

All conditions in each test were kept as nearly constant as possible. The same team was used each time; the games were played at the same time of day; the habits of the individuals were kept as nearly constant as possible before each test; temperature and humidity were noted each time; only one game was played a day and the tests were run in pairs, first one in the pavilion and then one in the gym, and then the order of play was reversed to correct for any discrepancies in this respect.

It will be noted that while the recovery time varies for different individuals, the shorter recovery time is always in favor of the games played on the pavilion court. The only logical conclusion that can be drawn from the above data (even though there are only a few cases, the trend is certainly conclusive) is that the floor with the greater elasticity (the pavilion floor) causes less fatigue for the same activity than the one with practically no elasticity. The players noticed the difference in the effect upon their legs and feet. Their legs and feet ached after the games in the gym, while they felt no ill effects whatever after games played in the pavilion.

Because of these data the reason for the difference was studied. The only variable found was the difference in the construction of the floor of the two courts. The pavilion floor is a uniquely constructed spring floor, while the gym floor is laid on a concrete foundation and has no appreciable resiliency. These results are of particular value to coaches of teams, because certainly it is an advantage to have conditions for play which are most beneficial to the players, and which are the least fatiguing. It would seem reasonable that for both practice and for games a player could produce better results at a higher intensity and for a longer period on the more resilient floor.

As a result of these data one new basketball floor has been constructed in accordance with the specifications for the Stanford Pavilion floor. In the interest of better facilities, blue prints of the design of the Stanford Pavilion floor may be secured for the cost of printing and mailing the same, by contacting the writer.

TESTS SOME OF THE PROPOSALS

Editor's Note: The following report has been taken from a letter written by Ray Hanson, Director of Athletics and Coach of Basketball at Western Illinois State Teachers College. Mr. Hanson has been a live member of this Association from the start. He was appointed on the Coaching Ethics Committee for 1935, but through an embarrassing oversight his name was omitted from the published lists of officers.

"We experiments with Phog Allen's suggestions (detailed in the first two bulletins) in a game played between the Quincy, Ill., High School Alumni team, last year's champions of Illinois, and our freshman team. After the game we asked the crowd to vote on the proposed rules changes, and the spectators were almost unanimously against the 12 foot goals. The majority opposed the scoring of three points for a field goal, and almost none liked the idea of shooting free throws in the end of the court where the offense occurred. Votes showed, also, that the use of three circles for held balls was not satisfactory. The one suggestion which was liked was the placing of the back-stop four or six feet from the end line.

"We tried to eliminate the center jump, and that experiment proved to be popular with the spectators, but the vote was not one-sided by any means. We experimented with another change, - that of allowing an incoming substitute to communicate immediately with his teammates. The players on both sides thought it a fine move. When Knox College plays here late this season, Dean Trevor, coach at Knox, has agreed to waive the present substitution rule and experiment with this change. At that time we will ask for a vote of the players, officials and spectators to find what they think of it".