

1963

## A Study of Football Training Rules in the High Schools of Chelan, Douglas, Grant and Okanogan Counties

Lynn Edward Rosenbach  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rosenbach, Lynn Edward, "A Study of Football Training Rules in the High Schools of Chelan, Douglas, Grant and Okanogan Counties" (1963). *All Master's Theses*. 355.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/355>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

A STUDY OF FOOTBALL TRAINING RULES IN THE  
HIGH SCHOOLS OF CHELAN, DOUGLAS,  
GRANT AND OKANOGAN COUNTIES

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education

---

by  
Lynn Edward Rosenbach  
August 1963

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

LD

5771.3

R813s

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

117556

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

Albert H. Poffenroth, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Everett A. Irish

---

Dohn A. Miller

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of the problem . . . . .	2
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	2
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	3
Training regulations or rules . . . . .	3
Football season . . . . .	3
High school football players . . . . .	3
Gathering the Data . . . . .	3
Importance of the Study . . . . .	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	5
Importance of Training Regulations . . . . .	5
Training Rules as a Part of Education . . . . .	8
The Athlete's Part in Training Rules . . . . .	9
III. THE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	11
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	39
Summary . . . . .	39
Conclusions . . . . .	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	44
APPENDIXES . . . . .	48

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I.	Should High School Football Players Have Training Rules? . . . . . 12
II.	Are Football Players That Train Able to Perform Better in Games? . . . . . 13
III.	Should the Football Coach Be Subject to the Same Training Rules? . . . . . 14
IV.	In What Areas Are Training Rules Necessary? . . . . . 15
V.	Who Should Make The Training Rules? . . . . . 16
VI.	Punishment for Smoking . . . . . 18
VII.	Punishment for Drinking . . . . . 19
VIII.	Punishment for the Breaking of Curfew . . . . . 20
IX.	Punishment for Scholastic Ineligibility . . . . . 21
X.	Punishment for Skipping Practice . . . . . 23
XI.	Punishment for Swearing . . . . . 24
XII.	Punishment for Overeating . . . . . 25
XIII.	Punishment for Excessive Dating . . . . . 26
IVX.	Who Will Administer Disciplinary Measures? . . . . . 28
XV.	Curfew for Friday and Saturday Nights . . . . . 29
XVI.	Curfew Sunday Through Thursday . . . . . 30
XVII.	Training Rules Broken Most Frequently . . . . . 31
XVIII.	Training Rules Least Often Broken . . . . . 32
IXX.	Season Rules Are Broken . . . . . 33

## TABLE

## PAGE

XX.	Should a Football Player Train Only During Season? . . . . .	34
XXI.	Does a Player Prefer to Know His Punishment in Advance? . . . . .	35
XXII.	Should Training Rules Be the Same for All Sports? . . . . .	36
XXIII.	Is the Breaking of Training Rules a Problem in Your School? . . . . .	37

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

One of the things the writer has found most disturbing in the coaching of high school athletics is the formation of a set of training rules or regulations. It has never been clear in the writer's mind whether the regulations which various coaches set up are just, or whether possibly these regulations should be constructed and enforced by the athletes themselves. Some persons even doubt whether training regulations are a necessary part of the athlete's training. Mills cites us an example.

Certainly one of the major problems facing the coach today is the breaking of faith by the professional athlete. A coach tries to have his team conform to certain standards regarding training and team obligations. However, large companies work against him by having well known athletes endorse tobacco and alcoholic beverages (34:34).

Each year the investigator submits his training rules to his athletes, and without exception they sign them, as do their parents and assure him that they understand and agree with them. But over a period of years it is necessary now and then to take disciplinary action for the breaking of the rules. The question is then, what is an acceptable set of training regulations?



## I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. To develop a set of training regulations or rules for a football season as suggested by the high school football players, coaches and principals of Chelan, Douglas, Okanogan and Grant counties. It is the purpose of this study to determine what the individual athletes, coaches and principals believe to be a just set of training rules. (1) Do they think training rules are an important part of athletics? (2) Should the individual athlete be involved in the formation of them? (3) What are the recommendations as to what should be included in the training rules? It is hoped that the information received can be used in setting up a training program in the investigator's school.

## II. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Recognizing that this problem may vary in different regions of the state, this study was confined to an area known as North Central Washington, which includes the counties of Chelan, Douglas, Grant and Okanogan. This study is further limited to high schools who play football in these four counties.

### III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Training regulations or rules. A group of statements governing the method by which an athlete conditions his body. Reference will be made to those statements which refer to smoking, drinking of alcoholic beverages, curfew, scholastic eligibility and other unacceptable behavior.

Football season. Defined by the Washington State Activities Association as that period of time dating from September 1, or the first day of school, whichever is earlier, until November 31 (49:53).

High school football players. All individuals turning out for football at the time the questionnaire was sent out.

### IV. GATHERING THE DATA

The data was gathered by the survey-questionnaire method. The investigator wrote each principal a letter explaining the study and giving instructions for the participation by the football squad, football coach, and the principal, himself. (See Appendix B.) The letter and questionnaires were mailed in a large envelope which contained sufficient copies for the football players of the school as well as separate copies for the coach and principal. Questions on the instrument were answered "yes," "no," "other"

and a space was left for any comments that the participants wanted to make. (See Appendix C.) It was suggested that the players fill out the questionnaire at a squad meeting. When the players finished, the coach could collect the completed questionnaires and return them to the investigator. It was requested the coach and principal return their completed questionnaires in the separate envelope provided.

#### V. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

It is the opinion of the investigator that each individual coach should be completely certain of the way he is teaching his sport. Training rules are an important segment of high school football. Therefore, it is the investigator's hope to obtain facts which will help him formulate training rules which will be more acceptable to his football squad. In addition, this study may have implications to other coaches as how they might vary their use of training rules.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is very little literature which is related directly to the problem and less of it was scientifically determined. Much of the material in this area is only the philosophy or thoughts of various interested individuals. Whether this indicates a lack of interest or an area which needs no study was impossible for the writer to ascertain. Most of the literature is related to school codes, standards in athletics, and coaching of athletics, and therefore only indirectly related to the problem.

#### I. IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING REGULATIONS

The importance of training regulations or rules is widely questioned. Many coaches and athletes agree that they are important but may not themselves adhere to them. Others feel conversely and state the best coach is one who sets the finest example in his every day life. Holman, in his study of training rules in a group of selected high schools in Kansas recommends; "By all means the coach should set an example for his team. It is impossible for a coach to gain the respect of every member of the team if he does those things which he asks them not to do" (23:79). Goeser, in his

study, "Training Rules for High School Athletics," concludes, "Training rules are a problem in fifty per cent of the schools" (18:38). The Athletic Institute recognizing that training rules are important and that the breaking of them is increasing has prepared the following resolution:

WHEREAS a principal purpose of interschool athletics is to contribute to the establishment of the benefits of physical fitness, and

WHEREAS the abstinence from the use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages is considered to be desirable on the part of teenage athletes, and

WHEREAS the abstinence of tobacco and alcoholic beverages is accepted as contributing to healthful living for youths, and

WHEREAS high school age students are at a most impressionable stage given to hero worshipping, and

WHEREAS there is need for great dedication on the part of school age athletes to accept training rules which have traditionally included an abstinence from the use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the delegates assembled at the Conference on Secondary School Athletic Administration that professional athletes be earnestly requested to refrain from endorsing and/or to decline to permit the use of their names and/or pictures in the promotion of the and/or sale of tobacco or alcoholic beverages, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the manufacturers, distributors, advertisers and news disseminating media refrain from soliciting athletes to endorse tobacco and alcoholic beverages, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that organizations providing athletic programs for television, radio and movie not employ athletes to advertise or recommend the use of tobacco and/or alcoholic beverages in such programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all organizations sponsoring programs in the area of growth and development of boys and girls aggressively support this resolution by indicating their disapproval of the practice of athletes endorsing the use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages (6:87).

Many coaches agree with the theory of Bud Wilkinson, one of the nation's top football coaches: "The player who lacks desire and determination to become the best possible football player, and thus to refrain from smoking, drinking and otherwise dissipating himself, is the same player who will let down the team and himself in the clutch" (47:51). The basic training rules refer to the habits of drinking alcoholic beverages, smoking and observing curfew. These are probably the most frequently broken regulations and consequently the ones most coaches believe are the most important. Walker in his book Organization For Successful Football Coaching states, "Basic rules prohibiting smoking and drinking and establishing a curfew would have to be considered essential for any football team" (47:146). However, some people disagree with Walker. Artie McGovern, former fighter and at one time one of America's top flight conditioners, suggests, "Training athletes is an individual proposition. What's good for one man is not good for another" (41:35).

Medical men are interested in this field, as evidenced by this statement from the American Medical Association. "Proper nutrition, plenty of sleep and rest, graduated physical

activity and the avoidance of drugs contribute to the chief factors in a training program. Without sound practices in these areas, no player can be at his best" (2:57). The stress is on the importance of training rules because these practices build healthy bodies not only for the time spent participating in athletics, but for later life. Edlund suggests: "A coach of any sport, if he is a good conscientious coach will not tolerate the use of alcohol or tobacco by any of his charges, and his first training rule is the non use of alcohol and tobacco" (14:39).

## II. TRAINING RULES AS A PART OF EDUCATION

Many people think that training rules are a very important portion of the educational aspect of athletics. Some no doubt believe that there is little value in athletics other than this facet. Others think this area is many times neglected. But well known educators and organizations seem to support the idea that athletics or sports are an important part of education. Archer states:

Typical of the American way of life is our nearly unanimous interest in sports. The red blooded American boy in sports thinks of little else; his sister, mother and particularly his dad also are well versed in the jargon of the sports writer. We can truly say that our nation's strength depends upon the physical fitness which most games develop (4:186).

A Joint Committee of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Federation of State High

School Athletic Associations and the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation reports, "Athletics should be used to develop and promote worthwhile educational goals" (25:16).

Student conduct codes, whether they are used in athletics or in the social life of the school, have a definite value in the educational process of the student. Grote suggests they are even more effective if the student has a part in the construction of the code.

Many teachers and principals believe that youth should formulate their own code of behavior and then support it. They believe that the only discipline worthwhile is self discipline that comes through understanding and acceptance of responsibility for one's behavior (21:38).

### III. ATHLETE'S PART IN TRAINING RULES

Philosophy regarding the student's or athlete's part in the game of football has varied from year to year. Possibly this variation is related to the particular ideas of the time regarding the importance of education and athletics. Tunis suggests: "The player is left to make all decisions. This results in more learning by the players" (45:464). Others disagree and believe that actually the coach should dictate to the player. Rice in his article, Qualities of a Good Coach, indicates: "The rules of training and standards of conduct should be drawn up and explained to the boy " (40:153). Many persons agree with this quotation. They



believe that the athlete is too immature to develop and execute his own training rules. However there are some examples which may partially refute that thinking.

Permit the members to set their own rules and let them as a group enforce them. Don't fret about your boys being too easy on the offenders (46:41).

First, you may be surprised to learn that these kids expect more of themselves, they administer severer retribution on themselves than their elders or so-called superiors ever thought of doing (11:67).

Essentially the game belongs to the player. Justification for including it in the school program rests upon the premise that it provides both physical and character value for those who play it (1:48).

The literature has revealed to the investigator a possible direction for his study, but with such limited bibliography related directly to the problem, it is impossible to draw any valid conclusions as to the outcome.

## CHAPTER III

### THE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Eleven hundred ten questionnaires were sent out to the football players of twenty-seven schools included in the study. The investigator arrived at this number by noting in the newspaper the number of players turning out at each school. Six hundred twenty-six answers were received from high school football players. The great difference between the number of questionnaires sent and those returned may be accounted for by the following possibilities: Some of the coaches handed them out to their A-squads only, the estimate was based on early season figures, and possibly some of the players didn't return them.

Twenty-three of the twenty-seven coaches returned completed questionnaires. The percentage of coaches returning questionnaires was 85 per cent.

Twenty of the twenty-seven principals returned their completed questionnaires. The percentage of principals returning questionnaires was 74 per cent.

Table I shows the thinking of high school football players, high school coaches and high school principals as to whether high school football players should have training rules.

TABLE I  
SHOULD HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL PLAYERS  
HAVE TRAINING RULES?

	Yes	No
Football Players	613	12
Coaches	22	1
Principals	20	0

Table I shows that football players, coaches and principals generally agreed by a large majority that football players should have training rules. It is noteworthy that of the twenty principals who answered this question all believed football players should have training rules.

The only coach who was opposed to training rules said he felt training rules led to problems, but there must be some "guidelines" presented for the player to follow. He did think however, that players smoking and drinking should be dismissed from the squad.

Football players who opposed training rules were of different opinions. Some believed that if a person wished to play football he would know enough to train. One fellow indicated that in a small town common sense should be sufficient. Another expression was that high school athletics are not professional; therefore, training rules and regulations take too much time and probably don't help a fellow play any better.

Table II shows that football players, coaches and principals agreed that football players who trained were able to perform better in games. Coaches and principals agreed unanimously.

TABLE II  
ARE FOOTBALL PLAYERS THAT TRAIN ABLE TO  
PERFORM BETTER IN GAMES?

	Yes	No
Football Players	618	8
Coaches	23	0
Principals	20	0

Some players suggested that the reflexes and reactions of a football player who trained were better. Others believed it helped the individual to discipline himself mentally. A number of players indicated there was less chance of injury for the player who followed training rules. A well-trained athlete is prepared to give his best at all times was another idea suggested. One football player presented his idea in the following way: "Training is an essential commodity for football, just as you must prepare for exams, you must prepare and train for games."

Table III indicates that football players were divided almost evenly in their beliefs regarding the responsibility the football coach has for keeping training rules. A few of

the players indicated it made no difference to them. Some suggested that some of the rules the squad kept should not pertain to the coach. Table III shows further that the coaches and principals closely agree that the coach should not be subject to the same rules as the players.

TABLE III  
SHOULD THE FOOTBALL COACH BE SUBJECT  
TO THE SAME TRAINING RULES?

	Yes	No	Don't Care	Some	Set Example
Football Players	306	303	8	2	1
Coaches	3	19	0	0	0
Principals	2	18	0	0	0

Although Table III indicates coaches don't think that they should have training rules, some agreed it would help the morale of the squad if they followed them. One coach presented the philosophy on training rules for the coach in this way. "The coach is an adult, and he has probably been through the training rule discipline. Ideally though, it is probably better if the coach follows most of the training rules." Another's ideas were: "I feel coaches should, to a degree, keep the same rules as the athlete. After all, whether we like it or not, we are setting the example. Also, if the coaches do not adhere to the rules, it is following the principle of don't do as I do, do as I say, which cannot work in the full sense of the word."

The players indicated that the team would probably work harder and have more respect for their coach if he would set a good example. "The coach should train in public," said one player. Another gave this idea: "Even though he should set an example, the rules should not be so strict for the coach."

On the other hand some players thought a coach should be restricted only in the presence of the players. Squad members should understand that coaches are adults and should not have to follow training rules. The coaches aren't playing the game and therefore should not be subject to the same training rules as the players, was the sentiment of some of the players. One player expressed the idea that since the coach was not taxed physically, he should not have the same rules as the athlete.

Table IV shows that football players, coaches and principals believed the five areas in which it was most important to have training rules were smoking, drinking, curfew, scholastic eligibility, and skipping practice.

TABLE IV  
IN WHAT AREAS ARE TRAINING RULES NECESSARY?

	Smoking	Drinking	Curfew	Eligibility	Skip Practice
Football Players	600	591	543	488	529
Coaches	23	23	21	20	22
Principals	19	19	20	20	20

Two hundred fifty-two players considered overeating a worthwhile training regulation but some players suggested it had no place in high school training rules. One hundred sixty-eight players said that excessive dating should be regulated. A few players suggested that regulations should extend to such things as chewing tobacco, "smart stuff," and sportsmanship.

It was shown that the football players listed more practices to be included in training rules than did the two other groups surveyed. There was a wide diversity of ideas about what should be included in training rules.

Table V shows who, football players, coaches and principals believe should make training rules for the football squad.

TABLE V  
WHO SHOULD MAKE THE TRAINING RULES?

	Coach	Players	Coach and players
Football Players	100	16	484
Coaches	5	1	14
Principals	9	0	9

Four hundred eighty-four players believed the training rules should be made by the coach and the football players. One hundred players would have reserved this privilege for themselves alone. Some players indicated that some of the

following persons should have a part in making training rules; the school board, the faculty, parents, the athletic director, managers, members of the Athletic Round Table, and as one player put it, "All persons connected with players and coach."

Fourteen coaches said that training rules should be made by the coaches and players. Seven coaches thought that they alone should make the rules. One coach believed the rules should be made by the coach and players, but with the approval of the administration.

Nine principals agreed with the seven coaches who would make their own training rules. Nine others replied that the coach and football players should make the rules. One principal believed that the rules should be made by parents, coach and players. One principal would have some of the rules made by the coach only and others by the coach and the football players together.

Table VI shows how players, coaches and principals believe football players should be punished for breaking a training rule by smoking.



TABLE VI  
PUNISHMENT FOR SMOKING

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	367	148	49	41
Coaches	15	6	1	
Principals	9	8	2	1

There seems to be wide disagreement on how athletes should be punished for smoking. The players and principals were the most closely agreed on what the punishment should be.

Three hundred sixty-seven football players said a smoker should be dismissed on the first offense. One hundred forty-eight believed he should be dismissed on the second violation. All but ninety-five, or less than one sixth of the players, believed he should be dismissed from the squad at some time. Two players suggested he be put on probation. One suggested he not be permitted to play some games and be given extensive physical work. One suggested the player who breaks training by smoking be made to run until he dropped. Another player suggested that the coach should warn the violator.

Fifteen football coaches thought that a football player who smokes should be dismissed immediately. Six believed he should be given a second chance. One believed he should not be permitted to play some games.

Nine of the principals believed the football player who smokes should be dropped from the squad immediately. Eight said he should be dismissed on the second offense. One suggested the guilty player be given physical punishment of some sort such as laps, calisthenics, etc.

Table VII shows what the football players, football coaches and principals believe the punishment should be for the football player who breaks training regulations by drinking.

Four hundred seventy-five football players believe a player should be dismissed on the first offense for drinking. Eighty-six indicated he should be dropped from the squad on the second infraction. Twenty-one thought he should not be permitted to play some games. Thirteen players indicated that physical punishment was the punishment a violator should have. Again one player said that a warning by the coach should suffice.

TABLE VII  
PUNISHMENT FOR DRINKING

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	475	86	21	13
Coaches	19	2	0	0
Principals	12	6	2	0

Coaches believed that individuals drinking should be punished by dismissal from the squad. Nineteen of the coaches thought this should be done immediately; two, that it should be done on the second infraction.

Twelve of the principals stated that the football player who breaks training by drinking should be dismissed on the first offense. Six said he should be dismissed on the second offense. The other two principals thought that he should not be permitted to play in some games.

Table VIII shows what football players, coaches and principals believe the punishment should be for the breaking of curfew.

TABLE VIII  
PUNISHMENT FOR THE BREAKING OF CURFEW

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	34	123	193	236
Coaches	0	13	6	2
Principals	1	9	6	4

Only thirty-four football players thought a player breaking curfew should be dismissed from the squad on the first offense. One hundred twenty-three believed he should be dismissed after the second offense. One hundred ninety-three would restrict him to not playing in some games. Two

hundred thirty-six football players said he should be given physical punishment.

No coaches believed the player who breaks curfew should be dropped from the squad on the first infraction but thirteen would drop him from the squad after the second offense. Six said he should not be allowed to play some games and four thought he should be given physical punishment.

One principal believed that breaking curfew should cause immediate expulsion from the squad. Nine principals said a curfew breaker should be given a second chance before being dismissed from the team. Six principals thought he should not be permitted to play some games, four said he should be given physical punishment.

Table IX shows how football players, coaches and principals think football players should be punished for scholastic ineligibility.

TABLE IX  
PUNISHMENT FOR SCHOLASTIC INELIGIBILITY

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	80	65	389	26
Coaches	1	3	12	0
Principals	2	3	15	0

Eighty players believed that a player who is ineligible scholastically should be dropped from the squad on the first offense. Sixty-five players thought the ineligible player should not be dismissed until the second infraction. Three hundred eighty-nine players said that an ineligible player should not be able to play in some games, presumably the particular weeks he was ineligible. Twenty-six players thought that the scholastically ineligible player should be subject to physical punishment. Some fellows suggested the player be put on probation; others suggested a talk with the coach, or the coach and the principal.

One coach indicated the scholastically ineligible player should be dropped from the squad immediately. Three coaches said he should be dismissed after the second infraction, while twelve coaches suggested he should not be allowed to play in some of the games.

Two principals said the ineligible player should be dropped from the squad on the first offense. Three principals would dismiss the scholastically ineligible player on the second offense. Fifteen principals indicated that the player should not be permitted to play in some of the games.

Table X shows how football players, coaches and high school principals believe football players should be punished for skipping football practice.

TABLE X  
PUNISHMENT FOR SKIPPING PRACTICE

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	54	142	193	224
Coaches	4	4	10	4
Principals	1	9	6	4

Fifty-four players said the player who skips practice should be dismissed from the team immediately. One hundred forty-two players thought he should be dismissed on the second infraction. One hundred ninety-three players thought that the player who skips practice should not be permitted to play some games. Two hundred twenty-four players indicated that physical punishment should be given for skipping practice.

Four coaches indicated that the football player who skips practice should be dismissed on the first offense; four on the second violation. Nine coaches believed the players should not be able to play some games and four thought physical punishment should be prescribed. One coach suggested the player be dismissed on the third offense and not be permitted to play in some games.

One principal indicated a player who skips practice should be dismissed on the first offense, while eight principals believed he should be dropped on the second offense.

Six principals said the player who skips practice should not be able to play some games. Four principals thought the player should be given physical punishment.

Table XI shows how football players, coaches and high school principals believe football players should be punished for swearing.

TABLE XI  
PUNISHMENT FOR SWEARING

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	26	66	68	395
Coaches	1	0	2	12
Principals	0	3	4	10

Dismissing the offenders on the first offense of swearing was the opinion of twenty-six players. Sixty-six players thought the violator should be dropped on the second infraction. Sixty-eight players said he should not be permitted to play some games while the majority of the players said that the punishment for swearing should be physical. Six fellows thought a talk with the coach might be good and one player suggested the violator be dismissed from practice that evening. One player said the offender should be given hacks.

One coach thought the football player who swears should be dismissed on the first offense. Two coaches

suggested he not be permitted to play some games and thirteen coaches indicated that physical punishment was the discipline that should be used.

Three principals thought the person who swears should be dismissed after the second offense. Four principals indicated the player should not be permitted to play some games and ten principals signified that physical punishment should be given to the player who swears in practice or in a game.

Table XII shows how football players, coaches and high school principals believe football players should be punished for overeating during the football season.

TABLE XII  
PUNISHMENT FOR OVEREATING

	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	15	32	287
Coaches	0	7	0
Principals	1	3	5

Only fifteen players thought this possible rule was important enough to drop a player for the infraction of it on the second offense. Thirty-two players suggested the offender not be permitted to play in some games, while two hundred eighty-seven advocated physical punishment. The remaining players didn't consider it important enough to check it on their questionnaire.



Only seven coaches considered this possible training rule important enough to list a punishment for it. They indicated the player who overeats should be given physical punishment.

One principal suggested that the player who overeats should be dropped from the squad on the second violation, while three thought he should not be permitted to play in some games. Five principals said physical punishment was the best way to handle this problem. One principal suggested benching the football player who overeats.

Table XIII shows how football players, coaches and high school principals believe football players should be punished for excessive dating.

TABLE XIII  
PUNISHMENT FOR EXCESSIVE DATING

	Dismissal	Dismissal Second Offense	Can't play some games	Physical Punishment
Football Players	3	41	91	119
Coaches	0	3	0	2
Principals	0	1	2	4

Three football players believed a player should be dropped from the squad if he makes a practice of excessive dating. Forty-one players thought he should be dropped on the second offense and ninety-one suggested he not be permitted

to play some games. One hundred nineteen players advocated physical punishment, while many said there should be no restrictions on dating. Several players did not answer this part of the questionnaire, possibly indicating that they thought a restriction of this sort was not necessary.

Three coaches thought the player should be dismissed on the second offense of excessive dating and two others indicated he should be given physical punishment. The remaining coaches did not answer this question.

One principal thought a player should be dismissed on the second offense of excessive dating. Three principals recommended that the violator should not be permitted to play some games and four principals said physical punishment was the action that should be taken. One principal suggests the best method of handling this was to bench the individual involved.

Table XIV shows who the football players, coaches and principals believed should administer the disciplinary action if a training rule is broken.

Four hundred ten players indicated it should be the exclusive responsibility of the coach to administer discipline. Six said the principal should carry out the punishment. Twenty-five players suggested the team captain should undertake this as a part of his responsibility. Sixty players believed this should be a squad action. Other

players suggested it might be done by various groups and individuals, such as coach, principal or captain. One player suggested a jury of the squad be used as a means of executing the punishment.

TABLE XIV  
WHO WILL ADMINISTER DISCIPLINARY MEASURES?

	Coach	Principal	Team Captain	Squad
Football Players	410	6	25	60
Coaches	18	0	0	0
Principals	16	0	0	0

One coach indicated that the coach and the team captain in a joint effort should administer the discipline. Three said the coach and the squad should do it jointly, while one coach would also include the principal. Eighteen coaches indicated administering of discipline should be their exclusive responsibility.

Three principals suggested that the coach and the squad should carry out the discipline together. One principal believed he should be included in this joint effort, but sixteen principals would leave this responsibility to the coach.

Table XV shows the time football players, coaches and principals believed should be established for curfew on Friday and Saturday nights.

TABLE XV  
CURFEW FOR FRIDAY AND SATURDAY NIGHTS

	10:00	11:00	12:00	12:30	1:00	2:00	None
Football Players	33	80	147	137	147	24	6
Coaches	2	9	3	5	0	0	0
Principals	0	2	12	2	0	0	0

Of the curfew times most commonly selected, one hundred forty-seven players, nine coaches, and twelve principals indicated the curfew for Friday and Saturday nights should be 12:00 midnight. One hundred thirty-seven players would set the curfew at 12:30 A.M.; one hundred forty-seven more players believed it should be at 1:00 A.M. Thirty-four players picked 2:00 A.M. as an appropriate hour for curfew. No coach or principal advocated the 2:00 A.M. hour and only five coaches and two principals thought the curfew should extend until 1:00 A.M. A number of players and a few coaches and principals indicated curfew should be earlier than midnight.

Six players suggested there should be no curfew at all. A few players thought 10:30 P.M., 11:30 P.M., or 1:30 A.M. should be the correct time for curfew. One coach suggested it should be up to the parents, and one said it should depend on whether the previous week's game was won or lost. One

principal would not set time limits but suggested the player be required to get nine hours of sleep daily.

Table XVI shows the time football players, coaches and high school principals believe should be the curfew Sunday through Thursday nights.

TABLE XVI  
CURFEW SUNDAY THROUGH THURSDAY

	9:00	9:30	10:00	10:30	11:00	12:00	None
Football Players	46	125	256	132	35	14	2
Coaches	1	7	11	4	0	0	0
Principals	1	4	12	2	1	0	0

The times most commonly chosen by all those interviewed were 9:30 P.M., 10:00 P.M., and 10:30 P.M. One hundred twenty-five football players picked 9:30 P.M., two hundred fifty-six players chose 10:00 P.M., and one hundred thirty-two preferred 10:30 P.M. Seven coaches selected 9:30 P.M., eleven coaches elected 10:00 P.M. and four coaches indicated 10:30 P.M. was the hour a football player should be in on Sunday through Thursday nights. Four principals selected 9:30 P.M., twelve picked 10:00 and two chose 10:30 as the time a football player should be in on those nights. One coach said that the squad should arrive at the times democratically, and one principal suggested again that no restrictions be made other than

the requirement of nine hours of sleep daily for the football player.

TABLE XVII  
TRAINING RULES BROKEN MOST FREQUENTLY

	Smoking	Drinking	Curfew	Eligibility	Skip Practice
Football Players	315	168	455	139	177
Coaches	11	3	19	4	6
Principals	8	6	13	4	7

In their estimation, all three groups believed that not observing curfew was the training rule most frequently broken. The other two training regulations the football players thought were broken the most were swearing and smoking. The next two regulations selected by the largest number of coaches were smoking and skipping practice. As a second choice the principals picked smoking. An equal number of principals selected skipping practice and swearing as the third most important training infraction.

Although not on the table above, three hundred eighty-seven players and seven principals indicated that they considered swearing to be one of the rules broken most often. One hundred forty-seven players and four principals selected overeating as a major problem. Ninety-six players and three principals selected excessive dating as one of the three training rules most often broken.

Table XVIII shows which training rules the football players, coaches and principals believed were the least often broken.

TABLE XVIII  
TRAINING RULES LEAST OFTEN BROKEN

	Smoking	Drinking	Curfew	Eligibility	Skip Practice
Football Players	213	330	61	331	294
Coaches	10	14	2	15	10
Principals	5	7	3	8	9

Scholastic eligibility, drinking and skipping practice were the three training rules football players indicated were the least often broken during the football season. The coaches concurred with this; however they rated skipping practice as important as smoking, which they rated number three. The principals agreed with two of the choices of the other respondents, scholastic eligibility and skipping practice, but they added that overeating was a training rule that was infrequently broken.

In addition to the rules presented in Table XVIII, fifty-six football players, six coaches and two principals selected swearing as one of the training rules the least often broken. Two hundred forty-one football players, five coaches and eight principals indicated overeating was one of the

training regulations least often broken. Two hundred ten players, six coaches and five principals thought that dating was a training rule least often broken.

Table IXX shows the season in which football players, coaches and principals believe training rules were usually broken.

TABLE IXX  
SEASON RULES ARE BROKEN

	Football	Basketball	Wrestling	Track	Baseball
Football Players	104	90	11	51	179
Coaches	2	0	0	1	6
Principals	6	6	2	6	9

Football players indicated that training rules were broken most often in baseball season first and football season next. In addition a number of players indicated that rules were broken in various combinations of seasons: Eleven--basketball and wrestling; three--basketball and track; five--football and basketball; six--football and baseball; one--basketball, wrestling and baseball; two--basketball, track and baseball; one--football, basketball and track; and twenty-three--all seasons.

The coaches indicated training rules were broken most often in a combination of the track and baseball seasons.



Baseball, singly, followed closely. Four coaches didn't have any idea, and one indicated there wasn't any difference.

The principals also indicated that training rules were broken most often in baseball season, followed closely by track, football and basketball. Wrestling was picked the least often as the season in which training rules were broken.

Table XX shows the thinking of football players, coaches and principals as to whether a football player should train only during the season that he participates in the sport.

TABLE XX  
SHOULD A FOOTBALL PLAYER TRAIN ONLY DURING SEASON?

	Yes	No
Football Players	112	472
Coaches	1	21
Principals	2	17

Four hundred seventy-two players indicated that they believed a football player should train all year, while one hundred twelve disagreed. Several players suggested that the rules should be relaxed during the off season.

Only one coach thought the player should train only during the football season. Twenty-one coaches indicated the player should train the entire year, while one coach thought it should be up to the individual football player.

Two principals believed the football player should have to train only in season, and seventeen thought he should train the entire year.

Table XXI shows whether a football player would prefer to know his punishment in advance for the breaking of a training rule. It further indicates the thinking of the football players, coaches and principals in answer to this question.

TABLE XXI

## DOES A PLAYER PREFER TO KNOW HIS PUNISHMENT IN ADVANCE?

	Yes	No
Football Players	517	80
Coaches	17	3
Principals	18	1

Five hundred seventeen football players said they would rather know their punishment in advance, while eighty preferred not to know. One indicated that he didn't know, two said it wouldn't matter, and one thought it should be up to the coaches.

Seventeen coaches indicated they thought players would rather know their punishment in advance. Three coaches said they thought they would not and three had no answer.

Eighteen principals thought players would prefer to know their punishment in advance. One principal thought a player would rather learn of his punishment after he had broken the rule.

Most of those surveyed said that if they knew what their punishment was in advance they would be less likely to break the rule.

Table XXII shows how football players, coaches and principals think as to whether training rules should be the same for all sports.

TABLE XXII  
SHOULD TRAINING RULES BE THE SAME FOR ALL SPORTS?

	Yes	No
Football Players	343	284
Coaches	16	7
Principals	16	4

Three hundred forty-three players indicated that training rules should be the same for all sports, while two hundred eighty-four players said they should not be. Other players suggested that this should be up to the coaches of the various sports, and a few indicated it really wouldn't matter.

Sixteen coaches suggested that the training rules should be the same for all sports, and seven that they should not be the same. One coach commented that above all, rules pertaining to smoking, drinking and late hours should concur. Another believed it depended on the philosophy of the coaching staff.

Sixteen principals believed that training rules should be the same for all sports. Four principals didn't think they had to be the same.

Table XXIII shows whether football players, coaches and principals believed the breaking of training rules was a problem in their schools.

TABLE XXIII  
IS THE BREAKING OF TRAINING RULES A PROBLEM  
IN YOUR SCHOOL?

	Yes	No
Football Players	218	367
Coaches	4	15
Principals	1	19

Two hundred eighteen players indicated the breaking of training rules was a problem in their schools. Three players indicated that they didn't know, and three indicated that they didn't care. Many players indicated that it was a problem, but that they thought it was improving in their school.

Four coaches said the breaking of training rules is a problem in their schools, while three coaches thought the situation was improving in their schools. Fifteen coaches did not see it as a problem in their schools. One coach suggested all schools have training problems, but that usually it really isn't too bad.

Only one principal indicated that the breaking of training rules was a problem in his school, while the remaining nineteen thought it was not a problem.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine what high school football players, coaches and principals believe is a fair set of training rules for the high school football player. It was the idea of the investigator that he might use the information gained in setting up training rules which would be more readily accepted and followed by his squad.

An attempt was made to compare the ideas of the players, coaches and principals to determine if there was any conflict in them, and to try to decide where they didn't agree.

It was found that generally players, coaches and principals agreed as to what comprises an adequate set of training regulations. There were only four areas in which there was general disagreement. Coaches and principals in the majority agreed that the football coach should not be subject to the same training rules as the player. The players were almost equally divided on this question. Those players who thought the coaches should be subject to the same rules indicated the coach should set a good example.

Players didn't agree with the coaches and principals concerning the punishment for the breaking of curfew. The

majority of coaches and principals agreed that for the breaking of curfew a player should be dropped on the second infraction. The players were more lenient and advocated either physical punishment of some sort or not permitting the offender to play in some games.

Disagreement arose again about the time for curfew on Friday and Saturday nights. The players advocated a later time than did many of the coaches and principals. The coaches, however, more closely agreed with the players than did the principals.

Coaches and principals didn't seem to think breaking of training rules was a problem in their schools. A large number of players, although not a majority, thought it was. Players indicated in their comments that more people were breaking training than were getting caught and they thought that should be corrected.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

1. It appears evident that high school football players should have training rules.
2. The data show football players who follow training rules are able to perform better in games.
3. The study indicates that the athletes are divided quite evenly as to their philosophy on the keeping of training by the coach. Therefore, it might help the squad morale if training rules were followed by the coach.

4. Training rules are probably necessary in the areas of smoking, drinking, curfew, scholastic eligibility and skipping practice.

5. The study showed football players and coaches jointly should make the training rules. If at all possible, they should be made democratically.

6. A football player who smokes should be dismissed from the squad. Players, coaches and principals seem to treat this as a less serious offense, however, than drinking.

7. Drinking is considered the most serious infraction of training rules and the offender should be dropped from the squad.

8. The study seems to indicate that all three groups don't believe that breaking of curfew is a very important regulation. Although there was some difference of opinion among the three groups involved, it was generally agreed that the player should get at least a second chance and possibly not be permitted to play in some games or to be given physical punishment.

9. The study reveals that the punishment for scholastic ineligibility should be to not permit the player to play in some games.

10. The results reveal a wide area of disagreement as to the punishment for the skipping of practice.



11. Swearing should be regarded as an act, which if it is frequent, should require some extra physical work.
12. The study seems to indicate that overeating and excessive dating should not be included in training rules.
13. The coach should administer the discipline taken if a player breaks a training rule.
14. The data collected show that an acceptable time for curfew on Friday and Saturday nights is between 12:00 midnight and 1:00 A.M.
15. The results of the survey show that the most acceptable time for curfew on Sunday through Thursday nights is between 9:30 P.M. and 10:30 P.M.
16. The data collected revealed that the training regulations broken most often were curfew and smoking.
17. The two training rules broken least often were drinking and scholastic eligibility.
18. The data indicated that training rules are most often broken in baseball, football, and basketball seasons respectively.
19. The results of the study reveal that a football player should train all year.
20. The player would prefer to know his punishment in advance if he were to break a training rule.
21. The study indicated considerable question as to whether training rules should be the same for all sports.

22. The study indicated training regulations were somewhat a problem in some schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Football Coaches Association, "Code of Ethics for Football Coaches," Scholastic Coach, 23:48-50, October, 1953.
2. American Medical Association, "Athletic Training," Scholastic Coach, 28:57, February, 1959.
3. Archer, J. K. "Standards in Athletics for Boys and Girls," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 36:322-5, March, 1952.
4. Archer, J. K. "What Are Acceptable Standards For Interscholastic Athletics?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 33:185-9, May, 1949.
5. Aspinall, R. F. "Ferno's Code of High School Fair Play," Clearing House, 21:176-7, November, 1946.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ "Athletic Institute Resolution," The Physical Educator, 20:81, May, 1963.
7. Battles, E. E. "Citizenship in Athletics," American School Board Journal, 106:47, May, 1943.
8. Caine, J. "Our High School Code," Journal of Health Physical Education and Recreation, 23:23, December, 1956.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ "Codes of Conduct," Scholastic Coach, 30:67, April, 1961.
10. Combes, H. "Captain's Role," Scholastic Coach, 22:30, December, 1952.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ "Curbing the Adult Delinquents," Scholastic Coach, 29:5, December, 1959.
12. David, L. "What Makes a Good Athlete," Readers Digest, June, 1954.
13. Doherty, Ken. "Basic Training for All Sports," Scholastic Coach, 27:16, March, 1958.
14. Edlund, Richard A. "Training and Eligibility Rules for High School Athletics in the United States and Canada," Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, 1955.

15. Fales, E. D., Jr. "What Makes the Athlete," Science Digest, 32:57-9, October, 1952.
16. Forsythe, Charles. The Athletic Director's Handbook, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1956.
17. Giese, Warren K. "Conditioning a Football Team," Athletic Journal, 37:6-7, September, 1956.
18. Goeser, George R. "Training Rules for High School Athletics," Unpublished Master's thesis, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, 1961.
19. Greenberg, J. M. "Athletics and Juvenile Delinquency," High Points, 27:73-5, April, 1945.
20. Grieder, C. "Can Any Good Word Be Said For Interscholastic Sports?" Nation's Schools, 64:6, November, 1959.
21. Grote, D. V. and T. M. Gillespie. "How Effective are Conduct Codes in Improving School and Community Citizenship?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 43:38-41, April, 1959.
22. Hobson, H. "Standards in Athletics for Boys," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 41:154-7, April, 1957.
23. Holman, Vester E. "An Investigation of Training Rules in a Group of Selected High Schools in Kansas." Unpublished thesis, The University of Wyoming, Laramie, 1953.
24. John, W. C. "Alcohol and Football; No Place Open on College and University Squads for Players Who Use Alcoholic Beverages," School Life, 27:63, November, 1941.
25. Joint Committee on Standards for Interscholastic Athletics, "Standards in Athletics for Boys and Girls," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 21:16-18, September, 1951.
26. Kammer, E. F. "Are School Athletic Programs Training Criminals?" School Activities, 1:13, September, 1960.
27. Lobdell, H. and M. M. MacKenzie, "Recognizing the Athlete," Journal of Higher Education, 29:339-41, June, 1958.

28. Loze, J. P. and W. S. Milburn. "Can Conduct Codes Favorably Affect Students Attitudes and Behavior?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 44:430-3, April, 1960.
29. Massey, P. E. "Football Conditioning," Athletic Journal, 37:40, November, 1956.
30. Mather, Charles V. Winning High School Football, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955.
31. McLendon, J. B. "Coaching to Win," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 29:24-5, October, 1958.
32. McGraw, L. W. "Democratic Values of Sports," Scholastic Coach, 20:34, April, 1951.
33. Meyers, W. L. "Ten Commandments for A Winning Coach," Athletic Journal, 37:28, June, 1957.
34. Mills, C. "Coaches Obligation to the Athlete," Athletic Journal, 39:34-5, December, 1958.
35. \_\_\_\_\_ "Our Unwritten Code, the Spirit of Rules," School Activities, 20:12-14, September, 1948.
36. Porter, H. V. "What are Acceptable Standards for Interscholastic Athletic," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 33:185-9, April, 1952.
37. \_\_\_\_\_ "Pupils Adopt Their Own Sportsmanship Code," Clearing House, 15:204, December, 1940.
38. Reaves, W. C. "Standards for Athletics," School Review, 60:196-7, April, 1952.
39. Robinson, T. E. "Athletics; Are They a Privilege?" Clearing House, 21:330-3, November, 1946.
40. Rice, H. M. "Qualities of a Good Coach," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 43:152-4, December, 1959.
41. \_\_\_\_\_ "Rule Breakers: The Most Athletes Abstain From Drinking and Smoking, There Are Exceptions," Literary Digest, 122:35, August 8, 1936.
42. Ryan, E. J. "Have It in Writing," American School Board Journal, 130:30, June, 1955.

43. Smith, L. "Many Roads to Rome," Today's Health, 38:40, August, 1960.
44. Stimson, R. W. "Codes of Conduct," Agriculture Education, 6:84, December, 1933.
45. Tunis, J. R. "Player Conduct in Football," Outlook, 153:464, November 20, 1929.
46. Veller, Don. "Compendum of Commonsense Principles in Modern Coaching," Scholastic Coach, 26:68-74, October, 1958.
47. Walker, Bob. Organization for Successful Football Coaching, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1960.
48. Ward, P. D. "Athletics as a Funnel for Guidance," School and Community, 36:225, September, 1950.
49. Washington Interscholastic Activities Association. Official Handbook, Seattle, Washington, 1960.
50. Wells, E. C. and C. F. Bates. "How Helpful are Conduct Codes in Improving School and Community Life," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 42:237-41, April, 1958.
51. Zahnisen, R. R. "Athletics as a Motivating Force," Scholastic Coach, 19:48, February, 1950.

APPENDIXES



## APPENDIX A

## SCHOOLS SURVEYED

- |                  |                      |
|------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Brewster      | 15. Omak             |
| 2. Bridgeport    | 16. Othello          |
| 3. Cashmere      | 17. Oroville         |
| 4. Chelan        | 18. Pateros          |
| 5. Coulee City   | 19. Peshastin-Dryden |
| 6. Coulee Dam    | 20. Quincy           |
| 7. Eastmont      | 21. Soap Lake        |
| 8. Ephrata       | 22. Tonasket         |
| 9. Entiat        | 23. Twisp            |
| 10. Grand Coulee | 24. Warden           |
| 11. Leavenworth  | 25. Waterville       |
| 12. Manson       | 26. Wenatchee        |
| 13. Moses Lake   | 27. Winthrop         |
| 14. Okanogan     |                      |

November 5, 1962

Dear Sir:

I am making a study of High School Football Training Rules; What our athletes think of some of the commonly composed training regulations as compared to the ideas of the coaches and administrators. The results of this study will be used as a partial fulfillment for the requirement of the Master's of Science degree at Central Washington State College.

I would like to ask you, your football coach and your football squad to take ten or twenty minutes to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. There is a small self-addressed envelope provided for the questionnaires of the principal and coach to be returned separately. The questionnaire for the football squad would probably best be administered by the coach at a squad meeting. When the squad is finished, collect the questionnaires, place them in the large self-addressed envelope provided, and return. Any extra questionnaires may be kept or returned as you see fit.

I would like to assure you that all information will be tabulated and in no manner will the results be identified with any individual school. I would like you to stress to your boys to be as frank as possible so that the results of this study might be more valuable.

Sincerely yours,

Lynn Rosenbach

School \_\_\_\_\_

Year in School \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: All questions may be answered with a check mark. (✓)  
 Feel free to add comments on any questions you wish. Be as frank and as honest as possible with your answers as they will be treated confidentially. When you finish the questions place in the accompanying envelope and return.

1. Do you believe high school football players should have training rules?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If your answer is NO please list your reasons.

2. Do you believe football players that train are able to perform better in games?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Should your football coach be subject to the same training rules as your squad members?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

4. In what areas do you believe training rules are necessary?  
 a. Smoking \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Drinking \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. Curfew (late hours) \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Scholastic Eligibility (grades) \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. Skipping Practice \_\_\_\_\_  
 f. Swearing \_\_\_\_\_  
 g. Eating habits \_\_\_\_\_ (Overeating)  
 h. Dating \_\_\_\_\_ (Excessive Dating)  
 i. Others \_\_\_\_\_

5. Who should make the training rules for the football season?  
 a. The coach only \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. The football players only \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. The coach and the football players \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

What should be the

Punishment for:

51

	Dismissal From Squad	Dismissal on Second Offense	Can't Play Some Games	Physical Punish- ment (laps, cal- listhenics, etc.)	Others (specify)
1. Smoking					
2. Drinking					
3. Curfew					
4. Scholastic Eligibility					
5. Skipping Practice					
6. Swearing					
7. Eating Habits					
8. Dating					
9. Others					

7. Who should administer the disciplinary measures if training rules are broken?
- Coach \_\_\_\_\_
  - Principal \_\_\_\_\_
  - Team Captain \_\_\_\_\_
  - Remainder of the Squad \_\_\_\_\_
  - Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
8. What should be the curfew established for Friday and Saturday nights?
- 10:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 12:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 12:30 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1:00 a.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2:00 a.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. What should be the curfew established for the remaining days of the week?
- 9:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9:30 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10:30 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - 12:00 p.m. \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
10. Which three training rules are most often broken during a football season?
- Smoking \_\_\_\_\_
  - Drinking \_\_\_\_\_
  - Curfew \_\_\_\_\_
  - Scholastic Eligibility \_\_\_\_\_
  - Skipping Practice \_\_\_\_\_
  - Swearing \_\_\_\_\_
  - Eating Habits \_\_\_\_\_
  - Dating \_\_\_\_\_
  - Others \_\_\_\_\_
11. Which training rules are least often broken during a football season?
- Smoking \_\_\_\_\_
  - Drinking \_\_\_\_\_
  - Curfew \_\_\_\_\_
  - Scholastic Eligibility \_\_\_\_\_
  - Skipping Practice \_\_\_\_\_
  - Swearing \_\_\_\_\_
  - Eating Habits \_\_\_\_\_
  - Dating \_\_\_\_\_
  - Others \_\_\_\_\_

12. In which season are training rules most often broken?

- a. Football \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Basketball \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Wrestling \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Track \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Baseball \_\_\_\_\_

13. Do you believe a football player should train only when turning out for football?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

14. If you were to break a training rule would you prefer to know your punishment in advance?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Should training rules be the same for all the sports in any one school?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

16. Is the breaking of training rules a problem in your school?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

Coaches only: If you wish a copy of the results of this survey please check here: \_\_\_\_\_