

Player K. Guard and Center.

With a playing time of 59.5 minutes this player made 297 evaluation points, 5 score points, 2 goals (25%) and 1 free throw (50.0%). His error rate in ball handling was 2.4% and of the 5 players with a better rating 3 were guards, one was a forward, and one was a center. His playing efficiency was 74.3, and of the three players who ranked better than he, two were guards and one was a center. In rebounds off the opponent's backboard, he rated 11th and in goals per minute he ranked 12th. This player had some excellent men to compete with and on a team without an all-American guard he might have had more opportunity to play. Like the other guards and centers, he passed more than he caught the ball. On rebounds off his own backboard per minute he ranked 8th and he ranked 6th on the recovery per minute of a teammate's jump ball. The data indicate that this player was a good ball handler and an efficient player, but that he did not shoot enough in proportion to his playing time. He was rated 12th by his teammates, and 10th by the coach and freshmen.

Player L. Guard.

This boy had a total time of 34.5 minutes, 120 evaluation points, and no score points. He is the only player of the 13 in the study that did not score during the home season. He attempted 5 goals and 2 free throws. His error rate in ball handling was 3.3% and this was better than four of his teammates who played longer. From the standpoint of playing efficiency he made a score of 84.5%, the lowest on the squad. The point most in favor of this boy was his rank in free throws attempted per minute (not making any) in which he was tied with Player J for 3rd place. This player ranked the lowest of the guards and was the only one to catch the ball more than he passed it. He was rated 11th by the varsity and freshmen, and 12th by the coach.

Player M. Forward.

This player ranked 13th in minutes of play (22.5), earned 117 evaluation points and 4 score points. He made one goal (33.3%) and 2 free throws (66.7%). He ranked 10th both in player efficiency (91.5%) and in error rate 3.4%. He had the highest rate of personal fouls per minute of any of the 13 boys. This player had a very definite height disadvantage as he was by far the shortest man on the squad and can be considered small in stature even in comparison with boys not playing college basketball. He was ranked 13th by all his fellow players and 13th by his coach.

The summaries have been presented and discussed in the body of the paper. In addition, some general conclusions seem to be warranted:

1. The study is of value in that a record was made of the number of times various activities are performed in college basketball.
2. An accurate record of the offensive abilities of players was made available, independent of the score book.
3. By examination of the material after a game a coach can see which men were performing their duties and which fundamentals need extra work.
4. The players have a definite interest in the charts and watch their improvement in deficient abilities.
5. There remains ample room for additional studies.