Due to the ease with which negative defense points can be accumulated the efficiencies for defense are low. The composite efficiency, like last year's efficiency, is based on the net positive points and negative points that are earned during the entire game. The composite efficiency rating seems to parallel the game score more closely than some of the other items.

A close examination of the statistics of the game with Team D will lead one to wonder just how the Kansas team won the game. The story is told in goals made where the home team made two more than the opposition. The remaining statistics are largely in favor of Team D.

In the middle of the season there was some question about the number of violations. It seemed that the number of violations was too low and it was the opinion that our observers were missing a few violations. Without discussing the matter with the observers, a check was made during the game with Team F and both sets of observers had nine violations on the Kansas team charged against the same boys. We realize the data cannot be more accurate than our observers and this check on the violations indicate that our boys were noticing the game rather closely.

Table IV shows the player analysis for twelve players. A few more players were used in the home contests, but all had less than 20 minutes of playing time to their credit and were not included in the present table. The number (see Table IV) preceding the dash in the various columns represents the individual's rank in relation to the other members of the squad.

The scoring ability index as shown in column 2 is based upon goals and free throws made and is computed as shown in the first study under definition of terms. If two boys each made 25 goals, the one with the highest percentage of made shots will have the highest scoring ability index.

By changing the order of some of the data it is possible to make some player comparison between the two seasons' play on the same basis.

| | 1937-38 Season | | 1938-39 Season | |
Player	Offensive efficiency	Ball handling error	Offensive efficiency	Ball handling error
A	90.5	4.6%	95.7	1.4%
B	96.4	1.7	97.9	.5
F	92.2	2.9	97.2	1.1
I	94.1	2.0	76.4	2.4
L	94.3	2.4	97.6	1.5

This rating shows that all the players, with the exception of Player I who did not finish the season, did make improvement.

The evaluation points per minute (see Table IV) earned during the playing season show how active the individual was, while the composite efficiency shows how well the individual performed his tasks.

The players of visiting teams were rated on the few items which are shown in Table V. The table is limited to players who played at least 15 minutes during the game. The table (V) divides itself naturally into three groups:

1. Above 90% playing efficiency
2. Between 80% and 90% playing efficiency
3. Below 80% playing efficiency.