

Penn
E
322
49x
L-35

50141

A STUDY OF STATISTICS FOR EIGHT RETURNING
BASKETBALL LETTERMEN AT AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in Education

by
Carl Leslie Taylor
December, 1968

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Mr. David Aaron, Department of Health and Physical Education, Austin Peay State University, for his suggestions and aid concerning the problem; and to Mr. John Martin, Sports Information Director, for his assistance in securing the statistics vital to the study. Appreciation is also extended to Mr. George Fisher, Austin Peay State University basketball coach, for allowing his players to be the subjects of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED.....	1
The Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Importance of the Study.....	1
Limitations of the Study.....	2
Hypothesis.....	2
Assumptions.....	2
Definitions of the Terms Used.....	3
Field goal.....	3
Free throw.....	3
Rebounds.....	3
Fouls.....	3
Assists.....	3
Errors.....	3
Total points.....	4
Playing time.....	4
Statistics.....	4
Average.....	4
II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE.....	5
III. FINDINGS THROUGH ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	7
Playing Time.....	7
Rank of Points Scored.....	8

CHAPTER	PAGE
Assists and Rebounds.....	9
Assists.....	9
Rebounds.....	10
Errors and Fouls.....	11
Errors.....	11
Fouls.....	12
Comparative Rank Orders.....	13
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	15
Summary.....	15
Conclusions.....	15
APPENDIX.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Playing Time.....	8
II. Points Scored.....	9
III. Assists and Rebounds.....	11
IV. Errors and Fouls.....	13
V. Comparative Rank Orders.....	14

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to determine the minute by minute statistics of in-play performance by individual basketball players at Austin Peay State University. Coaching varsity basketball at the collegiate level is a very complex and time-consuming project. Many coaches use game statistics during their seasons to aid their decisions concerning game strategy and personnel use. Overall "game total" statistics may be misleading. This study has taken the 1967-1968 ten game home schedule of Austin Peay State University and has computed individual statistics according to averages per minute played. It was done to ascertain whether this method of gathering statistics has proved more valid than overall game statistics per individual in evaluating that individual's game performance.

Importance of the study. The greatest importance of this study was that statistics accrued concerning players are not often taken by minute study. Most coaches in the athletic field depend on a game-by-game statistical analysis to evaluate performance and to aid strategical planning. The stress of winning in today's athletic competition makes it necessarily important that all legal means and techniques be used to evaluate personnel. For a coach to know where and when any particular player can be used most effectively is of

primary concern in modern scientific basketball.

Limitations of the study. The study was limited to the varsity basketball team of Austin Peay State University during the ten game home schedule for the 1967-1968 season. It was further limited to the statistical data compiled for eight returning lettermen on the squad. These men were the best performers of the 1967-1968 season and their statistics were the most valuable for study. Coaches agree that some players perform better on their home court while others function more proficiently on the road. Concentrating this study on the at-home schedule has limited the validity of the results since they would be more complete if concerned with an entire schedule of home and road games.

Hypothesis. Since there has been little breaking down of statistics into minute form by most coaches, the author feels this study will show a need for further such study and a breaking down of complete game averages of players. This writer further believes the true concept of a player can be diagnosed more thoroughly by a minute study of that player's statistics.

Assumptions. The reader must assume that this study can be used only as a supplement to the various tools the basketball coach uses in selecting the players who play for him. This writer assumes that many coaching situations need more material to aid in decision making for those particular circumstances. Out of thousands of

decisions to be made during a season, a coach sometimes needs statistical material to back his decisions. It is the assumption of this study that the breaking down of statistics into minute rather than total game averages will give a more valid picture of each player's performance.

II. DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED

Field goal (FG). An offensive shot made from the floor during play and which scores two points is a field goal.

Free throw (FT). A shot made as a penalty to the opposition is a free throw. The shot is attempted from the free throw line of the court with play halted and totals one point per shot made.

Rebounds (RB). Rebounds are actions taken by players following a field goal or final free throw attempt which result in their teammates gaining control of the ball on either defensive or offensive ends of the court.

Fouls (F). The penalties players accrue for having committed a personal foul as determined by the game referees are defined as fouls.

Assists (A). Assists are those direct passes made by a player which enable his teammates to score.

Errors (E). Errors are the actions of a player which are game rule infractions and result in loss of the ball either directly to an

opposing player or by the ruling of the referee.

Total points (TP). The total points for each player is the accumulation of his field goals and free throws successfully completed.

Playing time (PT). The number of minutes per game during which the performer was participating in active play is his playing time.

Statistics. The number of times each category occurs is classified as that particular category's statistics. The term also collectively refers to the numerical reports of all categories.

Average. This is defined as the arithmetic average of any of the given statistics. Per game averages were determined by the tallies of each player divided by the number of games in which he played; per minute averages were determined by the totals divided by the average playing time per game.

CHAPTER II

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The data used in this study was obtained with the aid of Austin Peay State University Sports Information Director, Mr. John Martin. This writer took the ten varsity home games, determined the game total statistics for the players involved and broke them down into per minute statistics. Eight key personnel were chosen to be studied. Of those eight, three played in all ten home games; two were involved in nine games; and one player each played in eight, six, and four games respectively. The total time played by each individual was determined and divided by the number of games in which he participated to ascertain an average playing time per game. By using this and the arithmetic averages of points scored, assists, rebounds, fouls, and errors divided by the average number of minutes played per game, an evaluative analysis of a player's effectiveness in each of the statistical categories resulted. Table I, Playing Time, page 8, shows each player's total accrued minutes for all games in which he played, the number of his active games, and his average playing time per game. Table II, Points Scored, page 9, shows both the per minute and per game average of points scored and the player's rank order in both measurements of that category. Table III, Assists and Rebounds, page 11, deals with the averages under each of these categories and each player's rank order per game and per minute. Table IV, Errors and Fouls, page 13, indicates the rank order of each of the squad members studied for their per game

and per minute averages on errors and fouls. Table V, Comparative Rank Orders, page 14, provides a comparison of rank orders under all the categories. All the rank order placements were determined through the per game and per minute averages figured on their game statistics. The actual game statistics used as a basis for the included tables and any resulting conclusions are included in the Appendix.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS THROUGH ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Playing Time

The average playing time of each of the subjects used in the study figured on the number of games in which they played ranged from 33 minutes, 23 seconds for Howard Wright for ten games, to five minutes, 44 seconds for Joe Murrey for four games. Howard Wright, Holly Heaberlin (32 minutes, 54 seconds for eight games), Charlie Moore (30 minutes, 21 seconds for ten games), and Terry Young (28 minutes, 49 seconds for ten games) played 75% or better of the total playing time of the games in which they participated and all but Heaberlin played in all the games studied. Waller participated in nine games and recorded an average time of 20 minutes, four seconds, 50% of the possible time of a game. Jobie Miller (ten minutes, 44 seconds for nine games), Don West (six minutes, 32 seconds for six games), and Joe Murrey actively played an average of only 25% or less of the official time of a contest. Table I shows the players studied, listed in their rank orders according to length of average playing time, their total playing time for all games, the number of their active games, and their average playing time per game.

TABLE I

PLAYING TIME

<u>RANK</u>	<u>PLAYER</u>	<u>TOTAL PLAYING TIME</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ACTIVE GAMES</u>	<u>PER GAME AVERAGE</u>	<u>RANK ORDER</u>
1	Wright	333:45	10	33:23	1
2	Moore	303:25	10	30:21	3
3	Young	288:13	10	28:49	4
4	Heaberlin	263:08	8	32:54	2
5	Waller	180:35	9	20:04	5
6	Miller	97:21	9	10:44	6
7	West	39:11	6	6:32	7
8	Murrey	22:55	4	5:44	8

Rank on Points Scored

The number of points scored by an individual is an essential factor since the accumulation of points is the means by which the game is won. A player's contribution in the area of points scored is a consideration when evaluating his performance and also his use in further contests. Wright ranked highest in average points per game (15.7) and had a per minute average of .47, almost $\frac{1}{2}$ point per minute for the 33 minutes, 23 seconds he spent per game. Rank order for per game averages (following Wright) was as follows: Heaberlin, 12.9 per game; Moore, 11.2 per game; Young, 10.3 per game; Waller, 8.2 per game; Miller, 3.3 per game; Murrey, 2.8 per game; and West, also 2.8 per game. Rank order according to a per minute average is considerably

different as is shown in the following: Murrey, .56 per minute; West, .53 per minute; Wright, .47 per minute; Waller, .41 per minute; Heaberlin, .40 per minute; Moore, .37 per minute; Young, .36 per minute; and Miller, .33 per minute. None of the players held the same rank in both listings. Table II, Points Scored, indicates the rank order on that category, both per game and per minute, and the averages by which they were ranked.

TABLE II
POINTS SCORED

<u>PLAYER</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER MINUTE</u>	<u>RANK ORDER</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER GAME</u>	<u>RANK ORDER</u>
Murrey	.56	1	2.8	7
West	.53	2	2.8	8
Wright	.47	3	15.7	1
Waller	.41	4	8.2	5
Heaberlin	.40	5	12.9	2
Moore	.37	6	11.2	3
Young	.36	7	10.3	4
Miller	.33	8	3.3	6

Assists and Rebounds

On the positive side of evaluating players, the categories of assists and rebounds are necessary for attention since high performance in these means additional scoring and better control of the ball.

Assists. Moore led his teammates in assists in both per game

average (3.0) and per minute average (.97). Next in rank order and again in both types of averages was Heaberlin who tallied 2.4 assists per game and .75 per minute. Third was Wright with an average of 1.8 assists per game and .50 per minute for ten games. Tied with Wright with a .50 per minute average was Young but Young's per game average was less, 1.5. West also had a per game average of 1.5 assists but had only a .25 per minute average. Next in rank order of per game averages are Miller, 1.0; Murrey, .5; and Waller, .3. The rank order for the latter three reverses itself for per minute averages as follows: Waller, .15; Murrey, .10; and Miller, also .10.

Rebounds. A breakdown of rebound average statistics reveals different rank orders per game and per minute. Moore was first with 8.4 rebounds per game, followed in order by Young with 7.7, Heaberlin with 6.8, Wright with 6.7, Waller with 5.6, Murrey and Miller with 1.3, and West with .7. When ranked according to rebounds per minute, Waller was first with .28, followed in order by Moore, .27; Young, .27; Murrey, .26; Heaberlin, .21; Wright, .20; Miller, .13; and West, .11. Only Miller and West's rank order remained consistent on both rebound measurements, maintaining seventh and eighth respectively. Table III, Assists and Rebounds, shows the rank orders according to per game and per minute averages on both categories.

TABLE III
ASSISTS AND REBOUNDS

PLAYER	ASSISTS				REBOUNDS			
	PER GAME	PER MINUTE	PER GAME	PER MINUTE	PER GAME	PER MINUTE	PER GAME	PER MINUTE
	AVERAGE	RANK	AVERAGE	RANK	AVERAGE	RANK	AVERAGE	RANK
Moore	3.0	1	.97	1	8.4	1	.27	2
Heaberlin	2.4	2	.75	2	6.8	3	.21	5
Wright	1.8	3	.50	3	6.7	4	.20	6
Young	1.5	4	.50	4	7.7	2	.27	3
West	1.5	5	.25	5	.7	8	.11	8
Miller	1.0	6	.10	8	1.3	7	.13	7
Murrey	.5	7	.10	7	1.3	6	.26	4
Waller	.3	8	.15	6	5.6	5	.28	1

Errors and Fouls

Errors and fouls are important in that high scores by players in these categories can be detrimental to the effectiveness of the team. A high incidence of either can result in loss of control of the ball and in possible scoring by the opposition. These, then, are considerations on the negative side of player evaluation. Rank order of the measurements of these categories was determined by the fewest tallies and lowest percentages to the most and highest in both.

Errors. Per game, West was first with a .8 average; second was Murrey with 1.0. Following and with equal averages per game of 1.1 are Miller, Moore, and Waller. Following them is Young with 2.2, then

Heaberlin with 2.3, and Wright with a 2.6 average.

Per minute, Miller was first with a .11 average followed by West with .13 and Murrey with .20. In the same rank order per minute as per game are Moore, .30; Waller, .55; and Young, .71. Seventh and eighth respectively are Wright with .71 and Heaberlin with .72.

Fouls. According to their per game foul averages, Miller ranked first with a .9 average, Murrey second with a 1.3, West third with a 1.7, Heaberlin fourth with a 2.1, Waller fifth with a 2.3 average, and Moore sixth with a 2.4 average. Seventh and eighth were Young and Wright with 2.7 and 2.9 averages respectively.

Per minute ranking of averages also shows Miller first with a .09 average and Waller moved to second with a .12 average. In the third position is Murrey, with .26, followed by West, .28; and then Heaberlin, .65. In sixth place, as in per game ranking, is Moore with a per minute average of .71. Exchanging seventh and eighth ranking are Wright, with .81 average, and Young, .90.

Table IV, Errors and Fouls, illustrates the rank orders according to per minute and per game averages for errors and fouls.

TABLE IV
ERRORS AND FOULS

PLAYER	ERRORS				FOULS			
	PER GAME AVERAGE RANK		PER MINUTE AVERAGE RANK		PER GAME AVERAGE RANK		PER MINUTE AVERAGE RANK	
West	.8	1	.13	2	1.7	3	.28	4
Murrey	1.0	2	.20	3	1.3	2	.26	3
Miller	1.1	3	.11	1	.9	1	.09	1
Moore	1.1	4	.30	4	2.4	6	.71	6
Waller	1.1	5	.55	5	2.3	5	.12	2
Young	2.2	6	.71	6	2.7	7	.90	8
Heaberlin	2.3	7	.72	8	2.1	4	.65	5
Wright	2.6	8	.71	7	2.9	8	.81	7

Comparative Rank Orders

In order to assist judgment, this writer considered it worthy to compare rank orders of all players under all categories. This was done to determine if the averages per game and per minute showed any consistency as far as their rankings were concerned. If players appeared in the same ranking in each measurement of a particular category, the value of per minute statistics would be disproved.

Table V lists all the statistical categories covered by the study and each player's rank under each category according to the per minute and per game measurements.

TABLE V
COMPARATIVE RANK ORDERS

TIME PLAYED		POINTS		ASSISTS		REBOUNDS		ERRORS		FOULS	
RANK ORDER	PLAYER	RANK	ORDER	RANK	ORDER	RANK	ORDER	RANK	ORDER	RANK	ORDER
		GAME	MIN.	GAME	MIN.	GAME	MIN.	GAME	MIN.	GAME	MIN.
1	Wright	1	3	3	3	4	6	8	7	8	7
2	Heaberlin	2	5	2	2	3	5	7	8	4	5
3	Moore	3	6	1	1	1	2	4	4	6	6
4	Young	4	7	4	4	2	3	6	6	7	8
5	Waller	5	4	8	6	5	1	5	5	5	2
6	Miller	6	8	6	8	7	7	3	1	1	1
7	West	8	2	5	5	8	8	1	2	3	4
8	Murrey	7	1	7	7	6	4	2	3	2	3

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The game statistics of eight returning varsity lettermen on the Austin Peay State University basketball squad were the subjects of an evaluative study. During the ten home games of the 1967-1968 season, the individual statistics of each of these men in the categories assists, errors, points scored (field goals plus free throws), rebounds, and fouls were tallied. Their playing time in each contest was recorded and averaged as to the number of minutes they actively participated in the games in which they played. The averages of each category figured with the average playing time per game yielded a per minute statistical record for each squad member studied. Using the categories "playing time" and "points scored" and grouping "assists with rebounds" and "errors and fouls", each player was ranked in relation to his teammates on two measurements: per game and per minute. The rank order listings of each measurement of the categories was compared and evaluated to determine the most effective means of player evaluation: per game or per minute statistical records.

CONCLUSIONS

In evaluating the comparative data and rank order sheets for the per game and per minute averages, it seemed consistent to also review

these by means of playing time, points scored, assists and rebounds, and errors and fouls. The categories in game statistics require specific rather than general talents when reviewed for the purpose of evaluating a performance. The diversity of the categories demands separate consideration and this writer felt the purpose of the study would best be served by this separation.

So far as playing time was concerned, the rank order was also consistent with rank order of points scored for ranks 1 through 6 on per game measurement. Seventh and eighth ranks on playing time were reversed on the per game points scored measurement. It is interesting to note that the eighth rank for playing time was seventh for points scored per game but first on points scored per minute. No player held the same rank order per minute as he had per game on points scored averages. In rank order of per game measurement, Heaberlin (2), Moore (3), and Young (4), followed one another and maintained that order for per minute although lower in rank, being 5, 6, and 7 respectively. The two players recording the shortest playing time per game, West (7) and Murrey (8), were 8 and 7 per game points scored and 2 and 1 on per minute ranking. Wright was first in rank order for playing time and points scored per game but 3 on per minute points scored. The only consistency apparent between the measurements on points scored so far as playing time was concerned is seen in the difference between ranks as Waller, 5 per game and 4 per minute (1 rank point difference); Wright, 1 per game and 3 per minute (2 rank points difference); and Miller, 6 per game and 8 per minute (2 points difference). Wright and

Miller descended in rank while Waller ascended. Wright's average playing time was 78% of the possible game time; Miller's was 25% and Waller's was 50%. It is interesting to note that Murrey, who had the lowest playing time average, had the lowest per game points scored average but the highest per minute average. In effectiveness based solely on points scored during the time spent in active play, his contribution was higher than Wright's, who ranked first for playing time and per game points scored. A significant point concerning the per minute rankings is the small differences in fractional points of the averages. There were only .23 points difference between first ranking (.56 average) and eighth (.33 average). On differences between per game rank averages, first (15.7) through fifth (8.2) were close, a more sizeable gap existed between fifth and sixth (3.3), and sixth, seventh (2.8), and eighth (2.8) were also close in relation to each other.

Under the category of assists, more consistency on rank order between measurements was apparent. All but two players held their same ranks based on per minute averages as they had on the per game average measurement. Miller was sixth per game but eighth per minute; Waller was eighth rank per game and sixth per minute. Considering playing time average ranks in relation to rank on assists, there seemed no general trend. It should be noted the first four ranked players on playing time were also the top four ranks on both measurements of assists although the averages were not in the same successive order.

The only consistent rankings for rebounds were seventh and

eighth positions held by Miller and West respectively. All other players changed rankings from one measurement to the other although the changes were not markedly different. The highest rank point difference existed for Waller, whose fifth ranking on per game changed to first per minute, a rank difference of four points. Disregarding the consistent rankings of seventh and eighth, the differences for the other players was either only one or two rank points.

The particular significance in the comparison of per game and per minute averages of the rank orders on errors is in relating them to the amount of playing time per game. The rank orders for average playing time per game has no consistency in relation to the resulting rank orders figured according to average assists per game and per minute. Errors definitely increased as the amount of playing time increased so that top ranks for playing time occupied the bottom ranks on per game and per minute errors. Sixth, seventh, and eighth ranked playing time averages occupied the top three ranks on errors although not in successive order or in consistent places on both measurements. Consistency was present for the middle ranks of fourth, fifth, and sixth under both measurements. The greatest rank point difference existed for Miller, whose third ranked per game average changed to first rank per minute, a difference of only two rank points.

The foregoing holds true for fouls: foul percentage increased on both measurements according to higher playing time per game averages. Miller remained in first rank position on both measurements and Moore retained sixth rank both per game and per minute. All other players

changed ranks between measurements although the changes concerned only one rank point difference with the exception of Waller, who moved from fifth to second, three points difference.

Overall conclusions for the results of the study indicate that the additional effort of taking per minute statistics can be worthwhile. There appeared a definite relevance in the difference of rankings when considered according to the average playing time involved. More conclusive comparisons could be made if the subjects being used could be controlled so far as having average playing times as similar as could be possible. This seems borne out by the fact that those players near each other in playing time ranking remained in close relation to each other in other category rankings even though the numerical rankings changed throughout all categories. Per minute averages makes players equal to a certain extent but in such a study as this where such a wide variation of playing time averages existed, the amount of time played per game must be considered.

The most reliable conclusion was that the method indicated more such study. An application of a per minute statistical compilation for an entire season would be more useful since it would reflect more diverse conditions than one concerned with only home games.

This study has shown that there can be definite differences in statistical averages when taken per minute rather than per game. The most noteworthy point to consider is the conclusions indicated by the length of playing time. The length of playing time increased the incidence of fouls and errors. The highest rankings in these categories

by the players with shorter average playing times could indicate they were less tired and therefore more agile and less prone to error.

It should be repeated that this method of gathering statistics should only be used as a supplement to other materials at hand. There was nothing entirely conclusive gained by this study since too many other factors were involved. Length of experience could reflect better rankings in the categories points scored, assists and rebounds, and, negatively, in errors and fouls. Attitude and aggressiveness affects assists, rebounds, fouls, and errors, as well as points scored. Size and agility are important to all the categories involved. A player who may rank low in any category may be valuable due to leadership ability where cohesiveness of the group and morale of the team is involved. Individual characteristics of each player should be considered in determining his value but per minute statistics can be a valuable tool. By ranking the subjects according to per game and per minute averages and comparing rank placements between measurements, this study has shown that per minute individual statistics presented a different picture of performance.

APPENDIX

1. The first part of the appendix

2. The second part of the appendix

3. The third part of the appendix

4. The fourth part of the appendix

5. The fifth part of the appendix

6. The sixth part of the appendix

7. The seventh part of the appendix

8. The eighth part of the appendix

9. The ninth part of the appendix

10. The tenth part of the appendix

11. The eleventh part of the appendix

12. The twelfth part of the appendix

13. The thirteenth part of the appendix

14. The fourteenth part of the appendix

15. The fifteenth part of the appendix

16. The sixteenth part of the appendix

17. The seventeenth part of the appendix

18. The eighteenth part of the appendix

19. The nineteenth part of the appendix

20. The twentieth part of the appendix

21. The twenty-first part of the appendix

22. The twenty-second part of the appendix

23. The twenty-third part of the appendix

24. The twenty-fourth part of the appendix

25. The twenty-fifth part of the appendix

26. The twenty-sixth part of the appendix

27. The twenty-seventh part of the appendix

28. The twenty-eighth part of the appendix

29. The twenty-ninth part of the appendix

30. The thirtieth part of the appendix

10 GAMES

PER GAME					
AVERAGES: 30:21	11.2	3.0	8.4	1.1	2.4
<hr/>					
PER MINUTE					
AVERAGES:	.37	.97	.27	.30	.7

TERRY YOUNG 10 GAMES

<u>PLAYING TIME</u>	<u>GAME</u>	<u>TP</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>
9:59	Bethel	2	0	1	2	0
33:31	U T Martin	5	0	9	1	5
26:48	Bellarmino	12	2	9	1	3
36:55	Eastern Ky.	7	4	7	4	4
31:21	Morehead	3	1	6	1	2
11:35	Murray	2	0	2	1	0
26:42	Middle Tenn.	27	3	16	4	1
35:38	Western	7	3	10	2	4
40:00	Tenn.. Tech	19	1	10	2	3
35:26	East Tenn.	19	1	7	4	5
<u>TOTALS: 288:13</u>	10	103	15	77	22	27
<hr/>						
<u>PER GAME</u>						
<u>AVERAGES: 28:49</u>		10.3	1.5	7.7	2.2	2.7
<hr/>						
<u>PER MINUTE</u>						
<u>AVERAGES:</u>		.36	.50	.27	.71	.90

9 GAMES

<u>PLAYING TIME</u>	<u>GAME</u>	<u>TP</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>
20:40	Bethel	10	0	5	1	1
13:00	U T Martin	7	1	3	0	1
11:28	Bellarmino	2	0	5	1	2
12:42	Morehead	3	1	2	3	3
16:15	Murray	5	0	3	0	2
23:36	Middle Tenn.	12	0	14	1	3
34:25	Western	16	1	6	1	3
31:07	Tenn. Tech	15	0	10	2	2
17:22	East Tenn.	4	0	2	1	4
<u>TOTALS: 180:35</u>	9	74	3	50	10	21
<hr/>						
<u>PER GAME</u>						
<u>AVERAGES: 20:04</u>		8.2	.3	5.6	1.1	2.1
<hr/>						
<u>PER MINUTE</u>						
<u>AVERAGES:</u>		.41	.15	.28	.55	.12

9 GAMES

PER GAME					
AVERAGES: 10:44	3.3	1.0	1.3	1.1	.9
<hr/>					
PER MINUTE					
AVERAGES:	.33	.10	.13	.11	.09

8 GAMES

PLAYING TIME	GAME	TP	A	RB	E	F
31:03	Bethel	15	2	7	3	3
38:11	U T Martin	10	1	6	3	2
35:19	Bellarmine	20	1	5	2	0
40:00	Eastern Ky.	13	3	10	0	3
32:55	Morehead	9	6	8	3	2
28:21	Murray	15	4	6	4	3
37:45	Middle Tenn.	17	2	7	1	2
19:34	Western	4	0	5	2	2
<hr/>						
TOTALS: 263:08	8	103	19	54	18	17
<hr/>						
PER GAME						
AVERAGES: 32:54		12.9	2.4	6.8	2.3	2.1
<hr/>						
PER MINUTE						
AVERAGES:		.40	.75	.21	.72	.65

6 GAMES

PLAYING TIME	GAME	TP	A	RB	E	F
7:50	Bethel	3	0	0	2	1
3:20	Morehead	0	1	0	0	1
8:03	Murray	7	3	1	0	0
5:44	Middle Tenn.	2	2	2	2	4
1:34	Western	2	0	0	1	2
13:25	East Tenn.	5	3	1	0	2

TOTALS:	39:11	6	19	9	4	5	10
----------------	-------	---	----	---	---	---	----

PER GAME					
AVERAGES: 6:32	3.2	1.5	.7	.8	1.7

PER MINUTE					
AVERAGES:	.53	.25	.11	.13	.28

4 GAMES

PER MINUTE					
AVERAGES:	.56	.10	.26	.20	.26