In the 1938-39 study the evaluation technique has been extended to include a defensive rating system for both the team and the individual player. The items and their evaluation weights, as used in this study, are shown in Table I.

Data were collected during all the home games on both the Kansas team and the visiting teams. The technique used in the collection of these data is the same as described in the first evaluation study.

In the 1937-38 season nine home games were played, and this season eight home games were played, thus making a total of 17 games on which averages of certain activities were available. These averages are shown in Table III. The 17-game averages seem to be reliable as there was no great variation in the figures computed for the two seasons. The team this year took more shots than did last season's team, but averaged one less goal per game. The number of free throws awarded in both seasons was practicall y identical, but the number made was slightly reduced this season.

This year the total number of positive offensive evaluation points is lower than last year's total. This is due to two reasons. First, there was a change in the technique of tabulating immediate assists. In last year's study credit was given the players for both passes and catches, which gave them double credit in evaluation points. In this year's study a player receives evaluation points only once. The second reason for the lower total is that the recovery of rebounds off the opponent's backboard was computed with the defensive play instead of offensive play, as was the case in last year's study.

The drop in negative offensive evaluation points indicates that the team made fewer mistakes during this season than last season. It is possible that the team summary posted in the team dressing room the day following each game made the individual players more conscious of their mistakes with the end result that fewer were made.

The defensive evaluation points as shown in Table I do not accumulate as rapidly as do the offensive points. However, this is not true of the negative defensive points. During the season the negative defensive points were accumulated almost exactly twice as fast as were the negative offensive points. The penalty for fouling should be high because if a player committed a foul he immediately gave the opponents a chance to make 5 or 10 positive offensive points. In games where a player was forced out by fouls his total negative points exceeded his positive points.

The team summaries (see Table IV) were made from the data gathered during the last home season. Kansas did not lose a home contest this season and lost only one last season. Because no data were available on the opposition at the time of the loss it is not possible to show the effect of losing a game on the statistics gathered. Due to its style of play, Kansas does more passing than most teams. This is well shown under total passes and catches, Table III. Even in a loss it is possible Kansas would show a higher evaluation point total due to the factor just mentioned. It would be interesting to collect data for games played away from home. However, this has been considered impractical to date.

Included in the team summary, Table III, a new term (defensive efficiency) is listed. This term is the result of the formula:

$$\frac{\text{total positive defensive evaluation points}}{\text{sum of positive and negative defensive points}}$$