

actually "called" a better game in the second instance than in the first. After all, in the former instance, the reason why so few fouls were called was because of the type of ball played. The game seemed to be worked well because there was nothing to call. The officials could have just as well hung up their whistles and sat on the bench watching the game for all of the value they had for that particular game. Few fouls were called because there were few to call, and it wasn't the officials fault that the game was played as it was. It was the fault of the two teams, and that <sup>usually</sup> goes back originally to the type of game the coach had taught them. ^

(I'll grant of course that, between two types of officials, the one who holds a rigid check on the players, and the other who is apt to be a little more loose, the first mentioned official is more apt to keep a game from deteriorating into a rough house than the last named, but my point is that if two teams are coached to play basketball and not rough house there will be few fouls to call).

Your study begins with the statement, "Before it was deemed possible to recommend ways and means to reduce the number of fouls COMMITTED OR CALLED in the game of basketball, it seemed wise ..... fouls committed." "Fouls committed or called" is the set-up, yet the study deals more with the "fouls called" and very little is said about the fouls committed and the circumstances under which they were committed. The entire study deals with the type of foul called by the official, and then goes on to state that the free throwing resulting from these called fouls resulted in the actual winning of the game in a certain percentage of cases.

HOW CAN THAT DEDUCTION BE MADE FROM THE STUDY when so many other factors are missing? How do you know that the free throwing actually won or lost the game? What about the baskets that were missed by the players of the losing team? What about the baskets that were missed by the winning team that may have made for a larger score on their part? How about the substitutions made by the coach at so-called critical moments that either made for or against defeat or victory?

Before any statement such as made by your report that so and so free throwing, which goes back at once to the fouls called by the official, either won or lost a game, it seems to me that there ought also to be measured the factors of baskets missed by both sides, and the actual substitutions made. It is easy enough, of course, to tabulate the baskets missed by both sides, AND THE SPOT FROM WHICH THEY WERE MISSED, and this is done by many coaches, but my point is that your study is of no value as far as the deductions you make if you only include the fouls called and do not put in baskets missed.

How to measure the substitutions made and the influence upon the result of the game is a horse of another color, and that isn't so easy, but if you are going to make any predictions as to influence upon results of games, that certainly ought to be included in the picture.

Because you have left out these factors I believe that your deductions regarding the influence of making free throws upon the result of the game, which means the influence of the official calling fouls, I believe that your report as it stands cannot have much value.