A Study of the Effects of the Return of World War II Veterans on Collegiate Football in the Southern Conference.

Louis Creekmur

College of William and Mary

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

Part of the Military and Veterans Studies Commons

Recommended Citation


https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/m2-meym-9683

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.
A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF THE RETURN OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS
ON COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL IN THE SOUTHERN CONFERENCE

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
Louis Creekmur
June 1952
TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER                         PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION                  1
   Statement of the problem       1
   Scope and limitations of the problem 2
   Significance of the study      3
   Sources of data               3
   Procedure                    4
   Organization of the thesis    6

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE     7
    Introduction                 7
    Conditions leading to increased enrollment 7
    Accepted coaching policies before World War II 17
    Summary                      19

III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATE 21
    Introduction                 21
    Coaching procedures           21
    Training regulations          25
    Practice schedules            28
    Actual game conditions        31
    Scheduling of football games between colleges 34
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Veteran Enrollment in the Southern Conference during 1946-1947</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Coaching Procedures Applied in Daily Practice Sessions</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Attitudes of Coaches towards Veterans' Infractions of Selected Training Rules</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Organization of Daily Practices</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Coaching Practices Used during Actual Game</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purposes of the study are to determine the effects of the return of World War II veterans on collegiate football in the Southern Conference during the immediate post-war years (1946-1949) in regard to (1) coaching procedures, (2) training regulations, (3) practice schedules, (4) actual game conditions, and (5) scheduling of football games between colleges.

Specifically, coaching procedures refer to the techniques used by the coaches in carrying out their basic principles underlying the science of coaching football. It includes the actual drills and actions used to attain perfection of a certain fundamental. The training regulations deal with the attitudes the coaches developed toward the treatment of the veterans in regard to the infraction of selected training rules. The practice schedules refer to the actions the players were subjected to by the coaches in daily practice sessions. It deals with the means used by the coaches to adjust to the presence of veterans, who, on the whole, were older than the non-veterans. The actual game conditions refer to the use of personnel in the football games against opponents. It deals with any change the coaches may have been forced to make due to the veteran's presence on the
squad. The scheduling of the football games between colleges deals with the actual scheduling of opponents by the coaches, and whether or not the veterans affected this factor.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE PROBLEM

The study deals with the sixteen schools within the jurisdiction of the Southern Conference at the time of the research (1946-1949).

The study endeavors to identify the major problems some coaches of collegiate football squads encountered with the return of the veterans from World War II, and what effects these problems brought about in their coaching and training techniques. The aspects to be dealt with are the coaching procedures, and in what respects they were changed, if any; the training rules and regulations, and how they had to be adjusted to the veterans' return; the practice schedules, and the means used by coaches to meet individual differences; the actual game conditions, and ways in which coaches had to adjust to the veterans' presence; and the scheduling of football games between colleges, and what effect the veterans' enrollment caused in this practice, if any.

The factors associated with any change in the above mentioned phases are discussed. These include the maturity of the veterans, the experience in athletics of the returnees, the benefits of the
G. I. Bill, the marital status of these men, and the acquisition of adult habits over their period of war service.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study is significant because it is concerned with the effects of the return of World War II veterans on collegiate football in the Southern Conference, and it should be of value to the members of the football coaching profession. After the termination of World War II many athletes returned to the schools they had left to enter the service, or many entered colleges to take advantage of their G. I. Bill benefits. With their return and matriculation, the coaching staff as well as the other members of the faculty were subjected to their influences. The revelation of these influences should be of profound value to the members of the coaching profession in the event a similar situation were to present itself. With the present Korean conflict, it may arise again in the near future.

SOURCES OF DATA

The sources of data upon which this study was based were a questionnaire (see Appendix A), sent to the coaches in the Southern Conference, personal interviews (see Appendix B), periodical litera-
ture, and discussions with former players in the Southern Conference. The personal interviews were with coaches in the Southern Conference at the time of the investigation, as well as with men well versed in the problems of the conference. The principal periodicals used were the *Journal of Higher Education*, *Journal of Educational Research*, *Research Quarterly* and *School and Society*.

**PROCEDURE**

Before the study was undertaken, the subject was thoroughly discussed with members of the coaching staff at the College of William and Mary, with professors of graduate school in Education and Physical Education at the College of William and Mary, and with veterans attending Southern Conference schools. Through these discussions, ideas were formulated and a questionnaire prepared.

The questionnaire was sent to the head football coaches of the schools that were official members of the Southern Conference as revealed in the *Southern Conference Constitution and Bylaws*. These men were asked to answer certain questions relating to their coaching philosophy, training regulations, practice schedules, actual game conditions, and the scheduling of football games between

---

1 *Southern Conference Constitution and Bylaws*, 1948.
colleges during the immediate postwar period.

The questionnaires were sent out on April 17, 1950 and by May 5, 1950 fourteen of the sixteen were returned. On May 10, 1950 follow-up letters were sent to the two schools failing to return the questionnaires, but no reply was received.

On February 13, 1952 once again questionnaires were sent to the two coaches failing to answer, and on February 16, 1952 one was returned. Fifteen of the sixteen possible responses were returned which gave a percentage of returns of ninety-three and eight tenths, considered to be adequate upon which to base conclusions.

During the period of August 1950 through January 1952 by personal associations with former Southern Conference players now in professional football, the problem was presented and discussed.

In May 1952, many of the coaches who were in the Southern Conference at the time of the investigation were interviewed and asked a standard set of questions developed from the written questionnaires.

The questionnaire returns and responses to the interviews were then studied in regard to the effects of the returning veterans on collegiate football. These effects were then compiled
and analyzed. This analysis along with the data collected from personal discussions with former Southern Conference players form the basis upon which conclusions for this study were made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

In Chapter II a background is provided for the study in a review of the literature concerning the sharp influx of veterans into higher education during the postwar period. Also in this chapter there is a report of coaching policies and techniques before World War II. In Chapter III, the data collected from the questionnaires and interviews are presented and analyzed. Chapter IV is devoted to the findings and conclusions derived from the research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The material in this chapter is intended to orient the reader with the origin of the problem of returning veterans facing the institutions of higher learning with the termination of World War II. Also, the coaching techniques before World War II that were accepted by some of the prominent coaches in the country are presented. With this information as a background, it is hoped that the reader will consider the text of this study to be of added importance in the sphere of athletics.

CONDITIONS LEADING TO INCREASED ENROLLMENTS

Many significant changes have occurred in the realm of American higher education since 1940. One factor of great importance was the tremendous increase of the student body, caused by the sharp influx of World War II veterans who were aided by subsidies under the so-called G. I. Bill of Rights.²

This so-called G. I. Bill of Rights was passed by the 78th Congress in its second session on June 22, 1944 and is technically known as Public Law 546, The Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The law was passed to provide federal assistance to World War II veterans in their readjustment to civilian life. In addition, it formed the Veteran's Administration as an essential agency, second only to the Army and Navy Departments.

The part of the law that is of significance to this study is found under Title II, Chapter IV, Education of Veterans, Part VIII. This section reads as follows:

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or re-training course, and who either shall have served ninety days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: Provided that such course shall be initiated not later than two years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is later."

---


4 Ibid., VIII
The law further provided that the administrator would pay the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees not to exceed $500. Also a subsistence allowance of $50 a month would be paid to veterans without dependents and $75 a month if they had a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave, not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year.

A previous law had been passed by the 78th Congress during its first session on March 24, 1943. This law, Public Law 165, amended a previous law passed by the 73rd Congress, and provided for rehabilitation of disabled veterans. This law was in the main the same as Public Law 346, only it provided additional subsistence as well as a six year period after the termination of the war in which to complete the course of study.

The passing of these two laws and the termination of World War II opened the gates of higher education to the veterans of the United States. On April 30, 1947, this veteran population stood at more than 14,000,000.6


By that date, 5,543,933, (39 per cent of the veteran population), had applied for education under Public Law 346 and Public Law 16. Of the 2,244,785 veterans who were training under Public Law 346 in April, 1947, 1,125,999 were in institutions of higher learning, and by December, 1947, this number had risen to 1,157,966. In addition, there were 87,336 veterans in schools of higher learning attending under Public Law 16 at the end of 1947.

This sharp influx of students put a terrific strain upon the colleges and universities of the country. In order to meet the needs of this tremendous student body, American colleges and universities had to double their teaching staffs, as well as their facilities. Today, one can still see many temporary buildings on almost every campus in the country. Even with federal assistance many institutions, especially those under private control, encountered difficulties in meeting the needs of their increased budgets. Thus it was apparent that the veterans were a challenge to the institutions of higher learning.

The peak of enrollment in 1939-40 was 1,490,000 throughout the country. During World War II, this had dropped to 890,000. However, in 1947-48, two years after the termination of the war, college enrollment reached the unprecedented figure of 2,338,226

---

7 Zook, op. cit., p.v.
with an estimate of 3,000,000, to be reached by 1950.

This tremendous increase was felt in the Southern Conference schools as well as all other institutions of higher learning in the country. In 1946-1947, of the total male enrollment of the Sixteen Southern Conference schools, sixty-nine per cent were veterans. Table I shows the veteran enrollment in the Southern Conference schools.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>VETERANS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson College</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson College</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>4797</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>4902</td>
<td>4840</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citadel</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Washington University</td>
<td>14911</td>
<td>10617</td>
<td>4294</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>11020</td>
<td>8340</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>4637</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>6802</td>
<td>5702</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>4167</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>2644</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>4672</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest College</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington and Lee University</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>66081</td>
<td>54520</td>
<td>12561</td>
<td>37809</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this table one can see that only one school, Virginia Military Institute, had under fifty per cent of its male enrollment during 1946-1947 composed of veterans. Three schools, North Carolina State College, University of North Carolina, and the University of South Carolina, had eighty per cent of their total male enrollment composed of veterans. At three other schools, the University of Richmond, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Washington and Lee University, seventy-five percent of the male enrollment was made up of veterans.

With this colossal influx of veterans throughout the country, the federal government had paid more than three hundred million dollars to institutions for their increased costs of teaching personnel and supplies by the end of 1948. During the two academic years 1946 through 1948, the federal government, through the Veteran's Administration, paid fifty-two per cent of the total student fees paid to institutions of higher learning.9

In addition to the amounts already spent, the 78th and 80th sessions of Congress approved legislation providing two billion dollars to colleges and institutions to assist them in providing housing facilities for the veteran enrollment.

The veterans did not let the federal government down, for they proved that this money was put to a good use. These new members of the student bodies averaged slightly over twenty-six years

---

of age with approximately thirty-eight per cent married and fifty per cent with dependents. Apparently these were men with purpose in life, men who knew that time was meant to be used constructively, and thus they set themselves to the task of acquiring their degrees.

There was much speculation as to the probable achievement of the veterans, but after a short period, this doubt was pushed completely out of the picture. Many studies helped to quell this doubt by showing that the veteran was consistently superior to the student non-veteran in his academic endeavors. Epler in his study made at the Vanport Extension Center, Portland, Oregon, disclosed that veterans were more serious about their work and received higher grades than non-veterans. By comparison, he pointed out, "That the veterans actually were slightly below the non-veterans for the first quarter of the work, but the improvement of the veterans in the following quarters was much more than that of the non-veterans." Also in this study, Epler revealed that when a veteran was married, and in many cases with children, there was a tendency for him to do better work than the non-married veteran.

10Monroe, op. cit., p. 1502.
12Ibid.
A similar study done by Sykes at the College of William and Mary agreed with the above findings. Sykes found that the veteran at the college, who was about a college generation older than the typical student attending colleges and universities prior to the war, was doing good enough work to remain in college. In addition, he found that "married veterans made significantly better grades than unmarried veterans". Also those veterans who were students at the College of William and Mary prior to entering the service did better work at the college on their return.

Garmezy and Jean M. Crose, in their study, showed that the veterans at the University of Iowa were slightly higher in their academic achievement than non-veterans. They believed that the maturity of the veterans with their greater motivation to finish college because of their age, as well as their increased time for study due to the financial aid provided by the G. I. Bill, might have been the reasoning factors for their academic superiority.

There have been many other studies to substantiate the findings reported in the paragraphs above. Investigation by Clark,

---


Gowan\textsuperscript{16}, and Taylor\textsuperscript{17} all established that there is a tendency for the veteran to be superior to the non-veteran in regard to academic achievement on the college level.

All these investigations have shown that the returning veteran was apparently mature enough to know what he wanted to acquire out of his academic life. Therefore, it would seem that the veterans in sports were also mature enough to know what they wanted out of their athletic lives.

All men subjected to any military service were also subjected to some form of athletic activity during that period. Special periods were allotted daily for physical training, as well as certain compensations granted for membership on organized teams. Many of these activities left deep impressions upon their participants\textsuperscript{18}, and with the termination of World War II veterans with the benefits of the G. I. Bill, swooped down upon the institutions desiring to carry on the muscular activities they had experienced in the service.


\textsuperscript{17}Edgar A. Taylor, "How Well are Veterans Doing?", School and Society, 66: 210, March 22, 1947.

Accepted Coaching Policies Before World War II

Before the conflict of World War II, the football coaches of the country had a rather uniform age group from which to develop their teams. The majority of the players were in their late teens, and dependent upon their football scholarships to complete their educations. Married players were almost unheard of, as it was difficult enough for them to pay individual expenses without taking on the added responsibility and expense of a wife.

The coaching techniques that were used by the coaches with these young men seemed to be based mostly upon repetition. In order to make certain fundamentals automatic, the men of the coaching profession apparently believed that the surest way to bring this situation about was through performing these fundamentals almost daily. All the players were expected to participate in the drill, with the fewer exceptions made the better.

It seemed the coaches believed that the best way to perform fundamentals for both the backs and linemen was through regular scrimmages. The backs received practice hitting the line, while the linemen received certain variations of two on one, a drill used in football in which two offensive players try to move one defensive man backward or to one side, or one on one, a drill used in football in which one offensive player tries to move one

---

defensive man backward or to one side. Any mistake, it was believed, could then be corrected on blocking machines.

In regard to training, the coaches believed that smoking during the football season should not be tolerated by either the coach or trainer\(^{20}\). The season was too short to be lax on the supervision of this phase of training and was strictly enforced. Also there was a uniform belief that no alcoholic beverages should be taken by the players. Lieb\(^{21}\) in his book stated, "the days of training on whiskey and beer are past". In addition, some coaches restricted the drinking of certain soft drinks.

The diet of the players were supervised at the training table. There was to be no eating between meals, with breakfast, lunch, and dinner served at the same time each day. If the players were accustomed to having coffee for breakfast, they were allowed to have one cup. The players were allowed to drink milk, but in the case of a short-winded player, its consumption was limited.

All the athletes were to get at least eight to nine hours of sleep. Their retiring hour was to be no later than ten or ten thirty o'clock. The players were treated alike in the enforcement


\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 26.
of this rule, as well as the other training rules with none shown favoritism.\textsuperscript{22}

In the practices, apparently the coaches believed that the men should be toughened up through contact and scrimmage. Bernie Bierman\textsuperscript{23} in his practice schedules, started scrimmaging on Wednesday of the first week of practice. After the season started, he limited his scrimmages to Tuesday and Wednesday, with some on Thursday if there were any outstanding weaknesses. The length of the regular season afternoon practices usually lasted two hours, from four to six o'clock.

The games apparently were left to be run by the quarterback and captain after the start of the game. The captain was usually a sixty minute man, and had to be familiar with both offensive and defensive situations and be able to adjust to any circumstances.\textsuperscript{24}

**SUMMARY**

In this chapter it was revealed that the return of the World War II veterans did affect the institutions of higher learning throughout the country. With their return, the faculties of the colleges, including the coaches, had to deal with (1) men who were older (an


\textsuperscript{24}Da Grosa, *op. cit.*, p. 280.
average age of twenty-six years, (2) men who were more mature
and serious about the acquisition of a degree, and (3) men who
did not necessarily need the assistance afforded by an athletic
scholarship in order to complete their educations.

Before World War II coaches were associated with a rather
uniform age group, but after World War II they were associated
with a heterogeneous group such as they had never encountered
in the prewar years. In prewar years, the players were usually
between the ages of 17-20, and they were largely dependent upon
athletic scholarships for continuance in college. Coaches could
treat these players alike, and could subject them to as much
physical contact as their coaching procedures required without
the fear of the players' rebellion.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze the data obtained from the questionnaires and the interviews concerning the effects the returning World War II veterans had upon collegiate football in the Southern Conference. The data are presented under the headings of coaching procedures, training regulations, practice schedules, actual game conditions and the scheduling of football games between colleges.

COACHING PROCEDURES

The data received from the questionnaire returns (see Table II), showed that the factor most affected in this area was the amount of physical contact required in daily practice sessions. It was significant that over fifty per cent of the coaches reported that they had less heavy contact than in previous years. Some coaches, it was noted, believed that heavy contact destroyed some of the player's enthusiasm. Other procedures that were changed to any extent were the dummy scrimmage and drills on offensive timing. Apparently, the sharp increase in the amount of dummy scrimmages and drills on offensive timing was due to the decrease in heavy contact. In order
to take up the time allotted to actual contact and game condition scrambles in previous years, dummy scrimmages and drills on offensive timing were inserted. It would seem that the slight increase in signal drills was due to the fact that the players were receiving the running and reviewing of plays through dummy scrimmages, therefore, the signal drills were unnecessary. Also probably the reason for the slight increase in defensive drills was that the coaches were of the opinion that the players needed running and conditioning more than learning their defensive assignments. In the defensive drills, there is quite a bit of inactivity in the line, and the coaches apparently were trying to remedy this situation.

TABLE II

COACHING PROCEDURES APPLIED IN DAILY PRACTICE SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Changing Procedures</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Not Changing Procedures</th>
<th>Percentage of Coaches Changing Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less heavy contact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More dummy scrimmages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More signal drills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress offensive timing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress defensive drills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal interviews further validated the questionnaire data that the coaches limited the time allotted to heavy contact in daily practices. From interviews with coaches as well as from inter-
views with other men familiar with conditions in the Southern Conference, it was revealed that the majority had to decrease their time allotment for heavy contact. Such drills as two on one were held down to a minimum.

Coach Bass, former line and head coach at the College of William and Mary, and Coach Tipton, backfield coach at the same institution, were of the opinion that the returning athletes had to be handled with "kid gloves". According to them, if there were too much contact and boredom, the athletes might simply drop out of the sport, which they could afford to do with their G. I. Bill subsistence. In previous years the only means of completing their education offered to the players was through playing football, but now with the government paying the majority of their expenses, football was of a secondary interest to the acquisition of a college degree.

The coach of the University of South Carolina, Rex Enright, was interviewed and he revealed that contrary to his questionnaire response that he had limited heavy contact considerably. By tabulating his interview response, the percentage of coaches reporting that they limited the amount of heavy contact was raised to sixty per cent. He believed that the veterans were more experienced and mature, and that the contact was unnecessary in order for them to learn fundamentals. In cases where the veterans had played service
football, he opined, as many others in the conference did, that with the experience acquired through playing service football, these players needed very little actual coaching.  

In lieu of the lack of heavy contact, coaches were of the opinion that the most difficult coaching problem they had to contend with was conditioning. The veterans had a tendency towards being overweight and short-winded, therefore, more time was spent on getting and keeping these athletes in shape. Coach Feathers stated that conditioning was the only major problem he had with the veterans. It was necessary, he reported, to work his older players harder than their younger teammates, though not through drills requiring physical contact.

Most of the conference coaches interviewed apparently believed that the veterans could be treated on a "man-to-man" basis. In fact, Coach Tatum of the University of Maryland said that he could treat his veterans on a par with his assistant coaches. Although the veterans couldn't be driven or "pushed around" as in the past, they were attentive enough so that some basic action or fundamental could be explained one time which was sufficient for their understanding. With the veteran's understanding so well, coaching was made simpler for the members of the University of Maryland coaching staff in that the veterans showed the younger

---

26 Interview with Rex Enright, March 7, 1952.

27 Interview with Beattie Feathers, March 7, 1952.
players how to perform certain fundamentals. The younger players tried much harder after seeing their fellow player demonstrate the action.

A noteworthy finding that was brought out through the interviews was the influence the wives of the married veterans had upon the playing incentives of their husbands. Coach McCray, formerly of the College of William and Mary, stated that he thought his players improved both physically and mentally after marriage. Wives, he stated, motivated the husbands to drive themselves until they were playing on the first team.

**TRAINING REGULATIONS**

From the questionnaire returns (see Table III), it was learned, that the action taken mostly to counteract any training problem was to have special discussions and rules for married men. Of the fifteen responses, forty per cent of the coaches reported having these special regulations for their married veterans in football. In addition, over thirty per cent reported that they allowed smoking in private, and made no attempt to break the habit these older men had contracted during their years in the service. In conjunction with allowing smoking in private, an additional twenty per cent reported that they overlooked the actions of the veterans, including smoking. Only one school reported that the retiring hour was extended.

---

28 Interview with James Tatum, March 7, 1952.

29 Interview with Ruben N. McCray, March 11, 1952.
TABLE III

ATTITUDES OF COACHES TOWARDS VETERANS' INFRACTIONS OF
SELECTED TRAINING RULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Number of Coaches</th>
<th>Number of Coaches</th>
<th>Percentage of Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking actions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing smoking in private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended retiring hour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special discussions and rules for married men</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the fifteen returns, only two coaches reported that the married men caused one of the most difficult problems that they had to cope with. It seemed that the married men were mature enough and serious enough about their conditioning so as not to cause a training problem.

Of all the persons interviewed in regard to this study, no one believed the married veteran was a problem. They believed that with marriage the players became more settled in all respects, training included. Coach Feathers\textsuperscript{30}, Coach Enright\textsuperscript{31}, and Coach Merrick\textsuperscript{32} all were of the opinion that veterans weren't any trouble in regard

\textsuperscript{30}Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{31}Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{32}Interview with Edward Merrick, March 6, 1952.
to the infraction of training rules in comparison with their younger non-veteran teammates. Though the veteran may have smoked, and so forth, it was done in private and out of the eyes of the general public. There was no fool-hardy carousing as before the war and before the veterans' marriages.

Interestingly, Coach Tatum and Coach Colby of the University of Maryland reported that the married veterans they knew set such an excellent example at their school, that the majority of the unmarried non-veteran athletes attempted to marry before leaving school33.

Frank Dobson, retired, a man well-versed in the problems of the Southern Conference, was of the opinion that the disciplining to which the veterans had been subjected during their service tenure was a definite cause of their better behavior on returning to college, as well as their maturity. Respect and loyalty, two words upon which the service is built, were brought into the lives of these athletes. Now that the athletes had learned that orders given in the service were for their own good, they realized that when their coaches issued orders, no matter whether it be in regard to training or playing, these orders were intended to help them. With their maturity the rebellious element was eliminated in the veterans34.

33Interview with James Tatum and W. W. Colby, March 7, 1952.
34Interview with Frank Dobson, March 7, 1952.
35Loc. cit.
Coach McCray reported that he used the "man-to-man" approach in his training regulations for the veterans. He simply explained to the men what he expected of them as athletes, and made no intensive effort to enforce his desires.\footnote{Loc. cit.}

**PRACTICE SCHEDULES**

The phase least affected from the questionnaire returns (see Table IV) in regard to coaches adjusting to the returning veterans was the practice schedules. The highest percentage of change was a mere 13.3 per cent which was shown in allowing the older men to go in earlier. The other effects, such as the separation of the older men in scrimmages and the use of the older men as tutors, did not show a percentage effect high enough to be significant. If there were any change due to the return of the veterans in regard to the practice schedules, it was not reported on the questionnaires.
TABLE IV

ORGANIZATION OF DAILY PRACTICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Changing</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Not Changing</th>
<th>Percentage of Coaches Changing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation of older men in scrimmages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of older men as tutors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing older men to go in earlier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the personal interviews, the coaches reported more adjustment in their daily practices than was shown by the questionnaire responses. It seemed as if the majority of the persons interviewed used the veterans* in some way as tutors or demonstrators.

Enright stated that in his practices he tried to pair off his younger players with veterans in drills. In this way, he believed the veteran learned more about fundamentals, and so forth, while the younger player learned more by having, in a sense, his own personal coach.\(^{36}\) He believed, as did Tatum\(^{37}\), that with the veterans' certain

*Veterans - football players attending college under the provisions of the G. I. Bill, who were on the whole older than the non-veterans with an average age of twenty-six years.

\(^{36}\) Loc. cit.

\(^{37}\) Loc. cit.
drills could be explained one time, and they, in turn, could then teach the drill or fundamental to their younger teammates.

Coach McCray, Coach Bass, and Coach Tipton all agreed that it was effective to use veterans as tutors or demonstrators of certain actions. The younger players seemed to learn much easier when they could see the fundamental performed by a teammate. In addition, these three coaches stated that in their practices they sent the veterans in earlier and kept the younger players out to practice certain fundamentals that the veterans had already mastered. Coach Tatum reported that rather than just send the veterans in earlier, he cut the practices shorter for all the players.

Erickson, of the University of North Carolina, was of the opinion that at his university the practices did not waiver one bit from previous years. Everyone was treated equally, and was required to perform the same drills and practice the same fundamentals, whether a veteran or not. The same situation was reported at Wake Forest

38 Loc. cit.
39 Loc. cit.
40 Loc. cit.
41 Loc. cit.
42 Interview with Charles Erickson, March 7, 1952.
College by Walker. He believed in treating all his players the same as he had in all the years previous to the entrance of the veterans.

ACTUAL GAME CONDITIONS

From the obtained data (see Table V), the game conditions affected most was the use made of defensive and offensive units. In actual game conditions this aspect showed that the coaches in the conference changed 46.6 per cent from their prewar practices. Only one coach reported that he used sixty minute players more in postwar years than he had in prewar years. Therefore, it would seem that the coaches were starting to change from the previous policy of having mostly sixty minute players to that of having two different units, defensive and offensive. Of the fifteen coaches responding, 26.6 per cent stated that they placed more dependence upon older quarterbacks. The coaches seemed to have more confidence in the playing ability of the mature veteran quarterback. The other phase of game conditions, namely, less substitution of younger players for older players, was not affected significantly by the return of the veterans. With the use of defensive and offensive units, it was necessary for the coaches to use all available personnel, therefore, there was a definite place for the younger players as first string men on one of the units.

43 Interview with D. C. Walker, March 6, 1952.
TABLE V

COACHING PRACTICES USED DURING ACTUAL GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Changing Practices</th>
<th>Number of Coaches Not Changing Practices</th>
<th>Percentage of Coaches Changing Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less substitution of younger for older players</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placing more dependence on older quarterbacks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of defensive and offensive units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sixty minute players</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaches did not respond completely to the sixty minute issue raised on the questionnaire. However, the majority of the coaches interviewed stated that they used the veterans as sixty minute players as much as possible. In interviewing Coach Enright, he stated that in his games, he would use as many of the veterans as possible for the full sixty minute period. He believed that even though tired, the veterans, with their experience, were still better players than the younger ones with their freshness. In cases where he had two veterans to play one position, he would have one on the offensive unit and one on the defensive unit. One of the major difficulties he had with his veterans during the games was apparently the same as the majority of the coaches had in the conference. Their emotions could not be worked upon as with the younger players. The "die for
dear old "alma mater" technique could not be used as extensively in arousing the boys' emotions for the games. Feathers stated that he, too, believed in leaving the veterans in as much of the sixty minute period as possible. He believed the veteran's presence was too valuable to the team to have him on the sidelines, and if ever taken out of the game, it was only for a short breathing spell.

Coach McCray, Coach Bass and Coach Tipton of the College of William and Mary believed that more veterans than non-veterans were used as sixty minute players on their squads. The veterans were so much better grounded in fundamentals that putting in a younger player hurt the efficiency of the team. Also, they believed there was the same dependence placed upon the quarterbacks as in previous years, for in their system the quarterbacks always ran the team on their own with the coaches' advice. They also encountered the problem of having to use some other means to arouse enthusiasm, rather than working on the emotions of the veterans.

Hawley, of the University of West Virginia, stated that in his college they also had the trouble of "deadened player emotions". He was of the opinion that the veterans hurt the younger players in

\[\text{Loc. cit.}\]

\[\text{Loc. cit.}\]

\[\text{Loc. cit.}\]

\[\text{Loc. cit.}\]
this respect; their failure to be emotionally aroused in games rubbed off on the younger players, and made it more difficult for the coaches to "fire up" these youngsters. The veterans with their experience were effective without drastic stimulation of their emotions before and during the games.\

SCHEDULING OF FOOTBALL GAMES BETWEEN COLLEGES

Through the questionnaires, it was revealed that three conference coaches believed that the veterans' participation in football could allow them to schedule the better big name football colleges. Eleven coaches reported that they did not schedule any schools that they had not scheduled in the past, and the veterans' participation did not warrant their scheduling larger colleges.

Feathers seemed to express the typical feeling of the conference coaches. He believed that veterans raised the quality of football played at his school, as well as the other schools in the conference. Therefore, with the quality of football being raised at all conference schools, the competition was just as strong in competing against the schools he had been scheduling previous to the war, without scheduling schools that stressed football even more.\n
Of the coaches interviewed, only the coaching staff of one school believed they could improve their schedule with the veterans returning to the college. At the College of William and Mary, Bass

---

48 Interview with Roy M. Hawley, March 6, 1952.

49 Loc. Cit.
and Tipton\textsuperscript{50} stated that bigger name schools in football were scheduled with the veterans' return. They believed, as did McGraw\textsuperscript{51} that with the veterans in school they were on a par with any other school in the country, no matter what conference the school might be in.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{50}Loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{51}Loc. cit.
\end{flushright}
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of the study were to determine the effects of the return of World War II veterans on collegiate football in the Southern Conference during the immediate postwar years (1946-1949) in regard to (1) coaching procedures, (2) training regulations, (3) practice schedules, (4) actual game conditions, and (5) scheduling of football games between colleges. Through an analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire returns, as well as the personal interviews with coaches and former players in the Southern Conference, certain findings were revealed in regard to these aspects.

Coaching Procedures. The significant findings in this area of the study are as follows:

1. The amount of heavy physical contact allotted in daily practice sessions was definitely limited.

2. Conditioning of the veterans seemed to be the predominant problem with which the coaches had to contend.

3. The veterans who married seemed to become better football players than the unmarried veterans. With marriage, they seemed to acquire a better mental attitude, and stayed in better condition.

4. The presence of veterans seemed to change the relationship of the coaches and their players from that of teacher and pupil to
that of man-to-man.

Training Regulations. The most noteworthy findings regarding training regulations were:

1. The married veteran offered no problem to the coaches in the matter of infractions of training rules.

2. Rather than try to break the athletes of the smoking habit, the coaches seemed to adjust to the fact that some of the athletes smoked.

3. In the administration of training rules, coaches used the man-to-man approach.

Practice Schedules. The principal findings of this area were:

1. The practice sessions seemed to last the same length of time as in prewar years with the same amount of time being spent in practices.

2. The veterans, if given any special treatment, were used as demonstrators or tutors for the younger players.

Actual Game Conditions. The three major findings in this area were:

1. The coaches seemed to lean toward the development of either offensive or defensive specialists.

2. The veterans were better grounded in fundamentals, and so forth, therefore, they were used as sixty minute players, even though the coaches attempted to develop defensive and offensive units.
3. Coaches encountered the problem of having to find a new means of arousing the veterans' emotions before and during the game.

Scheduling of Football Games between Colleges. The majority of the coaches in the conference believed that it was difficult enough winning over teams scheduled in the past without scheduling any new bigger name football schools.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The return of the World War II veterans resulted in a definite limitation of heavy contact in daily practice sessions held by the coaches of the colleges comprising the Southern Conference.

2. The married veterans seemed to be better football players on the whole than the unmarried veterans.

3. The return of veterans seemed to have little effect upon the practice sessions held by the coaches in the Southern Conference. The sessions still lasted the same length of time as in the past, with both the veterans and non-veterans treated alike.

4. Because the veterans were more mature than the non-veterans, the coaches seemed to be more confident of the veterans' playing ability.

5. The return of the veterans resulted in a definite problem in regard to the arousing of the players' emotions before and during the actual game.
6. The veterans' participation in football did not justify schools in the Southern Conference scheduling bigger name football colleges.
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QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE EFFECTS OF THE RETURN OF WORLD WAR II
VETERANS ON COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL IN THE SOUTHERN

CONFERENCE

Instructions: In the case where the responses pertain to the action taken in the four different fields, please check the correct responses. Where the response is different from those listed, please make a brief notation in the space provided.

I. Coaching Procedures

Did you change your coaching procedures during the immediate postwar years from 1946 through the season of 1949?

Yes __________  No __________

If answer is yes, how was this done?

Less heavy contact __________
More dummy scrimmages, fundamentals, etc. __________
More signal drills __________

Otherwise:

If answer is yes, where was the stress laid?

Offensive timing __________
Defensive drills __________

II. Training Regulations

Considering that many of the men were older and married and had acquired smoking and late hour habits, were regulations relaxed?

Yes __________  No __________

If answer is yes, how was this done?

Overlooking actions __________
Allowing smoking in private __________
Extending retiring hours __________
Special discussions and regulations for married men __________
Allowance of beer drinking after games __________

Otherwise:
III. Practice Schedules

Were practice schedules changed to meet differences in ages and attitudes?

Yes __________  No __________

If so, how was this done?

Separation of older men in scrimmages __________
Use of older men as tutors __________
Allowing older men to go in earlier __________

Otherwise:

IV. Actual Game Conditions

Did the having of these older and more experienced players on the squads cause a change in your game strategy?

Yes __________  No __________

If so, how was this done?

Less substitution by younger players __________
Placing more dependence upon older quarterbacks __________
Use of defensive and offensive units with the more experienced playing defense __________
Having sixty minute players __________

Otherwise:

Due to your having these experienced veterans on your squad, did you prepare your schedules so as to compete against larger and better name football schools in the country?

Yes __________  No __________
Dear Sir:

The purpose of this letter is to ask you to help me in securing information to be used in a graduate study.

I am attempting to make a study of the possible effects of the return of the World War II veteran on collegiate football in the Southern Conference during the immediate postwar years, 1946 through 1949.

Enclosed is a questionnaire that I hope you will complete and return to me in the stamped return envelope. If you wish to have the results of this survey, please indicate your wishes.

Please accept my sincere thanks for your help.

Very truly yours,

Lou Creekmur
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass, Marvin</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>March 3, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby, W. W.</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson, Frank</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enright, Rex</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Charles</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feathers, Beattie</td>
<td>North Carolina State College</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley, Roy M.</td>
<td>University of West Virginia</td>
<td>March 6, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCray, Ruben N.</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>March 11, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick, Edward</td>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
<td>March 6, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatum, James</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>March 7, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton, Eric</td>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>March 3, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, D. C.</td>
<td>Wake Forest College</td>
<td>March 6, 1952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>