

Student Work

10-1-1987

No Pass, No Play: Perceptions of Texas High School Administrators

W. Scott Clark
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Clark, W. Scott, "No Pass, No Play: Perceptions of Texas High School Administrators" (1987). *Student Work*. 2539.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2539>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

FIELD PROJECT PROPOSAL

Accepted for the Graduate Faculty, University of
Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Specialist in Education, University of Nebraska at
Omaha.

Supervisory Committee

Name

Department

Mary J. Lickert

Teacher Education

Thomas Petre

Ed Ad

Leo King
Chairman

October 15, 1987
Date

NO PASS, NO PLAY:

PERCEPTIONS OF TEXAS HIGH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Presented to the

Graduate Faculty

University of Nebraska

at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

W. Scott Clark

October, 1987

UMI Number: EP74084

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74084

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Acknowledgements

I extend sincere thanks to Dr. Mary Lickteig, Dr. Thomas Petrie, and especially Dr. Robert O'Reilly for their guidance and direction throughout the preparation of this study.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Texas high school principals for their candor in sharing their perceptions regarding an extremely controversial issue.

Dedication

To my lovely wife, Mary, for her encouragement,
support, love, and her belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v

Chapter

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Purpose.....	4
	Procedures.....	5
	Definition of terms.....	6
	Significance of the study.....	8
	Delimitations.....	8
	Limitations.....	8
	Assumptions.....	9
	Organization of study.....	9
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
3	METHODOLOGY.....	23
4	PRESENTATION OF DATA	25
	Student participation.....	25
	Academic achievement.....	30
	Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play".....	31
	Effectiveness of "No Pass, No Play".....	36
	Comments.....	37

5	<i>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS.....</i>	39
	<i>REFERENCES.....</i>	41
	<i>APPENDIX A.....</i>	45

LIST OF TABLES

<i>TABLES</i>	<i>TITLE</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>Girls' Volleyball Participation</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>Girls' Basketball Participation</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>Boys' Football Participation</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>Boys' Basketball Participation</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>Band Participation</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>Combined Activity Participation</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>8</i>	<i>Students' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>9</i>	<i>Parents' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>10</i>	<i>School Administrators' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>Coaches'/Sponsors' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>12</i>	<i>Combined Groups' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"</i>	<i>36</i>

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

For decades, there has been a continuous debate regarding the effect that school related activities have on their participants in later life. Some educators believe that school activities are a laboratory of the school curriculum and produce positive traits like leadership, self-esteem, and social and emotional development (Walter and Smith, 1986). However, many educators feel that activities (i.e. athletics) are too predominant in the educational process (Miller, 1985).

The proponents of stricter regulations of both college and high school activities cite numerous cases of student athletes who do not earn their diploma or degree at the completion of their athletic eligibility. Examples of college athletes who end their athletic career and have no degree are common. Names and verification of ex-athletes in higher education who are illiterate are not difficult to produce. One recent case which received considerable publicity involves Kevin Ross, a basketball player for Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, from 1979-81. Ross was admitted to Creighton as a special admission student. He left the university in 1982 academically ineligible to

participate in basketball. Ross entered Westside Preparatory School in Chicago, Illinois as an illiterate with a reading disability (Morrison, 1986).

Society often blames high schools, colleges, and universities for not enforcing stricter regulations and more difficult requirements. The majority of college officials blames the nation's high schools for not demanding adequate performance standards regarding the eligibility of athletic and activity participation (Zahm, 1985). High school officials generally regard activities as integral parts of education which serve as motivating factors that keep many potential drop outs in school. So, the debate continues. Do athletics hinder the scholastic achievements of the participants? Or do athletics and activities develop leadership and self confidence that no academic venture could produce?

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has concluded that the enforcement of tougher entrance requirements and stricter regulation of student progress is now necessary and appropriate for all collegiate student-athletes. The NCAA adopted Proposition 48 which refuses athletic eligibility to college freshmen who fail to achieve a specific score on either the Scholastic Aptitude Test or the American College Testing Program examination.

This rule also denies athletic eligibility to college freshmen who have a high school grade point average in selected academic subjects less than 2.0 ("Academic Standards," 1983). In January, 1984, the NCAA adopted a rule regarding the academic progress of college student-athletes after their freshman year termed the "satisfactory progress" rule. This rule specifies a minimum number of credits which are relevant to earning a bachelor's degree must be earned for the athlete to retain his/her eligibility ("Academic Requirements," 1984). These decrees by the NCAA have caused the school districts and the state activity associations to examine their current regulations of student activity eligibility standards.

The state of Texas has legislated an innovative regulation for all high school activities commonly referred to as "No Pass, No Play." Members of numerous Texas communities have been quite vocal about the benefits or lack thereof concerning "No Pass, No Play." The Texas media have had a field day with editorials, opinions, and feature stories. Many local and state Texas politicians have focused on "No Pass, No Play" for purposes of name and candidate identification.

Nebraska high school districts and the Nebraska School Activities Association are watching and studying the

eligibility situation in Texas. One Nebraska high school, Archbishop Bergan in Fremont, has enacted its own version of "No Pass, No Play" for all activity participants. The Superintendent of Archbishop Bergan, Gary Schmidt, states the eligibility regulation is very similar to Texas' "No Pass, No Play." The current problem is to determine the effects of the Texas "No Pass, No Play" regulation and to assess the merits of the regulation.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to assess the Texas school administrators' perception of the effects of the Texas "No Pass, No Play" method of regulating high school activity participation.

The questions this study will answer are:

1. Have the high schools experienced an increase or a decrease in student participation in activities?
2. Have the high schools experienced an increase or a decrease in academic achievement?
3. How do the school administrators perceive the rule was accepted by students, parents, administrators, and coaches or sponsors?
4. Do the school administrators perceive the regulation as effective without negative results?

PROCEDURES

After a review of the literature written prior to the passage of "No Pass, No Play", the researcher will complete the following procedures:

- 1. Identify specific questions that are relevant to the "No Pass, No Play" rule.*
- 2. Design a questionnaire to gather data.*
- 3. Send the questionnaire to a stratified sample of 100 Texas High School principals.*
- 4. Report the data which are accumulated including selected specific comments by the principals.*
- 5. Conclude with an assessment of the administrators' perception of the Texas "No Pass, No Play" method of eligibility regulation.*

DEFINITION OF TERMS

No Pass, No Play

The term "No Pass, No Play" is the basis of this study. It refers to the Texas Legislative House Bill No. 72, Part F. Extracurricular Activities Section 1. Subchapter 2, Chapter 21, Education Code, amended by adding Section 21.920,b. The bill states, "any student, other than a mentally retarded student, enrolled in a school district in this state shall be suspended from participation in any extracurricular activity sponsored or sanctioned by the school district during the grade reporting period in which the student received a grade lower than the equivalent of 70 on a scale of 100 in any academic class. The campus principal may remove this suspension if the class is an identified honors or advanced class."

Activity

Activity includes participation in athletic (baseball, basketball, cross country, football, golf, gymnastics, swimming, tennis, track, volleyball, wrestling) and non athletic (band, chorus, cheerleading, debate, journalism,

one-act plays, speech) which are under the sponsorship of the school districts.

Grade Reporting Period

The term "grade reporting period" refers to every six week period. All students in Texas high schools receive grades each six weeks for the purpose of eligibility.

Shall be Suspended

The "shall be suspended" stated above renders a student ineligible for all activities for the subsequent six weeks period of time.

Stratified Sample

The stratified sample included 100 Texas High School principals. Fifty schools have an enrollment exceeding 1,000 students (grades 10-12) and 50 schools have an enrollment less than 1,000 students (grades 10-12).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of the study is to report the effects of the "No Pass, No Play" method of activity regulation as applied to Texas High Schools as perceived by the local school administrators.

DELIMITATIONS

This study is treating only the state of Texas and its method of regulating the eligibility of the participants in athletics and activities. The study is not concerned with the regulations of any other state. The reader may choose to project the findings of the study to his or her own situation as seems appropriate.

LIMITATIONS

Experiencing "No Pass, No Play" for a period of only two complete years limits the accuracy of the administrators' perception of the effectiveness of the regulation. It has been in effect since January, 1985 and the data gathering ended on June 30, 1987.

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions of the study are that the principals perceive "No Pass, No Play" as a testable regulation.

ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one: Introduction, Chapter two: Review of the Literature, Chapter three: Methodology, Chapter four: Presentation of Data, Chapter five: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Ancient Greeks and many modern parents are similar in their understanding of the benefit of pure competition, of sport at its best (Cramer, 1986).

From President Theodore Roosevelt through the 1920s, we came to worship sports as a metaphor of democracy--a classless and collective experience that teaches teamwork and cooperation. Schools were called on to help spread this "religion" by sponsoring youngsters in sports and selecting the very best among them for teams that would represent local institutions. It was our young sons playing on teams with the strong young sons of our neighbors in an attempt to kick the hell out of the geeks from the next town. At the same time, for nearly a century, people have been complaining that sports are corrupting the schools (Cramer, 1986).

A survey in the mid 1900s focused on the 60 questions that are most frequently under scrutiny concerning "extra-class activities." In that group, the most common question posed by educators and non-educators dealt with the necessity of pupil participation being dependent on academic standards (Tompkins, 1950). A connection between academic

achievement in American high schools and participation in extracurricular activities has existed back through time.

According to Miller (1985), the status of athletics, as he describes it in Missouri, is that of being too dominant on the educational scene. The recommendation is that athletics must be delegated to a position from which they can contribute to the development of our youth without interfering with their academic growth. A Houston, Texas television study concluded that only one out of three university freshmen entering on football scholarships will continue their studies and earn a degree. Augie Erfurth, Athletic Director at Rice University, states, "We've taken the student out of student athlete. All of us today have student athletes who shouldn't be in college" (Athletic Journal, 1983, p. 116). Vance discovered of the 113 athletes chosen in the first five rounds of the draft for the National Basketball Association in 1983, only 36 (31.9%) had earned degrees (Vance, 1983). All 113 basketball players had been university athletes.

According to Zahm (1985), 80% of the black athletes in college never graduate, while 66% of all NCAA Division I football and basketball players never receive a degree according to 1985 statistics. The same statistics show that only 2% of all college athletes sign professional contracts and less than half of these survive more than three years.

As a 1983 New York Times article stated, "After living up to his agreement and giving four years of his athletic ability, the athlete may well find himself with no means of completing his education. He is ineligible to continue playing sports and has no professional avenues to pursue--in sports or other areas. He ends up a glorified version of unemployed, undereducated youth." (Zahm, 1985, p. 49).

Many people, including some college tutors, apply the common stereotype label of "dumb jock" to all athletes. Zahm (1985) was shocked to discover the number of athletes diagnosed in college as learning disabled. She concluded that high schools investigate and cultivate the athletic potential and ignore the learning disability.

Allan Page also blames the high schools for never expecting the athletes to learn to read and write. He believes that they (athletes) have "floated to this point (college, pros) because they were talented athletes." (Zahm, 1985, p. 49). The blame is laid clearly on the high schools.

In the late 1950's, Arthur Nelson (1959) was responsible for an innovation of academic help during an activity period for students involved in school activities. Basic principles of extracurricular activities included the notions that only active school students should be permitted to engage in extracurricular activities, only the principal

should have veto power and seldom use the power, and all activities should be closely correlated to the academic program (Middleton, 1960). When coaches are teachers, athletes will be students (Porto, 1984).

Cramer reminds us (1986) that the emphasis of the negative aspects of athletics is not new. In 1896, the very year that Princeton and Rutgers inaugurated intercollegiate football, a game between the two schools was cancelled because the faculties feared over emphasis. Even the New York Times slammed the "twin evils" in America: lynching and football.

In Texas, a recent education reform commission discovered that junior high students were being held back--"redshirted"--so they would be older, bigger, and stronger when they played high school football. One of these students is Kyle Burns of Justin, Texas who agreed with his father's plan of 7th grade retention in order to excel in high school football and receive a scholarship to Texas A&M. Kyle's mother called the action "academic suicide" (Athletic Journal, 1984, p. 141). Many high school coaches are paid more than the principal or the district superintendent (Cramer, 1986). This inequality adds to the claim of athletic dominance on the school scene.

A research project (Sowa & Gressard, 1983) included 75 students randomly selected from varsity athletes and

non-athletes at a major southern university. The study explored the relationship between participation in varsity athletics and the achievement of developmental tasks. Where differences were found, athletes scored significantly lower than non-athletes.

At North Carolina University, in the classes of 1976, 1977, and 1978, only two of 80 entering football players graduated. Not one of the 15 basketball players in those classes earned a degree. An athlete at the school needed to pass only three credit hours per semester to remain eligible for participation (Cramer, 1986). Many colleges were publicly stating that they were unwilling to accept an athlete who is an underachiever (Ostro, 1983).

In January, 1983, the NCAA passed a controversial rule known as "Proposition 48" which raises academic requirements for freshmen athletes at institutions in the NCAA's top competitive bracket, Division I. The rule would deny athletic eligibility to any freshman whose combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) was lower than 700, or whose score on the American College Testing (ACT) Program's examination was less than 15. The best possible score on the two part SAT is 1,600. The best possible score on the ACT is 36. Proposition 48 would also deny eligibility to any freshman whose high school grade point average in selected academic subjects was lower than 2.0, which is

equivalent to a grade of "C" ("Academic Standards," 1983). Proposition 48 went into effect on August 1, 1986.

In May, 1983, the NCAA announced the commission of a nationwide study of the academic performance of athletes. The purpose of this study was to determine if recently adopted academic requirements needed revision ("NCAA to Sponsor," 1983).

Harry Edwards (1983), an associate professor at the University of California at Berkeley, stated, "Rule 48 is one step toward resolving the problem. It lets young students know we have academic expectations, as well as athletic expectations." (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1983, p. 29). Professor Edwards was implying the same message to high school administrators.

The NCAA further tightened its academic requirements for athletes at its January, 1984 convention. A modified version of a new "satisfactory progress" rule was adopted. To remain eligible to play intercollegiate sports after their freshman year, athletes must earn a specified number of credits that are acceptable toward a bachelor's degree in a specific academic program. The hidden intent in this rule is to pressure high schools against allowing students to select easy elective courses ("Academic Requirements," 1984).

A new survey indicates that most high school principals know about the new academic requirements for freshmen college athletes, but fewer than half of them have taken steps to inform their students of the changes. The survey's authors also concluded that the NCAA had not fulfilled its obligation to inform high school officials and athletes of the new requirements. The rule's proponents have repeatedly predicted that its adoption would prompt high schools to make sure their top athletes were taking college preparatory courses, passing them, and learning enough in the process to meet the standardized test score requirements. But, that has not yet happened, according to the survey's authors. The authors of the survey are Gene Jenkins, John H. Walker, Marvin C. Woodson, Jr., and Joseph R. White. The authors stated that the NCAA has a particular responsibility to make sure high school officials know the specifics of the rule so that they can counsel potential college athletes about it ("Schools Found Not Telling," 1984).

College grading scandals are nothing new, but the strange case of Professor Edward D. Wynott, Jr., which involved all 42 varsity athletes enrolled in his upper-level history courses at Florida State receiving an "A", gave spark and new flame to the debate by regenerating the notion of preferential treatment for athletes (Biemiller, 1983).

This same fire was rekindled by an award of \$2.57 million to a former remedial English instructor at the University of Georgia who was dismissed from the faculty because she refused to provide special treatment for athletes. The dramatic court proceedings regarding this landmark expose' concluded in early 1986. Walter and Smith (1986) concluded that college presidents not only worry about accepting large numbers of student athletes who will finish their eligibility without a degree but also without achieving even basic literacy. They feel that the solution must lie within the institution and the high schools.

Charles Reavis (1984) stressed that high schools should include sport and activity emphasis, faculty closeness, principal availability, and community involvement.

Jackel (1986) reports that Arions High Schools and high school districts have proposed a diversity of solutions including the elimination of many activities, restricting participation with strict eligibility requirements, placing all activities outside the school day, and making no changes. Also included among the recommendations are the ideas that all activities should be well founded in theory and practice, activities are a laboratory of the school curriculum, and a positive relationship is indicated among increased homework hours, college expectations, and involvement in sports. Student grades are not jeopardized

by involvement in activities. Rather, school related activities showed a disproportionate number of students with the highest grades. The benefits of activities are leadership, self worth, self-actualization, useful skills and knowledge, social and emotional development, and motivation. It was further recommended that educators should place more emphasis on the preparation of teachers for activities and demand more practical scheduling of classes and activities. It is cautioned that limiting participation according to grades may be discrimination contrary to the democratic principles of American education.

James Parker, basketball coach at Columbia (South Carolina) High School, disagreed with the failure to place academic requirements on student athletes (Siedentop, 1985). In reference to the school district's policy of requiring a "C" average to participate, he stated "We're not losing athletes, we're gaining an insurance policy." (Siedentop, 1985, p. 67).

The Russians are involved in the same dilemma. The solution in the U.S.S.R. is to organize sport training camps and boarding schools. (Jeffries, 1984).

According to Cramer (1986), the NCAA is run by athletic directors and coaches whose jobs depend on winning football and basketball games. And these people--whose jobs ultimately depend on recruiting tall, fast, and strong 17

and 18 year old student athletes--also set the rules for the administration of college sports. Reminiscent of the fox and the hen house?

It will not be the NCAA that cleans up college sports or makes the student athletes gain academic and personal success. "Rules by themselves will not improve the academic integrity of interscholastic athletes", said Washington Post sports writer Mark Asher (Cramer, 1986, p. K-8). He adds, "Leaders of the nation's campuses cannot turn their heads, bask in the limelight at bowl games, and expect academics to coexist with the winning-at-all-costs environments that pervade big time college sports today." The conclusion is that the clean up job must be initiated and maintained by the nation's high schools to be effective.

The "No Pass, No Play" regulation became effective in January, 1985. On June 10, 1985, the Texas Supreme Court upheld the regulation as constitutional. "No Pass, No Play" had prompted educators to contrast and compare student athletes' participation and academic achievement. A review of selected recent literature, published after the passage of "No Pass, No Play," suggests that the controversy is still present.

Data argue strongly that student athletes' grades are aided by participation in sports (Soltz, 1986). The GPAs of athletes are significantly higher than non participating

students. Also, significantly fewer athletes receive a failing grade during a season of competition than when they are not actively competing.

Educators are concerned that emphasis has shifted to the physical success of the athlete rather than the combined excellence of the scholar-athlete according to Ruffin (1986). Educators have a professional responsibility to insist that all students understand the primary purpose in attending school is to achieve academically to the degree that is commensurate with their measured potential. Eligibility requirements (i.e. "No Pass, No Play") are necessary to demonstrate to student athletes the presence of the mandate to learn and achieve academically. If all of the recent discussions and decisions regarding academic eligibility requirements have prompted students, coaches, teachers, administrators, parents, and communities to move toward putting athletics in proper perspective, the time and effort have been well spent.

It is counterproductive to make athletic eligibility dependent on academic achievement when athletes afford some students an alternative way of succeeding in school. According to Warren Brown, Assistant Executive Director of the National Federation of State High School Associations, "We don't doubt the nation's schools might have some academic problems, but to use athletics as the whipping boy

is wrong." (Harper, 1986, Pg. 3). Denial of participation in a specific activity may decrease the ability of the youngster who is athletically talented to develop his or her potential earning power. Since one of the functions of the educational system is to develop marketable skills, we again would be contradicting our purpose. We must avoid the mandated policy syndrome, which far too often winds up short of its mark.

If we accept the athletic experience as educational rather than an extracurricular reward, allowing participation only for the academic achiever (i.e. "No Pass, No Play") would deny some students access to a valid educational opportunity. These standards may assist some educators in beating their academic chests, but accomplishes little else. We should not strive to put the high school athlete in the same position as Pavlov's dog.

Gordon Wood, probably the best known high school coach in Texas, is adamantly against "No Pass, No Play." Coach Wood states:

House Bill 72...did nothing for education, absolutely nothing. We started out with 1,178 students; 212 dropped out. Of the 966 that was left, about half of 'em were in extracurriculars and about half of 'em were not. Those in extracurriculars, yes sir, 17% of 'em failed one or more subjects. Over here

(non-extracurricular participants) 58% failed one or more. That's a pretty big margin, isn't it? But, that's not the answer. Over here (extracurricular) we had 3%, three out of 100, that failed two or more. Over here, those not in extracurriculars, 30 and three-tenths, or 10 times as many, failed two or more. Now, where is your problem with education? It's over here. We ought to be encouraging people to get in extracurriculars. (Tidmore, 1986, Pg. 1-2D).

Chapter 3

Methodology

Specific questions were formulated to discover the positive and negative effects of "No Pass, No Play" according to the perceptions of the Texas High School administrators. The areas of student participation, academic achievement, the degree of acceptance of "No Pass, No Play" by various groups, and the school administrators' perception of the effectiveness of "No Pass, No Play" were deemed as the basis from which to design specific questions.

A questionnaire was designed which asked Texas secondary principals for this pertinent information (Appendix A). They were asked, as a result of "No Pass, No Play" regulations, in 1986-87:

1. Did student participation increase, decrease, or remain the same in girls' volleyball, girls' basketball, boys' football, boys' basketball, and band?
2. Has academic achievement increased, decreased, or remained the same?
3. How was "No Pass, No Play" accepted by students, parents, administrators, and coaches or sponsors?
4. Has "No Pass, No Play" achieved its purpose without any negative effects?
5. To share comments regarding "No Pass, No Play."

The questionnaire was sent to a stratified sample of 100 Texas high school principals. Schools were selected on the basis of student enrollment in grades 10-12. Of the 100 schools selected, 50 schools have an enrollment under 1,000 and 50 schools have an enrollment exceeding 1,000. There was no specific selection or regard to urban vs. rural, but it was noted that all schools with an enrollment under 1,000 students (hereafter referred to as small schools) are located in smaller towns and in rural areas. Equally noted is the fact that all schools with an enrollment exceeding 1,000 students (hereafter referred to as large schools) are located in large cities.

The questionnaire was sent to the Texas high school principals on May 8, 1987. Responses were accepted for data collection until June 30, 1987 and a total of 67 responses were received.

Chapter 4

Presentation of Data

Of the 50 small schools sent a questionnaire, 37 principals responded (74%). Principals from 30 of the 50 large schools responded (60%). The total response was 67 out of 100 (67%).

Student Participation.

Table 1 shows a comparison of participation in girls' volleyball between the 1985-86 school year and the 1986-87 school year. Student participation in girls' volleyball in

Table 1

Girls' Volleyball Participation

School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	Small Schools	Large Schools	Total	Percent
Increased	0	1	1	2%
Decreased	2	4	6	12%
No change	<u>19</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>86%</u>
Total	21	30	51	100%

small schools did not increase in a single instance, decreased in two schools, and remained the same in 19 schools. Large schools reported volleyball participation

increased in one school, decreased in four schools, and remained the same in 25 schools. Combined results show that participation in girls' volleyball, under "No Pass, No Play," increased in one school (2%), decreased at six schools (12%), and remained the same at 44 schools (86%). Only 51 of the 67 schools engage in girls' volleyball.

As indicated in Table 2, girls' basketball is played at 65 of the 67 schools. Of the 35 small schools reporting, participation increased at three schools, decreased at four schools, and remained the same at 28 schools. The 30 large schools had an increase at one school, a decrease at five schools, and 24 large schools' participation in girls' basketball remained the same. The total number of small

Table 2

Girls' Basketball Participation

School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	Small Schools	Large Schools	Total	Percent
Increased	3	1	4	6%
Decreased	4	5	9	14%
No change	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>80%</u>
Total	35	30	65	100%

schools and large schools which reported an increase was four (6%), a decrease was reported by nine schools (14%), and no change was indicated by 52 schools (80%).

Table 3 shows that boys' football is played in all 67 schools in our study. The principals at the 37 small schools indicated an increase in football participation at seven schools, a decrease at four schools, and 26 schools

Table 3
Boys' Football Participation
School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	<i>Small Schools</i>	<i>Large Schools</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Increased</i>	7	3	10	15%
<i>Decreased</i>	4	9	13	20%
<i>No change</i>	<u>26</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>65%</u>
<i>Total</i>	37	30	67	100%

remained the same. The 30 large schools reported an increase at three schools, nine schools had a decrease, and 18 schools had no change in participation. The combined totals show an increase at 10 schools (15%), a decrease at 13 schools (19%), and 44 schools remained the same (65%).

Table 4 shows that all 67 schools participate in district sponsored boys' basketball. The 37 small schools reported an increase at four schools, a decrease at four schools, and 29 schools reported no change in student participation. The 30 large schools experienced an increase at only one school, a decrease at 10 schools, and 19 schools remained the same. Combined results indicate five schools increased (7%), 14 schools decreased (21%), and 48 schools

Table 4

*Boys' Basketball Participation**School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86*

	<i>Small Schools</i>	<i>Large Schools</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Increased</i>	4	1	5	7%
<i>Decreased</i>	4	10	14	21%
<i>No change</i>	<u>29</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>72%</u>
<i>Total</i>	37	30	67	100%

remained the same (72%).

Table 5 is a comparison of band participation. Band is a school activity at 61 of the 67 schools in our study. The 31 small schools that offer band indicated that band participation increased at six schools, five schools

reported a decrease, and 20 remained the same. All 30 large schools offer band with only one school reporting an increase in participation, 17 schools had a decrease, and 12

Table 5
Band Participation
School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<i>Increased</i>	6	1	7	11%
<i>Decreased</i>	5	17	22	37%
<i>No change</i>	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>52%</u>
<i>Total</i>	31	30	61	100%

schools had no change. The 61 schools reporting indicated an increase in band participation at seven schools (11%), a decrease at 22 schools (37%), and no change at 32 schools (52%).

All of the school reports regarding student participation in all of the activities previously stated (girls' volleyball, girls' basketball, boys' football, boys' basketball, and band) were considered. Table 6 indicates that 12% of the small schools had an increase in activity participation, 12% had a decrease, and 76% had no change.

Of the large schools, 5% reported an increase in some activity, 30% had a decrease, and 65% had no change. The

Table 6
Combined Activity Participation
School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>
Increased	12%	5%	9%
Decreased	12%	30%	21%
No change	<u>76%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>70%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

combined results show that 9% of the schools in the study had an increase in some activity, 21% experienced a decrease, and 70% had no change.

Academic Achievement

Thirty six of the 37 small schools answered the query regarding academic achievement. Table 7 shows that 16 principals reported an increase in academic achievement, two reported a decrease, and 18 principals reported no change. Of the 30 large school principals, 28 reported in this area. Nine large schools increased in academic achievement, three had a decrease, and 16 remained the same. The combined

results of the 64 school principals who responded concerning academic achievement showed an increase at 25 schools (39%),

Table 7
Academic Achievement
School Year 1986-87 vs. School Year 1985-86

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Increased	16	9	25	39%
Decreased	2	3	5	8%
No change	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>53%</u>
Total	36	28	64	100%

a decrease at five schools (8%), and 34 schools had no change (53%).

Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"

The principals were asked to indicate their perception of the acceptance of "No Pass, No Play" by their schools' students, parents, administrators, and coaches or sponsors. They were given the options of indicating the acceptance as excellent, good, fair, or poor.

The students' acceptance of "No Pass, No Play" is shown in Table 8. A principal of only one small school rated the students as excellent in the acceptance of the regulation,

17 rated the acceptance as good, 13 said fair, and six rated

Table 8
Students' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"
School Year 1986-87

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	1	2	3	4%
Good	17	13	30	46%
Fair	13	10	23	35%
Poor	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	37	30	67	100%

poor. The combined 67 schools reported the students' acceptance as excellent at three schools (4%), good at 30 schools (46%), fair at 23 schools (35%), and poor at 11 schools (15%).

Table 9 shows the acceptance of the regulation by the parents. The acceptance by the parents in the small schools was reported as excellent by only one principal, 18 rated good, 13 stated fair, and five indicated poor. The large school principals indicated their parents accepted the regulation excellent at three schools, good at 16 schools, fair at 11 schools, and poor at no school. The combined

results of the small and large schools as reported by the principals indicated four schools had excellent parent

Table 9
Parents' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"
School Year 1986-87

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	1	3	4	6%
<i>Good</i>	18	16	34	51%
<i>Fair</i>	13	11	24	36%
<i>Poor</i>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7%</u>
<i>Total</i>	37	30	67	100%

acceptance (6%), 34 schools had good acceptance (51%), 24 schools had fair acceptance (36%), and five schools had poor acceptance by the parents (7%).

Acceptance by the school administrators was apparently somewhat higher (Table 10). Small school principals noted the administrators' acceptance as excellent at eight schools, good at 16 schools, fair at nine schools, and four schools reported poor acceptance. Large schools stated excellent acceptance at seven schools, 15 schools had good acceptance, six schools rated fair, and two schools had poor

acceptance. The combined total of all 67 schools showed administrative acceptance of "No Pass, No Play" as excellent

Table 10

School Administrators' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"

School Year 1986-87

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	8	7	15	22%
Good	16	15	31	46%
Fair	9	6	15	22%
Poor	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10%</u>
Total	37	30	67	100%

at 15 schools (22%), good at 31 schools (46%), fair at 15 schools (22%), and six schools reported poor acceptance (10%).

Table 11 indicates the acceptance of the regulation by coaches and sponsors was not as positive as administrators. The small school principals reported excellent acceptance by coaches and sponsors at three schools, 11 stated good, 14 rated fair, and nine indicated poor. Only one large school principal indicated excellent acceptance, nine stated good,

12 reported fair, and eight indicated poor. The combined

Table 11
Coaches'/Sponsor' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"
School Year 1986-87

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	3	1	4	6%
<i>Good</i>	11	9	20	30%
<i>Fair</i>	14	12	26	39%
<i>Poor</i>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>25%</u>
<i>Total</i>	37	30	67	100%

totals of the small and large schools show that four schools' coaches and sponsors excellently accepted the regulation (6%), 20 schools stated good (30%), 26 schools rated fair (39%), and 17 schools indicated poor acceptance (25%).

Table 12 considers the acceptance of "No Pass, No Play" by all of the groups (students, parents, administrators, and coaches or sponsors). The small school principals reported 9% excellent acceptance, 42% good acceptance, 33% fair acceptance, and 16% poor acceptance. The large school principals stated 11% excellent acceptance, 44% good acceptance, 33% fair acceptance, and 12% poor acceptance.

The combined results of all of the schools showed 10%

Table 12
Combined Groups' Acceptance of "No Pass, No Play"
School Year 1986-87

	<u>Small Schools</u>	<u>Large Schools</u>	<u>Total</u>
Excellent	9%	11%	10%
Good	42%	44%	43%
Fair	33%	33%	33%
Poor	<u>16%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>14%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%

excellent acceptance, 43% good acceptance, 33% fair acceptance, and 14% poor acceptance.

Effectiveness of "No Pass, No Play"

The school principals were asked if "No Pass, No Play" had achieved its purpose without any negative results. Of the 36 small school principals who responded to this inquiry, 26 stated "No" and 10 responded "Yes." Twenty nine large school principals responded with 22 answering "No" and seven voting "Yes." The combined results of all of the schools regarding the principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of "No Pass, No Play" without negative results

showed a tabulation of 48 voting "No" (74%) and 17 voting "Yes" (26%).

Comments

The principals were encouraged to share comments regarding "No Pass, No Play." Twenty three principals complained the period of ineligibility (6 weeks) is too long. They all favored a 3 week period of "No Play" with the exception of one principal who favored a weekly eligibility list and two principals who opted for the student to regain eligibility at the time of passing. All of the 23 principals remarked that a season is near completion by the end of the "No Play" period and, therefore, the student has no real reason to improve the failing grade(s).

Nine principals stated the students are taking the "easy" courses to avoid the risk of failure. Four principals noted that "No Pass, No Play" is based on punishment and sends the wrong message to the students. Four principals complained the first 6 weeks of school being a "free period" regarding eligibility is unfair since there is no notice given to the last 6 weeks of the preceding semester. Five principals remarked that students have completely quit trying.

Four principals stated that "No Pass, No Play" is completely good and nine principals termed the regulation as completely bad. Other selected comments:

"The non-participant (over 75% of the student body) is not affected by the law."

"Very good!"

"For every student it has helped, there is a student who has quit trying."

"Much more work for the teachers."

"Students and parents say it is O.K. except when it happens to them."

"I feel it has pressured teachers more than students."

"Those students...who made a 64 prior to this regulation...are making 70 all of a sudden."

"It has achieved nothing."

"The system will work if left alone."

"It stinks!"

The Texas Principals are succinct in expressing their desire for a regulation that is effective without negative results.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusion, Recommendations

The Texas principals have reported that "No Pass, No Play" has decreased student participation in activities and has not improved academic achievement. They have stated the regulation has been received less than enthusiastically by students, parents, and coaches or sponsors. "No Pass, No Play" has not achieved its purpose without negative results, according to the principals. This group of educational leaders candidly reports that a major problem is the 6 week period of ineligibility is too long. This lengthy period is causing students to enroll in less challenging courses and, in many cases, to quit trying for success. Other negative results produced by the long ineligibility period are pressure on teachers, grade inflation, and a decline in student participation.

The majority of the principals are not comfortable with the present "No Pass, No Play" restrictions. The majority of the students, parents, and coaches or sponsors are not happy with the current status of "No Pass, No Play". The general feeling among the principals is that the regulation is too punitive in nature and does not breed academic success. "No Pass, No Play" is a testable regulation which needs some modification. The "No Pass, No Play" intent is to promote academic achievement as top priority among

students, parents, and staff. To accomplish this goal, the regulation must be firm, decisive, and supportive.

The Texas principals have indicated clear and specific recommendations to assist in achieving this goal. The length of ineligibility should be reduced from 6 weeks to a maximum of 3 weeks. The 6 week free period at the beginning of the school year should be eliminated and eligibility should be based on the last 3 weeks of the preceding semester. As one of the principals remarked, "It is the responsibility of the administrators and educators to make legislation positive."

REFERENCES

- Academic standards for athletes still controversial. (1983, Dec. 7). The Chronicle of Higher Education. 27-29.
- Biemiller, Lawrence. (1983, August). A's for athletes: the strange case. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 20-21, 24.
- Cramer, Jerome. (1986, May). Winning or learning? Athletics and academics in America. Phi Delta Kappan. K1-K8.
- Crowl, John A. (1984, January). Academic requirements for athletes stiffened; advocates had hoped for stronger measure. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 33.
- Durbin, Brice B. (1986, October). High school athletics: a valuable educational experience. NAASP Bulletin. 32-34.
- Harper, Thomas. (1986, October). Minimum academic standards: no. NAASP Bulletin. 1-4.
- Jackel, Ronald G. (1986, February). Academic eligibility requirements for student activities. The Education Digest. 33-36.
- Jeffries, Stephen C. (1984). Sport and education: theory and practice in the U.S.S.R. Quest. 36 (2). 164-176.

- Middleton, W.E. (1960, April). Basic principles of extracurricular activities. School Activities. 236.
- Miller, Rex D. (1985, Feb.). A proper place for athletics in Missouri schools. NASSP Bulletin.
- Morrison, Michael G. (1986, Oct.). Review of Kevin Ross' career at Creighton University. Letter to Alumni.
- Nelson, Arthur O. (1959, September). A varied activities program which includes academic help. School Activities. 31.
- Ostro, Harry. (1983, February). Should athletes be required to maintain a specific academic level? Scholastic Coach. 52 (7). 4-8.
- Porto, Brian L. (1984, Fall). When coaches are teachers, athletes will be students. Liberal Education. 231-233.
- Reavis, Charles A. (1984, Fall). Supervision in small schools. Small School Forum. 6 (1). 16-18.
- Ruffin, Santee C. (1986, October). Minimum academic standards: yes. NAASP Bulletin. 6-8.
- Siedentop, Daryl. (1984-85 Annual Edition). On the cutting edge - physical education. Today's Education. 67.
- Soltz, Donald F. (1986, October). Athletics and academic achievement: what is the relationship? NAASP Bulletin. 20-24.

Sowa, Claudia J. and Gressard, Charles F. (1983, May).

Student development. Journal of College Student Personnel. 236-239.

Staff. (1983, November) Journal editorial. Athletic Journal. 64 (4).

Staff. (1984, February). Journal editorial. Athletic Journal. 64 (7).

Tidmore, Kenneth W. (1986). Gordon Wood rips HB 72. Globe-News. 1-2D.

Tompkins, Ellsworth. (1950, May). Sixty frequently asked questions on extra-class activities. School Activities. 288-308.

Vance, N. Scott and Biemiller, Lawrence. (1983, December). Academic standards for athletes still controversial. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 27-29.

Vance, N. Scott. (1983, May). NCAA to sponsor nationwide study of athletes' academic performance. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 23.

Vance, N. Scott. (1984, February). Schools found not telling athletes about academic rules. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 23-24

Vance, N. Scott. (1983, July). Two-thirds of basketball stars drafted by pros have yet to graduate from college. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 13-14.

Walter, Timothy and Smith, Donald E. P. (1986, winter).

Taking athletes across the finish line. Educational Record. (40-44).

Zahm, Diane. (1985, Aug.). The student-athlete: a tutor's perspective. Athletic Journal. (48-49, 59).

Appendix A

In 1986-87, as a result of "No Pass, No Play":

1. Did student participation increase, decrease, or stay the same?

- a) girls' volleyball ☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same
 b) girls' basketball ☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same
 c) boys' football ☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same
 d) boys' basketball ☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same
 e) band ☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same

2. Has academic achievement:

☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ same

3. How has "No Pass, No Play" been accepted by:

- a) students ☐ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor
 b) parents ☐ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor
 c) administration ☐ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor
 d) coaches, sponsors ☐ excellent ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor

4. In your professional opinion, has "No Pass, No Play" achieved its purpose without any negative results?

5. Comments: