

In each game that was played, one of two combinations of end lines was used. The game was played either with 2 feet behind the backboard (the regular distance) at one end and 4 feet at the other, or 2 feet at one end and 6 feet at the other. No games were played with 4 feet at one end and 6 feet at the other. Fourteen regular games with two varsity teams were played. Eight of these were with the 2 feet and 4 feet end lines; and six were with the 2 feet and 6 feet end lines. Eleven additional scrimmages were held with different combinations of players and the scrimmages were for different lengths of time as shown in the tables. Five of these scrimmages were with the 2 feet and 6 feet end lines and six were with the 2 feet and 4 feet end lines.

Because of the double markings at the end of the court and because of the conditioned reflexes with respect to the distance under the present rule, between the backboard and the end line the players experienced some difficulty in adjusting themselves to and taking advantage of the greater freedom offered as a result of the extension behind the backboards. The data is arranged in the order in which the games were played, so it may be seen that as the players became accustomed to the added space they used it to advantage.

It will be noted from the tabulated data that the number of "unavoidable" out of bounds balls were comparable regardless of whether the end lines were 2, 4 or 6 feet behind the backboards. This is as it should be if the judgment of the recorder is correct.

With respect to a comparison of out of bounds due and probably due to the end lines between the 2 and 4 feet end lines, it will be seen that there were four times more out of bounds balls at the 2 feet end than there were at the four feet end line. This same relationship holds true between the 2 and 6 feet end lines. The same relationship, although not as pronounced, holds true for out of bounds balls that are probably due to the end lines. The difference is so marked both from the study of the recorded data and from the observation of play that one is forced to the obvious conclusion that there is a decided advantage to continuity of play in favor of the extended end lines. From the recorded data there seems to be no apparent advantage between the 4 and 6 feet end lines. However, from the standpoint of the use of the added area and from the standpoint of the observations made concerning freedom of movement and elimination of roughness, everything points to the 6 feet end lines.

It will be noticed first of all that there was practically twice as much play beyond the regular end lines in the case of the 6 feet end lines as there was in the case of the 4 feet end lines; 156 cases as against 87. It was observed, however, that there was considerably more freedom under the basket at the 6 feet end lines than there was at the 4 feet end line. The 4 feet end line did not permit the player taking the ball off the backboard to take a step with freedom or to circle out around his opponent behind the backboard with the ease that was permitted at the 6 feet end line. As a result of this difference practically all of the blocking, pushing out of bounds, charging and general roughness was eliminated at the 6 feet end line.

The writer is heartily in favor of changing the rules so that the face of the backboards sets into the court 6 feet from the end lines. However, before such a change is made a thorough study through a questionnaire survey is recommended in order to determine the feasibility and cost of making such a change in the various gymnasias of the country. This should be done because it is felt that no change in the rules should be made which would be impossible of general execution. With the changes in the recommended size of courts it would probably be a wise plan to move the backboards into the court an additional 4 feet rather than to extend the length of the court.

\*\*\*\*\*