

TABLE VIII.

Offensive Ability Rankings

<i>Player</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Varsity Ranking</i>	<i>Freshmen's Ranking</i>	<i>Coach's Ranking</i>	<i>Scoring Ability</i>	<i>Ball Handling Errors</i>	<i>Playing Efficiency</i>
A	g	1	1	1	1	2	1
B	f,c	3	2	2	2	7	8
C	g	2	3	3	3	3	2
D	c	4	4	4	4	4	3
E	f	6	6	7	6	12	12
F	f	5	5	5	7	5	6
G	f,g	9	9	9	9	1	5
H	f	10	12	11	5	13	7
I	f	7	8	8	8	11	9
J	f	8	7	6	10	8	10
K	g,c	12	10	10	11	6	4
L	g	11	11	12	13	9	13
M	f	13	13	13	12	10	11

*Guard, forward, center.

At the close of the season a letter was sent to the 16 letter men of the varsity and the 17 numeral men on the freshman squad. (Sample letter and rating blank, Exhibits C and D.) These 33 boys were asked to rate the 13 varsity players on their offensive playing ability. The 13 players included in the study were ranked by 21 players and the coach. On the basis of offensive playing ability, these rankings plus other significant rankings from the evaluation data are shown in Table VIII.

Of particular interest is the similarity of the rankings that were given by the varsity, the freshmen and the coach. There are only 3 players where the disagreement is more than 2 rankings apart. All are unanimous on 5 players. It should be remembered that in spite of the apparent discrepancies between the judgment ratings and the computed ratings, the latter are built up of isolated abilities. As pointed out earlier, the guards and center have a better chance of making a higher score in ball handling due to their positions and the style of basketball used in this school.

No attempt was made in this study to give any of the players a composite ranking, but it should be noted that player A was a guard known nationally as an All-American player.

On the basis of the individual evaluation tables certain facts are brought out that can best be shown in individual analyses. For that reason, the abilities of the players are discussed as single units.