HISTORY OF TENNIS PARTICIPATION

AT SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

AND THE PROBLEMS OF DUAL MEET AND TOURNAMENT PLAY

OF THE LONE STAR CONFERENCE

Approved:

E. O. Wiley

J. M. Roady

W. Strahan

Approved:

L. E. Derrick
Dean, Graduate Studies
Acting

HISTORY OF TENNIS PARTICIPATION

AT SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

AND THE PROBLEMS OF DUAL MEET AND TOURNAMENT PLAY

OF THE LONE STAR CONFERENCE

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of

Southwest Texas State Teachers College

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Frank Gensberg, B. S.
(San Marcos, Texas)

San Marcos, Texas

August, 1949

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. E. O. Wiley, Professor of Education; Dr. John M. Roady, Professor of Science; and Mr. O. W. Strahan, Director of Physical Education, all of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, for numerous valuable suggestions and guidance on the preparation of this paper. The writer wishes to express special appreciation to Miss Alta Mae Benke for her valuable assistance and extraordinary typing services.

August, 1949   Frank Gensberg

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

HISTORY OF TENNIS PARTICIPATION

AT SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

AND THE PROBLEMS OF DUAL MEET AND TOURNAMENT PLAY

OF THE LONE STAR CONFERENCE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this paper to present the
history of participation in tennis at Southwest Texas
State Teachers College and to make a study of the prob-
lems of dual meet and tournament play in the Lone Star
Conference. An attempt is made to draw certain conclus-
ions regarding these problems of dual meet and tourna-
ment play in the light of the history of tennis at this
institution.

B. Reasons for Selecting the Problem

A number of problems have arisen in the determina-
tion of the winner of tennis in the Lone Star Conference.
Up until now, the championship has been determined by an
elimination tournament in which each school enters four
singles constestants and two doubles teams. Since the
players are more than likely participating in both the

1

singles and doubles, an elimination tournament, at best, has been found to be either an endurance contest or an expensive time-consuming method of determining a champion. One of the main problems facing a coach has been to have each of his team members in tip-top shape at the time of the conference tournament. Due to the fact that there is always a possibility of unforeseen interference, a contestant may not be at his best at the time of a tournament. This problem was selected with the hope that a better method of determining a Lone Star Conference Tennis Champion may be obtained.

C. Source of Material

The Physical Education Department of Southwest Texas State Teachers College has a record of Bobcat intercollegiate athletic participation. These recorded data are called The Bobcat Historical Records. The results of contests presented in this study are obtained from the above source.

D. Limitations

The historical study has been limited to the period beginning with 1932 and continuing through the 1949 tennis

season. This is the period during which the Southwest
Texas State Teachers College has been a member of the
Lone Star Conference. The historical data includes all
matches as well as conference play. Henceforth, the
Southwest Texas State Teachers College Teams are refer-
red to as Bobcats. The problems of dual meet and tour-
nament play are confined to the Lone Star Conference.

E. Plan of Procedure

In Chapter II, historical data is presented in
three sections. The first section gives the results
of all Bobcat dual meets, the second deals with Lone
Star Conference tournaments, and the third is a summary
of both the dual meets and the tournaments. From these
data, an analysis was made of the points of strength
and weakness that have occurred in determining the
places awarded in dual meet and tournament play. In
Chapter III, prevailing methods of determining a cham-
pion and team winner are presented. The problems and
objections of these methods were analyzed, and a plan
by which they can be overcome is proposed. From these
procedures, certain conclusions and recommendations
were made to determine the final standing of team or
school participation.

CHAPTER II

3TORY OF BOBCAT PARTICIPATION IN TENNIS FROM

1932 THROUGH 1949

A. Introduction

It is the purpose of this chapter to present the
records of participation of the Bobcats in tennis from
1932 through 1949. Although complete records of each
game, match, and participant are available, only year-
ly summaries of the matches are presented.

B. Bobcat Dual Meets

Tables I through XVI presented below show the
results of Bobcat dual tennis meets.

Table I

Summation of the 1932 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	0	7	0	1
Southwestern University	10	2	2	0
Howard Payne College	6	0	1	0
Sam Houston State College	3	4	0	1
S. F. A. State College	1	5	0	1
Season Totals	20	18	3	3

Table II

Summation of the 1933 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	0	17	0	2
Southwestern University	6	13	1	1
St. Edwards University	12	1	2	0
East Texas State College	4	3	1	0
Sam Houston State College	5	2	1	0
S. F. A. State College	6	0	1	0
Season Totals	33	36	6	3

Table III

Summation of the 1934 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	3	18	0	2
Southwestern University	14	1	2	0
East Texas State College	8	2	1	0
Sam Houston State College	6	1	1	0
S. F. A. State College	5	2	1	0
A. & I. College	8	2	1	0
Schreiner Institute	6	0	1	0
Season Totals	50	26	7	2

Table IV

Summation of the 1935 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	1	17	0	2
Southwestern University	10	2	2	0
East Texas State College	9	3	1	0
Sam Houston State College	6	0	1	0
S. F. A. State College	4	2	1	0
Trinity University	9	5	2	0
Season Totals	39	29	7	2

Table V

Summation of the 1936 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	1	16	0	2
Trinity University	5	1	1	0
Howard Payne College	6	1	1	0
Southwestern University	6	0	1	0
Schreiner Institute	8	8	1	1
Sam Houston State College	6	1	1	0
S. F. A. State College	7	0	1	0
Season Totals	39	27	6	3

Table VI

Summation of the 1937 Bobcat Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	9	23	1	3
A. & M. College	8	1	1	0
Texas Tech. College	4	3	1	0
Howard Payne College	6	0	1	0
S. F. A. State College	6	0	1	0
Sam Houston State College	6	0	1	0
A. & I. College	5	1	1	0
Southwestern University	7	2	2	0
Season Totals	51	30	9	3

Table VII

Summation of the 1938 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	1	6	0	1
Sam Houston State College	6	1	1	0
S. F. A. State College	7	0	1	0
A. & I. College	11	1	2	0
Howard Payne College	6	0	1	0
Southwestern University	9	3	2	0
Season Totals	40	11	7	1

Table VIII

Summation of the 1939 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	0	7	0	1
North Texas State College	2	12	0	2
East Texas State College	4	3	1	0
S. F. A. State College	6	0	1	0
Southwestern University	8	4	1	1
Sam Houston State College	6	1	1	0
San Marcos Baptist Academy	11	1	2	0
Schreiner Institute	4	3	1	0
Season Totals	41	31	7	4

Table IX

Summation of the 1940 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	2	5	0	1
North Texas State College	1	13	0	2
East Texas State College	0	7	0	1
Sam Houston State College	3	4	0	1
S. F. A. State College	6	0	1	0
A. & I. College	9	4	2	0
Season Totals	21	33	3	5

Table X

Summation of the 1941 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	1	14	0	2
St. Edwards University	10	1	2	0
North Texas State College	2	9	0	2
S. F. A. State College	6	0	1	0
East Texas State College	1	5	0	1
Sam Houston State College	3	4	0	1
Schreiner Institute	6	0	1	0
Season Totals	29	33	4	6

Table XI

Summation of the 1942 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	0	6	0	1
North Texas State College	0	6	0	1
Sam Houston State College	0	6	0	1
S. F. A. State College	1	4	0	1
East Texas State College	1	5	0	1
Season Totals	2	27	0	5

Table XII

Summation of the 1946 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Trinity University	10	4	2	0
Season Totals	10	4	2	0

Table XIII

Summation of the 1947 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches		Meets	
	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
Texas University	0	8	0	1
Southwestern University	8	5	1	0
University of Houston	0	7	0	1
Trinity University	7	7	1	1
East Texas State College	0	7	0	1
Season Totals	15	34	2	4

Table XIV

Summation of the 1948 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	0	7	0	1
Southwestern University	8	5	1	0
University of Houston	1	6	0	1
Trinity University	8	6	1	1
North Texas State College	7	0	1	0
East Texas State College	4	3	1	0
Season Totals	28	27	4	3

Table XV

Summation of the 1949 Bobcat Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches Won	Lost	Meets Won	Lost
Texas University	0	17	0	2
A. & M. College	0	7	0	1
Southwestern University	10	4	2	0
Trinity University	9	4	2	0
Season Totals	19	32	4	3

Table XVI

Summary of all Dual Meets

Bobcats VS	Matches			Dual Meets			
	Won	Lost	% Win	Won	Lost	Tied	% Win
Texas Uni.	18	168	.097	1	22	0	.044
Texas A. & M.	8	8	.500	1	1	0	.500
Texas Tech.	4	3	.571	1	0	0	1000
St. Edwards	22	2	.917	4	0	0	1000
Southwestern	96	41	.701	17	2	2	.856
Howard Payne	24	1	.980	4	0	0	1000
A. & I.	33	8	.805	6	0	0	1000
Schreiner	24	11	.685	4	1	0	.800
S. M. B. A.	11	1	.917	2	0	0	1000
North Texas	12	40	.231	1	7	0	.125
East Texas	31	38	.449	5	4	0	.555
Sam Houston	50	24	.676	7	4	0	.636
S. F. A.	55	13	.809	9	2	0	.818
Trinity Uni.	48	27	.640	9	2	0	.818
Uni. Houston	1	13	.071	0	2	0	.000
Totals	437	398	.523	71	47	2	.600

Table XVI shows that the Bobcats took part in 120 dual meets over a period of fifteen seasons. This gives an average of eight dual meets per year. If each singles player played a three set match, he competed in twenty-four sets per season, regardless of rank. In a corresponding manner, it is estimated that each doubles player participated in twenty-four sets per season in dual meets.

C. Lone Star Conference Tennis Tournaments

The Lone Star Conference holds a tennis tournament to decide a singles, doubles, and team champion. The number of contestants entered by each school has been stated earlier in this paper. Three points to singles and six points to doubles are awarded for matches won in the last three rounds of the tournament. This point system is employed to determine a Lone Star Conference Tennis Championship.

Tables XVII, XVIII and XIX presented below show
the results of Lone Star Conference tennis tournaments.

Table XVII

Lone Star Conference Tennis Singles Winners

Year	Winner	School
1932	William Thrash	S. F. A. State College
1933	John White	Trinity University
1934	William Notley	Southwest Texas State College
1935	William Notley	Southwest Texas State College
*	Allen New	Southwest Texas State College
1936	Steve Latham	Southwest Texas State College
1937	Steve Latham	Southwest Texas State College
1938	Randolph Scott	North Texas State College
1939	Fred Barns	North Texas State College
1940	Randolph Scott	North Texas State College
1941	Jimmy Kroesen	East Texas State College
1942	Roger Smith	North Texas State College
1946	Ross Collins	North Texas State College
1947	Glenn Hewitt	University of Houston
1948	Glenn Hewitt	University of Houston
1949	Jason Morton	University of Houston

* In 1935, Allen New and William Notley, both of
Southwest Texas State College, were declared co-cham-
pions. This final match was never officially played.

Table XVIII

Lone Star Conference Tennis Doubles Winners

Year	Winners	School
1932	Poole and Blankenship	N.T.S.C.
1933	Curtis Traweek and Robert Prim	E.T.S.C.
1934	Phillips and Dittrich	N.T.S.C.
1935	William Notley and Allen New	S.W.T.S.C.
1936	Fred Barns and Dittrich	N.T.S.C.
1937	Steve Latham and Johnny Clawson	S.W.T.S.C.
1938	Wayne Park and John Malaise	N.T.S.C.
1939	Fred Barns and Randolph Scott	N.T.S.C.
1940	Dan Carr and Randolph Scott	N.T.S.C.
1941	Jimmy Kroesen and Glenn Hewitt	E.T.S.C.
1942	Ross Collins and William Matlock	N.T.S.C.
1946	Ross Collins and Frank Barns	N.T.S.C.
1947	Glenn Hewitt and Donald Napier	U. of H.
1948	Glenn Hewitt and Jason Morton	U. of H.
1949	Jason Morton and Jack Lanham	U. of H.

Table XIX

Lone Star Conference School Tennis Tournament Winners

Year	School Winner	Points Scored
1932	North Texas State College	30
1933	East Texas State College	21
1934	Southwest Texas State College	24
1935	Southwest Texas State College	45
1936	Southwest Texas State College	30
1937	Southwest Texas State College	39
1938	North Texas State College	48
1939	North Texas State College	39
1940	North Texas State College	30
1941	East Texas State College	42
1942	North Texas State College	42
1946	North Texas State College	36
1947	University of Houston	33
1948	University of Houston	51
1949	University of Houston	48

Table XX presented below shows the frequency with which conference members won in Lone Star Conference Tennis Tournament play.

Table XX

Frequency of School Tennis Tournament Winners

Conference Members	Singles	Doubles	Tournaments
Southwest Texas State College	4	2	4
North Texas State College	5	8	6
University of Houston	3	3	3
East Texas State College	1	2	2
S. F. A. State College	1	0	0
Trinity University	1	0	0
Sam Houston State College	0	0	0
West Texas State College	0	0	0
Hardin College	0	0	0

Table XXI

Lone Star Conference School Tournament

Winners and Points Scored By Each

Year	SWT	NT	ET	SH	SFA	TU	UH	WT	HC	Winner
1932	6	30	21	3	12	12	X	X	X	NTSC
1933	0	15	21	12	0	15	X	X	X	ETSC
1934	24	18	9	6	0	6	X	X	X	SWTSC
1935	45	6	6	6	0	X	X	X	X	SWTSC
1936	30	21	0	6	6	X	X	0	X	SWTSC
1937	39	6	12	6	0	X	X	X	X	SWTSC
1938	9	48	6	0	0	X	X	X	X	NTSC
1939	18	39	0	6	0	X	X	X	X	NTSC
1940	9	30	18	6	0	X	X	X	X	NTSC
1941	9	12	42	0	0	X	X	X	X	ETSC
1942	0	42	15	0	6	X	X	X	X	NTSC
1946	6	36	18	0	0	X	3	X	X	NTSC
1947	0	15	15	0	0	0	33	X	X	U of H
1948	0	6	6	0	0	0	51	X	X	U of H
1949	3	X	12	0	0	0	48	X	0	U of H
	198	324	201	51	24	33	135	0	0	

X Non-participation

Tables XVII through XXI show the results of Lone Star
Conference Tennis Tournaments over the fifteen-year period
of this study. During the majority of this time there
were six members participating. In a six-team elimination
tournament, the winner of singles played five matches. All
matches except the finals were determined by the best two
out of three sets; the finals were decided by the best
three out of five sets. Thus, the winner was forced to
play as many as eleven and possibly seventeen sets. In
most cases the winner in singles was also on a finals
doubles team. In doubles he played nine to fourteen sets.
Thus, each finalist competed in twenty to thirty-one sets
in two days' time. The maximum number in which a loser
playing in both singles and doubles could participate
was six sets.

Tables XXII and XXIII gives a detailed comparison of
maximum and minimum participation that may be obtained in
both dual meet and tournament play. These tables were
worked out on the basis of one elimination tournament
equals one season of dual meets. Furthermore, four sin-
gles players and two doubles teams from six conference
schools entered in a tournament are equal to four singles
players and two doubles teams entered in eight dual meets.
The average number of schools entered in a Lone Star Con-
ference tournament, within the limits of this study,

were six. Likewise, the average number of dual meets participated in by a Bobcat tennis team in one season was eight.

Table XXII

Summation of the Maximum and Minimum Participation by Winner and Loser in Match and Tournament Play

Sets Played	Tournament Play				Dual Meet Play			
By	Singles		Doubles		Singles		Doubles	
	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min
Winner	17	11	14	9	24	16	24	16
Loser	3	2	3	2	24	16	24	16
Differences	14	9	11	7	00	00	00	00

In dual meet play there was no difference in the amount of participation by a contestant, whether he won or lost. On the other hand, the maximum number of sets difference between winning and losing in singles was fourteen and the minimum nine. In doubles the maximum was eleven and the minimum seven. The maximum total difference between winning and losing in both singles and doubles was twenty-five sets. The minimum total difference between winning and losing in both singles and doubles was sixteen sets.

Table XXIII

Summation of the Maximum and Minimum Participation in
Singles and Doubles Between Match and Tournament Play

	Singles		Doubles		Singles & Doubles	
	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min
Dual Meet Play	24	16	24	16	48	32
Tournament Play	17	11	14	9	31	20
Differences	7	5	10	7	17	12

There was a maximum of seventeen and a minimum of
twelve sets more participation per season in match play
than in tournament play.

D. Summary

This chapter has presented a history of Bobcat par-
ticipation in tennis in the Lone Star Conference. In
tournament play the following summations were made:

1. The winner in singles played as many as eleven
and possibly seventeen sets of tennis.

2. The winners in doubles played nine to fourteen
sets of tennis.

3. In the past ten tournaments, the winner of sin-
gles was also a member of a doubles team that reached
the finals.

4. In the last ten, and in eleven of the past fifteen tournaments, a singles winner played in as many as twenty and possibly thirty-one sets.

5. The maximum amount of participation for a loser playing in both singles and doubles was six sets.

In a like manner, the following summations were made of match or dual meet play:

1. A winner or loser in singles and the winners or losers in doubles played in as many as four and possibly six sets of tennis per dual meet.

2. Records show eight dual meets per season to be the average amount of participation for a Bobcat tennis team.

3. Therefore, a winner or loser in singles or doubles played in as many as thirty-two and possibly forty-eight sets of tennis per season.

The summation of maximum and minimum participation in doubles and singles between match and tournament play showed these results:

1. Match play in singles showed that there was a maximum of seven and a minimum of five sets more participation per season than in tournament play.

2. Match play in doubles showed that there was a

maximum of ten and a minimum of seven sets more competition per season than in tournament play.

3. There was a maximum of seventeen and a minimum of twelve sets more participation per season in match play than in tournament play.

The following chapter will propose a method for determining a Lone Star Conference school tennis championship by means of dual meets.

CHAPTER III

A PROPOSED METHOD FOR DETERMINING A
CHAMPION IN TENNIS

A. Introduction

This chapter presents some of the prevailing methods
for selecting a champion in tennis. A weighted score
method of determining a champion by means of dual meets
in the Lone Star Conference will be proposed.

B. Prevailing Methods

The most used method of determining a champion in
tennis is the elimination tournament. An elimination
tournament is one in which three or more participants
are entered in any series of contests or games of skill;
where the losers disappear or cease to participate in the
tournament; and, where the winners play each other until
a champion is determined.[1] No difficulty is experienced
in running off this type so long as the number of entries
is a power of two, for example, 8-16-32-64, etc. When the
number of entries is not a power of two, it is necessary

---

[1] E. T. Roe, Webster's New Standard Dictionary, Wilcox
and Follett Company, Chicago, 1945, pp. 169 and 614.

to have a number of "byes" in order to have the tournament work out correctly. The number of "byes" is determined by subtracting the number of entries from the next higher power of two. The players not receiving "byes" play the first round and from then on the tournament conducts itself as though the number of entries were a power of two. When the placing of entries is left entirely to chance, the better players frequently play each other in the early rounds and interest drops when players are unevenly matched for the rest of the tournament. To offset this situation a method of seeding the better players has been devised. This consists in placing the better players in opposite halves of the bracket or at the top and bottom of each half so they cannot play each other in the early rounds, and placing the others according to chance. The amount of time required to run off an elimination tournament as well as the amount of participation of the winner depends entirely upon the number of players entered. In order to determine a team winner, as well as a champion, points may be given for each position attained in the elimination bracket. A similar method has been used in the Lone Star Conference.

The method of determining a champion and school winner in the Lone Star Conference is as follows:

In tennis an annual championship tournament shall
be held at the institution of the member selected
by the Conference. The tournament shall be on the
first Friday and Saturday in May, unless otherwise
deemed advisable.

The manager of the meet shall be the Athletic Di-
rector at the institution where the meet is held.
He is charged with the responsibility of conducting
the meet in a manner that is creditable to any Con-
ference in the United States. Entry blanks shall
be mailed by the manager to the coaches at least
two weeks prior to the meet. The entry blanks
shall state when they are to be returned to the
manager, and a team may be debarred from partici-
pation if said entries are not returned when desig-
nated.

The team or school championship in tennis shall
be won on points as follows: Each school may
enter two teams in doubles and four players in
singles. Preliminary matches shall be played so
that the teams remaining are a power of two. Scor-
ing shall start with the quarter finals. Each
match won by a doubles team shall count six, and
each match by a singles player shall count three.
The school whose players win the most points will
win the tennis championship.[2]

In addition to the above procedure, each school ranks its

singles players and doubles teams. This listing is sub-

mitted to the manager in charge of the tournament. The

bracket used in this tournament is so arranged that players

are seeded; in singles, no two members of the same team

will meet each other earlier than the semi-finals; and in

doubles, no two teams of the same school will meet each

---

[2]"By-Laws," Official Handbook of the Lone Star
Athletic Conference, (December, 1945), Art. XII, Sec.
4, Par. A and C, and Art. IX, Sec. 6, Par. B.

other before the finals. A separate draw is made for each, the singles and the doubles. After the drawings have been made, the brackets are filled out from the original listings submitted. For example, John Doe College submitted the following list: No. I singles, Cannon Ball; No. II singles, Foot Fault; No. III singles, Thirty Forty; No. IV singles, Service Ace; No. I doubles, Fore Hand and Back Hand; and No. II doubles, Love All and Have Fun. In singles, John Doe College drew position "A" on the bracket; and in doubles, they drew position "B". On the singles bracket "A1" determines Cannon Ball's position; "A2" determines Foot Fault's position; etc. This same procedure is followed in filling out the doubles bracket.

The International Lawn Tennis Championship is determined by match play. This type of play is employed in dual meets. When two players compete against each other to determine which is the better, they are engaged in match play. Two or more matches between two schools are the makings of a dual meet.

The Davis Cup, a tennis trophy, was placed in competition by the United States National Lawn Tennis Association in 1900.[3] Davis Cup Play is an international affair.

---

[3]S. Wallis Merrihew, "Quest of the Davis Cup," Lawn Tennis Manual, United States Lawn Tennis Association, New York, 1939, p. 60.

The world is divided into zones and each zone winner plays to determine a challenger for the Davis Cup holder. In Davis Cup play, each team enters a number one and number two singles player and a doubles team. Five matches are played, four singles and one doubles, with each match having a value of one point. The order of Davis Cup play is two singles, one doubles, and two singles in reverse of the first day's play.

The leading women players of England and the United States play every season alternately in the two countries for the Wrightman Cup.[4] Seven matches are played in each series, five in singles and two in doubles. Like the Davis Cup play, each match has a value of one point. The country whose players win the most points wins the right to keep the Wrightman Cup for one year.

The National Intercollegiate Tennis Tournament is held annually to determine a champion and team winner. Although this is classed as a tournament, the method of determining a team winner is on the basis of points won by each school player.

Every Conference in the United States has some method of determining a tennis school winner. The mem-

---

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 62

bership of the Conference has some bearing on which system will be employed to select a winner. Other variations of methods used over the Nation and pertaining to match play are: six singles and three doubles with equal value for each match; four singles and two doubles with double value for the doubles; two singles and one doubles with equal value for each match; and three singles and one doubles. In case of a tie, the doubles match carries enough weight to win the meet. Of all these variations mentioned, the most widely used is the five singles and two doubles type. On a point per match basis, this system eliminates the possibility of a tie. It also affords maximum number for comfort in travel. The Bobcats have used this method in the majority of their dual meets.

There are a number of problems and objections to an elimination tournament. These may be listed as follows:

1. The valuation of points used in doubles and singles is unjust. It is possible for the two doubles teams to score thirty points; whereas, the four singles players can score only twenty-one points. This gives the four players participating in doubles a nine point advantage over the four players in singles.

2. It is unjust to base an annual championship upon one two-day tournament.

3. The elimination tournament represents too much participation for the winner and too little for the loser.

4. Due to management, facilities, schedule and officials, it is difficult to administer a tournament.

5. In case of inclement weather, most tennis budgets may not permit a long tournament.

6. The luck of the draw may affect the outcome of second, third and fourth place winners in the Lone Star Conference.

In dual meets these problems are not so apparent. Therefore, it seems logical that some form of a dual meet would be a better method to use for the determining a winner in tennis. However, there are three possible objections to the dual meet method which must be overcome. These are as follows:

1. On a point per match basis, a win by a low-ranking player is equal to a win by a high-ranking player.

2. Coaches, in order to win matches and meets, are inclined to misrepresent the true rankings of their players.

3. If a large number of teams are participating, it is not always convenient to have one or more dual meets with each team.

If the winner of a number one position were given more points than a winner of a lower position, objections one and two would be overcome. Since the Lone Star Conference membership has ranged from four to eight, the objection of too large a number of teams participating is not applicable. It is logical that the winning team in tennis should be determined by a weighted point system in dual meets. From the above deductions, it is recommended that the championship team in the Lone Star Conference be determined by a weighted point system in dual meets. Such a plan is presented under "Proposed Plan" which follows:

PROPOSED PLAN

The team or school championship in tennis shall be won on a percentage calculation of dual meets won. A conference school champion in both singles and doubles shall be declared by the largest number of winnings in the number one position. Every tie meet shall be scored as a half win and half loss.

A dual meet, four singles and two doubles, shall be the pattern of play, and the winner shall be determined on points as follows: No. 1 doubles, ten points; No. 2 doubles, five points; No. 1 singles, eight points; No. 2

singles, four points; No. 3 singles, two points; and No. 4 singles, one point.

In case of inclement weather, an abbreviated dual meet shall be played indoors, unless a better procedure is deemed advisable. In this abbreviated meet, the No. 1 doubles and the No. 1 singles shall be played. Should each team win one of these matches, the No. 2 doubles shall then be played to decide the winner of the meet.

With six or fewer members in the Conference, a double Round-Robin Tournament of dual meets shall be played on a home and home basis. With seven or more members, a single Round-Robin Tournament shall be played on a two year home and home basis.

A schedule pattern for a double Round-Robin Tournament will be presented in Table XXIV. It is recommended as the procedure to follow in the Lone Star Conference for 1949-50 and as a pattern to follow in succeeding years as long as the membership remains at six or fewer. This table will be presented on following page

Table XXIV

Proposed 1949-50 Tennis Schedule

Team	East Texas	Sam Houston	S. F. A.	S. W. T.
East Texas		April 18th. AT Commerce	May 1st. AT Commerce	March 27th. AT Commerce
Sam Houston	April 6th. AT Huntsville		April 24th. AT Huntsville	April 10th. AT Huntsville
Stephen F. Austin	April 5th. AT Nacogdoches	April 17th. AT Nacogdoches		April 11th. AT Nacogdoches
Southwest Texas	May 8th. AT San Marcos	May 1st. AT San Marcos	April 25th. AT San Marcos	

To show that this plan is sound, a detailed study has been made of the 120 dual meets participated in by the Bobcats. If the proposed point system had been employed, nine of these meets would have had different results. In Table XXV, which follows below, these nine cases have been shown.

Table XXV

True and Proposed Results of Nine Bobcat Dual Meets

Year	Bobcats VS	True Results Bobcats	Opponents	Proposed Results Bobcats	Opponents
1933	Southwestern	5	4	12	18
1937	Texas	4	3	12	18
1939	Schreiner	4	3	8	22
1939	Southwestern	2	4	18	12
1946	Trinity	4	3	10	20
1947	Trinity	3	4	18	12
1947	Southwestern	3	3	13	17
1948	Southwestern	3	3	20	10
1948	East Texas	4	3	15	15
Totals		32	30	126	144

The following analysis of the above Table XXV has been made:

1. In two cases in which the Bobcats lost, this

method of scoring would have resulted in wins.

2. In five cases where the Bobcats won, this system would have resulted in four losses and a tie.

3. In the two cases resulting in ties, one would have been lost and the other won by the Bobcats.

4. Although it is mathematically easy to obtain a tie meet using this point system, only one of the 120 meets would have ended in a tie.

5. In seven of the nine cases, the reverse of these results was caused by the winning or losing of both No. 1 matches.

C. Summary

This chapter presented prevailing methods of determining a winning team in tennis. The problems and objections to both tournament and match play have been discussed. A method has been proposed to overcome these problems.

There are two distinct methods of determining a champion or team winner; the elimination tournament and match or dual meet play. The National Intercollegiate Tennis Championship and the Lone Star Conference Tennis Championship are both determined by a weighted point elimination tournament. Davis Cup Play and Wrightman Cup Play are both determined by match play.

The objections to tournaments as a means for declaring a team winner are:

1. The valuation of points used by the Lone Star Conference in doubles and singles is unjust.

2. Due to management, facilities schedule and officials, it is difficult to administer a tournament.

3. It is unjust to base an annual championship upon a two-day tournament.

4. The difference between the amount of participation by the winner and that of the loser is too wide.

5. The luck of the draw may affect the results of a tournament.

6. Tennis budgets have been limited and would not permit a long tournament.

The three objections to the dual meet method have been found to be as follows:

1. Equal value has been awarded for all matches regardless of rank.

2. The true ranking of players has been misrepresented by coaches.

3. More than eight teams may interfere with balancing a schedule.

The proposed plan provides for the following:

1. The schedule of dual meets will be determined by the number of members in the conference.

2. The championship will be decided by the percentage winnings in dual meets.

3. The individual champions in either singles or doubles may be declared by using the winnings in the No. 1 positions as a basis.

4. A pattern of play will be four singles and two doubles.

5. The scoring of each meet will be one point for a win and one-half point for a tie.

6. In case of rain, the meet will be played indoors. The No. 1 singles and the No. 1 doubles will be played; and if necessary, the No. 2 doubles will be played to determine the winner of the meet.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

The preceding pages have presented a history of the
Bobcat tennis participation, both in dual meets and elim-
ination tournaments. It has been shown that the elimina-
tion tournament represents a strenuous amount of partic-
ipation for the winner, very little competition for the
average player, and numerous difficult problems of admin-
istration. It was pointed out that dual meets represent
more participation for each player, a situation which is
easier to administer, and more relaxed conditions for the
player. False ranking was pointed out as one outstanding
fault of the dual meet. In order to obtain the advan-
tages of dual meet play and to compensate for actual
weakness, a weighted point system was proposed. Certain
proofs were presented that this method had many advan-
tages over the prevailing method of determining a cham-
pion.

B. Conclusions and Recommendations

From a detailed study of the history of tennis par-
ticipation in dual meet and tournament play at this

institution, the following conclusions are made:

1. The win and less record of Bobcat tennis partic-
ipation from 1932 through 1949, in both dual meet and
tournament play, has been above average.

2. There was more participation per individual
player in the 120 dual meets than in the fifteen elimin-
ation tournaments.

3. The assumption that both dual meet and tourna-
ment play are necessary, to determine a champion and a
team winner, is false.

4. The winner of singles is also a member of a
doubles team that reached the finals.

5. The Lone Star Conference Tennis Championship
has been determined by the winning of doubles play.

6. Two good tennis players have been able to win
a conference championship.

7. Bobcat tennis teams have won sixty percent of
their dual meets against all opponents.

Conclusions derived from this careful study of
methods and problems are as follows:

1. Although it is generally accepted as a standard
method of determining a champion, the merits of tourna-
ment play, as a mode for declaring a team winner, is
debatable.

2. The method of determining a winner by match or dual meet play increases participation and eliminates the luck of the tournament draw.

3. Untrue ranking of players by coaches and equal point value given for all matches makes the method of dual meet play questionable, as a means of selecting a team winner.

4. A weighted point scheme with emphasis properly placed on equal participation and equal value for singles as well as for doubles will regulate misranking. This method will impress both coaches and players that it is just as important to win in singles as it is to win in doubles.

5. The point system employed by the Lone Star Conference to determine a team winner is unfair.

6. Inclement weather is insufficient reason for the postponement of a dual meet.

7. Although mathematically unsound, there will be few tie meets if the proposed weighted point system for determining a dual meet winner is employed.

In the light of the preceding study, this writer wishes to make the following recommendation:

It is recommended that a weighted point dual meet Round-Robin type of tournament, such as presented in

this study, be substituted for the elimination tourna-
ment now used by the Lone Star Conference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dean, Everett S., "Tournament Time Coming Up!," The Athletic Journal, XXIII (February, 1943).

Driver, Helen Irene, Tennis for Teachers, W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, 1936.

Halliburton, Jack, "Individual-Doubles Tournament Plan," Scholastic Coach, XVII (September, 1947).

Hillman, Harry, "Physical Condition in Tennis," The Athletic Journal, XVII (June, 1937).

"How to Run a Tournament," Article in Lawn Tennis Manual, United States Lawn Tennis Association, New York, 1939.

Jacobs, William Plumer, Tennis Builder of Citizenship, Jacobs Press Company, New York, 1943.

Jay, Harold, "Why Not Devise New Methods and New Games," The Athletic Journal, XXII (May, 1942).

Lambert, Eugene, "What About Tennis?," The Athletic Journal, XXI (June, 1941).

Lone Star Athletic Conference, Official Handbook, Lone Star Conference, (December, 1945).

Masin, Herman L., "Tennis Training Program," Scholastic Coach, (April, 1948).

Merrihew, S. Wallis, "Quest of the Davis Cup," Lawn Tennis Manual, United States Lawn Tennis Association, New York, 1939.

National Collegiate Athletic Association, Preceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Convention, National Collegiate Athletic Association, XXVI (December, 1941).

Paret, Jahial L., Methods and Players of Modern Tennis, American Lawn Tennis, Inc., New York, 1931.

Paret, Jahial P., Lawn Tennis Library, American Lawn Tennis, Inc., 1931.

Randle, Dorothy Davies, and Hillas, Marjorie, Tennis Organized for Group Instruction, A. S. Barnes Company, New York, 1932.

Spaldings Tennis Annual, American Sports Publishing Company, New York.

Strahan, Oscar W., and Others, Bobcat Historical Records, (Unpublished Record Files, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, 1949).

Tilden, William Tatem, Match Play and Spin on the Ball, American Lawn Tennis Association, New York, 1925.

Tilden, William Tatem, Singles and Doubles, George H. Doran Company, New York, 1923.

Williams, Jesse Feiring, and Hughes, William Leonard, Athletics in Education, W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, 1930.