

"The new fan-shaped backboard is legal where the home management chooses to install it."

Since the rule in the book at this time read this way, most coaches interpreted the meaning of this statement to be a test for opinion relative to "play on the bank-board by coaches who had not installed it for their games at home" and they were willing to play for experimental purposes. Tying this statement up with the statement listed in the 1940 QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE NATIONAL BASKETBALL COMMITTEE:

"Assuming that proper safeguards would be made against any sudden compulsory use of equipment whose use would involve considerable expense, do you favor permitting the optional use of:

- (a) A flat surfaced backboard with several inches removed from the borders and with the upper edge circular.
- (b) "convex surfaced board with the shape as in (a)."

Is not the inconsistency of the wording evident? Reading further into the science of research we must return to the 1941 QUESTIONNAIRE and the following statement:

"Check below only if you ^{have} coached, played, officiated, or managed games on courts with new type of bankboards:

- (a) Prefer new type - 819
- (b) Prefer old type - 196 "

Two factors are very evident in this statement. First, those who have gone to their administrators for the money to buy this innovation will hesitate to condemn it even though they do not find it an improvement over the rectangular board.

Thesecond evident factor is that of the approximately 1900 high schools, colleges, Y's, and others who answered the questionnaire, 1015 answered the above statement. Since less than 4000 sets of these boards were in use at that time, one might logically draw the conclusion that the questionnaires were mailed to a carefully selected sampling of those schools favoring the new type of equipment.

Would not the schools using the rectangular equipment have a perfect right to voice their opinion regarding the fan-shaped bankboard?

The tabulation of the results of the questionnaire by the chairman of the Questionnaire Committee is questionable; the total summary of the results are tabulated in five sections as follows:

1. Atlantic Coast Area (New England States, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, D.C. and West Virginia)
2. Southern States (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas)
3. Central States (Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin)
4. Midwestern States (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota)
5. Western States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming)
6. Canada

How can a N.C.A.A. representative determine the reaction of his district when the research tabulations are scattered over three or more districts? Why was this change in tabulation allowed by our N.C.A.A. representatives?