against Major
League Baseball. Flood maintains he was sold down the
river by the owners and now his case will be heard by the
Supreme Court in what could be a decision of great conse-
quence to professional sports (43).

Two Negro athletes were suspended from the Purdue
track team for refusing to shave their mustaches. Ath-
letic Director, Red Mackey, explained that Purdue had had
good-grooming rules for twenty years. A sympathetic black
teammate passed a remark which was interpreted as a bomb
threat and was arrested and jailed. Black students
marched on City Hall. The bomb charges were dismissed and the two suspended athletes were reinstated, mustaches intact. The Purdue coaches then met with their teams and new good-grooming standards were drawn up (74:72).

A black football player in California began growing a natural despite the coach's rule about long hair. As the player's hair got bushier it became evident the coach was not going to do anything about it. Eventually the player had to change helmets because of the amount of hair he had. He did this several times until there were no helmets to fit him. Then the coach told him to cut his hair. The athlete wanted to play without a helmet and when the coach explained there were rules against that, the boy said they would have to change the rule (74:74).

Edgar Lacey quit UCLA's NCAA Championship basketball team saying Coach John Wooden could not handle him (Lacey is black). The next year Don Saffer quit. He also said Wooden could not handle him (Saffer is white) (74:75).

Nate Kirkman at Stanford and Archie Chapman at Valley State were athletes who quit their teams to head-up Black Student Union groups in protest against athletics and racism at their schools. Kirkman was peaceful and non-violent in his actions but Chapman led a student
revolt which rocked the whole campus in a militant manner (74:76).

Linebacker Fred Milton was told by Dee Andros to shave his mustache. Milton contended that it was off-season and the rules did not apply. Andros said they did and removed Milton from the team. Sides were drawn throughout the Oregon State campus and community and the battle was on. In the weeks that followed the only charge against Andros that was backed up was that Milton was told to shave. Andros remained and so did the rule, Milton did not (75:23).

In his book, The Athletic Revolution, Jack Scott reports a case where the NCAA caused more than one athlete to take a second look at the personal and social reasons for the increasing discontent among college athletes throughout the country. He relates:

The case of Sylvester Hodges, a wrestler from Hayward State, poignantly illustrates the reasons for much of the turmoil plaguing high school and college athletics in America today. Hodges enrolled at Hayward State in 1966 after serving three years in the Air Force upon graduation from high school. He had been wrestling competitively since his junior year of high school, and by the time he was a senior at Hayward, he was one of the outstanding college wrestlers in the country. In fact, he had become so skilled that he was undefeated his senior year and seemed a sure bet to win the NCAA college division wrestling championship. Hodges showed up at the 1969 NCAA tournament intent on winning the championship.
He was barred from competing because he wore a mustache. NCAA officials in charge of wrestling had passed a rule earlier that year that prohibited anyone from competing in college wrestling who had facial hair below the middle of the ear. The rule had not been enforced during the season, but now, at the championship tournament, the officials had decided to enforce it. Hodges and his coach, Dick Revenes, pointed out to the NCAA officials how he had worn this same mustache while wrestling in the Armed forces for three years without incident. They also explained that wrestlers in the Olympic Games and other international competitions regularly compete with mustaches, beards, and long hair. But the efforts of Hodges and his coach to reason with the NCAA officials proved futile, and he was not allowed to compete (11:3-4).

Rudolph Nureyev, the Russian ballet star, was explaining one reason why he had fled the Soviet Union when he wrote this:

I know that discipline is necessary; I know that it is discipline that forges character and that without it we would slowly disintegrate. But this systematic wearing down of the individual until his behavior exactly mirrors that of everyone else around him is not what I understand by discipline. My own natural instinct was just the opposite - I valued anything that I felt contributed to my own individuality (10:10).

Roger Bannister, who broke the four-minute mile barrier, spoke this about his school days:

I realized then how delicately one's individual freedom is poised. Though most of us were perhaps unaware of it, the school was in fact governed more by fear in one way or another, than by respect or tolerance. . . . Under these conditions freedom to explore was always in danger (10:14).
It is interesting to note how many schools are cutting back on monetary allotments for athletics because they feel the individuality of the athlete is gone. At San Francisco State the budget was reduced to zero and not until the athletic department pledged that coaches could no longer bar students from competition because of long hair or beards did the student body allot $12,000 to the department to cover contract obligations (10:10).

The players are not going to accept every word spoken or written by their coaches as the law. St. Thomas Aquinas was one of the first thinkers to stress the value of placing greater responsibility on those being educated (10). Athletes would like athletics to be for them in the same manner.

The reactions of the players to decisions on grooming and dress have been varied from mild to extreme. The players have opposed coaches and also tried to work with them to find a workable agreement on their standards.

The next section examines the legal aspects of protest of the grooming and dress regulations to see what the courts are saying about these standards and what can and cannot be done.
Legal Aspects

The legal battles over grooming and dress codes have centered around the constitutional freedoms guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The courts have been making many decisions in this area as have the policy-making bodies throughout the high school and college systems.

A major point of people arguing for and against the various athletic grooming and dress codes has been the concern for freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Along with the courts' decisions have been those of policy-making bodies throughout the school and college systems.

School officials in Williams Bay, Wisconsin insisted that boys with shoulder length hair distracted other students from their studies. Two students were told to get hair cuts or be expelled. They took the case to a federal district court which declared the school's demand unconstitutional. The judge said, "Freedom to wear one's hair at a certain length or to wear a beard is constitutionally protected, even though it expresses nothing but individual taste" (47).

The Eighth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that school dress codes were often based on school official's
prejudices and that a high school pupil's right to wear long hair is protected by the Constitution. Judge John Lay said, "When school authorities complain variously that such hair styles are inspired by a Communist conspiracy, that they make boys look like girls, that they promote confusion, then it is a little wonder even moderate students complain" (20).

A federal trial judge in Minnesota ruled that a local Board of Education regulation requiring short male haircuts has an effect on the student's life outside school, and for that reason, he ruled the regulation illegal. The judge said rules about hair length cannot be compared to rules concerning clothing because students can change their clothing after school, but not their hair length (70:7).

In contrast, a federal district court in Indiana upheld the suspension of a long-haired high school student because he was held to be a disruptive influence on the school (70:8).

The courts have also disagreed on another issue. In the Indiana case school officials said long-haired males disturbed other students while affecting class decorum and endangered health and safety standards in physical education classes. The Indiana court accepted
this. Yet, in a Massachusetts district court ruling it was stated:

... no factual foundation has been offered to show that hairstyle involved a health or sanitary risk to the students, or will interfere with others' performance of their school work, or will create disciplinary problems of a kind reasonably thought to be a concern for public officials (70:8).

These cases are all based on the First Amendment which guarantees freedom of expression. But the First Amendment does not talk about long hair, clothing, customs or personal behavior. Because federal courts disagree on nearly identical cases, many argue that the Supreme Court should make an all-encompassing ruling covering the First and Fourteenth Amendments and settle the grooming and dress legal battles. It would seem the logical thing to do.

Even Disneyland has ruled on long hair in its own way. Hundreds of young people are turned away at the gates because moonlighting physical education teachers who serve as security guards do not approve of their appearance (50:32).

The NCAA for years said an athlete could not be deprived of his scholarship for reasons of discipline. It was a rule to protect boys from unfair treatment by coaches. But now a new rule says in effect a boy can get
himself and his scholarship in difficulty for serious misconduct - conduct of sufficient gravity to warrant disciplinary penalties, including manifest disobedience of institutional regulations or established athletic department policies or rules (76:31).

In his book, Athletics for Athletes, Jack Scott advises athletes who seek revolt:

In most areas of the country, the American Civil Liberties Union will defend athletes attending public colleges who are barred from sports participation because of their personal appearance (10:70).

Coaches are now having to become constitutional law authorities. Hairstyles in athletics on the school and college levels have become increasingly prominent in the courts. The main issue seems to be whether or not the length of hair is disruptive to the discipline of a particular group. The coach has usually felt that team discipline requires a minimum standard of dress and grooming. The athlete contends he is free to wear whatever type of clothes he prefers and have any hairstyle because this is freedom of expression guaranteed by the Constitution. The courts are asked to resolve this issue.

The courts usually have supported the school officials when they prove that a particular hairstyle regulation is necessary for the safety of the individual
They also view the constitutional right of a student to dress or groom himself as he sees fit as being subject to a reasonable school rule (66:8). The court has ruled in favor of the athlete when it considered the policy to be too vague and indefinite (35:7,66:8). In determining whether or not a regulation for grooming and dress is reasonable and constitutional, the courts have used three tests: (1) the restraint imposed by the regulations must rationally relate to the enhancement of the educational function; (2) the public benefits produced must outweigh the consequent impairment of the students' constitutional rights; (3) there are no alternatives less subversive to the constitutional rights available (66:8,35:7).

Court decisions have usually upheld schools when it was felt a dress code based on decorum was not unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious (35:7). When regulations are related to safety, discipline, athletics, and teaching good grooming the courts have also usually held in favor of the school officials (35:7).

The Commissioner of Education in New Jersey stated his position like this:

Coaches make rules... that athletes must observe for the purposes of teamwork and organization. The reasonable limits of any rules of eligibility should not include any regulations on hair style and length, which are matters of
personal taste, unless it can be shown that such styles create classroom disorder, present a clear and present danger to the student or his fellow participants, or are detrimental to good health and hygiene (35:72).

On March 10, 1970, George Harris, U. S. District Court Judge for the Northern District of California, ruled against four students from Redwood High, Larkspur, California, who had sought relief from grooming regulations of the Tamalpais Union High School District (42). As a result of this case and of the growing controversy in regard to athletes and their grooming, the California State Bureau of Health Education, Physical Education, Athletics and Recreation developed a policy statement to serve as a basis for schools to establish standards for athletes which should have the full backing of the school's athletic staff, administration, and the local Board of Education (42). This statement said this among its guidelines:

... Interscholastic athletics is a voluntary program. ... thus, competition in high school athletics is a privilege and not a right. Accompanying that privilege is the responsibility of the athlete to conform to standards established for the school athletic teams. Each school, through the Director of Athletics and his staff, with the approval of local school administration and the School Board, should establish special standards of attitude, conduct, grooming and appearance, and training, consistent with achieving top performance. Standards should include Rules of Behavior - proper dress, grooming and appearance
Citizenship  .  .  . Team Responsibility  .  .  .
The athletic coach and/or athletic director who have been trained for athletic leadership have the prime responsibility for the implementation of the aforementioned standards. . . Because participation in athletics is a privilege, the school coach should have the authority to revoke that privilege when the athlete does not wish to comply with the rules. . . . (42).

Assuming that coaches will continue to use standards for grooming and dress the following guidelines drawn from the court decisions have been offered as being ways of protecting the interests of coaches and athletes:

1. The rule should apply solely to athletic teams and not to students generally (66:8).

2. The rule should contain a statement that restrictions on dress and grooming of team members are necessary to prevent disruption of team morale which would have a prejudicial effect on team spirit, and proper team discipline cannot be maintained in the absence of such a rule (66:26).

3. The rule should be supported by a statement that the benefits gained by such a rule are the development of character, initiative, and team-work which outweigh any impairment of student's rights (66:26).

4. The rule should be supported by a statement that proper habits of discipline and the development of personality cannot be achieved by any other available alternatives (66:26).

In adopting these rules the coach should keep these four ideas in mind (35:72):

1. Adopt policies that are applicable to the character of the institution.
2. Involve all members of the school community (students, faculty, administration) in the construction of policies and regulations.

3. Adopt rules that are specific and not too vague or broad. Keep fairness and reasonableness as the guiding feature.

4. Publish and announce the regulations and rules of conduct in advance.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the related literature pertaining to the growth of grooming and dress problems in athletics, the coaches' viewpoints and reactions, the players' viewpoints and reactions, and, the legal aspects of establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURAL DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to examine the principal factors involved in establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards used by California Junior College baseball coaches. Included in this chapter are the procedures utilized in the construction of the questionnaire, the processes involved in conducting the study and the methods and procedures utilized in analyzing the data.

Sampling Procedure

Selection of Respondents

The head baseball coach at each of the ninety-one California Junior Colleges which listed an intercollegiate baseball program in the 1971-1972 National Directory of College Athletics (83) was selected as a respondent.

Packet

A packet was compiled for the purpose of insuring
a greater response to the questionnaire. The packet included: a cover-letter describing the purpose of the study (Appendix A), the questionnaire (Appendix C), and self-addressed, postpaid envelope. These items were included so the respondents would have a better understanding of the study and to facilitate the return of the questionnaire.

Mailing

All packets of information were mailed to the ninety-one California Junior College baseball coaches on February 1, 1972. The coaches were asked to return the questionnaire prior to February 14, 1972, in the self-addressed, postpaid envelope.

Follow-up Procedure

On February 22, 1972, a follow-up letter was sent to those coaches who had failed to return the questionnaire, urging them to do so prior to February 29, 1972. An additional questionnaire was included in the event the original had been misplaced. Those respondents still not heard from by March 8, 1972, were given a telephone call.

Construction and Validation of the Instrument

Initial Investigations

The initial selection of items for the questionnaire
developed by listing sections which are of primary importance and then designing items which would cover questions for each section.

**Refinement of the Questionnaire**

After the initial questions had been formulated, they were evaluated by the thesis committee which included an expert on survey questionnaires, an expert on social-psychological aspects of athletics, and the Head baseball coach at California State University, Northridge. The questions were also evaluated by those students, and professors attending the colloquium for this study; two junior college football coaches; three high school baseball coaches; and numerous people in physical education and athletics. Their opinions and suggestions were then utilized to rework and reconstruct the questionnaire.

**Format of the Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was constructed using questions designed to get specific information. The information being sought was divided into six sections which had specific questions distributed throughout the questionnaire. The first section was designed to discover if the respondents and/or schools were using grooming and dress standards. The second section was intended to determine
what the standards actually cover. The third section was designed to determine who was actually establishing the standards. The fourth section attempted to discover why the standards were established. The fifth section allowed the respondent to reveal his personal beliefs about grooming and dress standards. The sixth section gave background information on the respondent.

The survey was constructed so that the respondents would have only two choices, YES or NO, when selecting an answer to seventeen of the twenty-three questions. Seven of the questions required the respondent to answer a sub-question. Three of the questions provided the respondent a choice of answers from which to choose. Ten questions asked for short explanations of opinions. One question asked the respondent to fill-in background information on his coaching experience. One question asked the respondent to relate any significant problems and one question asked for a copy of the grooming and dress regulations being used by his team. The final question was open ended and asked for further comments relative to the study.

Survey Questionnaire

The purpose of this section was to present the items selected for each section in the questionnaire. Each
question had a definite objective and questions with similar objectives were grouped together to make the finding more meaningful.

The questions in the first group were asked to determine if the respondent or his school actually were using grooming and dress standards:

YES NO 1. Does your school have grooming and/or dress standards for the general student body?

YES NO 2. Does your athletic department require you to have grooming and/or dress standards for your team?

YES NO 4. Do you have specific grooming and dress standards for your team?

YES NO 17. Are the coaches in your department required to follow grooming and dress standards?

The second group of questions attempted to determine what the standards actually covered:

7. Does your team have standards for:

YES NO Hair Length

YES NO Sideburns

YES NO Mustaches

YES NO Beards

YES NO 8. Do the standards used by your team make specific allowances for Negro, Chicano, or other minority athletes?

9. Do you have team standards for:

YES NO Daily dress at school

YES NO School dress on game days at home
YES NO 11. Do you have dress standards for road trips?

YES NO 12. Are the standards different for trips that require overnight stays?
   If YES, Explain_____________________________________________________

YES NO 14. Do all of the grooming and dress standards used by your team apply to out-of-season as well as in-season?
   Explain__________________________________________________________

22. If available, please forward a copy of the grooming and dress standards used by your team when you return this questionnaire.

The third group of questions attempted to determine who established the standards:

YES NO 3. Do the coaches in your department establish their own grooming and dress standards?

YES NO 13. Are the penalties for violation of any of the standards predetermined?
   If NO, how are the violation penalties handled? Explain__________________________

NOTE: Answer each of the following questions by checking the appropriate box.

15. To what degree do the following participate in determining the grooming and dress standards used by your team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENTIRELY</th>
<th>PARTIALLY</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Body  □ □ □
Department Coaches □ □ □
Head Coach (You) □ □ □
Team Members □ □ □
Other (Explain__________)

If someone other than those listed above determines the penalties for violation of the grooming and dress standards. Explain below:_________________________

The fourth group consisted of two questions to determine why the standards were used:

10. Does your team travel by:
   YES NO School Bus
   YES NO School Cars
   YES NO Charter Bus
   YES NO Private Cars
   Other - Explain_________________________

NOTE: Question ten was asked to discover if the mode of travel would affect the answers to questions eleven and twelve.

16. What degree of importance would you place on the following reasons for the grooming and dress standards used by your team?

   VERY IMPT  IMPT  NOT VERY IMPT  NONE

   Health/Sanitation □ □ □ □
   Safety □ □ □ □
The fifth group of questions asked the respondent to indicate his personal beliefs about grooming and dress standards:

YES NO 2. Does your athletic department require you to have grooming and/or dress standards for your team?

YES NO If YES, is this contrary to your beliefs?

YES NO 3. Do the coaches in your department establish their own grooming and dress standards?

YES NO If NO, do you think they should have that privilege?

YES NO 4. Do you have specific grooming and dress standards for your team?

IF YES, how is your team made aware of the standards?
Explain

YES NO 5. Do you give your team the rationale behind the standards you use?

YES NO 6. Do you personally follow the same standards?
YES NO 18. Do you feel grooming and dress standards are necessary for Junior College baseball teams? Explain

YES NO 19. Do you feel the standards used by your team are effective in meeting the objectives for establishing them?

20. Please relate any significant problems you have had in the grooming and dress area:

The sixth group of questions provided background information on the respondent and for standards he used:

21. Please indicate your baseball coaching experience below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>NO. OF SEASONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Please feel free to make any comments relative to this study:

Analyzing the Data

A sixty percent return of the questionnaires was needed in order to have significant return to provide a basis for valid conclusions and recommendations. The methods used in the sampling procedure resulted in a ninety-nine percent return with only one coach failing to respond.
As each questionnaire was received the responses for each question and sub-question were tabulated onto cards assigned to each section. The total number of coaches responding to each question requiring YES or NO answers was determined and tabulated. Each explanation offered by the respondents was also listed on the appropriate card. Once all the questionnaires had been received a table was constructed for each question and sub-question giving all replies offered by each responding coach.

Seventeen of the twenty-three survey questions were intended for those coaches actually using grooming and dress standards. It was determined that eighty of the eighty-four responding coaches were actually using standards and only their answers to these seventeen questions were used despite the fact that the other four coaches persisted in answering the questions.

In drawing conclusions from the data, percentage of answers was used to determine trends. In most cases the percentages were above fifty percent and closer to ninety percent. The higher the percentage above fifty percent the greater the significance of the responses.
Summary

This chapter has presented an overview of the procedures utilized in this study. The next chapter will report and discuss the findings of this study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION
OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter was to present and interpret the results of the study in establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards used by California Junior College baseball coaches.

Response to Questionnaire

Questionnaires were sent to ninety-one California Junior Colleges which had intercollegiate baseball listed in the athletic department section of the 1971-1972 National Directory of College Athletics (83). In the initial return fifty-nine (64.8%) questionnaires were received. After the follow-up letter, sixteen questionnaires were received bringing the total response to seventy-four (81.3%). At this time a telephone call was made to each remaining respondent and ten more questionnaires were received. It was learned during the telephone conversations that six junior colleges of the original ninety-one contacted did not offer baseball programs during the 1972 season. These six were
eliminated from the study and the working number reduced to eighty-five. On April 7, 1972, the investigative portion of the study was terminated. At this time eighty-four of the eighty-five respondents had returned questionnaires for a 99 percent response.

Presentation and Discussion of Findings

Because some of the respondents failed to complete all of the questions and misinterpreted a few others, percentages were utilized in this chapter to clarify the numbers used. The section on the survey questionnaire in Chapter III explained the grouping of the questions into six sections. This format is used in the presentation and discussion of the findings of this study.

Section I. Are Grooming and Dress Standards Being Used?

This section uses four questions to determine if standards are being used in the California Junior Colleges and if so, who is establishing the requirement.

Question 1. Does your school have grooming and/or dress standards for the general student body? Of the eighty-four coaches who responded seventy-two (85.7%) indicated NO and twelve (14.3%) indicated YES.
Question 2. Does your athletic department require you to have grooming and/or dress standards for your team? Of the eighty-four coaches responding seventy (83.3%) said NO and fourteen (16.7%) said YES.

Question 4. Do you have specific grooming and dress standards for your team? Of the eighty-four coaches responding eighty (95.2%) said YES and four (4.8%) said NO.

Question 17. Are the coaches in your department required to follow grooming and dress standards? Of the eighty-four coaches who responded seventy-five (89.3%) said NO and nine (10.7%) said YES.

Sub-question 17 asked the coaches who answered YES to explain who determined their standards. In five of the nine cases where coaches were asked to follow certain standards, the coaches established the standards themselves.

Questions one, two, four, and seventeen, establish that the majority of coaches are not required by either the school or athletic department to have grooming and dress standards, however, eighty (95%) of the eighty-four coaches replying report they do have such standards for their team.
Section II. What Areas Do the Standards Cover?

This section used seven questions to identify specifically what the grooming and standards being used covered.

Question 7. Does your team have standards for: Hair Length, Sideburns, Mustaches, Beards? Of the eighty coaches who have grooming and dress standards seventy-five (93.8%) include Hair Length, seventy-one (88.8%) include Sideburns and Mustaches, and seventy-six (95%) include Beards as being areas where grooming standards apply.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF COACHES WHO HAVE TEAM STANDARDS IN THE AREAS LISTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Coaches Using Standards N=80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Length</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideburns</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustaches</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beards</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8. Do the standards used by your team make specific allowances for Negro, Chicano, or other minority athletes? Of the eighty coaches who use standards sixty-eight (85.0%) said NO and eleven (13.8%) said
YES. One coach failed to respond.

Question 9. Does your team have standards for daily dress at school and school dress on game days at home? Of the eighty coaches who have grooming and dress standards twelve (15.0%) have daily dress requirements while thirteen (16.3%) require their players to be dressed in specific ways on days when they have a home game.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for Daily School Dress</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have daily school dress standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no daily school dress standards</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for Home Game Dress</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have home game dress standards</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no home game dress standards</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 11 and Question 12. Do you have dress standards for road trips? Are the standards different for trips that require overnight stays? The response to Question 11 indicates sixty-seven (83.8%) of the eighty coaches who have grooming and dress standards do have dress standards for road trips. Of these sixty-seven coaches twenty-four (35.8%) require different standards for
overnight trips. Sub-question 12 asked for an explanation of these different standards. Table 3 indicates the standards are a little more strict with coat and tie (29.1%) and appropriate motel and restaurant dress (25.0%) the most prevalent requirements.

TABLE 3
HOW THE DRESS STANDARDS FOR OVERNIGHT ROAD TRIPS DIFFER FROM THOSE OF REGULAR ROAD TRIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dress Items Required for Overnight Road Trips</th>
<th>Coaches Using Different Overnight Standards N=24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat and Tie</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Dress for Motel and Restaurant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricter Dress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Blazer or Shirt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Levis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Blazer and Tie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat and Slacks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Casual for Late Departures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressed Up at Night</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14. Do all of the grooming and dress standards used by your team apply to out-of-season as well as in-season? Of the eighty coaches who have grooming and dress standards seventy-two (90.0%) answered NO and eight (10.0%) said YES.

Sub-question 14 asked the coaches who did not use year-round standards to explain why. Table 4 indicates
that forty-four of the seventy-two coaches who did not use year-round standards gave their reasons. Sixteen (36.4%) of these forty-four coaches felt the player was responsible for himself in the off-season and ten (22.7%) felt they should be concerned with the players' grooming and dress only when they (the coaches) were responsible.

TABLE 4
REASONS GIVEN BY THE COACHES AS TO WHY THEY DO NOT USE YEAR-ROUND STANDARDS FOR THEIR TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Given</th>
<th>Coaches Using In-Season Standards Only N=44 (28 coaches did not respond)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player responsible for himself in this period</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach concerned only when he is responsible</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no control in this period</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no reason for the pressure in this period</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rules are more relaxed in this period</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard enough during the season</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessary during this period</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is foolish to try in this period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is impractical in this period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no contact in this period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no inter-school competition in this period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 22. If available, please forward a copy of the grooming and dress standards used by your team when you return this questionnaire. In response to this question thirty-two coaches sent some type of handout sheet, booklet, memo, or handwritten sheet that described their standards. Table 5 identifies the major areas of concern with a frequency distribution. Hair that is neat and does not stick out of the baseball hat was desired by fifteen (45.2%) of the thirty-one coaches who gave their hair standards. Of the twenty-seven coaches who gave their sideburn standards fourteen (51.1%) do not allow sideburns to go below the ear lobe. Of the twenty-two coaches who forwarded their beard standards twenty (90.9%) do not allow beards. Of the twenty-three coaches who sent their mustache standards seventeen (73.9%) do not allow mustaches to be worn.

These thirty-two coaches are concerned that the players' hair and sideburns be neat and appear reasonable in a baseball uniform. They also feel that beards and mustaches are unacceptable for their baseball players.

Section II indicates that of the eighty coaches who state use of grooming and dress standards the main emphasis was on prohibiting facial hair. There is also attention given to hair length as indicated in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Coaches Forwarding Standards N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Hair Standards N=31</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not stick out of hat</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Length</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Neck</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Collar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapered sides and back</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No long, flowing hair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Naturals OK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Long Hair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Length OK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three inches long and tapered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One inch below hat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butch or Ivy League Only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Sideburns Standards N=27</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not lower than the earlobe</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (Continued)

No muttonchops or flares 5
Moderate 1
To middle of ear 1
Reasonable 1

III. Beard Standards  N=22
None allowed 20
Neat 2

IV. Mustache Standards  N=23
None allowed 17
Trimmed 3
Neat 2
OK to have 1

questionnaire and the standards sent in response to Question 22. Coaches are concerned with hair that sticks out, curls over and appears shaggy under a baseball cap. The coaches indicate that moderately long hair is acceptable if it looks neat under the cap and in the baseball uniform. Sideburns are allowed if they do not go below the ear lobe. Mustaches and beards are prohibited by over 89 percent of the coaches who responded. The coaches are
willing to let their players dress as they please in their school attendance and somewhat as they please on road trips that do not require overnight stays. When the player is participating as a recognized representative of the school, team or coach, such as in motels and restaurants, then the coaches have specific standards of dress to follow. These standards usually consist of a coat and tie or other appropriate dress. The trend appears to be that when a player is on his own the coaches allow him more freedom to choose dress styles but when he represents the school, team, or coach on the field and on road trips, the coach assumes the responsibility of deciding how the player should be groomed and dressed.

Section III. Who Actually Determines the Standards Being Used?

**Question 3.** Do the coaches in your department establish their own grooming and dress standards? Of the eighty-four coaches who responded to this question eighty (95.2%) said YES and four (4.8%) said NO.

**Question 15.** This question asked the coach to list specifically from a choice of seven items who is responsible for determining the grooming and dress standards used by his team. Eighty-four coaches replied to
this question and Table 6 shows the results. Two of the coaches checked the last box in each case indicating they did not have standards and two others did not check any boxes but had indicated in question four that they did not have standards. Of the eighty coaches who do have standards twenty-eight (35.0%) use standards determined by the team members and the Head Coach, seventeen (21.3%) use standards determined entirely by the Head Coach, eleven (13.8%) use standards determined by the team, Head Coach and Athletic Department, and, ten (12.5%) use standards determined by the Athletic Department, Department Coaches, and the Head Coach.

**Question 13.** Are the penalties for violation of any of the standards predetermined? Question 13 and sub-question 15 ask for information regarding who determines the penalties for the standards in use. In Question 15, 99 percent of the coaches indicated the people determining the standards also were responsible for determining the penalties. There was one exception and in this case a Sophomore Grievance Committee handled the penalties. Question 13 asked if the penalties for violation of any of the standards were predetermined. Forty-three (53.8%) of the eighty coaches with standards indicated they have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Determines</th>
<th>Coaches Using Standards N=80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>28 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>17 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept., Dept. Coaches, Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>11 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept., Dept. Coaches and Head Coach</td>
<td>10 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept.</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf. Officials, School Board, Athletic Dept., Student Body, Dept. Coaches, Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept. and Dept. Coaches</td>
<td>2 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body, Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Coaches, School Board, Athletic Dept., Student Body and Head Coach</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept., Student Body, Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Dept., Head Coach and Team</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach and Community</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body, School Board and Team</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

predetermined penalties. Sub-question 13 asked the coach how he handled problems where the penalties were not pre- determined. Thirty-one of the thirty-seven coaches who
answered Question 13 NO listed their answers as shown in Table 7. The most widely used method, seventeen (56.1%) of dealing with the athletes was through individual conferences and counseling.

These three questions indicated that 95 percent of the California Junior College baseball coaches were free to decide if they want to have grooming and dress standards and how they want to determine them. It has previously been established that 95 percent of the coaches do have some type of grooming and dress standards. Question 15 indicates that 35 percent of the coaches decided the standards in conjunction with their team. Twenty-one percent of the coaches determine the standards by themselves, 13.8 percent use standards determined in part by the team, athletic department, and themselves, and 12.5 percent use standards determined by the athletic department, department coaches and the head coach. The coaches all seem to be having success with their methods of establishing the standards as no significant problems were reported in Question 20 which will be discussed later. Each of the coaches is apparently working out the best method of establishing grooming and dress standards for his situation. Penalties are also being handled successfully as the coaches prefer (56.1%) to talk with their
TABLE 7

METHODS OF HANDLING VIOLATIONS OF THE GROOMING AND DRESS STANDARDS WHEN THE PENALTIES ARE NOT PREDETERMINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Coaches Giving Methods N=31 (Six coaches did not respond)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td>17 56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players not allowed to make road trips</td>
<td>3 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach handles the problem</td>
<td>3 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal reprimand given</td>
<td>2 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player not allowed to play</td>
<td>2 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let the penalty fit the crime</td>
<td>2 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player given deadline or faces suspension</td>
<td>1 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players' Council handles the problem</td>
<td>1 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

players individually to work out any differences.

Section IV. Why Are the Grooming and Dress Standards Used

With 95 percent of the coaches free to decide whether or not they want grooming and dress standards and 95 percent indicating they do have these standards, the questions in this section were intended to discover why the coaches were using the grooming and dress standards.

Question 10. This question asked the coach to indicate the method of travel used by his team in order to
establish if there was a relationship between method of travel and mode of dress required. Table 8 indicates the different ways the teams travel. School Buses (22.6%), Charter Buses (20.2%), and School Bus/School Cars (17.9%) were the most frequently used methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Travel</th>
<th>Coaches Responding N=84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Bus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus/School Cars</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Cars</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Cars/Charter Bus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Cars/Private Cars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Cars/Charter Bus/Private Cars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus/Charter Bus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus/Charter Bus/Private Cars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus/Private Cars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus/School Cars/Charter Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There did not appear to be a relationship between the method of travel and mode of dress for road trips. It was
indicated by the coaches in sub-question 12 that the places where the team would be staying and eating were the primary factors in determining mode of dress on road trips. Dress requirements were also influenced by the team's staying overnight or returning home after road games.

Question 16. This question asked the coach to place relative importance on six reasons why grooming and dress standards were important to his team. The results of this question are found in Table 9. The reasons considered by most coaches to be Very Important were Discipline/Morale (61.3%) and Neatness (55.0%). Reasons considered important were Safety (37.5%) and Health (41.3%).

Most of the coaches feel that the standards were necessary for their team's discipline and morale and for the team's appearance through neatness. They also feel their personal dislike for long hair, if any, and traditional views on grooming and dress are the least important reasons for having grooming and dress standards.

Section V. Coaches' Personal Beliefs About Grooming and Dress Standards.

The questions in this section were asked to discover what the coaches felt about the grooming and dress standards they were either asked to follow, establish, or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Coaches Using Standards N=80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Morale</td>
<td>49 (61.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatness</td>
<td>44 (55.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>17 (21.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Sanitation</td>
<td>18 (22.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>14 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dislike</td>
<td>9 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other reasons listed N=7

- Practical to keep hats on 2
- Uniformity of Appearance 1
- Pride Development 1
- Team Identity 1
- Professional Image for Scouts 1
- Long Hair looks lousy under a hat 1
used for their own teams. Sub-question 2 asks the coach if having grooming and dress standards required by the athletic department was contrary to his beliefs. Of the fourteen coaches who were required to have standards 100 percent indicated that it was not contrary to their beliefs. In sub-question 3, the coaches who were not allowed to set their own grooming and dress standards were asked if they felt that they should have that privilege. Of the four coaches who do not have the privilege of establishing their own standards, two felt they should have the privilege, while one was undecided and one did not respond.

Sub-question four asked the coach for the method used to make his team aware of the standards used. Seventy-four of the eighty coaches who use grooming and dress standards responded and the results are in Table 10. The most widely used method was reported by forty-nine (66.2%) of these coaches to be a team meeting where the coach explained the standards. Question five asked the coach if he explains his standards by giving the team the rationale behind the standards. Of the eighty coaches who do use standards, seventy-eight (97.5%) answered YES and two (2.5%) said NO.
TABLE 10

METHODS USED BY THE COACHES TO MAKE THEIR TEAM AWARE OF WHAT THE GROOMING AND DRESS STANDARDS ARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Coaches Giving Methods N=74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explained by coach at team meeting</td>
<td>49  66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meeting and printed hand-outs</td>
<td>7   9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meeting where player signs code</td>
<td>2   2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained during recruiting and team meeting</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained during recruiting and printed hand-outs</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meeting and personal letter from coach</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed hand-out materials</td>
<td>1   1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6. Do you personally follow the same standards (your team follows)? All eighty-three responding coaches said they would follow any standard they asked of their team.

Question 18. This question asked the coach if he felt grooming and dress standards were necessary for junior college baseball teams. Of the eighty-four coaches who replied sixty (82.1%) felt they were necessary while fourteen (16.7%) felt they were not. One coach was
undecided and four (4.8%) of the coaches felt they were necessary for their teams but not for every team. Sub-question 18 asked the coach to explain his answer and Table 11 lists the reasons given by the coaches. Once again discipline and morale were the primary reasons (23.7% of the fifty-nine coaches who replied) in the coaches minds for having grooming and dress standards. Six of the coaches who felt the standards were not necessary listed their reasons (Table 11) with no one point being prevalent.

**Question 19.** This question asked the coach if he felt the standards used by his team were effective in meeting the objectives for establishing them. Of the eighty-four coaches who replied, eighty-three (98.8%) said YES. One coach was in his first year of coaching and could not make a judgment at the time he completed the questionnaire.

**Question 20.** This question asked the coach to relate any significant problems he had encountered in the grooming and dress area. Twelve coaches listed problems. The most noticeable problems, six (50%), reported involved the reluctance of a few players in getting their hair trimmed when asked to do so by their coach. In most
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Given</th>
<th>Coaches Responding N=59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morale and Discipline</td>
<td>14 (23.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to each coach to decide</td>
<td>8 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For my team, other coaches decide for theirs</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatness and Appearance</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players represent coach, school or community</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for any college</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary commitment to baseball tradition</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives class in recruiting</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must stay within modern styles</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer but probably not necessary</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later life identity</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must meet other standards in life</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play like you look</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain taxpayer support</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride development</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum standards only</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look like the pros look</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 (Continued)

| Players need guidelines in all areas | 1 | 1.1 |
| Eliminate extremes to have a team | 1 | 1.1 |
| Takes more to be an athlete | 1 | 1.1 |
| Basis for asking other things | 1 | 1.1 |
| Upgrade Junior College baseball | 1 | 1.1 |
| Use only if team makes them | 1 | 1.1 |

cases, as reported in Table 12, there were no significant problems.

The coaches responding to this questionnaire feel that grooming and dress standards are necessary for their baseball team. Even though they are not required to use them, over 95 percent have indicated the use of grooming and dress standards of some sort. The coaches feel their standards are meeting their objectives and do not report any significant problems in this area. Discipline and morale are the two major factors most of the coaches feel are strengthened by the use of grooming and dress standards.
**TABLE 12**

SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS LISTED BY THE COACHES IN THE GROOMING AND DRESS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
<th>Coaches Responding N=12</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Players who hesitate to get hair cuts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body hassles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents who allow long hair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing what is &quot;Long-Hair&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team complaining coach not strict enough on one player who violated standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No money for hair cuts claimed by players</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVP of team cut for not getting hair cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section VI. Background Information of Respondents.**

**Question 21.** Question 21 asked the coach to indicate his baseball coaching experience by number of seasons as a High School Coach, Junior College Coach, College Coach, and/or Professional Coach. This question was asked to see if the problems being reported were more frequent in the older or younger coaches, and, if it was the older or younger coaches who were asking for the
standards. No problems of any significance were reported and there did not appear to be a relationship between the amount of experience of the coach and the type of standards he was requiring. Table 13 identifies level, number of seasons, average number of seasons for each level, and frequency of each year at each level of baseball coaching experience. It was found that each coach had standards he felt suited his situation and did not give any obvious relationship to his coaching experience.

Question 23 asked each coach to make any comments he felt to be relative to this study. Twenty-three of the eighty-four coaches had comments to express and a summary can be found in Table 14.

Summary

Although the review of literature indicated great controversy among athletes, coaches, families, schools, administrators and student bodies over the use of grooming and dress standards by coaches, the findings of this study indicated that the majority of California Junior College baseball coaches are using grooming and dress standards. This chapter has presented the findings of the data received from eighty-four of eighty-five Junior College baseball coaches in California. The standards covered
# TABLE 13

**BASEBALL COACHING EXPERIENCE OF CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE BASEBALL COACHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>AVERAGE NUMBER OF SEASONS</th>
<th>HIGHEST TOTAL REPORTED</th>
<th>Coaches Responding N=84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>17 Seasons</td>
<td>00-05 Seasons: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06-10 Seasons: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 Seasons: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16+ Seasons: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR COLLEGE</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>22 Seasons</td>
<td>00-05 Seasons: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06-10 Seasons: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 Seasons: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16+ Seasons: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4 Seasons</td>
<td>00-05 Seasons: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06-10 Seasons: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 Seasons: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16+ Seasons: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>12 Seasons</td>
<td>00-05 Seasons: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06-10 Seasons: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 Seasons: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16+ Seasons: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14
COACHES COMMENTS RELATIVE TO THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Coaches Responding N=21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grooming and Dress Standards Listed. (4 coaches)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good-Luck, sorry for being late. (3 coaches)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please send a copy of the results. (3 coaches)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have more important things to do, Good-Luck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should ask a question concerning racial make-up of college.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an excellent questionnaire and good job by you, Good-Luck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions 8, 16, 18 are intriguing to me, am awaiting results-Good-Luck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to answer Yes or No questions. Need to witness players reactions. Good idea, hope you get answers from everyone, we need it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times are changing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before I made the rules, now the players have a say. The involvement gives them responsibility and there are no problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards benefit haberdasheries and hair tonic manufacturers. It's not a big thing for us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't worry about it but pro scouts and four-year recruiters make judgments on appearance and there is possibly some value in making personal sacrifices for team participation, Good-Luck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you doing it other than the degree?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have standard rules but have objectives. If a player doesn't desire to meet these objectives there are other organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hair length, facial grooming, and mode of dress. They are determined largely by the coach and his team and are used primarily to reinforce discipline and morale on the team. The coaches are using the standards despite not being required to do so and are having few, if any, problems at this level.

It should be noted that as the result of the questions in Sections one and three, eighty California Junior College baseball coaches were determined to be using grooming and dress standards. Despite the fact that only eighty coaches reported use of standards, questions were repeatedly answered by more than eighty of the coaches. This indicates that these coaches may have been using some sort of standards even though they had not openly expressed them.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the principal factors involved in establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards used by California Junior College baseball coaches. This chapter summarizes the study, presents the conclusions which the findings indicate, and offers recommendations for further study.

Summary

The California Junior College baseball coach was chosen as a respondent for this study because the community college coach is much closer to the pressures and influences of the local community population and is more likely to be influenced by the thoughts of this population and there is no available information on grooming and dress standards at this level.

The questions utilized in the questionnaire were carefully selected from a wide review of literature, from personal experiences as a college and professional baseball player, and personal interviews with instructors,
coaches, and students concerning the issue of grooming and dress standards. The questionnaire was refined by submitting it to critical review by experts in coaching and physical education. The first section of the questionnaire was designed to find out if grooming and dress standards were actually being used by these coaches. The second section was intended to find out what areas the standards covered. The third section revealed who was establishing the standards. The fourth section was designed to show why the standards were being used. The fifth section allowed the coach to give his personal beliefs on grooming and dress standards. The sixth section gave personal background information of the respondent.

Each respondent was mailed a packet which included a letter describing the purpose of the study, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed, postpaid envelope for returning the questionnaire. Follow-up letters and packets were mailed to thirty-two respondents and telephone calls were made to seventeen respondents. The telephone calls revealed that only eighty-five, vice the original ninety-one, California Junior Colleges offered intercollegiate baseball programs for the 1972 season. The survey procedures resulted in a 99 percent return of the eighty-five
possible responses.

Based on the responses received and within the limitations of the study, a summary of the major findings within each section is presented below.

Section I. Are Grooming and Dress Standards Being Used?

(1) Of the eighty-four California Junior Colleges replying, 85.7 percent did not require the general student body to follow grooming and/or dress standards.

(2) Of the eighty-four California Junior College baseball coaches replying, 83.3 percent were not required to have grooming and dress standards for their teams.

(3) Of the eighty-four California Junior College baseball coaches replying, 95.2 percent did have grooming and dress standards for their team to follow.

(4) Of the eighty-four California Junior College baseball coaches replying, 10.7 percent were personally required to follow grooming and dress standards by their athletic department.

(5) Because four coaches who indicated they did not use grooming and dress standards repeatedly responded to questions intended only for those coaches using standards, it appears these coaches are subliminally using standards even though they have not openly expressed them.
Section II. What Areas Do the Standards Cover?

(1) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches who have grooming and dress standards: 93.8 percent have grooming standards for hair length; 88.8 percent have grooming standards for sideburns and mustaches; and 95.0 percent have grooming standards for beards.

(2) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches who have grooming and dress standards, 85.0 percent do not make any specific allowances for minority athletes.

(3) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches who have grooming and dress standards: 15.0 percent have dress standards for daily dress at school; 16.3 percent have dress standards for game days at home; 83.8 percent have dress standards for road trips, with 35.8 percent of these coaches requiring a coat and tie or other appropriate dress for overnight stays.

(4) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches who have grooming and dress standards, 90.0 percent did not require these standards to be followed out-of-season.

Section III. Who Actually Determines the Standards Being Used?

(1) Of the eighty California Junior College
baseball coaches indicating they have standards: 35.0 percent use standards determined by team members and the Head Coach; 21.3 percent use standards determined entirely by the Head Coach; 13.8 percent use standards determined by the team members, Head Coach, and the Athletic Department; and 12.5 percent use standards determined by the Athletic Department, Department Coaches, and the Head Coach.

(2) The penalties for these standards were determined by the same people who determined the standards when predetermined penalties were used.

(3) Individual conferences and counseling is the most widely used (56.1%) method of handling violations with no predetermined penalty.

Section IV. Why Are the Grooming and Dress Standards Used?

(1) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches using grooming and dress standards, 61.3 percent believed Discipline and Morale to be a Very Important reason for having standards.

(2) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches who used grooming and dress standards, 22.5 percent believed that Personal Dislike for Long Hair was the Least-Important factor in having standards.
(3) The place where the team was staying overnight and eating its meals determined the mode of dress for overnight road trips.

(4) There was no apparent relationship between the type of travel used by the teams and the mode of dress required.

Section V. Coaches' Personal Beliefs About Grooming and Dress Standards

(1) Of the eighty California Junior College baseball coaches using grooming and dress standards, 97.5 percent explained the rationale for the standards to their team.

(2) One hundred percent of the eighty-three California Junior College baseball coaches replying indicated they would follow any standard they asked of their team.

(3) Of the eighty-four California Junior College baseball coaches replying, 82.1 percent felt grooming and dress standards were necessary for Junior College baseball teams with discipline and morale being the major reasons.

(4) The only problem with repeated responses was the hesitancy of some players to get haircuts as reported by six coaches.
Section VI. Background Information of Respondents

No apparent relationship was found between the coaches' type or amount of coaching experience and the type of standards used or problems encountered.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings, and within the limitations of the study, it was concluded that:

California Junior College baseball coaches are using grooming and dress standards, even though not required to do so, and are not encountering any problems.

Recommendations

The recommendations resulting from this study are presented in two sections. The first section considers recommendations related to the survey research method used and the second section considers recommendations related to future research in the grooming and dress area.

Survey Research Method

Problem areas encountered while conducting this survey are the basis for the following recommendations:

(1) That the telephone follow-up be carried out one week after the follow-up letter is mailed.
Future Research

The findings of this study suggest the following implications for further research:

(1) That a similar study be conducted at High Schools and Four-Year Colleges in specific geographical locales in California to determine if problems not encountered at the Junior College level are present at these levels.

(2) That a similar study be conducted during the 1974 baseball season using the same institutions as respondents to determine if coaches have remained firm with their attitudes and/or if players have different ideas on grooming and dress standards.

(3) That a similar study be conducted among California Junior Colleges using only the baseball players as respondents.

(4) That a similar study be conducted among several other sports to compare beliefs and practices of coaches and players who are not baseball oriented.

(5) That a similar study be conducted among professional baseball scouts to see the influence of grooming
and dress standards on their opinions of young baseball players.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

February 1, 1972

Dear Coach:

I am a candidate for the Master of Arts Degree in Physical Education at San Fernando Valley State College in Northridge. Because of the current concerns regarding the grooming and dress habits of athletes I am attempting to identify the present thinking and practices in regard to grooming and dress standards used by California Junior College baseball coaches.

My research involves surveying the Head baseball coach at all Junior Colleges in California to determine their reasons for establishing and implementing grooming and dress standards. Would you please take a few minutes to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. All replies will remain confidential and no reference to any individual or institution will be made without their consent.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed, post-paid envelope prior to February 14, 1972. Thank you for your assistance and consideration.

Respectfully,

Terry D. Craven
Junior Varsity Baseball Coach
San Fernando Valley State
Dear Coach:

On February 1, a packet of materials was mailed to you and the other ninety Junior College baseball coaches in California which included a questionnaire on grooming and dress standards. Thus far there has been a favorable return on the questionnaires but a few are still not in. I am sure you realize the importance of getting each coach's opinion in a study of this type and I would certainly like to have yours. Your time is probably very limited now that your season has begun but hopefully you will have a few minutes to help me in my study. Another questionnaire and post-paid envelope are being forwarded in the event the original never reached you or was misplaced. It would be very helpful if you could return the questionnaire prior to February 29, 1972.

Let me re-emphasize that all replies will remain in the strictest confidence and no reference to any individual or institution will be made without their consent.
In the event you prefer not to complete the questionnaire, would you please sign the first page and return the questionnaire in order that my study can be completed. My thanks and appreciation for your assistance. Good-luck this season.

Respectfully,

Terry D. Craven  
Junior Varsity Baseball Coach  
San Fernando Valley State
APPENDIX C

A Survey of Current Practices in Establishing and Implementing Grooming and Dress Standards:

Questionnaire for Baseball Coaches in Selected Junior Colleges in California

Average answering time: 5-10 minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach's Name</th>
<th>Coaching Position(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>College Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you desire a copy of the results of this study, check here ________.

NOTE: Answer each of the following questions by circling YES or NO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

If YES, is this contrary to your beliefs?

If NO, do you think they should have that privilege?

If YES, how is your team made aware of the standards?

Explain ____________________________________________
YES NO 5. Do you give your team the rationale behind the standards you use?

YES NO 6. Do you personally follow the same standards?

7. Does your team have standards for:

YES NO Hair Length
YES NO Sideburns
YES NO Mustaches
YES NO Beards

YES NO 8. Do the standards used by your team make specific allowances for Negro, Chicano, or other minority athletes?

9. Do you have team standards for:

YES NO Daily dress at school
YES NO School dress on game days at home

10. Does your team travel by:

YES NO School Bus
YES NO School Cars
YES NO Charter Bus
YES NO Private Cars

Other - Explain

YES NO 11. Do you have dress standards for road trips?

YES NO 12. Are the standards different for trips that require overnight stays?

If YES, Explain

YES NO 13. Are the penalties for violation of any of the standards predetermined?

If NO, how are the violation penalties handled? Explain

_________
YES  NO

14. Do all of the grooming and dress standards used by your team apply to out-of-season as well as in-season? If NO, Explain

NOTE: Answer each of the following questions by checking the appropriate box.

15. To what degree do the following participate in determining the grooming and dress standards used by your team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENTIRELY</th>
<th>PARTIALLY</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach (You)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Explain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If someone other than those listed above determines the penalties for violation of the grooming and dress standards, Explain below:
16. What degree of importance would you place on the following reasons for the grooming and dress standards used by your team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>VERY IMPT</th>
<th>IMPT</th>
<th>NOT VERY IMPT</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health/ Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/ Morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Dislike for Long Hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Explain__________)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YES NO 17. Are the coaches in your department required to follow grooming and dress standards? If YES, who determined these standards? Explain____________________________________

YES NO 18. Do you feel grooming and dress standards are necessary for Junior College baseball teams? Explain____________________________________

YES NO 19. Do you feel the standards used by your team are effective in meeting the objectives for establishing them?

20. Please relate any significant problems you have had in the grooming and dress area: