

# Analysis on the Examination of Single Basketball Recruit for Sports Training Majors in Chinese Colleges

Yufeng Yang<sup>1</sup>, Xiaoying Tan<sup>2</sup>, Wenxuan Fang<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports Training, Shanghai University of Sport, Shanghai, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Health Sciences and Sports, Macao Polytechnic Institute, Macao, China

## Email address:

fangwenxuan@sus.edu.cn (Wenxuan Fang)

\*Corresponding author

## To cite this article:

Yufeng Yang, Xiaoying Tan, Wenxuan Fang. Analysis on the Examination of Single Basketball Recruit for Sports Training Majors in Chinese Colleges. *International Journal of Education, Culture and Society*. Vol. 7, No. 1, 2022, pp. 9-16. doi: 10.11648/j.ijecs.20220701.12

**Received:** December 29, 2021; **Accepted:** January 12, 2022; **Published:** January 21, 2022

---

**Abstract:** The major of sports training basketball single recruitment system has been developed for more than 30 years. It is an important path for my country to screen and cultivate outstanding sports talents of senior high school and a powerful measure for the integration of sports and education in my country. This article takes the 2018-2020 basketball single recruit students of the three colleges of sport in the East China examination area as the entry point. Through research, it is found that the following problems exist in the current basketball particular test: 1. The evaluation is singleness, which cannot fully demonstrate the students' exceptional sports quality; 2. The particular technical items are not well-targeted; 3. The match time is short, the random team formation leads to the imbalance of the lineups of both sides of the competition, and the scoring standards are generalized. The suggestions are as follows: 1. Using the scoring standards to measure the absolute and relative height to scientifically evaluate the special qualities of the candidates; 2. The particular technical part establishes a targeted assessment system based on the inside and outside players; 3. The shooting test is based on each position requirements of the player position appropriately extend the shooting distance; 4. Properly extend the match time, reasonably allocate the lineup configuration of the two sides of the game, and at the same time refine the scoring standards, establish a combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods.

**Keywords:** Sports Training Major, Single Recruit, Particular Basketball Test

---

## 1. Introduction

The "Chinese national Medium and Long-term Educational Reform and Development Plan Outline (2010-2020)" points out that the examination and admission system of ordinary colleges and universities shall be improved, and the content of the examination shall be deepened, based on the requirements for the selection of talents in colleges and universities and the national curriculum standards to ensure the science of the national admission examination [1]. The single-recruitment examination system for sports training was established in 1986 and was first implemented by the six sports colleges directly under the former National Sports Commission. The purpose is to solve the problem of low cultural quality of retired athletes in the system and difficulty at the technical level of college sports graduates to achieve special coaches [2].

Since its implementation, the reference number of special basketball exams has always been among the top of many special exams. Therefore, its exam formation, settings, and assessments have attracted much attention. How to effectively and fairly select potential basketball players is this. Scholars such as Zhong, based on a comprehensive analysis of the work plan of the sports training single-recruitment examination, clarified the recruitment of athletes and on-the-job coaches for high-level sports teams, and the recruitment of promising athletes for sports schools and middle schools [3]. With campus basketball's constant maturity and development, students specializing in undergraduate sports training have gradually become the main competitive forces in campus high-level basketball leagues such as CUBA (Chinese University Basketball Association) and SCBA (Sports College Basketball Association) [4]. Therefore, schools have begun to raise the requirements for basketball candidates. The gradual

centralization and elitism of enrollment make it necessary to develop a scientific and systematic development of the basketball special examination's project setting and evaluation standards and establish a complete and reasonable basketball particular examination system for single basketball recruitment [5]. This article focuses on the project setting and assessment standards of the sports training single-recruitment basketball particular exam, discussing the rationality of its project settings and what still needs to be improved so that the single-recruitment basketball particular exam can be more comprehensive and accurate to the examinee's special ability. Provide a reference for comprehensive evaluation;

## 2. Object and Methods

### 2.1. Object

This article will take the general college sports training single-recruitment basketball particular exam as the research object and investigate its project settings and assessment standards.

### 2.2. Methods

#### Literature

This article uses "sports training major," "single recruit,"

"basketball special test" as the keywords. Three years ago, the official website of the Department of Science and Education of the State Sports A search was conducted on the policy of the single-recruitment examination system for the training of ordinary colleges and universities in China. Twelve national-level documents and ten local and scholastic documents were collected; through China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Excellent Master and Doctoral Thesis Database. The literature website consults and sorts out relevant journal articles on the development of the sports training single-recruitment examination system from 1995 to 2020, focusing on the development status of the assessment form, project setting, and assessment standards of the particular basketball exam, a total of 50 articles have been consulted. Books on sports statistics sports scientific research methods, and other related fields provide methodological references for this research.

#### Expert interview

This article is based on interviews with six team coaches, six basketball experts, one international basketball referee, and one expert who has participated in the sports training single-recruitment basketball test score evaluation by interviewing six-team coaches from three sports colleges in eastern China.

#### Questionnaire

**Table 1.** Statistics on the number of questionnaires issued and collected.

Questionnaire types	Issued questionnaires	Recovered questionnaires	Recovery rate (%)	Valid questionnaires	Effective response rate (%)
Student	300	252	82.3	240	95.2
Coach	64	64	100	60	93.8

As shown in Table 1, this article designs the questionnaire to determine the candidates' satisfaction with the item setting and assessment standards in the single-recruitment basketball particular test. It conducts the questionnaire reliability and validity test through relevant experts. 300 questionnaire survey was issued to the basketball students of the 2018-2020 grades sports and training majors in Shandong, Nanjing, Shanghai University of Sport to collect the satisfaction and different opinions of the students who had participated in the sports and training single recruitment basketball special examination on the project setting and assessment standards. At the same time, this article issued the coaches of ordinary high schools and amateur sports schools who have more than five years of experience in leading a team, who have won the top eight or above scores in the municipal and provincial middle school students' basketball championships or matches

of the same level, and who have coached the students who participated in the single-recruit basketball particular program to consult them for different views and opinions on the setting of special basketball test items and assessment standards.

#### Validity test of the questionnaire

To ensure that the two questionnaires designed by this research have a certain degree of validity and can conduct effective investigations on the various issues involved in this research, the author will ask eight experts in the field of Basketball to discuss the questionnaire validity. Experts evaluated the validity of the two questionnaires. The five-level Likert subscale was selected as the validity test table. Eight experts combined the purpose and significance of this study to carefully review the questionnaire's structural validity, content validity, and overall validity.

**Table 2.** Validity test table of the questionnaire.

Questionnaire type	Validity type	Very	Relatively	Normally	Less	unreasonable
Student	structure	2	4	2		
	Content	1	5	2		
	Overall	1	5	2		
Coach	structure	2	4	2		
	Content	1	5	2		
	Overall	1	4	3		

As shown in Table 2, 8 experts have a high degree of recognition for the structure, content, and overall validity of the two questionnaires designed by this research. At the same time, some experts also put forward their own opinions on the questions that appeared in the questionnaire after evaluation. The author integrates the suggestions of the experts and further improves and revises the questions in the questionnaire to ensure the validity of the questionnaire.

#### *Reliability test of the questionnaire*

The reliability of the questionnaire can reflect whether the various issues involved in the questionnaire can genuinely and effectively reflect the problems that this research needs to analyze, and it can measure the consistency, reproducibility, and stability of the results [6]. This study uses the "retest reliability" method to test the reliability of the questionnaire. Before the official questionnaire was issued, this study selected 60 students from the Shandong, Nanjing, Shanghai University of Sport, and 20 basketball coaches from ordinary high school and amateur sports schools from the 2018-2020 level to pre-test. After discussion with experts, the two parts of the questionnaire were retested after 15 days. According to the two criteria of "subject to the first test result, the second test result to calculate the correlation coefficient" and "two test results to calculate the correlation relationship between the questionnaire answer," SPSS 20 software is used to analyze the data obtained from the two questionnaires. The reliability coefficient of the two measurements of the coaches questionnaire is  $R=0.947$ , and the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire for undergraduate sports training professional basketball students is  $R=0.972$ , which confirms that the indicator system of the two questionnaires is trustworthy reliable.

#### *Mathematical Statistics*

Considering that the test scores of different players in the same event need to be compared and cross-analyzed, this study uses SPSS 20, Excel, and other software to perform mathematical statistics tests on the measured data.

### 3. Results

The selection of materials for each project should fit the characteristics of its particular sports [7]. Ma proposed in his master's thesis that the selection of basketball players should highlight specific characteristics and proceed according to

the essential laws of Basketball [8]. Since its inception, the sports training single-recruitment basketball particular test has been continuously improved in its project settings and assessment standards. What is currently being implemented is the test and examination project evaluation system since the reform in 2016. The author issued questionnaires to amateur sports schools and ordinary high school coaches to research this test project evaluation system. Judging from the results of the recovery, 83.3% of the coaches believe that the current sports training single-recruitment basketball special test items and assessment standards "have certain defects and can assess" the skill level of the candidates, 11.7% of the coaches believe that "there is a very big defect, it can't be assessed at all," only 5% of coaches think that "there is no defect." In interviews with six college coaches, the coaches unanimously stated that the current project settings and scoring standards are only comprehensively set based on the five positions on the field. It is not easy to distinguish between ordinary and elite athletes, which has a specific impact on the construction of college sports teams. So, whether the current sports training single-recruitment basketball particular test needs to be further improved, this article will analyze the test scores of the candidates and the degree of satisfaction of the recruiting parties with this test item.

This article consults many literature materials to provide a basis for reasonable group comparison statistics. At present, the basis for grouping is mainly on the field position and technology. Xue believes that to ensure the balance of offensive and defensive and the effective use of skills and tactics in the game, players in each position need to have corresponding skills [9]. Gao is conducting an empirical study on the position requirements of young basketball players, using the guard, forward and center groups to make statistical calculations [10], that is, the point guard and shooting guard are used as the guard group, and the small forward and power forward are collectively recorded as the forward group to compare the center group [11, 12]. After consulting the relevant literature and discussing with experts, this article decided to use the grouping format of "guard, forward, center" to conduct further research.

Note: the analysis results of male and female basketball players show the same trend. This article focuses on the analysis results of male basketball players.

**Table 3.** Statistics of the scores of the players in each position in the Sargent jump test (male).

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Other positions	P
Guard	65	3.1640	.08771	Forward	.000
				Center	.000
Forward	67	3.2575	.10909	Guard	.000
				Center	.011
Center	11	3.3400	.08246	Guard	.000
				Forward	.011
Total	143	3.2213	.11265		

\*Note:  $P<0.05$ , showing a significant difference,  $P\leq 0.01$ , showing a very significant difference.

**Table 4.** Statistics of lay-up test scores of players in each position (male).

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Other positions	P
Guard	65	38.9411	2.30461	Forward	.013
				Center	.000
Forward	67	40.2836	3.64565	Guard	.013
				Center	.002
Center	11	43.4182	3.31265	Guard	.000
				Forward	.002
Total	143	39.9145	3.28526		

\*Note: P<0.05, showing a significant difference, Pless than 0.01, showing a very significant difference.

**Table 5.** Statistics of 1-minute shooting test scores of players in each position (male).

	N	Average	Standard deviation	Other positions	P
Guard	65	12.4000	3.34851	Forward	.037
				Center	.004
Forward	67	11.2090	3.27774	Guard	.037
				Center	.069
Center	11	9.2727	2.24013	Guard	.004
				Forward	.069
Total	143	11.6014	3.34441		

\*Note: P<0.05, showing a significant difference, Pless than 0.01, showing a very significant difference.

## 4. Analysis and Discussion

### *Sargent jump test*

Basketball is a sport that pays attention to space and height. The Sargent jump test can not only reflect the player's jumping ability but also examine their instantaneous explosive qualities [13]. As shown in Table 3, the guard (3.16 meters) <the forward (3.25 meters) <the center (3.34 meters). There is a significant difference between the forward and the center ( $P=0.011<0.05$ ), and the guard was significantly different from the forward and the center, respectively ( $P=0<0.01$ ). The difference in performance has led to significant satisfaction with this project between positions. The data shows that 32 point guards and 27 shooting guards believe that the setting of this project is unreasonable and is not conducive to self-expression.

On the contrary, there are 40 power forwards and 28 centers, the satisfaction rate for the Sargent jump has reached more than 60%. In terms of coaches, 56% believe that there is something unreasonable in this project. Among them, 19 coaches believe that compared with the center forwards with the advantages of height and arm length and inherent physical fitness, the relatively short players have certain disadvantages in project testing.

The difference in performance in this part mainly comes from innate quality. The center forward group's superior physical fitness gives it more room to play in this event. At the same time, the guard is limited due to factors such as height and arm length and only tries to bridge the gap in this area as much as possible. In the process of data sorting, it was found that there are many candidates whose touch-to-high scores are equivalent to the fourth and fifth positions among the second and third positions. However, in the current evaluation system, the candidates in this part cannot reflect their excellent jumping and explosive qualities

through objective results due to the use of absolute height measurement standards. This is undoubtedly a loss for these candidates. However, for the admissions school, it is not easy to distinguish the particular sports of outstanding athletes through objective results to cause the phenomenon of non-interoperability of information with athletes. After consulting related literature, some scholars advocated that abandoning the measurement of absolute height evaluation and adopting the measurement of relative height values, that is, the jump height of the examinee during the process of touching the height [14]. This article discusses this point of view with experts. The experts agree that an essential basketball law is a competition between the two sides of the game at speed and height. The height reflects an athlete's occupation of the air dominance of the game, but the player's bounce quality is sufficient. However, it cannot play a role in rebounding, so it is not very meaningful even if the bounce height is very prominent.

To sum up, if a single evaluation index is used to score candidates, the absolute height measurement method is unfair to each position. The measurement value cannot genuinely reflect candidates with outstanding athletic abilities. His own special sports quality and the method of measuring the relative height value pays too much attention to the so-called fairness of the examination but ignores the characteristics and essential laws of Basketball itself that pay attention to space and height; from the perspective of selecting outstanding student-athletes, a single measurement The index cannot effectively reflect its excellent athletic quality and has a certain degree of procrastination in distinguishing and tapping student-athletes with development potential.

### *Dribble to the basket test*

A variety of crossover to the basket adopts the timing system. Candidates need to perform behind-the-back dribble, back turn dribble, and cross-the-leg dribble in sequence. The essential dribbling ability of the left and right hands during

high speed are examined. It is a comprehensive test. Wang believes that when the opponents have strong defensive abilities, it is often difficult to use a single dribble skill to lay up effectively. If the athletes skillfully use behind-the-back dribble, back turn dribble, and cross-the-leg dribble smoothly, that increases his offensive threaten. It is easier to achieve the desired effect of lay-up [15].

As shown in Table 4, the average of the center's time is about 43.4 seconds, which is about 4.5 seconds away from the guard (38.9 seconds), while the forward (40.2 seconds) is only 1.3 seconds away from it; the guard has a significant difference with the forward ( $P=0.013<0.05$ ), while the center, the guard, and the forward have very significant differences ( $P=0<0.01$ ,  $P=0.002<0.01$ ) with each other. Among the 40 power forwards and 28 centers, a total of 23 power forwards and 22 centers expressed that this project was unreasonable, and 17 of them believed that "compared to the dribbling ability and speed of outside players, The dribbling ability of inside players may have certain disadvantages." In contrast, outside players such as point guards and shooting guards think this project is reasonable. As for coaches, half of the total number of people think this project test is "reasonable" and "unreasonable."

The disadvantages of center players are mainly affected by two factors: 1—the figure. Since the center player is in the most intense 3-second zone in the offensive and defensive position, he must have a certain height and weight advantage to defend the opponent effectively. Nevertheless, height and weight make them at a disadvantage in speed; 2. Technical. During the interviews with some public high school and amateur sports school coaches, they stated that in daily training, the center is mainly practiced inside movement and technique according to the game's needs. The high-speed dribble is mainly practiced in the transition, and this part is mainly based on players. In summary, the guards and forwards perform better than the center players, whether it is an innate quality or position requirements.

#### *1-minute shooting test*

Before 2016, this test has always used the form of 1-minute self-shooting and grabbing [16]. Wang believes that 1-minute self-shooting and grabbing is limited by time and the number. There is a large contingency, and it is not easy to give full play to the actual level of candidates [17]. To increase the number of shooting, reflect the candidates' actual shooting level, reduce the instability of the shooting itself, the General Administration of the sport of China decided to implement a 1-minute 25-ball shooting test in 2016.

As shown in Table 5, the shooting performance of the guard is in the forefront, with an average of 12, the average of the forward is 11. The center is 9, at the end of the three groups. There is a significant difference between the guard and forward ( $P=0.037<0.05$ ), and there is a very significant difference between the guard and center ( $P=0.004<0.01$ ). From the survey and analysis of satisfaction, people who expressed an "unreasonable" attitude towards the 1-minute shooting test focused mainly on the setting of shooting distance.

From the perspective of the fairness and rationality of the test, the outside players of the guard and forward are affected by their position requirements; when they are farther away from the basket, the efficiency is less [18], and although center players can shoot in the context of gradual expansion of space, they still focus on low-post offense and close shots. Therefore, the unification of shooting distance is bound to affect the performance of center players. From the perspective of competitive games, the distance of 5.5 meters is "embarrassing." The shooting difficulty is equivalent to a 3-point shot, but the score differs by 1 point. All ordinary high school and amateur sports school coaches and college basketball team coaches said that the setting of this distance does not meet the needs of actual combat, so in daily competitions and training activities, there are fewer targeted exercises for shooting here. Although in the early stage of the exam, candidates in each position will pay more attention to practice for this test, the long-term actual competition needs and their location requirements make it both from the rationality of the admissions test items and the specific abilities of the candidates. Effective enrollment is still from the perspective of the nature of the actual game. The way that the shooting distance is set and tested uniformly for the candidates at each position has different degrees of impact on the actual shooting level of the candidates.

#### *Match*

The game is a comprehensive assessment test that reflects the athletes' technical application level, tactical application experience, and on-the-spot response, and other special abilities and qualities [19]. The goal of all training activities is to obtain the final victory of the game. As a team sport, Basketball can effectively screen out whether an athlete has a high level of exceptional quality in terms of judging the situation and communicating with teammates.

Regarding the time setting, 34% of candidates and 40% of public high school and amateur sports school coaches think the game's time setting is insufficiency. Within 10 minutes, candidates cannot show their ability very well. The ten experts in the interview agreed that the 10-minute game time setting is not enough for candidates to perform. As the country pays more and more attention to the development of Basketball, the level of youth basketball competition is gradually improved. There is rarely a situation where there is a gap in the personal strength of players like in the past. In today's actual combat evaluation, the match has even been extended to 15 minutes or even 20 minutes to make a practical evaluation of the candidates.

The examination set needs to be comprehensively coordinated and formulated according to national policies, candidates, training, and the development of social talents. As an entrance examination closely linked to higher education, reasonable items and sufficient duration are necessary prerequisites for candidates to demonstrate fully. Especially in the actual competition part, where many factors are changing rapidly, in the form of random team examinations, candidates need to adapt to the cooperation with their teammates quickly. Short-term competitions

cannot well demonstrate their abilities and technical requirements. The assessor also needs time to evaluate the candidates as effectively and comprehensively as possible. From the perspective of the recruiting parties, the 10-minute competition time that has been used so far is no longer suitable for the current exam environment.

The two sides of the actual competition will be conducted in random team formation. Among the 240 student questionnaires, 50.4% of the candidates believed that random team formation might show that five players on the field have similar technical styles that cannot be smoothly connected or even contradictory. They hope to follow the tradition of 1–5 positions to make a suitable lineup configuration to maximize the candidates' ability. During the interview with the assessor, the experts pointed out that teams' random formation is prone to two unreasonable lineups. One team is all outside and the other is all inside. This phenomenon leads to overlapping positions and technical conflicts between teammates, which adversely affects the candidates' performance in actual competitions. In this context, as an assessor of actual competition, it is also unable to evaluate candidates objectively.

In terms of the exam's fairness, the form of random team formation is a relatively fair manifestation. The candidates do not understand each other and can only adapt to the situation on the court. However, the enrollment needs are constantly improving, evolving context of the integration of sports and education; more and more outstanding student-athletes have been adversely affecting the single move of sports training is no longer just to ensure settlement that professional athletes in the traditional three-level system are guaranteed after retirement. It mainly focuses on cultivating more potential sports seedlings. The changes in demand promote the continuous improvement of assessment methods, and a reasonable lineup configuration is a foothold for students to show their competitive ability. Therefore, no matter from the perspective of examinee performance or evaluation scoring, this format cannot meet the needs of examiners and assessors, and the examination deviates from the enrollment needs of high-level sports teams in colleges and universities.

At present, qualitative evaluation methods are used to evaluate candidates' actual combat ability. Some scholars have specifically conducted research on these grading rules and believe that its subjectivity is too strong, the description of the evaluation standard is too general, and there is no quantitative index for evaluation, which will cause the examiner's subjective evaluation of the candidates to increase the difference, which is not conducive to the students. To make an objective evaluation, it is recommended to establish a quantitative indicator system, and at the same time include psychological indicators in the scope of assessment to evaluate in a more reasonable and standardized manner [20]. However, this article believes that the game is a project that shows players' versatility. There are many uncontrollable factors in the game. The athletes' performance is not a result that formulas can calculate but must be evaluated by on-the-spot performance. The establishment of quantitative

indicators is not suitable for use in actual combat. Instead, quantitative data such as test takers' scores and mistakes should be combined with qualitative evaluations such as offensive and defensive tactical awareness choices to make a more scientific assessment of the candidates' actual combat capabilities.

#### *Survey and analysis of demand for targeted special tests*

The improvement of the system is not simply a deletion of projects or a simple concept of "Neither A nor B." However, it should be based on a solid pertinence, and the system's content should be developed in a more diversified and comprehensive direction [21]. In the process of counting the number of admissions of the three sports academies, this article found that: shooting guards and small forwards with strong special sports qualities and solid basic skills committed more, while center forwards is only 28 in the list of 240 people that accounting for 11.7% of the total number of people. From the point of view of the number of people, it shows that the current project setting is more beneficial to the performance of outside players. Because center athletes are restricted in the particular technical part of the assessment, the number of admissions is small. From the data, it can be concluded that the current sports training single-recruitment basketball particular test setting is comprehensive from the perspective of each position, and it cannot effectively test the technical ability of the players in each position. At the same time, it cannot effectively distinguish outstanding athletes.

Therefore, this article conducts an investigation and analysis on demand for specific tests for the training of single-recruitment Basketball according to the technical and location characteristics of the players on the court. Among the 240 student-athletes who participated in the sports training single-recruitment basketball particular test, 186 believed that specific tests should be conducted according to the technical characteristics of their positions, accounting for 76.7% of the total number. As for coaches, 50 of them believed that they needed to be based on position and technical characteristics; special tests were conducted on players at various positions on the field, accounting for 83.3% of the total number of players. Above the data, this article believes that it is necessary to set up detailed indicators based on players' technical and tactical characteristics and position characteristics in each position in the future sports training single-recruitment basketball particular test and establish a targeted testing system.

## 5. Conclusion

In the Sargent jump test, measuring absolute height is more beneficial to the center forward group athletes with height and arm length, and the relatively short guard group is at a disadvantage in this test. At the same time, for players in positions 2 and 3, who have outstanding special sports qualities and have a high score comparable to that of center forward athletes, the absolute height measurement method makes it impossible to highlight their excellent explosive and jumping ability through objective results. This is a loss for this part of the candidates.

Affected by each position's quality characteristics and technical characteristics, the guard group and the forward group have faster displacements. The dribbling during high-speed travel is more skilled and solid. In contrast, the center forward group athletes are affected by their body and competition needs; in daily training activities, the main focus is on inside movement and basket attack. Therefore, in the assessment process of this project, the test results of the center forward group players are worse than those of the other two groups, and they cannot give full play to their technical advantages.

In the 1-minute shooting test, the outside players in the guard group and the forward group dominated by their solid and stable outside shooting ability, shooting at a radius of 5.5 meters in the middle and long-distance test scores are higher. However, the center forward group players' test results at this distance are poor because they often carry out offensive activities in and near the inside area at the same time. The shooting distance with a radius of 5.5 meters does not match the game's characteristics.

The 10-minute game duration of actual combat ability is relatively short, which has certain limitations for candidates to play and has a particular impact on the examiner's objective evaluation; the two sides of the game should be conducted under a reasonable lineup configuration. The candidates are unfamiliar with each other. The random team formation has unreasonable lineups, hurting the candidates' performance; the evaluation criteria are too vague, and the significant subjective differences.

## 6. Suggestions

In terms of approaching height, the take-off height after the jump should be included in the assessment system, given a specific score, and combined with the absolute height test score for comprehensive scoring to systematically evaluate the athletic quality of the candidates at each position.

Set up special technical assessments for different technical characteristics of the inside and outside. Point guards to small forwards still use a variety of variable lay-up tests. Power forwards and center forwards implement inside hooks and lay-ups under the basket. For internal technical assessment, a corresponding scoring system is established, and a targeted and comprehensive examination evaluation is carried out according to each position's technical style to maximize the candidates' technical characteristics.

The evaluation of the shooting test should be carried out according to the characteristics of the actual competition, and the test format of 25 balls in 1 minute is still used. Candidates in positions 1-3 can continue to use the distance of 5.5 meters as the radius of the distance shooting test. Candidates for positions 4 and 5 should be adjusted to a position closer to the basket for shooting tests, combining the characteristics of each position to give full play to their real application level.

In terms of the actual combat ability time setting, the game time should be appropriately extended to help the test and

evaluation sides to perform effectively and scientifically evaluate; in terms of team formation, the reasonable configuration should be made according to the candidates' position on the field, and the team formation should be based on the traditional 1-5 positions, equalize and rationalize the team level and team configuration of the two teams; the description of the scoring standard should be more specific, and the qualitative and quantitative evaluation should be combined to help the examiner make a fair evaluation based on subjective and objective factors.

## References

- [1] State Council. "National Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development Plan Outline (2010-2020)". [EB/OL]. [http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A01/s7048/201007/t20100729\\_171904.html](http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A01/s7048/201007/t20100729_171904.html), 2011-10-29.
- [2] Zheng Yaping. On the reform of the separate enrollment and examination system for physical education colleges [J]. Journal of Beijing Normal University of Physical Education, 1999 (02): 9-12.
- [3] Zhong Bingshu, Yuan Zuosheng, Cheng Jianping, Pan Yongzhi, Zuo Qiong. Facing the main battlefield of competitive sports, strengthen the construction of sports training specialty [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2003 (03): 394-396.
- [4] Ge Hui. The Enlightenment of Recruiting Players for the High-level Basketball Team of Arizona State University to my country [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2018, 41 (07): 102-110.
- [5] Evans, Brent, Pitts, Joshua, D. The determinants of NCAA basketball recruiting outcomes [J]. Applied Economics Letters, 2017, 24 (5): 351-354.
- [6] Ke Youzhi, Sun Jiangang, Zhang Yean, Li Bo, Liu Yang. Whether the questionnaire is credible—Based on a systematic analysis of sports core journal articles (2010-2018) [J]. Sports Science, 2020, 40 (02): 90-97. DOI: 10.16469/j.css.202002010.
- [7] Phillips E, Davids K, Renshaw I, Portus M. Expert performance in sport and the dynamics of talent development. Sports Med. 2010; 40 (4): 271-283.
- [8] Ma Kai. Research on the establishment of special selection indicators and evaluation standards for young basketball players in my country [D]. Beijing Sport University, 2017.
- [9] Xue Lan. A brief discussion on the position technology of basketball games [J]. China Sports Science and Technology, 2002 (07): 32-34.
- [10] Gao Guoxian, Lian Bizhen, Ren Hong, Hu Yang. An Empirical Analysis and Application of Position Factors for Young Basketball Players [J]. Sports Science, 2017, 37 (09): 65-73.
- [11] Zhao Liang, Mi Sen, Zhang Xin. Research on the Internal and External Physical Fitness Evaluation System of Chinese Outstanding U19 Male Basketball Players [J]. Journal of Tianjin Institute of Sport, 2020, 35 (02): 240-248.7.

- [12] Xu Jianhua, Cheng Liping. Study on the Location Characteristics of CUBA Men's Basketball Players' Special Athletic Quality [J]. Journal of Shandong Institute of Physical Education, 2015, 31 (03): 90-97.
- [13] Jiang Nan. Research on the Variation Characteristics and Evaluation Index of Isometrics in Different Positions of High-level Basketball Players in Colleges and Universities [D]. Shanxi University, 2018.
- [14] Yuan Rongli. Analysis and Research on the Basketball Special Examination for Physical Education Enrollment in Sichuan Normal Colleges and Universities [D]. Chengdu Institute of Physical Education, 2015.
- [15] Wang Jinlian, Xu Chunlin. The action method and technical analysis of basketball's change-direction dribbling breakthrough combination technique [J]. Journal of Wuhan Institute of Physical Education, 2002 (05): 69-70.
- [16] State Sports General Administration. In 2015, general college sports training, martial arts and traditional national sports professional examination methods and scoring standards. [EB/OL]. <http://www.sport.gov.cn/kjs/n5083/index.html>, 2014-12-01.
- [17] Wang Yanfei. Analysis of Basketball Special Examination for the Enrollment of Physical Education Major in General Colleges and Universities in Henan Province [D]. Henan University, 2008.
- [18] Pu Kai. A comparative study on the characteristics of the use of positional offensive techniques of guards between the top eight in the 2019 Men's Basketball World Cup and the Chinese Men's Basketball Team [D]. Wuhan Institute of Physical Education, 2020.
- [19] Liu Changjun. Research on the Status Quo and Development Countermeasures of Youth Basketball Competition in my country [D]. Capital Institute of Physical Education, 2015.
- [20] Jin Longquan, Li Hui, Li Jinpeng. Research on Quantitative Analysis of Scoring Standards for Sports Training Majors—Taking the Quantitative Evaluation of Basketball Actual Combat Ability as an Example [J]. Journal of Gansu Lianhe University (Natural Science Edition), 2013, 27 (02): 72-74+78.
- [21] Pérez-Toledano MÁ, Rodríguez FJ, García-Rubio J, Ibañez SJ. Players' selection for basketball teams, through Performance Index Rating, using multiobjective evolutionary algorithms. PLoS One. 2019; 14 (9): e0221258. Published 2019 Sep 4.