

1953

## A Study of the T Formation in Relation to its Defenses

William Ekron Bowman

*College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Health and Physical Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bowman, William Ekron, "A Study of the T Formation in Relation to its Defenses" (1953). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. William & Mary. Paper 1539624494.  
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-3ctq-yh79>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@wm.edu](mailto:scholarworks@wm.edu).

A STUDY OF THE T FORMATION IN RELATION TO ITS DEFENSES

---

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Physical Education

College of William and Mary

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

William Ekron Bowman

August 1953

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study of the T formation football offense in relation to its defenses has been made possible through the kind cooperation of the many outstanding football coaches throughout these United States employing this type of football offense during the years 1946 through 1951.

The investigator wishes to dedicate this thesis to his mother, and to his son, Bill Jr., because of their constant and unfailing encouragement.

To the members of his committee; Mr. Howard M. Smith, Mr. Kenneth H. Cleeton and Mr. Luther McRae, the writer wishes to express his sincere thanks and appreciation for each of their helpful suggestions and guidance throughout the course of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The problem . . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Need for the study . . . . .	1
Procedure . . . . .	1
Definition of terms . . . . .	3
Organization of remainder of this thesis . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Advantages of the T offenses over the	
defenses used against them . . . . .	7
Summary of the advantages the T attack	
has over its defenses . . . . .	15
Defenses employed effectively against	
the T attack . . . . .	16
Defenses least effective against the T	
formation . . . . .	20
Defenses most effective against the T	
formation . . . . .	21
Summary of the effectiveness of the	
defenses employed against the T attack . . .	23
III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	25
Success of T teams over defenses . . . . .	25
Success of T teams in holiday bowl games . . .	30



CHAPTER	PAGE
Success of T teams in conference play . . . .	31
Ranking of college and university teams . . .	32
ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES .	32
Records of coaches obtained from	
questionnaires . . . . .	32
The opinions of T formation coaches . . . . .	33
The most and least effective defenses	
against the T . . . . .	36
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	39
Summary of the findings . . . . .	39
Recommendations . . . . .	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	44
APPENDIX A . . . . .	54
APPENDIX B . . . . .	58
APPENDIX C . . . . .	73
APPENDIX D . . . . .	78
APPENDIX E . . . . .	87
APPENDIX F . . . . .	100
APPENDIX G . . . . .	114

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		PAGE
I.	Six Year Record of the 115 T Formation	
	Football Teams . . . . .	59
II.	Average Score Per Game for the 115 T	
	Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	60
III.	Six Year Record of 18 Conventional T	
	Formation Teams . . . . .	61
IV.	Average Score Per Game for 18 Conventional	
	T Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	62
V.	Six Year Record of 16 Winged T Teams . . . . .	63
VI.	Average Score Per Game for 16 Winged T	
	Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	64
VII.	Six Year Record of 19 Split or Sliding	
	T Formation Teams . . . . .	65
VIII.	Average Score Per Game for 19 Split or	
	Sliding T Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	66
IX.	Six Year Record of 31 Open T Formation	
	Football Teams . . . . .	67
X.	Average Score Per Game for 31 Open T	
	Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	68
XI.	Six Year Record of 31 Composite T	
	Formation Football Teams . . . . .	69
XII.	Average Score Per Game for 31 Composite	
	T Teams and Their Opponents . . . . .	70

TABLES	PAGE
XIII. Coaches' Records as Obtained from the Questionnaires . . . . .	71
XIV. Coaches' Opinions Regarding Defense Catching up with the T Attack . . . . .	72
XV. The Ten Top Ranking College Football Teams for Past Six Years . . . . .	74
XVI. Fifty Top Ranking College Football Teams for Past Six Years . . . . .	75
XVII. Seventy-five T Teams in Major Bowl Games for Past Six Years . . . . .	79
XVIII. Results of Major Bowl Games Played During Past Six Years . . . . .	80
XIX. T Teams Winning Conference Football Championships During Past Six Years . . . .	82
XX. Champions of Major Football Conferences . . .	83
XXI. Excerpts from Returned Questionnaires . . .	88
XXII. Responses of 219 Coaches Relative to Most Effective Defenses Employed Against the T Attacks . . . . .	99
XXIII. List of Coaches Employing the Conventional T Formation Attack . . . . .	101
XXIV. List of Coaches Utilizing the Winged T Formation Offense . . . . .	103
XXV. List of Coaches using the Split or Sliding T Formation Attack . . . . .	104

TABLES	PAGE
XXVI. List of Coaches Employing the Open	
T Formation Offense . . . . .	106
XXVII. List of Coaches Utilizing the Composite	
T Formation Attack . . . . .	109
XXVIII. List of Coaches Returning Questionnaires	
Not Used in This Study . . . . .	113
XXIX. Complete Six Year Record of the 115	
Outstanding T Formation Football Teams . . .	115

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study is to determine whether T formation football offenses are superior to the defenses that have been set up and utilized against them.

Need for the study. In the past few years the tempo of football has increased tremendously. Many types of defense have been introduced in an effort to lower or stop the scoring of the T formation. There has been much controversy in regard to the defense catching up with this offense. The problem is of interest and importance to experienced coaches and to college graduates just starting out in the coaching profession.

#### II. PROCEDURE

In the attempt to determine the relationship between T formation offenses and the defenses employed against them, a two-fold approach was used. The first approach was to find out whether or not the T offenses were successful in winning games, and the second approach was to survey opinions of coaches regarding the superiority of T formation offenses over defenses utilized against them. The survey also asked for the coaches' records, that is games won and lost.

The first part of this study was based upon the results of the playing schedules of 115 college and university football teams employing the T formation as their offense during the years 1946 through 1951. These teams were selected from a list published in The Football Digest.<sup>1</sup> The records of the 115 teams with regard to the number of games played, won, lost and tied were studied. The percentage of games won or lost by each team for each and all of the six years was computed. An analysis was made of the total scores, and from these the average score per game was calculated along with the percentage of games won. This was done for all the T teams and for their opponents.

The teams selected were studied as a whole group and then classified by the chief type of offense employed. Such factors as the number of games played, won, lost and tied for each year were studied. The results are revealed in Tables I, II, and III through XII inclusive and may be found in Appendix B.

It was found that eighteen teams used the Straight or Conventional Bear type of T offense, sixteen utilized the Winged or Flankered T, nineteen employed the Split or Sliding T offense as used by Maryland, Missouri and the University of Oklahoma, thirty-one others made use of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Herbert F. Simons, "Five Out of Six Schools Now Use Some T", The Football Digest (Chicago: Simons Publications, Incorporated, 1951), p. 111.

Open T formation while the remaining thirty-one employed the Composite T attack, which is a combination and variation of all the types of T formation offense.

To obtain data for the second part of this report, a questionnaire was sent to 279 college and university football coaches employing the T formation as their main method of attack. Their names were obtained from a publication of the American Football Coaches' Association,<sup>2</sup> and from a list prepared by The Football Digest.<sup>3</sup> Two hundred and thirty-three coaches (eighty-three per cent of those questioned) replied to the questionnaire. All coaches were asked to specify the type of T formation employed during the past six years, to give their coaching records during the years 1946 through 1951 inclusive, to reveal their opinions as to whether they thought the defenses were catching up with their types of attack, and to list reasons for their answer to the latter question. The coaches were also asked to specify the defenses most difficult for their type of T formation offense to operate against.

### III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The Straight or Conventional T Formation.<sup>4</sup> In this formation the linemen are tight from tackle to tackle in a

---

<sup>2</sup> D. O. McLaughry, Membership List, American Football Coaches' Association (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1951).

<sup>3</sup> Herbert F. Simons, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>4</sup> Clark Shaughnessy, Ralph Jones and George Halas, The Modern T Formation, Published by the Authors, 1945.

heel to toe alignment. The ends are split away one to two yards from their tackles. The line is balanced with three players on each side of the center. The two halfbacks and the fullback are in a parallel position from three to four yards behind their linemen. The quarterback lines up directly in back of the center with his hands up and under the center in order to take the ball on direct hand-back passes. The fullback is directly back of the center and the quarterback and is about four and one-half yards from the line of scrimmage. The halfbacks straddle the outside leg of their own tackles and are usually about four yards back of the line with their heels in line with the toes of their fullback.

The Winged or Flankered T Formation.<sup>5</sup> The Winged or Flankered T formation differs from the regular T formation in that one of the backs is always moved out to a position on either flank before the ball is put in play by the center. The line may be either balanced or unbalanced. At the desire of the quarterback the line may acquire splits and spaces similar to those of other split and open lines.

The Split or Sliding T Formation.<sup>6</sup> This type of offense derives its name from the fact that the seven linemen take their positions with splits or spaces between them. This distance may vary from two to as much as four

---

<sup>5</sup> Joe Stanczyk, "The Winged T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:9-58-60-61, September 1948.

<sup>6</sup> Don Faurot, Secrets of the Split T Formation (New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1950).



feet between each player on the line. The line is usually balanced with three players on each side of the center. The guards generally line up about two feet away from their center. The tackles are about three feet from their guards, while the ends are from three to four feet away from their tackles. The halfbacks line up directly back of their tackles and are down in a three point stance which is similar to a sprinter's stance. Their feet are slightly spread with the toe of the inside foot even with the instep of the outside foot. The inside hand is down but has very little weight on it. The fullback lines up directly back of the center and the quarterback approximately four and one-half yards from the ball. He may assume the same three point stance as taken by the halfbacks, or he may remain in an up-right two point stance. In this stance the feet are under the hips and are in an even heel alignment; the hands are placed on the knees. The toes of the fullback are in line with the heels of the halfbacks. The quarterback maneuvers up and down the line parallel to and back of the line of scrimmage. The quarterback is a ball-carrying threat in the Split T attack.

<sup>7</sup>  
The Open T Formation. The Open T is the formation in which the normal alignment may find the guards one or two feet away from the center. The tackles may be from two feet to one yard away from their guards while the ends are set out

---

<sup>7</sup> Al Barwis, "Is Your T Too Tight?", The Athletic Journal, 29:26-28-48-50-52, September 1948.

from two to four feet away from their tackles. This alignment is usually considered a tight alignment for the Open T formation. There may be an open side of the line in which the guard continues to line up one to two feet away from the center, while the tackle may take a spacing of three to five feet away from his guard with the end being permitted to line up anywhere from fifteen feet to fifteen yards away from his tackle. Often the line will remain tight on one side and open on the other side.

The Combined or Composite T Formation. The combination and variation type of T formation offense presumably brings together and utilizes the good points of all the T formation offenses.

#### IV ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINING CHAPTERS OF THIS THESIS

Chapter II contains a review of the literature.

Chapter III presents an analysis of the data as secured from records, literature and questionnaires.

Chapter IV contains a summary of the findings and presents the conclusions as formulated.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been said about the defense catching up with the T formation football attack. In modern football the defense must endeavor to contain the offense. The double platoon system has brought about the playing of specialists, with men for the attack and men for the defense. It has become a question whether or not the T formation attack can continue to be consistently effective against the many defenses employed against it.

Advantages of the T offenses over the defenses used against them. The T offense has many advantages over the various defenses set up and employed against it. The defensive linemen find themselves out-flanked, maneuvered out of position, trapped and just plain stymied by the faking, handing-off, pitching-out and passing by the quarterback. Frank Leahy of Notre Dame acknowledges in his book that the greatest advantages of the T attack are:

The center becomes one hundred per cent a blocker. He is actually into the play before any other lineman because he knows exactly when the ball is going to be snapped and he starts to operate accordingly. The plays strike much more swiftly in the T offense and allow the coach to utilize the element of surprise more effectively. Although there is but one basic formation, a maximum number of variations can be formulated without trouble to any one except the opponents. Such movements as sending out flankers, or men in motion, or spreading the ends are very disconcerting to the defense. When a man goes in motion the defense must send a player out to cover him. This automatically takes the defender out of the play.

The flanker who goes wide can never be held-in on a pass play and he has many other chores to perform, as he may be a pass receiver, a decoy, a blocker or a receiver of a lateral pass.

The T offense provides a method of moving the ball and, if properly employed, will tend to keep adequate pressure on the defense. The wide spacing of the linemen on the offense does not require them to over-power their opponents in order to make a hole in the defensive line. These holes already exist and have to be maintained only for an instant as the ball-carrier arrives at the point of attack just as the blockers initiate their contact. The T offense makes use of speed and deception. It is, therefore, possible to make greater use of smaller and more elusive backs who are not compelled to depend upon size to make gains or break away after reaching the secondary. Bobby Dodd of Georgia Tech declared in a quoted lecture:

I am a great believer in the T formation attack. I think it is the finest running offense in football today. It is easy to pick material for the T formation. We try to get a tall rangy boy who can throw at quarterback, and we put our three fastest men in the three deep backfield positions and we try to leave out as much blocking as possible by our small fast backs. The greatest factor in football is being able to run. We try to out-run the other team by running our plays past their defense. We never allow the defense to recover from the effects of our speed.

The wide spaces that have been created in the defensive

---

1 Frank Leahy, Notre Dame Football The T Formation (New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1948), p. 14.

2 Robert E. Dodd, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949. p. 10.

line tend to give the offense better blocking angles. This tends to cause less wear and tear on the small players since they are not required to mix it up with larger opponents on every play. The offense is simple and easy to learn. There are five offensive threats to each side of the line. Some of the reasons for employing the T offense as made known by Ray Eliot of the University of Illinois are:

We think we have the best sequence of plays in football; the quarterback sneak, the hand-offs, the keep off-tackle play, the pitch-out end run, the running pass and the fullback counter play. The following reasons are why I changed to the T formation offense. The T fits our material, it is easier to teach, it offers the smaller backs an opportunity to do a better job offensively, and its quick striking possibilities permit the backs to do a better job of running, and we are able to get these ball-carriers into the open a little more often.<sup>3</sup>

The T attack tends to keep a terrific burden on the defense as its swift moving action is able to strike either side of the defensive line with equal rapidity. The deception of the Split T offense has brought success to its originator, Don Faurot of Missouri University, who declares:

Every time the ball is snapped by the T offense there are three possibilities; a buck, a wide play or a forward pass. The T offense tends to have less wear and tear on its personnel and requires only average size players. It puts and retains greater pressure on the defense. It springs the ball-carrier into the open more quickly and more frequently than other types of offense. It averages more yards per play than any other offense and it does not require a triple threat man in the backfield. The blocks do not have to be sustained, nor does the defensive man have to be moved, as he is more or less

---

<sup>3</sup> Ray Eliot, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Football Clinic, August 1946.

screened out of the play by the use of high type blocks.<sup>4</sup>

The Split T maintains a powerful running attack. It seldom loses ground and because of this, the Split T gives a team an opportunity to keep the ball and there-by control the game. Many coaches find it difficult to contain the Split T attack. Charles "Bud" Wilkinson of the University of Oklahoma explains why this is true:

The advantage of the Split T attack is the constant short gains which can be obtained on almost every play. Such an attack enables the offensive team to retain possession of the ball longer. Possession of the ball is also the best defensive tactic in the game. The opponents can not score when they do not have the ball. The basic concept of the Split T attack involves three fundamentals; maximum speed, straight ahead thrusts and fakes at the line. These three principles must be integrated in order to make the short steady gains that bring first downs and touchdowns.<sup>5</sup>

Today, football is different; it is more scientific and improved. Deception, finesse and tricky strategy have improved and speeded up the game. The slight slim youth is no longer at a disadvantage, for the T formation is a boon to the speedy, tricky operator. Coach Muse in a recent article relates why the Split T is considered a better formation for high schools than for colleges:

Fundamentals, strategy and tactics of the Split T have been featured by Don Faurot, Jim Tatum and Bud Wilkinson in books and numerous magazine articles. Most students of football have heard these and other

---

<sup>4</sup> Don Faurot, Lecture, Ohio High School Football Coaches' Football Clinic, August 1948.

<sup>5</sup> Charles Wilkinson, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1950. pp. 1-80.

successful users of the Split T in coaching school lectures. We employ the Split T and consider its formation even better for high schools than for colleges and universities. The Split T has the advantage of being less familiar to the opponents. Our opponents have to prepare especially for us, or are forced to use defenses which are not best adapted for use against the Split T attack. Few plays and their simple nature makes the Split T ideal for beginning teams. During the season we utilize eight running plays and three passes. That means eight to the right and the same eight to the left. Of these eleven plays, four running and one passing are rarely employed. We found our offense combines well with a spread which we stole from Kentucky. This added no burden to the play learning, as we still run our regular plays which reduces the learning labor, since in each group the blocking is identical or very similar. By using few and simple plays has resulted in fewer busted signals in practice and almost none in games. The simplicity of the plays has meant that fewer changes in blocking assignments are necessary to meet a change in defense. This results in less drill time spent in working on blocks against various defenses. This time has been devoted to more work on fundamentals, punt returns, blocking punts and defense. We believe the small number of plays give more effective quarterbacking. A good offensive system has the ability to strike any spot in the defense with speed of attack and deception as to the point of attack. It must include counter plays to punish the defense which sets to stop particular plays. The Split T provides this with a minimum number of plays. Since the quarterback is not compelled to shuffle through a long list of plays to decide what he needs, his signal calling is more reasoned and effective.<sup>6</sup>

Easier man for man blocking is obtained when deception is employed. Man for man blocking permits the off-side linemen to release their blocks more quickly and head down field to run interference for the man carrying the ball. If the defense refuses to spread and cover the spaces in the offensive line, outside blocking angles are gained and the wide plays can be utilized more effectively. Coach Ivan B.

---

<sup>6</sup> George Y. Muse, "The Split T for High Schools", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:16, January 1952.

Williamson employs these principles at the University of Wisconsin:

At Wisconsin we major in the Straight T formation and the T formation with a set flanker. Our offense is primarily our own version, using the so-called original Chicago Bears' T as the basis from which to start. We do not use the Missouri T. Our Straight T formation is the Conventional one. When we operate from this there is no man in motion or movement in the backfield until the ball is snapped. Normally, our Flanker attack involves the right halfback setting left or the left halfback setting to his right. The distance may vary anywhere from one yard outside of his end to 10 or 12 yards. Occasionally, we set the left halfback to his left at varying distances, or the right halfback to his right. In both the Straight T and the Flanker, our guards are split about 18 inches from the center, and the tackles are the same distance from the guards in a balanced line. The ends vary anywhere from six inches to about 12 yards from their tackles. Therefore, in the Flanker attack the backs may be inside or outside of the end, depending on the end's split. Some use of the halfback in motion, either from the Straight T or the Flanker T is made. At the present time we lean toward the flanker rather than the man in motion, in order to have the defense in position, where there is less difficulty with blocking assignments. We have also added an unbalanced line to our attack. This set up is made by moving one of the ends over to the other side. It is our feeling that in building an offense the most difficult problem is the adjustment of the line blocking assignments to varying defenses. These should be the same, or as nearly so as possible, from all formations. The offense should be kept as simple as possible and still present opportunities for the use of power, speed and deception in the running attack and sound passing game. We have two basic series of plays around which our running attack is built. Number one is the halfback hand-off series, and number two is the fullback hand-off series. A good offense should have four kinds of passes, namely; those that develop out of the running play operation; those that have the quarterback going straight back and not particularly deceptive; running passes and screens. We feel that a good attack must be balanced; with long and short passing, with power, speed and deception. Above all, our concern is to have the offense as simple as possible and still be able to accomplish our objectives against all of the



varying defenses.<sup>7</sup>

The possibilities of the T formation offense have not been fully exploited. The formation has been developed in a scientific manner and many variations have been incorporated which utilize flankers, split ends, spread and open lines along with men in motion. Actually, the T formation is only a T at the beginning. The current fashion in offense could be called a conglomeration of variations. It starts as a T, the linemen are spaced, an end is split from five to fifteen yards from the tackle, a back may be flanked on the opposite side of the alignment and a man may be sent in motion to either side of the line. These rapid changes in the offensive formation make it difficult for the defense to adjust adequately to meet all possibilities of the attack. Al Barwis in explaining the Cleveland Browns' type of Open T offense claims:

The Open T offense forces the defense to play the way the offense wants it to play, thereby lessening the burden of assignments on the offense. The defenses that can be successfully employed against the Open T narrows down to the regular six man line. Most all coaches design their plays against a six man line. The Open T places the burden on the defense and permits little choice as to the number of defensive formations that may be used as well as the number of men that may be placed on the line of scrimmage. In order to cope with four, five, seven, eight and over and under shifted six man lines, the coach should have one play that can be run to either side of the line against special defenses.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ivan B. Williamson, "Wisconsin's T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 32:5-6-7-22, June 1952.

<sup>8</sup> Al Barwis, "Is Your T Too Tight?", The Athletic Journal, 28:26-28-48-50-52, September 1948.

When a flanker is set out, the defense is always forced to move at least one defensive man in order to cover the maneuver. The flanker removes a potential tackler away from the path of the ball-carrier. The same results are obtained when ends are deployed and backs are sent in motion. These maneuvers can result in almost any type of offensive alignment. Coach Chuck Klein discloses how he employs the T formation in building an offense for the average high school football team:

Today, the T formation and its variations have speeded the game up to its maximum. The T makes mediocre power and speed an asset rather than a detriment. Today, the 140 pound halfback and the 150 pound tackle have found their place on the football team. The T requires lateral movement for linemen, and quickness of foot for the backs. The small boy in the backfield is a gem. Today, there are more sophomores and freshmen playing high school football than ever before---the reason---the T formation and its variations. The high school coach no longer needs to roam the halls looking for the 200 pound tackles and the 175 pound halfbacks. Any boy with an average amount of intestinal fortitude may be a member of his varsity football team.

The college and university game is fast approaching the pros' in complexity and perfection. About one-fifth of the nation's major varsities have completely revamped their method of attack according to The Football Digest.<sup>10</sup> The survey discloses a continued growth in popularity of the Split T attack. Many schools have junked their old offenses

---

<sup>9</sup> Chuck Klein, "Building an Offense for a High School", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:14-15-46, June 1952.

<sup>10</sup> Herbert F. Simons, "Sixty Teams Try New Offenses", The Football Digest (Chicago: Simons Publications, 1952),

for something new and radically different. Herbert F. Simons maintains in his survey that:

Approximately twenty per cent of the major college varsities have completely changed their football attack. Schools like the University of North Carolina, Clemson, North Carolina State, Pennsylvania, George Washington, University of Pittsburgh, Washington and Jefferson, Texas A and M, Ohio State University and many others have junked their old methods of football offense. The reason, in some cases, that changes were brought about by new coaches. In others it was simply an old coach with new ideas. In some instances the material coming up seems faster and better suited for the T attack. Some teams are adding the Split T to their regular T, while some Split T teams are utilizing Regular T tactics along with their regular offense. The Split T has made big strides forward in usage. In 1949 only thirteen major teams were employing the Split T as their method of attack. In 1950 the number grew to thirty and last year it went to fifty-eight. This coming season of 1952 no less than sixty-seven major teams and many lesser ones will owe allegiance to Don Faurot, who originated the Split T attack in 1941.<sup>11</sup>

Many college and university coaches have been junking the Straight T attack and are employing the Split T with spreads, open lines, flankers and men in motion along with devastating combinations of all the good points of the T offense. Francis Wallace asserts that, "My guess at the most popular 1952 offense will be the Split T with splits and spreads, the idea in all of this is to confuse the defense."<sup>12</sup>

Briefly summarizing the favorable literature reviewed as to the advantages of the T formation attack has over its

---

<sup>11</sup> Herbert F. Simons, op. cit., p. 72.

<sup>12</sup> Francis Wallace, "13th College Football Review", Colliers' Magazine, pp. 16-17, August 1952.

defenses, it appears that:

1. It permits the attack to strike more quickly.
2. It produces constant short gains on almost every play.
3. It springs the backs into the open more quickly and more frequently.
4. It tends to place and retain greater pressure on the standard defenses.
5. It compels the defense to deploy in order to contain the running attack.
6. It releases more men for down-field blocking.
7. It presents three possible plays, a buck, a wide end run or a forward pass, every time the ball is snapped.
8. It makes possible a quick change in blocking assignments without altering the nature of the play.

Defenses employed effectively against the T attack. The early fundamental set-up in defense was a seven man line with a diamond or box alignment in the backfield. Thus, the 7-1-2-1 and the 7-2-2 defenses. The forward pass, however, forced these defenses to deploy their linemen when the offense began sending more receivers down-field than the four defensive backs could cover. The defensive center was quickly given backfield responsibility. From these deployments came the six man line with two linebackers, two halfbacks and a safety. Thus, the beginning of the 6-2-2-1 and the 6-3-2 defenses. The 6-2-2-1 defense is fundamentally sound against

offensive maneuvers of the T formation and is often preferred to other types of defense. Coach G. O. Watson maintains: "The smashing six man line is hard to beat as a basic defense against the T formation offense".<sup>13</sup>

The T formation enables the throwing of forward passes to ends, flankered backs and to men in motion from any position behind the line of scrimmage. These passes forced the defense to continue to loosen its methods of containment. One of the guards of the six man line was assigned defensive backfield responsibility when the ball was put in play on passing downs. This maneuver unquestionably lead to the five man line. The guard or another defensive lineman became a permanent fixture in the linebacker's alignment. Therefore, this new defense became known as the 5-3-2-1 defense. The important factor of this defense is the trio of linebackers which are utilized as in the 6-3-2 defense. These five linemen and three linebackers combine the features of the six and seven man lines into one defense. Bob Higgins of Pennsylvania State College explains his use of the five man line, thusly:

We use the five man line almost entirely against the T formation, whether it is the Split or Conventional type of offense. We always line up in the five man line defense but we never stay in it. We move from a five into a six, or from a five into a seven depending pretty much on the down and distance. I must caution you about two things to watch for. First, your defensive ends must never be clamped by the offensive ends or by the man in

---

<sup>13</sup> G. O. Watson, "The Smashing Six Defense Against the T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 20:30-32-82, September 1950.

motion. If this happens, the T formation pitch-out will go a long way. Second, the guards must be sure that the quarterback hands the ball off and does not keep it undetected for a quarterback sneak. These must be watched carefully no matter what defense you use. It is my opinion that offensively, the T formation has always been away ahead of the defense.<sup>14</sup>

The five man line has become the basic defense of many coaches. This defense employs many variations in attempting to meet and effectively contain all maneuvers expected from the T attack. The defense harasses the offense by constantly shifting from one alignment into another. Chink Coleman says that: "Present trends among defenses aimed at stopping the scoring power of the T offense shows that the changing defense is the most popular."<sup>15</sup>

The five man line has taken its place with the other defenses in football. It is well adapted to cope with the deceptive maneuvers of the T formation. Bobby Dodd of Georgia Tech declares that: "I favor the 5-3-2-1 defense against the T formation because of its flexibility."<sup>16</sup>

The T offense put additional pressure on the defense when it introduced the use of flankers, split ends, open lines and men in motion. The defense was compelled to spend more time in devising methods of containing these new

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert Higgins, "Defense for the T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 18:4-15-49, October 1948.

<sup>15</sup> E. P. "Chink" Coleman, "Trends in Defense Against the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:12-13, October 1948.

<sup>16</sup> Robert E. Dodd, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949. p. 10.

maneuvers. James Perry employs unorthodox methods in defending the T attack. Some of his comments are that:

Looping, angle charging and gap plugging are being used more and more due to the increasing influence of play by the professionals. Looping and angle charging are used chiefly by teams with six man defensive lines. This gives the defensive team the opportunity to contain four men of the offensive line while the use of a five man line affords the defensive team a chance to contain a maximum of three offensive players. Some teams, however, do use looping tactics when they employ a five man line. In this case the secondary linebackers fill in rapidly to protect the unguarded territory.<sup>17</sup>

In modern football the defense is constantly changing from one alignment into another in order to effectively defend against the diversified attack of the T formation.<sup>18</sup> There are many types of defense being utilized against the T attack. These may be placed into two categories.<sup>19</sup> First, the major or eight man combinations, in which eight men are arranged within two yards of the line of scrimmage. Included in this group are the 3-5-3, the 4-4-2-1, the 5-3-2-1, the 6-2-2-1, and the 7-1-2-1 defense. The second group is the minor or box group of defenses. In this category, there is a combination of nine men aligned within two yards of the scrimmage line. This group consists of the 4-5-2, the 5-4-2, the 6-3-2, the 7-2-2 and the 8-1-2 defense. Another feature

---

<sup>17</sup> James A. Perry, "Unorthodox Defensive Tactics", The Athletic Journal, 31:28-30-38, October 1950.

<sup>18</sup> Herbert O. Crisler, Modern Football (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1949), p. 102.

<sup>19</sup> John DaGrosa, Functional Football (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, Incorporated, 1942), pp. 224-225.

of this group of defenses is that there is no defensive man in the safety position.

Some coaches prefer one category of defense over the others and use it against all types of offense. Frank Howard of Clemson University never employs a defense that does not have a safety-man in the defensive alignment. His reasoning is that:

Defense is just as important in football as the offense. I have come to the conclusion that I do not want any part of a defense that does not have a safety man and two halfbacks. I do not believe that any coach can successfully contain any formation with only one defense. We use a five man line, a six man line, a tight six man line, and an eight man line against the T formation offense.<sup>20</sup>

Defenses least effective against the T formation. The defense can not be relied upon to prevent the offense from making yardage on every play. Against the Split and Open types of offense the six man line is forced to receive assistance from the secondary in order to strengthen the alignment at the line of scrimmage. Don Faurot of the University of Missouri maintains that:

The Split T offense is much harder to stop with the standard defenses when they are played in a normal fashion. The T formation has been very successful against these basic five, six and seven man lines. The best reason we can advance for continuing to use the Split T is the success it has given us in running against the standard eight man combination defenses. In these defenses, only eight men are within two yards of

---

<sup>20</sup> Frank Howard, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1951. pp. 78-116.



the line of scrimmage.<sup>21</sup>

Defenses most effective against the T formation. The types of defense that have been most effective against the Split T attack are the nine man alignments. Some of these most successful combinations are the 5-4-2, the 6-3-2, and the 7-2-2 defense with many variations. When the standard eight man defenses have failed against the Split T offense, the 7-2-2 alignment has often been utilized. This defense is considered by some coaches to be the best of the nine man combinations. Coach Biggie Munn of Michigan State has this to disclose:

Many teams use the seven man line against the T attack, and if the defensive ends play on the offensive ends, this defense will give the T formation plenty of trouble. The eight three defense is a good defense against any type of T formation attack. This is a very tough defensive alignment to run against.<sup>22</sup>

The 7-2-2 defense does not completely solve the problem of containing the T offenses, as it has a definite weakness against certain types of forward passes. It is a fine defense to employ against a strong running attack but is ineffective against a strong passing offense. The eight three defense has been utilized to advantage against the Split T attack. The eight three defense, however, is not the complete solution for containing the attack of Wilkinson,

---

<sup>21</sup> Don Faurot, Secrets of the Split T Formation (New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1950), pp. 8 and 243.

<sup>22</sup> Clarence Munn, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1950. pp. 83-123.

Tatum and Faurot; but when this defense is properly employed, it presents a most pressing problem to all devotees of the Split T offense. Coach Alonzo A. Stagg, Jr., of Susquehanna University, in a personal letter to the investigator, had the following to relate:

We find that the Split or Sliding T formation has been the most difficult for us to stop. We use variations of the 6-2-2-1 and the 6-3-2 defenses against the normal T offenses. We use the 6-3-2, the 7-2-2 and the 8-1-2 defenses against strong Split T teams, however, <sup>23</sup> we prefer the 6-3-2 defense against the Split T formation.

When the T teams began employing combinations of split ends, flanked backs and men in motion along with spread and open lines, the defense was forced to become more efficient in resisting these new offensive maneuvers. Tonto Coleman of the University of Florida infers that:

The 5-4-2 defense has become extremely popular because of its use by the professionals and because it seems to be one of the better defenses against the T formation. It is the opinion of the writer that the 5-4-2 defense can be used to better advantage as a basic defense rather than as an alternate defense. This is true because the five man line uses somewhat different fundamentals. It <sup>24</sup> is easy to go from a 5-4-2 set-up into other defenses.

Bob Voigts of Northwestern University stresses these objectives in defending the T attack by saying that:

When we think of defense, there are four things that, we try to accomplish; stop the running, stop the passing, stop the trapping and rush the man throwing the ball when passing. In order to obtain the best results

---

<sup>23</sup> Alonzo A. Stagg, Jr., Personal letter to investigator.

<sup>24</sup> Arthur M. Coleman, "The 5-4-2 Defense", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:20-37-42, October 1951.

we have to employ the 5-4-2 defense.<sup>25</sup>

The most disturbing defenses encountered by the T attack, are those which tend to drive the quarterback in the direction of his own goal line.<sup>26</sup> Any time this can be accomplished the offense suffers tremendously. Coach Bear Bryant of the University of Kentucky advises: "Standardize effective defenses and do not try to out-smart and out-guess the offense by always shifting a lot of defensive men around."<sup>27</sup>

Briefly summarizing the effectiveness of the defenses employed against the T attack, the favorable literature tends to indicate that:

1. No one defense can be employed that will successfully contain all types of T formation attack.
2. The eight man defenses tend to be inadequate against the T offense. This is especially true when the Split T series is employed.
3. The nine man defenses are most effective against the Split T attack, but are extremely weak against the Open and Composite T offenses.

---

<sup>25</sup> Robert Voigts, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949. p. 16.

<sup>26</sup> Charles Wilkinson, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1950. pp. 1-80.

<sup>27</sup> Paul Bryant, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1951. pp. 1-52.

4. The nine man defenses are strong against running attacks, but are not too effective against a good passing offense. This is especially true of the 7-2-2 defense.

5. The eight three defense is generally effective against any type of T attack, especially against the Split T running attack.

6. The 6-3-2 defense is usually preferred against the Split T, but the 5-4-2 defense is the more popular and the most effective against all types of T formation offense.

7. The most effective defenses against the T attack are those which tend to force the quarterback towards his own goal line, and at the same time hold up the pass receivers.

## CHAPTER III

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data as presented in this chapter are revealed in two parts; first, an analysis of the games won and lost by T formation football teams, and second, an analysis of the data revealed through a questionnaire to 279 coaches. The analysis of games won and lost will tend to indicate the effectiveness of the T formation, in general, and the relative success of each type of T formation. The degree of success of the T formation teams was appraised in the light of the won and lost records of the 115 T teams selected.

Success of T teams over defenses. Eighty-five per cent of the college and university football teams used some form of T formation offense during 1951.<sup>1</sup> There are about as many types of T formation as there are teams and coaches utilizing them. It seems that all of these formations can be classified into five main categories:<sup>2</sup>

1. The Straight or Conventional Tight Chicago Bear T.
2. The Winged or Flankered T formation, a hybrid of Single Wing and the Straight T formation.
3. The Split or Sliding T formation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Herbert F. Simons, "Five Out of Six Schools Use Some T", The Football Digest (Chicago: Simons Publications, Incorporated, 1951), p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> Ray Eliot, "Illinois' T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 31:9-12, September 1950.

4. The Open T formation.

5. The Combined or the Composite T formation.

In studying the records of the 115 selected teams, it was found that eighteen used the Conventional Chicago Bear type of T offense, sixteen teams employed the Winged or Flankered T, nineteen the Split or Sliding T, thirty-one the Open T formation and thirty-one others utilized combinations and variations of these four main types of T offense. Some teams had perfect records while others had not won any games during the season. One of the teams had scored five hundred and seventy-five points for an average of fifty-two points a game while winning an eleven game schedule. Another team was unable to win a game or score a point during an entire season.

It was revealed that the group of teams as a whole had won fifty-eight per cent of games played during the period from 1946 through 1951. An average of twenty points per game was maintained by T teams as compared to a little more than fifteen per game for their opponents. It was disclosed that the average score of T teams ranged from sixteen and one-half points a game in 1946 to nearly twenty-two per game in 1951. In comparison the average score of their opponents ranged from fourteen per game in 1946 to nearly seventeen per game in 1951. (See Tables I and II in Appendix B.). The computed difference in average scores was two and one-half points per game in favor of the T teams in

1946. This difference steadily increased to a little more than five points per game during the season of 1951. At the same time the percentage of games won had increased significantly. In light of these statistics it seems apparent that the defenses have not equalized or neutralized the T formation attack as a whole.

The Conventional T teams had won a little more than fifty-one per cent of their games during the period investigated with an average of eighteen points per game as compared to nearly seventeen points a game for their opponents. (See Tables III and IV in Appendix B.). It was disclosed that the Conventional T formation had won more than half of its games in 1946 with an average of fifteen and one-half points per game as compared to a little more than fourteen per game for their opponents. The percentage of games won had decreased steadily during this six years until less than half of them had been won during the season of 1951. The average score, however, had steadily increased for both the Conventional T teams and their opponents. The computed difference in average scores in 1946 was only one and one-half points in favor of the Conventional T teams. This difference steadily decreased until there was only a one point margin in favor of this type of T offense during the season of 1951. The scores of both teams' offense had increased, where-as, the tabulated difference and the percentage of games won had lessened as revealed in the

tables. It would seem that the defenses have tended to neutralize the effectiveness of the Conventional T attack.

The Winged T formation won fifty-eight per cent of its games with an average score of almost twenty and one-half points a game as compared to fifteen points per game for the opponents. The percentage of games won has steadily decreased since 1946. However, the Winged T offense continues to win more than half of its games. The average scores for both the Winged T teams and their opponents have steadily increased during the past six years. The difference in average scores has decreased from a five point margin in 1946 until there was a difference of only four points in favor of the Winged T offense at the conclusion of the 1951 season. (See Tables V and VI in Appendix B.). It is apparent from these tabulations that the defense has not completely counteracted the effectiveness of the Winged T attack even though the per cent of games won and the computed difference in average scores has lessened during the period of this study.

The Split T teams have won fifty-five and one-half per cent of their games during the period of this research with an average of twenty points a game in comparison to sixteen per game for their opponents. In 1946 the difference in average scores of the Split T teams and their opponents was only six hundredths of one point per game. This difference steadily and progressively increased until a spread of seven points a game was attained at the close of



the 1951 season. (See Tables VII and VIII in Appendix B.). It was revealed that the Split T had won less than half of its games in 1946. During the six years covered by this study there was a significant increase in the percentage of games won by the teams employing the Split T attack. During this period there had been a steady increase in average scores per game while the average score of the opponents had remained almost constant. These increases, in percentage of games won, in the spread of the average scores per game and the increase in total scores per game are significant.

It was disclosed that the Open T formation had won a little more than sixty-one per cent of its games with an average score of nearly twenty-one points a game as compared to nearly fifteen per game for their opponents. In 1946 there were only two points difference in the average score per game in favor of the Open T teams. (See Tables IX and X in Appendix B.). This difference steadily and progressively increased until the spread was more than eight points a game in favor of the Open T formation. In 1946 the Open T had won a little more than half of its games. Since that time the percentage of games won has steadily increased until more than sixty-five per cent has been won at the close of the 1951 season. The average score per game made a significant increase while the average score of their opponents increased very slightly. These increases would seem to be significantly important.

Tables XI and XII (See Appendix B.), disclose that Composite T teams had won fifty-nine per cent of their games from 1946 through the season of 1951. This was accomplished with an average of almost twenty points a game as compared to almost fifteen per game for their opponents. In 1946 the Composite T teams won nearly sixty per cent of their games. At the close of the 1951 season the percentage of games won had increased only nineteen hundredths of one per cent. Therefore, during the past six years the percentage of games won had remained almost constant for the Composite T attack. The average score per game progressively increased for both the Composite T teams and for their opponents. In 1946 the difference in average scores was a little more than four points a game. At the conclusion of the 1951 season, this spread had increased only twelve hundredths of one point. Apparently then, there has been no significant improvement in the effectiveness of the Composite T formation attack during the period of this investigation. The average scores per game have increased, the difference in average scores of both teams has remained almost constant, and the percentage of games won has not been lessened. Therefore, the Composite T formation has apparently more than held its own against its defenses during the past six years.

Success of T teams in holiday bowl games. Ninety-six teams participated in eight major New Year's Day games during the period 1946 through 1951. Seventy-five of these

ninety-six teams have been T formation teams. It is very significant to note that during this period only twenty-one of the contests have failed to have both participating teams employing some form of T formation as their method of attack. The results of these twenty-one games, as a whole, are not too significant as ten were won and ten were lost and one was tied. However, the results of the 1952 bowl games show that thirteen of the sixteen participating teams employed the T offense in some form. (See Tables XVII and XVIII in Appendix D.). The tables reveal that all eight holiday bowl games in 1952 were won by teams using the T formation attack. It is, perhaps, very significant to note that during the past six years only ten of the forty-eight contests have been won by teams not utilizing the T as their offense. The results of these forty-eight games reveal that T teams have won thirty-two, lost ten and tied six games for a percentage of seventy-three for games won.

Success of T teams in conference play. During the past six years ninety-six conference championships have been won by football teams in sixteen conferences. Tables XIX and XX (See Appendix D.) disclose that seventy-seven, or eighty per cent of these championships, have been won by teams employing the T offense exclusively. During the season of 1951 thirteen of the sixteen championships were won by teams using the T attack. During each year of this study no fewer than twelve teams, or seventy-five per cent,

have won conference football championships employing the T formation as their method of attack.

Ranking of college and university football teams. An analysis of Table XV (See Appendix C.) reveals that during the period of this study, eight of the ten top ranking college and university football teams utilized the T attack as their offense. According to Table XVI (See Appendix C.), the six year cumulative record of the fifty top ranking football teams, disclosed that forty-one of the fifty teams used the T formation as their method of attack.

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

Records of coaches obtained from questionnaires. The data presented in Table XIII (See Appendix B.) reveal the coaching records of 219 T formation coaches during the period from 1946 through the season of 1951. These data disclose that thirty-four coaches used the Conventional T formation and that of 1,278 games played, 756 were won, 485 were lost and thirty-seven were tied. This gave a percentage of a little more than sixty per cent for games won.

Obtained data revealed that teams of twenty Winged T coaches had played 634 games, and 371 were won, 234 were lost and twenty-nine were tied. This gave the Winged T coaches a percentage of sixty-one for games won. The study indicated that thirty-four coaches' teams utilized the

Split T attack, and had played 1,255 games, and of this number 774 were won, 428 were lost and fifty-three were tied. This gave the Split T coaches a percentage of sixty-four for games won during the past six years.

The teams of fifty-three Open T coaches had played 2,872 games and of these 1,924 were won, 836 were lost and 112 were tied. These results gave the Open T coaches a percentage of sixty-nine for games won. It was disclosed that the teams of seventy-eight Composite T coaches had played 3,717 games, and that 2,442 were won, 1,131 were lost and 144 were tied for a percentage of sixty-eight for games won.

During the past six years, the teams of the 219 T formation coaches had played 9,756 games. It was revealed that 6,267 were won, 3,114 were lost and 375 were tied. This gave a percentage of sixty-six for games won by all types of T formation coaches from the season of 1946 through the season of 1951.

The opinions of T formation coaches. Presented in Table XIV (See Appendix B.) are data regarding the opinions of the 219 T formation coaches relative to the defenses catching up with their type of T formation offense.

These data reveal that seventy-two per cent of the 219 T formation coaches believed their offenses were superior to the defenses employed against them. It was the opinion of fifteen of the thirty-four Conventional T coaches that the

coaches were of the opinion that their offense was superior to the many defenses set-up and employed against it. These opinions were sustained by data which revealed that the Composite T coaches had won sixty-eight per cent of their games. It was also the opinion of seventy-nine per cent of the coaches queried that the defense would never catch up with their methods of attack. (See Table XXI in Appendix E.).

Seventy-three coaches, including such outstanding men as Bobby Dodd, Art Guepe, Sid Gillman, Don Faurot, Jim Tatum, Edd Price, Andy Pilney, Jesse Hill and others were in general agreement that the defense is not catching up with their methods of attack. These methods are not stereotyped and have unlimited possibilities with which to deploy the defense. Also, rule blocking makes it easy to switch assignments quickly without changing the nature of the attack. (See Table XXI in Appendix E.).

In the over-all study, seventy-two per cent of the T coaches had the opinion that their offense was superior to its defenses. These opinions were further substantiated by records which revealed that all T coaches had won sixty-six per cent of their games. The responses, as given in the aforementioned table, disclose that forty-seven coaches claimed the defense was equal or superior to their type of T attack even though their coaching records revealed that their teams had won sixty-five per cent of their games. It was also disclosed that twelve coaches believed their method

of T offense was superior to its defenses even though data disclosed that their teams had not won fifty per cent of the games played. It would seem that these twelve T coaches continue to have faith and confidence in their methods of attack in spite of adversity.

Most and least effective defenses against the T. The opinions of 219 T coaches in relation to the defenses that have proved most and least effective against their methods of attack are presented in Table XXII (See Appendix E.).

In studying these responses, it was the general opinion of the 219 T coaches that the eight man defenses, (the 3-5-2-1, the 4-4-2-1, the 5-3-2-1, the 6-2-2-1 and the 7-1-2-1 defense), were inadequate and not too effective against the T attack. This was especially true when the Split T series was being employed along with the Open and Composite T offenses.

The Split T coaches claimed their attack had had little difficulty with any of the eight man defenses and believed they were inadequate to cope with their Split T offense. It was the opinion of these coaches that the nine man defenses, (the 4-5-2, the 5-4-2, the 6-3-2, the 7-2-2 and the 8-1-2 defense), were most effective and caused their attack the most trouble. Ninety-four per cent of the Split T coaches claimed that the 5-4-2 defense was the most difficult for their Split T to combat. Fifty-nine per cent of the Split T coaches claimed the 7-2-2 defense caused their

offense great difficulty, while fifty-seven per cent of these coaches declared that the eight three defense was very difficult to engage without an outstanding passing attack.

More than half of the Conventional T coaches had difficulty with the nine man defenses. Fifty-nine per cent of these coaches claimed that the 5-4-2 defense was the most difficult for their attack. The nine man defenses were more effective against the Conventional T attack than were the eight man defenses. Fifty-six per cent of these Conventional T coaches revealed that the eight three defense was about as difficult as the nine man defenses. (See Table XXII in Appendix E.).

Forty per cent of the Winged T coaches had some difficulty with the eight man defenses, especially the 5-3-2-1 and the 7-1-2-1 defenses. About the same percentage of these coaches had trouble with the nine man alignments. This was especially true when the 6-3-2 and the 7-2-2 defenses were employed. Eighty per cent of the Winged T coaches claimed that the 5-4-2 defense was the most difficult for their Winged T attack to combat. In addition to these eight and nine man defenses, sixty per cent of the Winged T coaches had difficulty with the eight three defensive alignment.

According to the data obtained from the questionnaires it was revealed that the Open and Composite T coaches claimed



that their methods of attack have not had consistent trouble from any one particular type of defense. Only thirty-six per cent of the Open T coaches and thirty-five per cent of the Composite T coaches claimed to have had difficulty with the 5-4-2 defense. This was the only defensive alignment that seemed to cause either of these attacks any trouble at all. Only thirty-one per cent of the Open T coaches claimed the eight three defense to be a hindrance to their method of attack.

In the over-all study the coaches generally admitted the nine man defenses to be the most effective and the most troublesome to combat. This seemed to be especially true of the 5-4-2 defensive alignment. It was revealed that many of the defensive teams employed the nine man combinations against the T formation mainly, in an effort to contain their strong running attack.

Such outstanding coaches as Don Faurot, Bobby Dodd, Jim Tatum, Jack Carls, Ray Eliot, Chuck Bear, Alva Kelley, Ray Gwzyniski, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Jr., and many others are in agreement that in order to cope with the nine man defenses more effectively, flankered backs, deployed ends, spread and open lines along with men in motion should be employed. These maneuvers, when utilized properly, tend to force the defense to change from nine man alignments into one or more of the eight man combinations. These deployments then make it easier for the T offenses to operate more effectively.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has been designed to reveal the findings after all pertinent data have been carefully studied. These findings are summarized and definite conclusions have been formulated in regard to the T formation's superiority over the defenses employed against it during the six years from 1946 through the season of 1951.

#### Summary of the findings

The findings of this study tend to indicate that:

1. Approximately eighty-five per cent of all college and university football teams employed the T attack in some form. This offense was utilized by about eighty-five per cent of the top ranking teams and it, also, predominated holiday bowl and conference competition.

2. The 115 teams had won about fifty-eight per cent of their games with an average score of twenty points a game. Significant differences in the successfulness of methods of T attack were disclosed upon classifying these selected teams. The greatest difference as found was between the Conventional and Winged T attacks and the other systems of offense. The compiled data indicated that the aforementioned types of attack were no longer experiencing success; in fact, the Conventional T coaches themselves indicated that their

method of attack had become passe'.

3. The Split, Open and Composite attacks all seem to be highly successful against all types of defensive alignments employed against them. The Split and Open offenses continue to remain the more popular as well as the more effective. The data seem to suggest a close relationship between the Split and Open attacks. Their effectiveness steadily and progressively increased against the varied defenses used in an attempt to contain them. The Composite T has more than held its own with the defense. There has been no appreciable increase in its effectiveness, however, since the percentage of games won has remained almost constant.

4. One hundred and fifty-eight T coaches queried were of the opinion that their attack had lost none of its prestige and that it was equal or superior to the defenses utilized against it. They further declared that in their opinion the defense would never catch up with their methods of attack.

5. Sixty-three coaches were of the opinion that no one defense could be employed that would completely contain or neutralize their methods of attack. It was the opinion of one hundred and forty-six coaches that the eight man defenses were inadequate and ineffective against the T formation offense. This seemed especially true when the Split T series was utilized as a regular part of the Open and Composite systems of play.

6. The nine man defensive alignments are the most

effective defenses employed against the Split T attack. It was the opinion of thirty-two Split T coaches that the 5-4-2 defense was the most difficult to combat. However, twenty of them claimed that the 7-2-2 defense caused quite a hindrance, especially when the passing attack was weak. One hundred and fourteen coaches were in agreement that the 5-4-2 defense remained the most effective against all types of T formation offense. Seventy-eight of them claimed that they had trouble with the 7-2-2 defensive alignment.

7. It seemed to be the trend of the Split and Open T offenses to employ flankers, split ends and open lines to force the defense from the nine man alignments into one or more of the eight man defensive combinations.

8. The tendency of the defense has been to constantly change from one alignment into another in order to confuse the diversified attack of the T formation. The most troublesome defenses are those which tend to force the quarterback towards his own goal line and, at the same time, hold up the pass receivers at the line of scrimmage. These objectives seem to be best accomplished whenever the defense utilizes the 7-2-2, the 6-3-2, the 5-4-2 or the eight three defenses. These defenses are most effective when the offense neglects to employ flankers, deployed ends, spread and open lines along with men in motion.

### Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence as obtained from the analysis of statistical records, from an extensive review of the favorable literature and from the returns of 233 questionnaires, it would seem justifiable to recommend that:

1. Coaches using the T give additional thought to the evidence as presented in this study concerning the use of split and open lines along with deployed ends and flankered backs. The maximum spacing should be retained between the linemen in order to prevent the defense's concentration on containing the running attack and on holding up the pass receivers. One or more of these maneuvers should be constantly employed so as to obtain maximal effectiveness from small, fast elusive backs.

2. Coaches should endeavor to keep their attack from becoming too tight in alignment. This can be prevented by establishing a man in motion along with split ends, open lines and flankered backs. The man in motion should be used as a change of pace rather than as a regular part of the offense. This tends to mix things up for the defense, forcing it to deploy when covering the man in motion. If adjustments are not made, completed passes for long gains and touchdowns may be attained. The more these maneuvers are utilized the more confused the defense becomes.

3. Coaches might further consider employing defensive alignments at the line of scrimmage that make possible the

containment of as many as four or five of the defensive linemen. This endeavor prevents down-field blocking and aids in rushing the passer. The defense should remain fluid enough to adjust and upset the offense by maneuvering linemen and linebackers into areas unexpectedly. The evidence presented favors utilization of the 5-3-2-1, the 5-4-2, the 6-2-2-1, the 6-3-2 and/or the 7-2-2 defense.

4. Continued research be conducted on this problem to further substantiate or disprove the findings and conclusions of this investigation. Further study of this problem might very well point out better and more successful methods of offense and defense. Such information would be invaluable to all football coaches.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. BOOKS

- Baker, L. H., Football--Facts and Figures. New York: Farr and Rinehart, Incorporated, 1945. 5 pp.
- Barta, J. J., Football--Intercollegiate and Professional. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1950. 92 pp.
- Bible, Dana X., Championship Football. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1947. 115 pp.
- Buchanan, Lamont, Football. New York: Stephens-Paul Publishers, 1947. 13 pp.
- Crisler, Herbert O., Modern Football. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1949. 201 pp.
- DaGrosa, John, Functional Football. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, Incorporated, 1946. 224 pp.
- England, Forrest W., Coaching the T Formation. Jonesboro, Arkansas: Arkansas State College Press, 1948.
- , The T Formation From A to Z. Danville, Illinois: School-Aid Company, 1952.
- Faurot, Don., Secrets of the Split T Formation. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1950. 233 pp.
- Grombach, John, Touch Football. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, Incorporated, 1942. 5 pp.
- Halas, George S., The Modern T Formation. Published by Clark Shaughnessy, Ralph Jones and George Halas. 1941.
- Hamilton, Thomas J., Football. Annapolis, Maryland: United States Naval Academy, 1950. 151 pp.
- Killinger, Glen W., Football. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, Incorporated, 1939. 141 pp.
- Leahy, Frank, Notre Dame Football - The T Formation. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1948. 13 pp.
- , Defensive Football. New York: Prentice-Hall Incorporated, 1951.
- Little, Lou., Want to be a Football Champion? General Mills, Incorporated, 1946. 16 pp.



Luckman, Sidney, Luckman at Quarterback. New York: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company, 1949. 95 pp.

Oakes, Bernard F., Football Line Play. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, Incorporated, 1938. 143 pp.

Palrang, Maurice H., High School T Formation. Boys Town: Boys Town High School Press, 1945. 1 pp.

Rice, Grantland, Football Schedules. New York: Petroleum Incorporated, 1946-47-48-49-50-51 and 52 Issues.

Stagg, Amos Alonzo, and Wesley W. Stout, Touchdown. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1927. 24 pp.

Wilkinson, Charles, Oklahoma Split T Formation. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1952. 8 pp.

#### B. PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Aker, John A., "Flankered Split T", Scholastic Coach, 19:10-11-84, September 1949.

-----, "Advanced Flankered Split T", Scholastic Coach, 20:20-21-22-24, September 1950.

Barwis, Al., "Is Your T Too Tight?", The Athletic Journal, 29:26-28-48-50-52, September 1948.

Bates, Frank A., "High School Football Offense", The Athletic Journal, 31:36-37-38-39-40-42-44-45-51, March 1951.

Beacher, Eddie, "The Adaptable T", Scholastic Coach, 16:44-45, October 1946.

Bolt, Donald, "One Way Football", The Athletic Journal, 32:34-57-58, October 1951.

Brown, Paul E., "Why the T Formation?", The Athletic Journal, 27:7-8-43, June 1947.

Bryant, Paul, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1951. pp. 1-52.

Cecil, H. R., "Single Wing to T Formation", Southern Coach and Athlete, 13:20-21, November 1950.

Clagg, Sam, "Psychology of Teaching an Offensive Number System", The Athletic Journal, 32:50-58-59-61, March 1952.

Coleman, Arthur M., "The 5-4-2 Defense", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:20-37-42, October 1951.

Coleman, E. P., "Trends in Defense Against the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:12-13, October 1948.

-----, "The Straight T and the Spin T", The Athletic Journal, 30:22-24-62, September 1949.

-----, "The Split T", The Athletic Journal, 31:40-78-79, September 1950.

-----, "Defense Against Pass Patterns", The Athletic Journal, 32:32-78-79, September 1951.

-----, "Call and Rule Blocking", The Athletic Journal, 32:38-58-59, October 1951.

Crisler, Herbert O., "Variable Team Defenses for the T", Scholastic Coach, 19:12-13-58-60-61-62, June 1950.

Danowski, Edd., "I'll Stick to the T Formation", Sportsvue, October 1949.

Davis, Al., "Line Quarterbacking", Scholastic Coach, 21:12-13-14-34-35-36-37, May 1952.

Dodd, Robert E., Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949.

Drew, Harold D., "Defense Against the T Formation", Southern Coach and Athlete, 13:18-19, September 1950.

Dromo, John, "T Trap Plays", The Athletic Journal, 29:10-11, May 1949.

Earls, Arthur M., "A-T-Antidote", Scholastic Coach, 20:68, October 1950.

Eliot, Ray, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, Dallas, Texas, August 1946.

-----, "Illinois' T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 31:9-12, September 1950.

England, Forrest W., "Running the Ends in the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 28:31-32-33, March 1948.

-----, "Downfield Blocking Analyzed", Scholastic Coach, 18:36-38-40, September 1948.

- , "Teaching Forward Pass Defense", The Athletic Journal, 30:16-49-50, October 1949.
- Faurot, Don., Lecture, Ohio High School Football Coaches' Clinic, Toledo, Ohio, August 1948.
- , "The Split T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 20:7-46-48-50, October 1950.
- , Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Dallas, Texas, January 1951.
- Fesler, Wesley, "Ohio State's Unbalanced T", Scholastic Coach, 20:8-9-58, September 1950.
- Fischbein, Marty, "Our Answer to Changing Defenses", The Athletic Journal, 32:17-45-46, May 1952.
- Fisher, Gale W., "Ray Eliot's T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 14:9-12, October 1944.
- Ford, Lewis, "On Defense", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:16, October 1951.
- Geske, Norman, "Passing Offense", The Athletic Journal, 32:40-42-86, September 1951.
- , "Defensive Strategy", The Athletic Journal, 32:24-26-61-62, October 1951.
- , "A Simplified Pass Defense", The Athletic Journal, 32:19-20-74, March 1952.
- Gillman, Sidney, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1950.
- , "Cincinnati's Defensive Line Play", The Athletic Journal, 32:9-10-11-12-13-14-15-55, October 1951.
- , Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Dallas, Texas, 1951. Cincinnati, Ohio, January 1952.
- Golden, Johnnie, "Blocking Walls", Scholastic Coach, 20:10-11-51, October 1950.
- , "The Reversible 5-4 Defense", Scholastic Coach, 21:14-15-61-62, October 1951.
- Graves, Ray, "Defensive Line Play", Southern Coach and Athlete, 11:20-21, November 1948.

-----, "Basic Defenses for the T Formation", Southern Coach and Athlete, 13:16-17-18, October 1950

Greenich, Duke, "Building Pass Patterns", The Athletic Journal, 29:12-13, June 1949.

-----, "Simplified Signals", The Athletic Journal, 30:28-30, September 1949.

Griffin, Pete., "Beat the T Formation with 5-2-2-2 Defense", Scholastic Coach, 17:42-44, June 1948.

Harlow, Richard, "Defense for the T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 17:34-35-36, October 1947.

Harwood, Harold A., "Quantico's Tight T", Scholastic Coach, 20:36-38, September 1950.

Hellman, Walter H., "Rip Engle's Winged T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 16:12-20, June 1947.

-----, "Defense for the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:17-18, November 1948.

Hickman, Herman, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949.

Higgins, Robert, "Defense for the T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 18:4-15-49, October 1948.

-----, "Hold That Line With a Five-Three-Two-One Defense", Sportsvue, October 1948.

Howard, Frank, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1951.

Kampf, Sol., "Offensive Trends in Football", The Athletic Journal, 30:24-26-44, May 1950.

Klein, Chuck, "Building an Offense for a High School", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:14-15-46, June 1952.

Lambert, Standard, "Jesse Neely's T", Scholastic Coach, 17:10-18, June 1948.

Liegerot, Giles F., "The 4-4-2-1 An-T-idote", Scholastic Coach, 18:10-11-47, September 1948.

Mackenzie, Robert C., "Outside Attack from the Straight T", Scholastic Coach, 18:14-18-48, June 1949.

- , "Cracking the Eight-Three Defense", Scholastic Coach, 20:10-11-44-46-48-80, September 1950.
- , "Halfback Stutter Sequence", Scholastic Coach, 20:54-55-56-57-58, November 1950.
- , "The Fullback Draw Series", Scholastic Coach, 21:32-34-36-80-81, September 1951.
- McKeever, Edd., "Notre Dame T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 14:9-10-12, September 1944.
- , "Quarterback Play", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:14, October 1951.
- McLaughry, D. O., Membership List, American Football Coaches' Association, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1951.
- McLendon, Dana, "They Shall Not Pass T Formation Defense", Scholastic Coach, 16:7-8, October 1946.
- McMillian, John, "Defense Against the T Formation", Southern Coach and Athlete, 11:38, November 1948.
- McWilliams, Jay., "The Cup Defense", The Athletic Journal, 32:18-59-60-61, October 1951.
- Medley, R. M., "A 5-4-2 Defense Against the T", Southern Coach and Athlete, 11:23-26-28-43, November 1948.
- Munn, Clarence, "Michigan State's Line Play", Scholastic Coach, 18:7-54-55, October 1948.
- , Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, August 1950. pp. 83-123.
- Muse, George Y., "Split T for High Schools", Southern Coach and Athlete, 14:16, January 1952.
- Neeley, Jesse, "Defense for the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 28:12-46, October 1947.
- Nolting, Ray, "The Fullback in the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:30-31, September 1948.
- Odell, Howie., "The T Quarterback as a Passer", Scholastic Coach, 21:8-9, October 1951.
- Oliver, G. A., Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, August 1941.

Perry, James A., "Defensive Line Play Against the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 30:18-20-24, June 1950.

-----, "Looping, Angle Charging and Gap Plugging", The Athletic Journal, 31:32-34, September 1950.

-----, "Unorthodox Defensive Tactics", The Athletic Journal, 31:28-30-38, October 1950.

-----, "Simplified Rule Blocking", The Athletic Journal, 31:18-20, May 1951.

-----, "Spot Marking to Perfect Timing", The Athletic Journal, 32:14-15, May 1952.

Reiley, Thomas J., "Line Play in the T", Scholastic Coach, 20:32-33, September 1950.

Reynolds, Richard, "Open Those Big Holes", Sportsvue, October 1949.

Robinson, Frank, "Comparison of Starting Times", The Athletic Journal, 32:24-81-82-83, September 1951.

Ronzani, Gene, "The Bear Style of T", Scholastic Coach, 16:14, September 1946.

-----, "The Bear Style of T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 16:10, October 1946.

Rose, Dale F., "Blocking Assignments by Rules", The Athletic Journal, 30:16-42-43-44, May 1950.

Schwartzwalder, Floyd B., "The Waldorf T Formation", Scholastic Coach, 16:14-15-16-18-42-43, June 1947.

-----, "Georgia Tech's Passing Game", Scholastic Coach, 18:10-11-30-32, October 1948.

-----, "Georgia Tech's Pass Defense", Scholastic Coach, 18:18-19-20-57, November 1948.

-----, "Georgia's Elastic T", Scholastic Coach, 19:9-10-11-38, October 1949.

-----, "Georgia's Air Arm", Scholastic Coach, 20:9-49, June 1951.

-----, "Syracuse Winged T", Scholastic Coach, 21:12-13-14-54-56-58-60-85, September 1951.

Scropos, Ted., "A Fluid Passing Offense", The Athletic Journal, 32:32-52-53-54-55, October 1951.

Shaughnessy, Clark, "Quarterback Footwork in the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 28:12-13-14, May 1948.

Sherman, Al., "Model T Quarterbacking", Scholastic Coach, 19:7-8, September 1949.

Simons, Herbert F., "Five Out of Six Schools Now Use Some T", The Football Digest, September 1951.

Smith, Wilfrid, "The Defense Can't Win", The Football Digest, September 1950.

Snavely, Carl G., "Defense", The Athletic Journal, 30:10-11-34, October 1949.

Stanczyk, Joe, "The Winged T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 29:9-58-60-61, September 1948.

Steel, Arch., "Splitting the T", The Athletic Journal, 31:36-53, May 1951.

-----, "Defensing the Unexpected", Scholastic Coach, 20:10-11, June 1951.

Steel, Robert, "Balancing the T Attack", The Athletic Journal, 29:42-43, May 1949.

-----, "Aids For Linebackers Against T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 31:10-11-54-55-56-67, October 1950.

Stewart, Maco, "Defense for the T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 28:44-45, June 1948.

Svensen, George, "Trends in Defense Against The T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 28:16-17-18, September 1947.

Tatum, James M., "Maryland's Split T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 32:9-10-66-67-68, September 1951.

Thoreau, H. D., "Official Collegiate Football Record Books", The National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, 1947-----1952.

Voigts, Robert, Lecture, American Football Coaches' Association, Evanston, Illinois, August 1949.

-----, "Pass Defense For The T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 30:11-12-13-14-15-64, September 1949.

Watson, G. O., "The Smashing Six Defense Against The T", Scholastic Coach, 20:30-32-82, September 1950.

Webb, Charles, "The T With a Wingback", The Athletic Journal, 27:12-13-14-15-38-40, September 1946.

Wilkinson, Charles, "The Split T or the Single Wing", The Athletic Journal, 28:26, April 1948.

-----, Lecture, Texas High School Football Coaches' Clinic, Dallas, Texas, August 1950.

-----, "The Split T Offense", Scholastic Coach, 20:12-13, June 1951.

Williamson, Ivan B., "Wisconsin's T Formation", The Athletic Journal, 32:5-6-7-22, June 1952.

Zarza, Lou., "Zone Blocking in The T", The Athletic Journal, 28:15-16, April 1948.

-----, "Use of Zone System to Combat Changing Defenses", The Athletic Journal, 32:13-59-60-61-62, April 1952.

#### C. SURVEYS

Survey of High School Football, The Athletic Journal, 30:13-14-15-37-38, December 1949.



## APPENDIX A

Box 1027  
Williamsburg, Virginia.  
29 January, 1952.

Mr. Marvin Bass., Athletic Director.  
College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg, Virginia.

Dear Coach Bass:

I am completing my thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts in Physical Education at the College of William and Mary. Your assistance in answering this questionnaire will be of great value to me in my research.

While teaching and coaching this past year, I became interested in a study of the T formation in relation to its many defenses. I believe an investigation would be of interest and value to coaches, as well as to college graduates starting out as football coaches and teachers of Physical Education.

My research is based upon the study of the results of the playing schedules of T formation teams for the past six years, beginning with the season of 1946 and continues through the season of 1951.

You have been selected as one of the outstanding coaches using the formation during this period. Therefore, your help and cooperation in answering the inclosed questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

The information supplied by you will be used and treated statistically. It will be kept in the strictest of confidence and will be used in completing my research.

If you desire, I will gladly furnish you a copy of the results of my findings.

Again, I ask your assistance and cooperation in regard to the inclosed questionnaire. Please return it to me as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,

William E. Bowman

# QUESTIONNAIRE

The data collected in this questionnaire will be used for educational purposes and will be held as confidential.

1. Please check as many of the following as apply to you.

Is your T formation one or more of the following types?

- ( ) A. The Straight or Conventional Tight Chicago Bear T, with flankers and men in motion.
- ( ) B. The Winged or Flankered T Formation.
- ( ) C. The Split or Sliding T Formation.
- ( ) D. The Open T Formation with flankers and men in motion.
- ( ) E. Combinations and Variations of the above formations.
- ( ) F. Other types \_\_\_\_\_ Please list \_\_\_\_\_

2. How long have you been using the T formation? \_\_\_\_\_ Years

3. What is your record for the past six years?  
 Won \_\_\_\_\_ Lost \_\_\_\_\_ Tied \_\_\_\_\_

4. What is your all-time record using the T formation?  
 Won \_\_\_\_\_ Lost \_\_\_\_\_ Tied \_\_\_\_\_

5. What defenses cause your type of T most difficulty?

- ( ) 5-3-2-1, ( ) 5-4-2, ( ) 5-2-2-2, ( ) 5-3-3, ( ) 8-3,  
 ( ) 6-2-2-1, ( ) 6-3-2, ( ) 6-2-3, ( ) 7-1-2-1, ( ) 7-4,  
 ( ) 7-1-3, ( ) 7-2-2, ( ) 4-4-3, ( ) 4-5-2, ( ) 8-1-2,

Others? Please list \_\_\_\_\_

6. In your opinion, do you think the defenses are catching up with your type of T offense? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

7. Will you please list your reasons on the back of this sheet for your answer to question number six.

Box 1027  
Williamsburg, Virginia.  
29 February 1952.

Mr. Marvin Bass., Athletic Director.  
College of William and Mary  
Williamsburg, Virginia.

Dear Coach Bass:

On 29 January of this year, I sent to you a letter accompanied by a questionnaire.

In order to complete my thesis for a Master's Degree at the College of William and Mary, by this June, it is imperative that I receive your reply. Your consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated. I am,

Cordially yours,

William E. Bowman

## APPENDIX B

TABLE I

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 115 OUTSTANDING T FORMATION FOOTBALL TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	1,093	628	437	28	58.79
1950	1,100	671	376	53	63.36
1949	1,081	615	430	36	58.54
1948	1,070	568	465	46	54.77
1947	1,066	583	431	52	57.71
1946	1,038	549	457	32	54.43
<hr/>					
1946-51	6,457	3,614	2,596	247	57.89

TABLE II

AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR T TEAMS AND THEIR OPPONENTS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	1,093	24,031	18,209	21.98	16.65
1950	1,100	24,130	16,801	21.94	15.27
1949	1,081	23,809	17,868	21.09	16.53
1948	1,070	20,298	16,899	18.97	15.79
1947	1,066	18,428	14,812	17.28	13.98
1946	1,038	17,283	14,578	16.65	14.04
1946-51	6,457	127,979	99,167	19.82	15.34

TABLE III

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 18 CONVENTIONAL T FORMATION TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	168	77	84	7	47.92
1950	163	82	76	5	51.84
1949	163	87	75	1	53.68
1948	165	81	79	5	50.60
1947	163	74	76	13	49.39
1946	159	84	66	9	55.67
<hr/>					
1946-51	981	485	456	40	51.48



TABLE IV

AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR 18 CONVENTIONAL T FORMATION TEAMS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	168	3,302	3,105	19.60	18.48
1950	163	3,239	2,775	19.86	17.02
1949	163	3,253	3,016	19.96	18.50
1948	165	3,056	2,769	18.52	16.78
1947	163	2,480	2,599	15.21	15.94
1946	159	2,481	2,249	15.54	14.09
1946-51	981	17,811	16,513	18.17	16.83

TABLE V

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 16 WINGED OR FLANKERED T TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	146	81	63	2	56.17
1950	142	87	46	9	64.36
1949	143	76	63	4	54.54
1948	146	74	64	8	53.42
1947	143	84	53	6	60.84
1946	139	81	55	3	61.11
<hr/>					
1946-51	859	483	344	32	58.09

TABLE VI

AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR 16 WINGED OR FLANKERED T TEAMS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	146	3,215	2,619	22.02	17.94
1950	142	2,986	2,255	21.03	15.88
1949	143	3,236	2,441	22.63	17.07
1948	146	2,710	2,353	17.87	16.11
1947	143	2,772	1,796	19.38	12.56
1946	139	2,546	1,812	18.31	13.03
1946-51	859	17,465	13,276	20.33	15.45

TABLE VII

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 19 SPLIT OR SLIDING T TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	182	106	72	4	59.34
1950	191	122	63	6	65.45
1949	182	99	75	8	56.59
1948	182	93	82	7	53.02
1947	181	95	80	6	54.14
1946	178	79	95	4	45.50
1946-51	1,096	594	467	35	55.70

TABLE VIII

AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR 19 SPLIT OR SLIDING T TEAMS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	182	4,135	2,876	22.69	15.80
1950	191	4,492	3,123	23.52	16.35
1949	182	3,999	3,063	21.97	16.83
1948	182	3,485	2,884	19.16	15.84
1947	181	2,975	2,791	16.43	15.41
1946	178	2,593	2,585	14.55	14.49
1946-51	1,096	21,679	17,322	19.78	15.80

TABLE IX

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 31 OPEN T FORMATION TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	302	194	101	7	65.59
1950	307	206	83	18	70.03
1949	300	187	105	8	63.67
1948	295	165	116	14	58.33
1947	294	161	121	12	56.80
1946	284	145	132	7	52.29
<hr/>					
1946-51	1,782	1,058	658	66	61.22

TABLE X

## AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR 31 OPEN T FORMATION TEAMS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	303	7,144	4,650	23.66	15.39
1950	307	7,216	4,235	23.51	13.79
1949	300	6,999	4,882	23.33	16.27
1948	295	5,715	4,418	19.71	14.97
1947	294	4,980	4,089	16.94	13.57
1946	284	4,760	4,207	16.94	14.98
1946-51	1,782	36,814	26,481	20.69	14.89

TABLE XI

## SIX YEAR RECORD OF 31 COMPOSITE T FORMATION TEAMS

<u>GAMES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1951	295	171	116	8	59.32
1950	297	174	108	15	61.11
1949	293	166	112	15	59.22
1948	291	155	124	12	55.33
1947	285	168	102	15	61.58
1946	278	160	109	9	59.13
<hr/>					
1946-51	1,739	994	671	74	59.29



TABLE XII

AVERAGE SCORE PER GAME FOR 31 COMPOSITE T FORMATION TEAMS

	<u>GAMES PLAYED</u>	<u>T TEAMS SCORES</u>	<u>OPPONENTS SCORES</u>	<u>T TEAMS AVERAGE</u>	<u>OPPONENTS AVERAGE</u>
1951	295	6,234	4,950	21.13	16.78
1950	297	6,197	4,411	20.87	14.85
1949	293	6,322	4,466	21.58	15.24
1948	291	5,332	4,475	18.32	15.38
1947	285	5,221	3,537	18.31	12.39
1946	278	4,903	3,725	17.63	13.40
1946-51	1,739	34,209	25,564	19.67	14.70

TABLE XIII

COACHES' RECORDS AS OBTAINED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

KINDS T	NUMBER			GAMES			PER CENT WON
	<u>TEAMS</u>	<u>COACHES</u>	<u>PLAYED</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	
BEAR T	30	34	1,278	756	485	37	60.56
WINGED T	20	20	634	371	234	29	60.81
SPLIT T	33	34	1,255	774	428	53	63.79
OPEN T	49	53	2,872	1,924	836	112	68.99
COMPOSITE T	74	78	3,717	2,442	1,131	144	67.64
TOTALS	206	219	9,756	6,267	3,114	375	66.16

TABLE XIV

## COACHES' OPINIONS REGARDING DEFENSE CATCHING UP WITH T ATTACK

KINDS T	NUMBER		SAY		PER CENT	
	<u>TEAMS</u>	<u>COACHES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
BEAR T	30	34	19	15	55.88	44.12
WINGED T	20	20	5	15	25.00	75.00
SPLIT T	33	34	9	25	26.44	73.56
OPEN T	49	53	12	41	22.64	77.36
COMPOSITE T	74	78	16	62	20.53	79.47
TOTALS	206	219	61	158	27.84	72.16

## APPENDIX C

TABLE XV

THE TEN TOP RANKING COLLEGE FOOTBALL TEAMS FOR PAST SIX YEARS<sup>1</sup>

<u>RANK</u>	<u>TEAMS</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1	NOTRE DAME*	47	6	3	86.61
2	OKLAHOMA*	54	9	1	85.16
3	CALIFORNIA*	48	13	1	78.23
4	ARMY*	41	10	4	78.18
5	GEORGIA TECH*	49	15	1	76.02
6	MICHIGAN	41	12	3	75.89
7	TEXAS*	47	15	1	75.09
8	TENNESSEE	46	15	3	74.22
9	RUTGERS*	36	16	0	74.04
10	KENTUCKY*	48	17	2	73.13

\* Denote teams utilizing T formation offense.

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Thoreau, Official Collegiate Football Record Books (New York: The National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952).

TABLE XVI

FIFTY TOP RANKING COLLEGE FOOTBALL TEAMS FOR PAST SIX YEARS<sup>2</sup>

<u>RANK</u>	<u>TEAMS</u>	<u>WON</u>	<u>LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>	<u>PER CENT WON</u>
1	NOTRE DAME*	47	6	3	86.61
2	OKLAHOMA*	54	9	1	85.16
3	CALIFORNIA*	48	13	1	78.23
4	ARMY*	41	10	4	78.18
5	GEORGIA TECH*	49	15	1	76.02
6	MICHIGAN	41	12	3	75.89
7	TEXAS*	47	15	1	75.09
8	TENNESSEE	46	15	3	74.22
9	RUTGERS*	36	16	0	74.04
10	KENTUCKY*	48	17	2	73.69
11	MICHIGAN STATE*	41	13	2	73.13
12	MARYLAND*	42	15	3	72.50
13	VIRGINIA*	39	15	2	71.43
14	PENN STATE*	37	14	3	71.19
15	PRINCETON	36	15	0	70.59
16	CORNELL*	37	16	1	69.45
17	KANSAS*	40	17	3	69.17
18	RICE INSTITUTE*	41	19	2	67.74
*19	CLEMSON	39	18	3	67.50
20	WILLIAM and MARY	42	15	3	66.66

---

<sup>2</sup> H. D. Thoreau, op. cit. 1946-47-48-49-50-51 and 52.

21	ILLINOIS*	35	17	4	66.07
22	VILLANOVA*	37	19	2	65.52
23	PENNSYLVANIA	32	17	1	65.00
24	GEORGIA*	41	21	5	64.91
25	ALABAMA*	41	22	2	64.62
26	SOUTHERN METHODIST	37	20	6	63.49
27	MIAMI*	37	22	2	62.29
28	U. C. L. A.*	35	21	1	62.28
29	NORTH CAROLINA	37	22	4	61.91
30	LOUISIANA STATE*	36	22	5	61.11
31	VANDERBILT*	37	24	1	60.48
32	WAKE FOREST*	34	22	2	60.35
33	SAN FRANCISCO*	35	23	0	60.35
34	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA*	33	21	5	60.17
35	BAYLOR*	35	23	3	59.83
36	MISSISSIPPI*	34	23	1	59.49
37	OHIO STATE*	29	19	7	59.09
38	DUKE	30	21	5	59.09
39	TULANE*	30	21	2	58.49
40	YALE*	31	23	4	56.89
41	WISCONSIN*	29	22	3	56.48
42	NORTHWESTERN*	30	24	1	55.45
43	STANFORD*	31	26	4	54.19
44	MINNESOTA	28	24	2	53.71
45	OREGON STATE*	30	26	3	53.39
46	MISSOURI*	32	28	2	53.23

47	SANTA CLARA*	27	25	4	51.79
48	COLUMBIA*	27	27	0	50.00
49	ARKANSAS*	29	30	3	49.19
50	BOSTON COLLEGE*	23	28	4	45.45

\* Denotes teams employing the T formation attack.



## APPENDIX D

TABLE XVII

SEVENTY-FIVE T TEAMS IN MAJOR BOWL GAMES FOR PAST SIX YEARS<sup>1</sup>

<u>NAME OF BOWLS</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1947</u>	<u>TOTALS</u>
ROSE BOWL	2*	1*	1*	2*	1*	2*	9*
SUGAR BOWL	1*	2*	2*	1*	2*	1*	9*
COTTON BOWL	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	2*	7*
ORANGE BOWL	2*	1*	2*	2*	2*	1*	10*
GATOR BOWL	1*	1*	2*	1*	2*	2*	9*
SUN BOWL	2*	2*	2*	2*	2*	2*	12*
CIGAR BOWL	2*	1*	1*	2*	2*	1*	9*
TANGERINE BOWL	2*	2*	2*	2*	1*	1*	10*
TOTAL TEAMS	13*	11*	13*	13*	13*	12*	75*

\* Denote number teams in bowl games utilizing T offense.

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Thoreau, Official Collegiate Football Record Books (New York: The National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952).

TABLE XVIII

RESULTS OF MAJOR BOWL GAMES PLAYED DURING PAST SIX YEARS<sup>2</sup>ROSE BOWL GAME, Pasadena, California.

1952	ILLINOIS*	40	STANFORD*	7
1951	MICHIGAN	14	CALIFORNIA*	6
1950	OHIO STATE*	17	CALIFORNIA*	14
1949	NORTHWESTERN*	20	CALIFORNIA*	14
1948	MICHIGAN	49	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA*	0
1947	ILLINOIS*	45	U. C. L. A.*	14

SUGAR BOWL GAME, New Orleans, Louisiana.

1952	MARYLAND*	28	TENNESSEE	13
1951	KENTUCKY*	13	OKLAHOMA*	7
1950	OKLAHOMA*	35	LOUISIANA*	0
1949	OKLAHOMA*	14	NORTH CAROLINA	6
1948	TEXAS*	27	ALABAMA*	7
1947	GEORGIA*	20	NORTH CAROLINA	10

COTTON BOWL GAME, Dallas, Texas.

1952	KENTUCKY*	20	TEXAS CHRISTIAN	7
1951	TENNESSEE	20	TEXAS*	14
1950	RICE INSTITUTE*	27	NORTH CAROLINA	13
1949	SOUTHERN METHODIST	21	OREGON*	13
1948	SOUTHERN METHODIST	13	PENN STATE*	13
1947	ARKANSAS*	0	LOUISIANA*	0

ORANGE BOWL GAME, Miami, Florida.

1952	GEORGIA TECH*	17	BAYLOR*	14
1951	CLEMSON	15	MIAMI*	14
1950	SANTA CLARA*	21	KENTUCKY*	13
1949	TEXAS*	41	GEORGIA*	28
1948	GEORGIA TECH*	20	KANSAS*	14
1947	RICE INSTITUTE*	8	TENNESSEE	0

\* Denote teams employing the T formation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

GATOR BOWL GAME, Jacksonville, Florida.

1952	MIAMI*	14	CLEMSON	0
1951	WYOMING	20	WASHINGTON-LEE*	7
1950	MARYLAND*	20	MISSOURI*	7
1949	CLEMSON	24	MISSOURI*	23
1948	GEORGIA*	20	MARYLAND*	20
1947	WAKE FOREST*	14	SOUTH CAROLINA*	14

CIGAR BOWL GAME, Tampa, Florida.

1952	CAMP LEJEUNE*	0	BROOKS MEDICS*	20
1951	LA CROSSE	47	VALPARISO*	13
1950	FLORIDA STATE*	19	WOFFORD	13
1949	MISSOURI VALLEY*	13	SAINT THOMAS*	13
1948	MISSOURI VALLEY*	26	WEST CHESTER*	7
1947	DELAWARE*	21	ROLLINS	7

TANGERINE BOWL GAME, Orlando, Florida.

1952	STETSON*	35	ARKANSAS STATE*	20
1951	MORRIS HARVEY*	35	EMORY-HENRY*	14
1950	SAINT VENCENT*	7	EMORY-HENRY*	6
1949	MURRAY*	21	SUL ROSS*	21
1948	CATAWBA	7	MARSHALL*	0
1947	CATAWBA	31	MARYVILLE*	6

SUN BOWL GAME, El Paso, Texas.

1952	TEXAS TECH*	25	COLLEGE of PACIFIC*	14
1951	WEST TEXAS STATE*	14	CINCINNATI*	13
1950	TEXAS WESTERN*	33	GEORGETOWN*	20
1949	WEST VIRGINIA*	21	TEXAS WESTERN*	12
1948	MIAMI*	13	TEXAS TECH*	12
1947	CINCINNATI*	18	VIRGINIA TECH*	6

TABLE XIX

T TEAMS WINNING CONFERENCE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS 1946-51<sup>3</sup>

<u>NAME OF CONFERENCE</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1947</u>	<u>1946</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
WESTERN	*					*	2
SOUTHWESTERN		*	*			*	3
SOUTHERN	*	*					2
SOUTHEASTERN	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
IVY LEAGUE			*	*		*	3
BIG SEVEN	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
MISSOURI VALLEY	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
PACIFIC COAST	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
MID-AMERICAN	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
BORDER	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
ROCKY MOUNTAIN		*	*	*	*	*	5
MOUNTAIN STATES	*			*	*	*	4
CALIFORNIA ATHLETIC	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
LONE STAR	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
TEXAS	*	*	*	*	*	*	6
SKYLINE	*			*	*	*	4
<hr/>							
TOTAL T CHAMPIONS	13	12	12	13	12	15	77

\* Denote conference championships won by T formation teams.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

## TABLE XX

CHAMPIONS OF MAJOR FOOTBALL CONFERENCES<sup>4</sup>WESTERN CONFERENCE

1951	ILLINOIS*
1950	MICHIGAN
1949	OHIO STATE*
1948	MICHIGAN
1947	MICHIGAN
1946	ILLINOIS*

SOUTHWESTERN CONFERENCE

1951	TEXAS CHRISTIAN
1950	TEXAS*
1949	RICE INSTITUTE*
1948	SOUTHERN METHODIST
1947	SOUTHERN METHODIST
1946	RICE INSTITUTE*

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE

1951	MARYLAND*
1950	WASHINGTON-LEE*
1949	NORTH CAROLINA
1948	CLEMSON
1947	WILLIAM and MARY
1946	NORTH CAROLINA

SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE

1951	GEORGIA TECH*
1950	KENTUCKY*
1949	TULANE*
1948	GEORGIA*
1947	MISSISSIPPI*
1946	GEORGIA*

\* Denote conference championships won by T formation teams.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

IVY LEAGUE CONFERENCE

1951	PRINCETON
1950	PRINCETON
1949	CORNELL*
1948	CORNELL*
1947	PENNSYLVANIA
1946	YALE*

BIG SEVEN CONFERENCE

1951	OKLAHOMA*
1950	OKLAHOMA*
1949	OKLAHOMA*
1948	OKLAHOMA*
1947	OKLAHOMA* (TIED)
	KANSAS*
1946	OKLAHOMA*

MISSOURI VALLEY CONFERENCE

1951	TULSA*
1950	TULSA*
1949	DETROIT*
1948	OKLAHOMA A & M*
1947	TULSA*
1946	TULSA* (TIED)
	OKLAHOMA A & M*

PACIFIC COAST CONFERENCE

1951	STANFORD*
1950	CALIFORNIA*
1949	CALIFORNIA*
1948	CALIFORNIA* (TIED)
	OREGON*
1947	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA*
1946	U. C. L. A.*

MID-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

1951	MIAMI*
1950	MIAMI*
1949	CINCINNATI*
1948	MIAMI*
1947	MIAMI*
1946	CINCINNATI*

BORDER CONFERENCE

1951	HARDIN-SIMMONS*
1950	WEST TEXAS STATE*
1949	TEXAS TECH*
1948	WEST TEXAS STATE*
1947	TEXAS TECH*
1946	HARDIN-SIMMONS*

ROCKY MOUNTAIN CONFERENCE

1951	COLORADO MINES
1950	COLORADO COLLEGE*
1949	COLORADO COLLEGE*
1948	COLORADO COLLEGE*
1947	MONTANA STATE*
1946	MONTANA STATE*

MOUNTAIN STATES CONFERENCE

1951	UTAH*
1950	WYOMING
1949	WYOMING
1948	UTAH*
1947	MONTANA STATE*
1946	UTAH*

CALIFORNIA ATHLETIC CONFERENCE

1951	SAN DIEGO STATE*
1950	SAN DIEGO STATE*
1949	SAN JOSE STATE*
1948	SAN JOSE STATE*
1947	SAN JOSE STATE*
1946	SAN JOSE STATE*

LONE STAR CONFERENCE

1951	EAST TEXAS STATE*
1950	SUL ROSS STATE*
1949	EAST TEXAS STATE*
1948	EAST TEXAS STATE*
1947	NORTH TEXAS STATE*
1946	NORTH TEXAS STATE*



TEXAS CONFERENCE

1951	ABILENE CHRISTIAN*
1950	ABILENE CHRISTIAN*
1949	MCMURRY COLLEGE*
1948	MCMURRY COLLEGE*
1947	MCMURRY COLLEGE* (TIED)
	HARDIN-SIMMONS*
1946	ABILENE CHRISTIAN*

SKYLINE CONFERENCE

1951	UTAH*
1950	WYOMING
1949	WYOMING
1948	UTAH*
1947	MONTANA STATE*
1946	UTAH*

## APPENDIX E

## TABLE XXI

REPRESENTATIVE RESPONSES FROM COACHES RELATIVE  
TO EFFECTIVENESS OF DEFENSES USED  
AGAINST THEIR T FORMATION

Robert E. Dodd:

I am a great believer in the T formation. I think it is the finest running offense in football today. I favor the 5-3-2-1 defense against the T formation because of its flexibility. If we run into the nine man defenses (the 5-4-2, the 6-3-2 and the 7-2-2) we will operate with a flanker or with a man in motion.

Don Faurot:

The Split T offense is hard to stop with the standard eight man combination defenses. The reason we continue to use the Split T is because of the success we have had with it against the eight man defenses. When the defense uses the nine man alignments against us we set out a flanker and make the defense take one of the eight man combinations. Therefore, our offense is run with the same effectiveness with a flanker set out to either side.

Amos A. Stagg, Jr.:

We find that the Split T offense is the most difficult for us to stop. We employ variations of the 6-2-2-1, and the 6-3-2 defenses against the normal T offenses. We use the 6-3-2, the 7-2-2, the 8-1-2 or the 8-3 defense against strong Split T teams. However, we prefer the 6-3-2 defense against the Split T formation.

Chuck Baer:

The defense has not caught up with the Split T attack, because it has a very strong running attack. Many teams have tried to utilize the nine man alignments to stop our running, but we have found their weakness to be in their pass defense.

Nelson Nitchman:

Added combinations and variations to the offense

cause the defense plenty of worry. We have set passes to cope with linemen and linebackers stunting from the nine man defensive alignments. I do not feel that the defenses are catching up with the T attack. However, I do feel that the eight three and the nine man defenses call for quick hitting passes to ends, flankered backs and to men in motion.

Andy Pilney:

I certainly do not feel like the defenses are catching up with any particular type of T formation. The main reason for my statement is that when the T attack is properly and intelligently used it has variations that will make it successful against any type of defense that may be employed. With proper use of splits in the line, flankered backs and by spreading one or both ends, you can force the opponents out of any defensive alignment and into one, which your offense can move against at any time. The inhaustable variations that can be devised and utilized by the T type of offense makes it almost impossible to say that any defense can stop it.

Clyde Lee:

The Split T has a great advantage over the defense in its ability to change assignments readily. I feel that the offense is a long way ahead of the defense. I am sure that through your survey, you will find convincing evidence in comparative scores.

Frank Leahy:

The defenses are improving against the T formation due to the fact that teams play against it so often. Still, in my estimation, the T is the finest formation in football.

Frank Brogger:

We do not use the 5-3-2-1 defense with a straight charge very often. We stunt a great deal from the 5-3-2-1 defense. We employ the eight three defense with a straight away charge. There are too many coaches, that coach out of a book, and their imagination of improving their offense depends too much on one another.

Babe Curfman:

It is my opinion that none of the defenses will stop

the T formation if they are played straight. But with defenses sliding, slanting and looping, it gives the T attack a bad time. Most all of the teams that we have played use the changing defenses. It is my opinion that the defenses are catching up with the Conventional T. That is why the offense is spreading the line more often and employing flankers in order to get the defense to come out and cover them.

Edd Struck:

There is too much variation in the T formation for the defense to catch up with our methods of attack.

Jesse Hill:

If two teams are evenly matched in personnel, I don't think there is a defense that can half-way stop a good T. The T has so many variations and counter plays to throw against the defense that the defense must be constantly changing in order to compensate for the openings left by the defense in trying to stop basic T plays. The pros are conceded to have the best man-power, both on offense and defense. They can not stop each other as football has become an offensive game with very few exceptions.

Ray Gwzyniski:

I believe that with linemen and linebackers working cooperatively to cover designated areas without regard to the hocus-pocus of the ball handler, the element of surprise and deception fails to be as effective. Sliding, slanting, looping six-two open, closed, tight and other variations are some of the varieties of defense encountered by the T offense. It is difficult to run the ends against nine man combinations without the use of flankers, split ends and men in motion.

Bert LaBrucherie:

I believe that most T teams have split their lines in an approximation of the Split T line, although not using the Split T offense exclusively, but mixing in standard T plays. I do not believe that the defenses have caught up with any of the T formations, save those perhaps who continue to use a tight offensive alignment. Because of the flexibility of the T offense in passing, and the chance that a back may break away and go all of the way at any time and because the faking is done closer to the line of scrimmage and because of quick hitting plays, I

do not believe that many coaches will give up the T offense.

Bob Snyder:

We have more trouble with a team that uses several defenses each game and does a good job of mixing them up. If a team would use a standard five and six man line with the many different patterns of stunting, I really believe that it would cause any offense lots of trouble. With the T running many new types of plays from its formations, I don't see how any team can remain in one defense for an entire game.

Jim Tatum:

It was the policy of our opponents to show us quite a few defenses (6-2 both tight and loose, 5-3, 5-4, and the 7 diamond and the 7 box). I think that if the defenses have caught up with the T attacks, most of the defensive teams would be employing that type of defense.

Charles "Rip" Engle:

I believe we can stay ahead of the defense if we continue to improve our offense from year to year.

Clyde A. Lamb:

The T formation is so flexible and is so varied and has so many possibilities, such as speed and passing ability that it is hard to stop. I am forced to use the T formation as we do not have the material for a power formation.

Jack R. Carl:

I do not believe the defense is catching up with the T formation when it is exploited to its fullest possibilities. The 6-3-2 defense gives us the most difficulty, or most of the nine man combinations. However, by splitting the line, using flankers and men in motion to break down these nine man alignments, we have been able to move against our opponents.

Edd Allen:

We have enough variation in our offense that we believe we can take care of any type of defense. In my opinion, the best defenses against the T are the 5-3 or

an 8-3 smashing and holding up the ends, or a looping or slanting 6-2 arrangement. If the opponents don't know how to cope with a slanting or looping defense, the T will have lots of difficulty.

Charles Atkinson:

I believe that T defenses are still behind the attack. The element of surprise, deception, quickness-speed makes the T offense go. I do believe the T attack is the reason so much stunting has been placed in the defense.

Joe Beidler:

I would say that the defenses used against the T attack have not been too effective.

Clarence Boston:

I believe the T offenses are moving ahead of the defenses, and I believe the T attack will hold its own against all types of defense.

Frank Burns:

I feel that the defenses have caught up with the Conventional T offense, which does not use to advantage such things as flankers, men in motion and split ends. However, I feel that with the use of these maneuvers the T offense can still keep ahead of its defenses.

Alva Kelley:

The tendency is to use the nine man combinations on defense against the T attack. By using flankers and men in motion, the defense is forced to change into some of the eight man alignments with three deep defensive backs.

Ara Parseghian:

We feel by splitting different ends, using halfback and fullback flankers, that we can force a team into a combination of different defenses. We will take advantage of their coverage and hammer away at their weaknesses. In other words, we will force them into the defenses that we want. We are of the opinion that the T formation is still a comparatively new formation and its potentialities have not been completely exploited.

Tom Samuels:

The defenses that we play against, are so set up to permit one or two men to concentrate on our quarterback, getting to him before he has a chance to hand-off or keep the ball. We are using several variations to combat this type of defense, for instance, passing the ball through the quarterback's legs directly to the fullback and letting him do the passing. Spreading men out helps us a lot in taking these extra men away from the center of our line. We continue to work on variations to keep our quarterback free to make our plays work.

Horace Hendrickson:

I believe six, seven and eight man combinations, with men playing on men are the most troublesome defenses.

Joe Zabilski:

I think the T formation is elastic enough to operate effectively against any type of defense. This is especially true if the basic assignments are such that they can be easily switched without changing the nature of the play.

Tom Triplett:

We believe that our offense is flexible enough that we meet the changing defenses successfully.

Edd Price:

By adding the Split or Sliding T series to the Bear type of T makes the conventional defenses (6-2, 5-3 and the 7-1) very weak.

James Stevens:

I do not think that the defense is catching up with the T offense. The T is explosive and anything can happen at any time. We have scored against all types of defense. The only reason the 5 man line backed up by 4 men, with alternate men rushing and charging worried us was because we did not have an alternate series, like the one that Graham and Motley use. Had we had a fullback series where the quarterback comes back and fakes, the pass or runs, we could have worked against the 5-4-2 nine man combination successfully. It wasn't so much the defense, it caught us unprepared for it.



Ray Eliot:

I do not believe that the defense is catching up with the T formation offense. It has too many variations for the defense.

Fritz Heisler:

The T is an open formation and makes for an open type of attack and becomes one of the most difficult types of offense to defense.

Paul Brown:

I have never believed that the defenses have caught up with the T formation, and until it catches up a lot closer than it has in the past, I'll continue to use the T as my method of attack.

Gene Ronzani:

Shifting defenses on every play causes us the most trouble. We change our offensive T formation to make the opponents play our game.

Steve Owens:

The defenses are not catching up with the T, as we use it, as we can take advantage of any defense. This is done by your men in motion and spread ends. The T attack is based upon speed and if you can out-run and out-flank the defense, you must advance the ball.

Frank Broyles:

We make the defense adjust their play after we break the huddle. We break the huddle quickly and run our plays on quick counts. Therefore, the defense can not make their adjustments as fast as we can. We catch the defense many times failing to shift to meet our strength.

Arthur L. Guepe:

Our offense is not stereotyped. No one defense can be set up to stop all of the variations of our particular type of T attack. However, we have been defeated by superior personnel. Never the less, we have scored in every game for the past six years.

Eddie Baker:

The offense has so many modifications that, without changing basic assignments, the offense can adapt to any type of defense.

Jack Clayton:

The T attack with variations will continue ahead of all possible defense.

Lowell Dawson:

The T formation allows a greater versatility in offense than does any other formation.

Herbert Eisele:

When you use combinations and variations of the T attack you can deploy and take advantage of the many defenses.

Jack T. Faulkner:

The defenses are not catching up with the T attack, because of the many combinations and variations used by the offense.

Wesley L. Fry:

The defense is not catching up with the T as we are utilizing many combinations and variations in offense.

Sidney Gillman:

The T formation has not come close to realizing its maximum potentialities in offense.

Harvey Harman:

The T formation can drive the defense into any set-up it desires. Therefore, I don't think the defense will ever catch up with the T formation offense.

Floyd B. Schwartzwalder:

None of the defenses give us trouble because our attack is varied enough that it cuts down the defensive efficiency of our opponents.

Marvin Bass:

The T formation is too flexible and has elasticity.

Dave Henderson:

The full potentialities of the T have not been fully utilized as yet.

Mel Hetzler:

There is enough variation in the T offense to take care of any defensive situation.

Jim Hickey:

By changing the T with variations you can create some interesting problems for the defense.

George James:

With variations and combinations we have been able to keep ahead of the defense.

Dan Jessee:

We keep ahead of the defense by making changes and variations in our attack.

Glenn Killinger:

There are too many variations that can be utilized by the T attack for the defense to catch up with it.

Jack Landrum:

If the defense adjusts to stop any particular type of play, the T can defeat the defense by means of great variation in the T attack.

Crowell Little:

By using combinations and variations the offense can force the defense to deploy into the kind of defensive alignment that the offense desires.

D. O. McLaughry:

The T formation has possibilities of such wide variation that the defense can be forced to deploy.

John McMillian:

In the T formation, changing or multiple defenses are no bother. The method of blocking has been improved and so devised that defense is of little consequence.

Joe McMullins:

With the variety of play possible from the T attack, the defense can not stop the offense consistently and effectively.

Edd Merrick:

It is impossible for the defense to stop the T attack with all the possible combinations and variations.

Tom Nugent:

By shifting from one variation of the T into another gives our offense a distinct advantage over its many defenses.

Jordon Oliver:

No defense bothers us in particular, as we meet them with combinations and variations of the T formation.

Paul Severin:

Our T offense is so designed to take advantage of the weaknesses in any particular type of defense.

Edd Sherman:

Defenses do not bother us. With our rule blocking adjustments, we can run or pass on one defense as well as another.

James Shreve:

I feel that the T has too many variations and can strike too quickly either on the ground or in the air for the defense to bother us.

Jerry Thompson:

The defense does not bother us as our offense can make adjustments to various defenses easier and faster.

Walt West:

The defense can not catch up with the offense because of constant variations in the method of attack.

Robert Whittaker:

I do not think the defense will ever catch up with the T formation because of the various combinations that can be employed without changing the basic blocking assignments.

Carl Wise:

Combination and variation T methods of attack keep the defense from catching up with the possibilities of this offensive formation.

Frank Deig:

By adding variations and combinations methods to the T attack, the offense is able to stay ahead of the many defenses.

DeWitt Weaver:

I don't believe the defenses are catching up with the T formation, as they are forced to put too many players on the line of scrimmage in order to stop the running attack. This makes the defense vulnerable to a good passing attack.

William Schutte:

Combinations and variations in the T attack keeps the defense busy trying to stop the offense.

TABLE XXII

RESPONSES OF 219 COACHES RELATIVE TO MOST EFFECTIVE DEFENSES EMPLOYED AGAINST THE T ATTACKS

KINDS OF ATTACK	BEAR-T	WINGED-T	SPLIT-T	OPEN-T	COMPOSITE-T	TOTAL-T						
NUMBER OF COACHES	34	20	34	53	78	219						
Number & Per Cent	#	%	#	%	#	%						
ALIGNMENTS												
EIGHT MAN												
5-3-2-1	10	29	9	26	9	15	14	18	49	22		
6-2-2-1	9	26	6	30	10	29	13	25	15	19	53	24
7-1-2-1	11	30	8	40	8	24	9	17	16	20	44	20
NINE MAN												
5-4-2	20	59	16	80	32	94	19	36	27	35	114	52
6-3-2	8	24	8	40	14	41	6	11	13	17	49	22
7-2-2	17	50	9	45	20	59	16	30	16	20	78	35
SPECIAL												
5-2-2-2	7	20	4	20	5	14	14	26	5	7	28	13
7-4	1	3	2	10	8	24	3	5	6	8	20	9
8-3	18	56	12	60	19	57	19	36	21	27	79	36
9-2	5	14	5	25	16	47	4	8	13	17	43	20

## APPENDIX F

## TABLE XXIII

## CONVENTIONAL T COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES

Edward Allen, Drexel Inst. of Tech., Philadelphia, Pa.  
Edward N. Anderson, Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.  
John Barnhill, Arkansas University, Fayetteville, Ark.  
Dana X. Bible, Texas University, Austin, Texas.  
Earl H. Blaik, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.  
Clarence Boston, New Hampshire University, Durham, N. H.  
Henry T. Breams, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.  
Edward Danowski, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.  
Robert L. Davis, Colorado A & M College, Fort Collins, Colo.  
Otis W. Douglas, Arkansas University, Fayetteville, Ark.  
Ray George, Texas A & M College, College Station, Texas.  
John Gill, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo, Mich.  
Tom Hamilton, University Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Walter G. Hargesheimer, University of Southern Cal., at L. A.  
Dave Henderson, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.  
Herman Hickman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
Stuart K. Holcomb, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.  
Edd Jontos, Rensselaer Poly Tech Inst., Troy, N. Y.  
Bert LaBrucherie, California Inst. Tech., Pasadena, Calif.  
James Loveless, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.  
Henry Margarita, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
D. O. McLaughry, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.  
Jack Mollenkopf, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.



Jesse Neely, Rice Institute, Houston, Texas.

Larry Siermering, Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz.

James A. Stevens, Prairie View College, Prairie View, Texas.

Bernard Crimmins, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Richard Todd, Texas A & M College, College Station, Texas.

Murray A. Warmath, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Linn Wells, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.

Carroll Widdows, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

Carl Wise, Washington-Lee University, Lexington, Va.

Frank Zazula, North Dakota University, Grand Forks, N. D.

Louis F. Zarza, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

## TABLE XXIV

## WINGED T COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES

Edward B. Baker, Carnegie Inst Tech., Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Walt Barkiewicz, Indiana Central College, Indianapolis, Ind.  
Francis J. Deig, St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.  
Aldo T. Donelli, Boston University, Boston, Mass.  
Fred M. Ellis, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.  
Charles A. Engle, Penn State College, State College, Pa.  
Walter Hass, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.  
Frank Kimbrough, West Texas State College, Canyon, Texas.  
Lou Little, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
E. R. McConnell, Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.  
John J. McLaughry, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
Wilford H. Moore, McMurry College, Abilene, Texas.  
David M. Nelson, Delaware University, Newark, Del.  
James Shreve, Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa.  
Edwin Struck, Illinois Normal University, Normal, Ill.  
Thomas Triplett, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.  
J. Edward Tryon, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.  
Irwin C. Uteritz, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.  
James A. Wilson, Buffalo University, Buffalo, N. Y.  
Warren B. Woodson, Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas.

## TABLE XXV

## SPLIT T COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES

Robert Appleby, Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.  
Charles E. Baer, Detroit University, Detroit, Mich.  
George Barkley, Washington-Lee University, Lexington, Va.  
Joe Beidler, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.  
Mike Brumbelow, Texas Western College, El Paso, Texas.  
Frank Burns, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Dick Clausen, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.  
Raymond A. Curfman, Idaho University, Moscow, Idaho.  
Mark E. Deam, Indiana State College, Terre Haute, Ind.  
Harold E. Drew, University Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.  
James W. Dunn, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.  
Garland Frazier, Wabash College, Crawfordville, Ind.  
Loyd Grow, Kalamazoo University, Kalamazoo, Mich.  
John P. Heinrick, Puget Sound College, Tacoma, Wash.  
Duke Jacobs, Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.  
Gomer T. Jones, Oklahoma University, Norman, Okla.  
Clyde V. Lee, University Houston, Houston, Texas.  
Thomas Lieb, University Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.  
Lonnie S. McMillian, Presbyterian College, Clinton, S. C.  
Ray Morrison, Austin College, Sherman, Texas.  
Preston A. Mull, Appalachain State College, Boone, N. C.  
William D. Murray, Duke University, Durham, N. C.  
Carl T. Nelson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Trevor Rees, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.  
Thomas Samuels, Eastern Kentucky Teachers, Richmond, Ky.  
Edward R. Snavely, Depauw University, Greencastle, Ind.  
James M. Tatum, University Maryland, College Park, Md.  
Jerry Thompson, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. D.  
Len Watters, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.  
DeWitt Weaver, Texas Tech College, Lubbock, Texas.  
Charles Wilkinson, University Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.  
Starr Wood, Tennessee Poly Inst Tech., Cookeville, Tenn.  
William A. Young, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.  
Harry Lawrence, Bucknell College, Lewisburg, Pa.

## TABLE XXVI

## OPEN T COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES

Charles Atkinson, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

George Benz, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.

Frank Broyles, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.

Paul Bryant, University Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

Lysle Butler, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Wallace Butts, University Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Jack Clayton, Western Kentucky Teachers, Bowling Green, Ky.

Joe T. Coleman, New Mexico A & M College, State College, N. M.

C. Nelson Corey, Colby College, Waterville, Me.

Don L. Cumley, Colorado Western State College, Gunnison, Colo.

Lowell Dawson, University Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dudley DeGroot, New Mexico University, Albuquerque, N. M.

Raymond Didier, Southwestern Louisiana Inst., Lafayette, La.

Robert E. Dodd, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.

Rex Enright, South Carolina University, Columbia, S. C.

Glenn M. Fraser, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Wesley Fry, University California, Berkley, Calif.

Sidney Gillman, Cincinnati University, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ralph Ginn, South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. D.

J. William Glassford, Nebraska University, Lincoln, Nebr.

Ray Graves, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.

Arthur Guepe, University Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Ray Gurzynski, Urinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

John W. Hancock, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo.  
William Heiss, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.  
Mel Hetzler, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa.  
Micheal Holovak, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.  
Edward L. Jackson, Howard University, Washington, D. C.  
Donald Jones, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.  
Louis B. Juillerat, Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio.  
Edward W. Krause, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.  
Frank Leahy, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.  
Dewey A. Mayhew, Texas A & I College, Kingsville, Texas.  
Frank R. Maze, Dickerson College, Carlisle, Pa.  
Harry J. Miller, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.  
Frank O. Moseley, Virginia Poly Tech Inst., Blacksburg, Va.  
Tom Nugent, Virginia Military Inst., Lexington, Va.  
Howard Odell, Washington University, Seattle, Wash.  
Jordon Olivar, Loyola University, Los Angeles, Calif.  
Ara Parseghian, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.  
Andy Pilney, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.  
George Sauer, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.  
William H. Schutte, San Diego State, San Diego, Calif.  
Edward Sherman, Muskingum College, North Concord, Ohio.  
Catfish Smith, East Texas State, Commerce, Texas.  
Conley Snidow, Emory-Henry College, Emory, Va.  
S. Woodrow Sponaugle, Franklin-Marshall, Lancaster, Pa.  
Charles A. Taylor, Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.  
Harold Turner, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.

Robert Voigts, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Lynn Waldorf, University California, Berkley, Calif.

Robert Whittaker, Bowling Green Univ., Bowling Green, Ohio.

Joseph Zabitski, University California, Berkley, Calif.

P.

## TABLE XXVII

## COMPOSITE T COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES

Marvin Bass, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va.  
Emory G. Bauer, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.  
Garvin Beauchamp, Abilene- Christian, Abilene, Texas.  
John O. Brothers, Tulsa University, Tulsa, Okla.  
Henry Brown, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.  
Frank Broyles, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.  
Frank Camp, University Louisville, Louisville, Ky.  
Jack Carl, Denison University, Granville, Ohio.  
Len Casanova, Oregon University, Eugene, Oreg.  
Earl Clark, University Detroit, Detroit, Mich.  
Jack Clayton, West Kentucky Teachers, Bowling Green, Ky.  
Joe T. Coleman, New Mexico A & M, State College, N. M.  
Jack C. Curtice, University Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.  
Norman J. Daniels, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.  
Quinn Decker, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.  
E. A. DeLuca, St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa.  
Robert E. Dodd, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.  
Carl H. Doehling, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.  
Edward Doherty, Rhode Island State, Kingston, R. I.  
Edward Dunn, Miami University, Miami, Fla.  
Herbert C. Eisele, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Ray Eliot, University Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Ill.  
Forrest W. England, Arkansas State, Jonesboro, Ark.



Roy E. Engle, Santa Barbara College, Santa Barbara, Calif.  
Edward Erdelatz, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.  
Jack Faulkner, University Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Donald Faurot, University Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
Richard Gallagher, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, Calif.  
Ray Graves, Georgia Tech University, Atlanta, Ga.  
Harvey J. Harman, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.  
Woodrow W. Hayes, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.  
Horace Hendrickson, North Carolina State, Raleigh, N. C.  
James Hickey, Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va.  
William Houghton, Akron University, Akron, Ohio.  
Burton Ingwersen, University Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Ill.  
George K. James, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
Dan Jessee, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
Edd Jontos, Rensselaer Poly Tech Inst., Troy, N. Y.  
Ernest L. Jorge, College of Pacific, Stockton, Calif.  
Alva E. Kellet, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
Glenn W. Killinger, State Teachers, West Chester, Pa.  
Edward King, Morris-Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va.  
Lee Krough, Gustavus-Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.  
Clyde B. Lamb, Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio.  
Jack Landrum, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.  
Frank Leahy, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.  
William B. Leckonby, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.  
James Leonard, Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.  
Crowell Little, Davidson College, Davidson, S. C.

Edward McKeever, Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge, La.  
John McMillian, Erskine College, Due West, S. C.  
Joe McMullen, Stetson University, Deland, Fla.  
Edward J. Merrick, University Richmond, Richmond, Va.  
A. C. Moore, University Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
Ralph E. Ness, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.  
Nelson Nitchman, Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn.  
Willard M. Pederson, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.  
Edwin B. Price, University Texas, Austin, Texas.  
Alured C. Ransom, Washington-Jefferson, Washington, Pa.  
Wayne Replogle, University Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.  
Ralph Ricker, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pa.  
Louis H. Saban, Case Inst Tech., Cleveland, Ohio.  
John E. Sauer, University Florida, Gainesville, Fla.  
Floyd B. Schwartzwalder, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.  
Paul V. Severin, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.  
Ted Shipkey, University Montana, Missoula, Mont.  
Robert A. Snyder, Toledo University, Toledo, Ohio.  
Clem Stralka, U. S. M. M. A., Kings Point, N. Y.  
Emmett R. Stuber, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.  
Thad Vann, Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg, Miss.  
John H. Vaught, University Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.  
John Vesser, Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho.  
Adam Walsh, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.  
Dallas Ward, University Colorado, Boulder, Colo.  
Mac Wenskunas, North Dakota State College, Fargo, N. D.

Walter J. West, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.

Ivan B. Williamson, University Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

George R. Woodruff, University Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

## TABLE XXVIII

## COACHES RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES NOT USED IN THIS STUDY

Volney Ashford, Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo.  
Frank Brogger, St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa.  
Jack Hagerty, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.  
Bill Meek, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.  
J. O. Morgan, Texas Tech College, Lubbock, Texas.  
J. B. Whitworth, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater, Okla.  
Amos A. Stagg, Jr., Susquehanna College, Selinsgrove, Pa.  
Amos A. Stagg, Sr., Susquehanna College, Selinsgrove, Pa.

Herman Ball, Washington Redskins, Washington, D. C.  
Paul E. Brown, Cleveland Browns, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Curley Lambeau, Chicago Cardinals, Chicago, Ill.  
Steve Owen, New York Giants, New York, N. Y.  
Eugene Ronzani, Green Bay Packers, Green Bay, Wis.

•

## APPENDIX G

TABLE XXIX

COMPLETE SIX YEAR RECORD OF 115 OUTSTANDING T FORMATION TEAMS<sup>1</sup>

<u>NAME OF TEAMS</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SCORES</u>		<u>WON</u>	<u>GAMES LOST</u>	<u>TIED</u>
		<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGST</u>			
ARMY	1951	116	183	2	7	0
CONVENTIONAL T	1950	267	40	8	1	0
	1949	354	68	9	0	0
	1948	294	89	8	0	1
	1947	222	68	6	2	1
	1946	263	80	9	0	1
BOSTON COLLEGE		135	198	3	6	0
OPEN T OFFENSE		78	270	0	9	1
		209	187	4	4	1
		151	128	5	2	1
		184	134	5	4	0
		234	123	6	3	0
BOSTON UNIVERSITY		299	157	6	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE		139	187	3	5	0
		250	108	6	2	0
		127	102	6	2	0
		196	168	4	3	1
		122	185	3	5	0

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Thoreau, Official Collegiate Football Record Books (New York: The National Collegiate Athletic Bureau, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952).

BROWN UNIVERSITY	124	222	2	7	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	147	271	1	8	0
	263	94	8	1	0
	242	103	7	2	0
	185	139	4	4	1
	122	185	3	5	1
COLGATE UNIVERSITY	184	186	4	5	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	184	191	5	3	0
	186	291	1	8	0
	133	196	3	6	0
	87	139	1	5	2
	154	95	4	4	0
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	140	103	5	3	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	151	169	4	5	0
	82	276	2	7	0
	194	177	4	5	0
	170	113	7	2	0
	222	176	6	3	0
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	207	139	5	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	170	85	7	2	0
	284	111	8	1	0
	224	112	8	1	0
	126	161	4	5	0
	135	115	5	3	1

DARTMOUTH UNIVERSITY	121	152	4	5	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	123	157	3	5	1
	183	107	6	2	0
	213	130	6	2	0
	102	127	5	4	0
	91	194	3	6	0
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	232	183	5	4	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	174	123	8	1	0
	226	117	5	3	0
	182	192	3	6	0
	44	250	1	6	1
	43	228	0	7	0
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	105	87	4	4	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	116	186	2	7	0
	119	177	5	4	0
	98	103	3	4	1
	100	54	3	4	1
	114	97	5	3	0
HOLY CROSS COLLEGE	362	117	8	2	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	247	209	4	5	1
	116	325	1	9	0
	151	128	5	5	0
	144	75	4	4	2
	114	103	5	4	0



U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY	132	155	2	6	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	122	176	3	6	0
	151	238	3	5	1
	77	227	0	8	1
	86	165	0	8	1
	105	186	1	8	0
PITTSBURGH UNIVERSITY	156	215	3	7	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	99	204	1	8	0
•	156	154	6	3	0
	119	154	6	3	0
	27	267	1	8	0
	88	136	3	5	1
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	184	114	4	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	186	154	4	4	0
	266	138	6	3	0
	224	130	7	2	0
	262	99	8	1	0
	252	48	7	2	0
VILLANOVA COLLEGE	194	207	5	4	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	141	166	4	5	0
	265	103	4	5	0
	255	118	7	2	1
	154	82	7	1	1
	182	142	6	4	0

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	225	190	5	5	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	163	259	2	8	0
	227	275	4	6	1
	236	128	8	3	0
	252	84	7	3	0
	120	99	5	5	0
YALE UNIVERSITY	126	131	3	5	1
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	142	120	6	3	0
	142	137	4	4	0
	167	170	4	5	0
	182	101	6	3	0
	272	72	7	1	1
ALABAMA UNIVERSITY	263	188	5	6	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	328	107	9	2	0
	227	130	6	3	1
	228	170	6	4	0
	203	73	8	2	0
	186	110	7	4	0
FLORIDA UNIVERSITY	174	131	5	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	157	181	5	5	0
	180	218	4	5	1
	213	206	5	5	0
	125	156	4	5	1
	104	264	0	9	0

GEORGIA UNIVERSITY	176	184	4	6	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	158	65	6	2	3
	177	134	4	6	1
	278	100	9	1	0
	192	115	7	4	0
	372	100	10	0	0
GEORGIA TECH UNIVERSITY	278	76	10	0	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	182	193	5	6	0
	191	129	7	3	0
	226	69	7	3	0
	220	35	9	1	0
	243	108	8	2	0
KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	294	114	7	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	380	62	10	1	0
	304	53	9	2	0
	199	128	5	3	2
	151	52	7	3	0
	233	97	7	3	0
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	128	111	7	3	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	165	151	4	5	2
	231	74	8	2	0
	99	271	3	7	0
	149	161	5	3	0
	240	123	9	1	0

MISSISSIPPI UNIVERSITY	254	157	6	3	1
SPLIT T OFFENSE	207	183	5	5	0
	246	243	4	5	1
	226	93	8	1	0
	254	101	9	1	0
	76	144	2	7	0
MISS STATE UNIVERSITY	82	127	4	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	169	137	4	5	0
	38	224	0	8	1
	103	87	4	4	1
	155	89	7	3	0
	271	71	8	2	0
TULANE UNIVERSITY	143	172	4	6	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	260	97	6	2	1
	251	142	7	2	1
	207	60	9	1	0
	94	192	2	5	1
	179	209	3	7	0
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	201	195	6	5	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	252	216	7	4	0
	177	183	5	5	0
	328	73	8	2	0
	183	85	6	4	0
	108	43	5	4	0

MARYLAND UNIVERSITY	353	62	9	0	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	274	120	7	2	1
	246	75	8	1	0
	207	132	6	4	0
	187	101	7	2	1
	136	193	3	6	0
SOUTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY	175	135	5	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	110	114	3	4	2
	145	168	4	6	0
	106	126	3	5	0
	113	85	7	2	0
	107	133	5	3	0
VIRGINIA MILITARY INST	227	162	7	3	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	189	166	6	4	0
	157	207	3	5	1
	184	116	6	3	0
	120	152	3	5	1
	133	189	4	5	1
WAKE FOREST COLLEGE	200	142	6	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	168	47	6	1	2
	207	183	4	6	0
	217	148	6	3	0
	133	101	6	4	0
	156	92	6	3	0

WASHINGTON-LEE UNIVERSITY	281	188	6	4	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	318	120	8	2	0
	174	152	3	5	1
	108	187	4	6	0
	140	226	5	5	0
	118	149	2	6	0
MIAMI FLORIDA UNIVERSITY	182	126	7	3	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	237	82	9	0	1
	165	96	6	3	0
	154	179	4	6	0
	80	140	2	7	1
	200	147	8	2	0
VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	278	104	8	1	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	260	151	8	2	0
	199	121	7	2	0
	175	157	5	3	1
	244	99	7	3	0
	180	170	4	4	1
ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	180	76	8	0	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	137	56	7	2	0
	149	140	3	4	2
	135	140	3	6	0
	204	102	6	3	0
	172	91	7	2	0

INDIANA UNIVERSITY	118	191	2	7	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	99	155	3	5	1
	117	254	1	8	0
	75	217	2	7	0
	156	102	5	3	1
	129	95	6	3	0
IOWA UNIVERSITY	161	233	2	5	2
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	120	201	3	5	1
	184	247	4	5	0
	127	142	4	5	0
	145	179	3	5	1
	129	92	5	4	0
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	244	124	5	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	155	143	6	3	0
	137	156	4	5	0
	171	77	7	2	0
	129	196	3	6	0
	156	136	4	4	1
PURDUE UNIVERSITY	153	152	5	4	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	143	200	2	7	0
	119	135	4	5	0
	126	175	3	6	0
	205	130	5	4	0
	97	208	2	6	1

WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY	186	53	7	1	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	137	97	6	3	0
	207	129	5	3	1
	126	193	2	7	0
	177	156	5	3	1
	140	144	4	5	0
CINCINNATI UNIVERSITY	345	112	10	1	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	245	155	8	3	0
	204	168	6	4	0
	106	193	3	6	1
	203	87	8	2	0
	221	93	9	2	0
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	223	213	4	6	1
WINGED T OFFENSE	204	144	5	3	1
	257	209	4	5	0
	127	212	2	8	0
	185	223	4	5	0
	139	148	4	5	0
MIAMI OHIO UNIVERSITY	225	159	6	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	322	79	8	1	0
	251	163	5	4	0
	249	90	7	1	1
	240	97	9	0	1
	220	72	7	3	0



NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY	241	122	7	2	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	139	140	4	4	1
	360	86	10	0	0
	320	93	9	0	1
	291	52	9	0	0
	271	24	8	0	1
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY	211	216	4	4	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	174	200	3	6	1
	169	134	5	3	1
	116	197	4	6	0
	111	141	3	6	0
	77	239	2	6	1
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	316	208	7	2	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	284	188	6	4	0
	259	183	5	5	0
	199	137	7	3	0
	290	82	8	0	2
	157	145	7	2	1
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	73	228	1	7	1
SPLIT T OFFENSE	122	355	1	9	1
	191	257	2	8	0
	78	232	1	9	0
	71	283	0	10	0
	41	233	0	9	0

MISSOURI UNIVERSITY	169	292	2	8	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	166	215	4	5	1
	257	205	7	3	0
	308	137	8	2	0
	240	116	8	2	0
	158	161	5	4	1
OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY	321	97	8	2	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	345	135	10	0	0
	364	88	10	0	0
	366	115	9	1	0
	194	161	7	2	1
	275	107	7	3	0
OKLAHOMA A & M COLLEGE	168	251	3	7	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	159	259	4	6	1
	223	212	4	4	2
	219	107	6	3	0
	114	134	3	7	0
	202	264	3	7	1
TULSA UNIVERSITY	372	200	9	2	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	339	124	9	1	1
	223	233	5	5	1
	135	330	0	9	1
	143	128	5	5	0
	295	83	9	1	0

ARKANSAS UNIVERSITY	178	162	5	5	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	200	157	2	8	0
	167	175	5	5	0
	227	136	5	5	0
	170	126	4	4	1
	132	92	6	3	0
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	231	114	8	1	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	183	128	7	3	0
	232	120	8	2	0
	147	118	5	3	2
	128	138	5	5	0
	56	182	1	8	0
RICE INSTITUTE	149	144	5	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	168	196	6	4	0
	249	84	9	1	0
	168	119	5	4	1
	202	74	7	3	0
	237	62	8	2	0
TEXAS UNIVERSITY	182	129	7	3	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	238	128	9	1	0
	290	93	6	4	0
	182	119	6	3	1
	265	67	9	1	0
	290	68	8	2	0

CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY	307	166	8	2	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	218	76	9	0	1
	305	114	10	0	0
	277	80	10	0	0
	275	111	9	1	0
	112	169	2	7	0
TEXAS TECH COLLEGE	276	155	6	4	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	222	241	3	8	0
	174	164	7	4	0
	212	136	7	3	0
	172	215	6	4	0
	148	116	8	3	0
OREGON UNIVERSITY	130	351	2	8	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	96	214	1	9	0
	250	219	4	6	0
	194	82	9	1	0
	174	121	7	3	0
	81	118	4	4	1
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	204	180	3	7	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	107	183	3	6	0
	232	188	7	3	0
	202	209	4	4	3
	170	136	6	4	0
	157	81	7	1	1

SOUTHERN CALIF UNIVERSITY	241	195	7	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	114	182	2	5	2
	214	170	5	3	1
	142	87	6	3	1
	192	65	7	1	1
	158	106	6	4	0
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	222	141	9	1	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	188	117	5	3	2
	291	101	6	3	1
	164	159	4	6	0
	73	214	0	9	0
	222	147	6	3	0
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	273	218	3	6	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	265	133	8	2	0
	167	285	3	7	0
	89	189	2	7	1
	98	99	3	6	0
	144	140	5	4	0
WASHINGTON STATE UNIV	280	187	6	4	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	168	182	4	3	2
	149	205	3	6	0
	164	219	4	5	1
	93	148	3	7	0
	118	147	1	6	1

SAN FRANCISCO UNIVERSITY	286	72	9	0	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	291	182	7	4	0
	260	144	7	3	0
	123	216	2	7	0
	234	139	7	3	0
	162	172	3	6	0
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	133	208	3	5	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	165	198	3	7	0
	201	114	7	2	1
	228	153	7	2	1
	109	158	4	4	0
	112	181	2	5	1
DELAWARE UNIVERSITY	173	109	5	3	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	202	67	8	1	0
	106	95	5	3	0
	151	113	5	3	0
	161	113	4	4	0
	337	38	9	0	0
SAINT BONAVENTURE	218	175	5	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	253	148	7	2	0
	211	110	6	3	0
	130	59	7	1	1
	174	84	6	3	0
	154	43	6	1	0

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY	151	102	7	2	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	301	77	9	0	0
	255	182	6	3	0
	191	128	5	4	0
	111	120	5	4	0
	53	147	2	6	0
OHIO UNIVERSITY	167	141	5	4	1
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	165	161	6	4	0
	114	120	4	4	1
	98	179	3	6	0
	80	116	3	5	1
	206	97	6	3	0
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	336	189	7	3	1
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	386	120	9	1	0
	321	171	7	2	0
	276	192	5	5	0
	233	234	5	4	1
	218	136	4	4	2
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	79	327	1	7	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	88	157	1	5	1
	146	181	3	6	0
	96	190	3	6	0
	65	194	4	4	1
	101	163	5	3	0

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY	155	161	5	4	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	141	155	5	3	1
	219	55	7	1	1
	162	175	5	4	0
	319	27	9	0	0
	192	48	6	2	0
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	168	176	6	4	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	173	132	4	4	1
	156	225	5	4	0
	95	182	2	6	1
	91	128	3	6	0
	61	114	2	4	2
LOYOLA CALIF UNIVERSITY	194	215	4	5	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	298	137	8	1	0
	230	226	6	4	0
	159	199	3	6	1
	184	214	4	6	0
	73	149	5	4	0
COLLEGE OF PACIFIC	261	191	6	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	348	131	7	3	1
	575	66	11	0	0
	321	98	7	1	1
	371	111	10	1	0
	159	163	4	6	0



TEXAS A & M COLLEGE	213	179	5	3	2
SPLIT T OFFENSE	304	186	6	4	0
	92	267	1	8	1
	123	247	0	9	1
	169	185	4	5	1
	125	107	4	6	0
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	180	147	5	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	199	138	5	5	0
	207	215	4	5	0
	89	244	1	8	0
	77	167	2	7	0
	146	158	4	5	0
ABILENE-CHRISTIAN UNIV	242	205	6	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	231	50	10	0	0
	119	181	3	6	0
	200	128	5	3	1
	142	90	6	3	0
	228	53	8	1	1
COLORADO A & M COLLEGE	160	158	5	4	1
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	215	141	6	3	0
	206	86	9	1	0
	224	117	8	2	0
	159	182	5	4	1
	50	183	2	7	0

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE	192	85	5	2	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	175	117	6	2	1
	78	364	0	8	0
	99	152	4	4	0
	99	248	4	5	0
	218	101	6	3	0
COLORADO COLLEGE	171	189	4	5	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	216	123	9	1	0
	155	115	6	3	0
	93	266	2	7	1
	130	146	4	4	1
	131	106	4	4	1
COLORADO UNIVERSITY	289	229	7	3	0
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	227	172	5	4	1
	129	184	3	7	0
	168	164	3	6	0
	90	162	4	5	0
	91	147	5	4	1
GUSTAVUS-ADOLPHUS	230	68	8	0	1
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	277	60	9	1	0
	252	74	8	1	0
	200	52	7	1	1
	148	33	7	1	1
	187	52	7	0	1

NORTH TEXAS COLLEGE	434	132	8	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	266	174	7	2	1
	366	192	8	4	0
	249	133	6	4	0
	225	86	9	3	0
	127	102	7	3	1
WEST TEXAS COLLEGE	152	241	2	7	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	372	177	9	1	0
	249	170	5	4	0
	192	153	6	5	0
	254	125	7	4	0
	121	132	5	5	0
TEXAS A & I COLLEGE	87	165	4	4	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	147	105	6	3	0
	246	130	8	2	0
	216	132	5	5	0
	161	83	5	4	1
	52	201	2	7	0
TEXAS WESTERN COLLEGE	131	249	3	7	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	279	232	7	3	0
	259	93	7	2	1
	349	161	8	1	1
	159	79	5	3	1
	136	150	3	6	0

OBERLIN COLLEGE	140	173	4	5	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	229	77	7	1	0
	179	225	2	6	0
	119	162	3	5	0
	92	135	3	4	1
	136	46	4	2	1
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	174	130	4	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	233	91	9	1	0
	218	88	6	3	0
	134	123	5	3	1
	126	110	4	3	1
	108	130	3	6	0
SANTA BARBARA COLLEGE	184	197	5	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	197	95	7	3	0
	111	202	2	7	0
	176	244	5	5	0
	199	210	4	4	1
	66	137	2	6	0
TRINITY COLLEGE	240	92	7	2	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	256	57	7	1	0
	333	38	8	0	0
	242	52	5	2	0
	189	46	6	1	0
	108	74	4	2	0

WESTERN KENTUCKY COLLEGE	198	161	4	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	199	176	6	2	2
	102	120	5	4	0
	152	130	5	4	0
	82	149	3	4	2
	84	213	2	6	0
ZAVIER UNIVERSITY	305	46	9	0	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	247	141	8	1	0
	224	89	9	1	0
	179	182	4	6	0
	111	110	4	4	1
	84	256	3	7	0
APPALACHAIN STATE COLLEGE	128	87	6	3	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	237	80	9	0	1
	239	88	8	3	0
	251	107	8	1	1
	225	103	6	3	1
	202	92	6	3	0
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY	339	126	9	0	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	206	90	6	3	0
	215	96	6	2	0
	76	209	1	8	0
	57	193	2	7	0
	95	154	3	6	0

COE COLLEGE	108	76	3	5	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	135	89	6	2	0
	86	219	1	6	1
	26	112	1	5	2
	88	199	1	6	0
	30	119	3	5	0
DETROIT UNIVERSITY	135	263	4	7	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	226	143	6	3	1
	179	165	5	4	0
	209	112	6	3	0
	276	154	6	4	0
	214	134	6	4	0
EMORY-HENRY COLLEGE	287	111	9	0	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	376	97	9	1	0
	285	114	10	0	0
	76	172	1	8	0
	84	152	4	5	1
	95	143	3	7	0
SOUTH DAKOTA STATE	311	105	8	1	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	381	116	9	0	1
	185	175	7	3	0
	293	130	7	3	0
	123	211	4	5	0
	38	107	2	4	0

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	328	62	9	0	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	329	48	9	0	0
	212	95	7	2	1
	94	123	4	5	0
	115	103	2	5	1
	50	156	1	7	0
WILLIAMS COLLEGE	201	59	7	1	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	196	139	7	1	0
	196	80	5	2	1
	97	140	3	5	0
	19	146	0	7	0
	40	90	2	5	0
BUFFALO UNIVERSITY	141	189	4	4	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	191	126	5	3	0
	183	95	6	3	0
	235	99	6	1	1
	260	80	8	1	0
	224	91	7	2	0
CARNEGIE TECH UNIVERSITY	219	119	6	2	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	171	141	7	1	0
	202	161	4	3	1
	60	145	1	7	0
	57	132	1	5	0
	000	181	0	6	0

GENEVA COLLEGE	52	205	2	5	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	154	49	8	1	0
	130	51	7	2	1
	68	115	2	6	0
	162	46	7	2	0
	142	35	7	1	0
ILLINOIS NORMAL	127	165	3	5	1
WINGED T OFFENSE	148	86	7	0	2
	179	54	6	2	1
	220	75	7	2	0
	99	70	3	4	2
	106	53	6	3	0
NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY	121	259	1	8	1
OPEN T OFFENSE	267	217	6	2	1
	124	172	4	5	0
	137	273	2	8	0
	73	211	1	8	0
	126	161	3	6	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY	173	80	4	3	1
CONVENTIONAL T OFFENSE	236	53	8	0	0
	153	153	4	4	0
	155	103	5	3	0
	255	59	8	1	0
	161	45	6	1	1



HARDIN-SIMMONS UNIVERSITY	272	217	6	6	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	278	180	5	5	0
	318	189	6	4	1
	346	212	7	2	2
	317	73	9	2	0
	322	48	11	0	0
SAINT AMBROSE COLLEGE	313	117	10	1	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	338	177	12	1	0
	301	107	8	0	0
	151	192	7	3	0
	170	115	5	2	1
	101	77	5	3	0
DENVER UNIVERSITY	283	133	6	4	0
SPLIT T OFFENSE	266	260	3	8	1
	192	214	4	6	0
	166	174	4	5	1
	153	137	5	4	1
	179	182	5	5	1
UTAH UNIVERSITY	236	247	7	4	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	240	254	3	4	3
	141	166	2	7	1
	221	96	8	1	1
	207	79	8	1	1
	257	114	8	3	0

SOUTH DAKOTA UNIVERSITY	218	107	7	1	0
COMPOSITE T OFFENSE	201	180	4	5	0
	166	195	2	5	2
	293	130	7	3	0
	164	152	7	2	0
	38	107	2	4	0
EAST TEXAS STATE COLLEGE	332	212	9	2	0
OPEN T OFFENSE	146	166	4	5	2
	117	160	5	3	1
	87	171	3	6	1
	144	129	4	3	3
	157	107	5	2	2
EMPORIA STATE COLLEGE	259	72	8	0	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	185	119	6	2	1
	252	158	6	4	0
	245	95	7	2	0
	186	79	7	1	1
	171	163	4	5	0
ST LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY	295	112	8	0	0
WINGED T OFFENSE	223	71	8	0	0
	252	84	6	2	0
	62	59	3	3	2
	74	133	3	5	0
	100	51	5	2	0