



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

A method to assess the influence of individual player performance distribution on match outcome in team sports

This is the Accepted version of the following publication

Robertson, Samuel, Gupta, Ritu and McIntosh, Sam (2016) A method to assess the influence of individual player performance distribution on match outcome in team sports. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 34 (19). 1893 - 1900. ISSN 0264-0414

The publisher's official version can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02640414.2016.1142106>
Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/31984/>

Total Word Count: 3960

Abstract Word Count: 198

Number of Tables: 3

Number of Figures: 3

1 **Abstract**

2 This study developed a method to determine whether the distribution of individual player
3 performances can be modelled to explain match outcome in team sports, using Australian
4 Rules football as an example. Player-recorded values (converted to a percentage of team
5 total) in 11 commonly-reported performance indicators were obtained for all regular season
6 matches played during the 2014 Australian Football League season, with team totals also
7 recorded. Multiple features relating to heuristically determined percentiles for each
8 performance indicator were then extracted for each team and match, along with the outcome
9 (Win/Loss). A generalised estimating equations model comprising eight key features was
10 developed, explaining match outcome at a median accuracy of 63.9% accuracy under 10-
11 fold cross validation. Lower 75th, 90th and 95th percentile values for team goals and higher
12 25th and 50th percentile values for disposals were linked with winning. Lower 95th and higher
13 25th percentile values for Inside 50's and Marks respectively were also important
14 contributors. These results provide evidence supporting team strategies which aim to obtain
15 an even spread of goal scorers in Australian Rules football. The method developed in this
16 investigation could be used to quantify the importance of individual contributions to overall
17 team performance in team sports.

18

19 **Keywords:** performance analysis, coaching, strategy, Australian Rules football

1 **Introduction**

2 In sport, the term ‘performance indicator’ is used to refer to an action variable that defines
3 an aspect of a successful performance (Hughes & Bartlett, 2002). This definition has been
4 used broadly to extend to anthropometric, physiological and skill-related variables (Reilly,
5 2001; Robertson, Burnett, Newton & Knight, 2012). In the team sport notational analysis
6 literature, discrete performance indicators (i.e., passes completed, shots on goal) have
7 specifically been used to develop models explaining competition outcome in football
8 (Castellano, Casamichana & Lago, 2012), basketball (Gomez, Lorenzo, Barakat, Ortega &
9 Palao, 2008) and rugby (Vaz, Van Rooyen & Sampaio, 2010). This information can then
10 potentially be used to make inferences about which characteristics of competition are
11 typically most important to achieving success.

12 However, such approaches have also experienced some criticism in the literature.
13 Specifically, it has been proposed that they neglect to consider the spatiotemporal
14 components of sporting competitions, such as the location and sequences of possession
15 between multiple players (Cervone, D’Amour, Bornn & Goldsberry, 2014) and the dynamic,
16 interdependent relationships that exist within a team (Clemente, Martins, Couceiro, Mendes
17 & Figueiredo, 2014). Consequently, an increase in research relating to assessing player and
18 ball movement patterns as they pertain to team performance has gained popularity of late
19 (Cervone *et al.*, 2014; Clemente *et al.*, 2014; Passos, Davids, Araujo, Paz, Minguéns &
20 Mendez, 2011). Additionally, investigations into quantifying the contribution of individual
21 players within a team context have also emerged (Duch, Waitzman & Amaral, 2010;
22 Tavana, Azizi, Azizi & Behzadian, 2013).

23 As in many professional team sports, the collection and reporting of performance
24 indicators is commonplace by the 18 teams participating in the elite-level Australian
25 Football League (AFL) competition. Australian Rules football is played on an oval field
26 with two opposing teams consisting of 22 players each (18 on the field + 4 interchange).

1 Scoring is achieved by kicking the ball between the two large goal posts located at either end
2 of this field. In the AFL, discrete performance indicators are typically obtained via a
3 commercial sports statistics company (Champion Data Pty Ltd, Melbourne, Australia),
4 which uses a mixture of live and retrospective video coding in order to produce data for both
5 professional clubs and media sources. Investigations into how these performance indicators
6 associate with match outcome, defined as either 'Win/Loss' (Robertson, Back & Bartlett,
7 2015; Stewart, Mitchell & Stavros, 2007) or score differential (Stewart, Mitchell & Stavros,
8 2007) have been previously undertaken. In these studies, higher team totals relative to the
9 opposition for kicks, Inside 50's and goal conversion were shown to be particularly
10 influential on the match result.

11 Recent improvements in the reporting combined with the technologies used to
12 capture such information (i.e., wearable athlete devices) has seen a concurrent increase in
13 both the number and complexity of performance indicators reported in the AFL. Attempts to
14 quantify the individual's contribution to the team in the AFL have also been noted in both
15 the media (i.e., the AFL player ranking system) and the peer-reviewed literature (Heasman,
16 Berry, Dawson & Stewart, 2008; Sargent & Bedford, 2013). In addition to understanding the
17 value of an individual to the team, these approaches may also allow for the evaluation of
18 player selections for a given match.

19 However, it is evident that each team sport contains a unique set of constraints
20 which limit the contribution of an individual player to the overall success of their team
21 (Vilar, Araujo, Davids & Travassos, 2012). These constraints can be conceptualised as
22 relating to the individual, task or environment and differ for each sporting competition
23 (Newell, 1986). Examples include the position played (Bourbousson, Deschamps &
24 Travassos, 2014), the physical and technical abilities of an individual (Kempton, Sirotic,
25 Cameron & Coutts, 2014) and their designated role within the team (Buszard, Farrow &
26 Kemp, 2013). In Australian Rules football specifically, given the percentage of match time
27 typically spent by a defender in their own half of the field it may be unreasonable to expect

1 this individual to create as many scoring opportunities as a forward player. In contrast, a
2 defender may be expected to produce a higher contribution to the team total for tackles than
3 a forward, due to their defined role within the team.

4 Despite these generally accepted perceptions, a quantitative method of
5 understanding how the distribution of individual player contributions within a team relates to
6 achieving a successful match outcome has not been reported in the literature to date. In
7 basketball for example, it could be hypothesised whether it is preferable for a single player
8 to record a high percentage of a team's points scored in a game, or whether a more even
9 spread of contributors is desirable? Obtaining this type of information for performance
10 indicators having previously been shown as important to match outcome in a sport would
11 have clear practical benefits. Notably, such findings could be used to inform team selection
12 (i.e., optimisation of team structure), improve the validity of player scouting and list/roster
13 management as well as increased sophistication of existing performance analysis.

14 This study developed a method to assess the influence of the distribution of
15 individual player contributions in team sport on match outcome. The aim of this study was
16 to provide an application of this method using AFL performance indicator data obtained
17 from all 18 teams during the 2014 regular season.

18

19 **Methods**

20 *Data collection and analysis*

21 Performance indicator data from all 198 games played during the 2014 AFL regular season
22 was obtained from www.afl.com.au/stats. Specifically, a total of 13 discrete performance
23 indicators were selected for extraction based on their reporting in previous literature
24 (Robertson, Back & Bartlett, 2015; Stewart *et al.*, 2007; Tangelos, Robertson, Spittle &

1 Gastin, 2015; Young & Prior, 2007), with definitions of each presented in Table I. The study
2 was approved by the relevant human research ethics advisory group.

3 ****INSERT TABLE I ABOUT HERE****

4 Following this, raw (absolute) individual player ($n = 22$) values for each performance
5 indicator ($n = 13$) were extracted for all AFL teams ($n = 18$). This process was undertaken
6 for all 22 games each team played during the 2014 regular season ($n = 396$), with the match
7 outcome (Win/Loss) also obtained. One draw occurred during the 2014 season; this match
8 was removed from the analyses. As all 22 player contributions for each team were included
9 in the dataset, the sample consisted of players injured during the course of a match, along
10 with a single substitute (a player who typically only participates in one quarter of a match).

11 *Coding reliability and validity*

12 As performance indicator data is provided to the AFL by a commercial provider (Champion
13 Data Pty Ltd, Melbourne, Australia), the reliability and validity of such information is not
14 publicly available. In order to determine the inter-rater reliability of the extracted data, a
15 sample of all matches from a single round during the 2014 AFL season were selected for
16 assessment. This process consisted of the lead author observationally coding each of the nine
17 matches for all 13 performance indicators whilst blinded to the original AFL values. The
18 coding was undertaken using a specially constructed output window in Sportscore (version
19 10.3, Sportstec Pty Ltd, Warriewood, Australia). Three time-synchronised video files for
20 each match (side, behind the goals and broadcast view) were used to undertake the coding,
21 with all vision provided by a single AFL club. Totals of each performance indicator for all
22 teams were then obtained and recorded for comparison with the AFL data. Kappa statistics
23 were not able to be determined due to the research team being blinded to the original coding
24 results from Champion Data. This meant that a direct comparison between raters may not
25 have always resulted in the identical number of observations (i.e., a kick may be missed
26 altogether by a coder, rather than misclassified as in typical scenarios where kappa or

1 weighted kappa may be applied). Thus, using team totals ($n = 18$) for each performance
2 indicator ($n = 13$), two-way mixed single measure intra-class correlation coefficients (ICC
3 3,1) were used to determine the agreement between AFL and author-coded values. To
4 determine the validity of the author's coding, root mean square error (RMSE) values were
5 obtained for each performance indicator in order to provide an absolute error estimate (using
6 the AFL data as the criterion measure).

7 *Data conversion and feature extraction*

8 For modelling purposes, each of the 22 player's contribution to the team total was converted
9 to its relative format, by transforming this value to a percentage of their team total for a
10 given match. For example, if a team recorded a total of 200 kicks in a match and a player
11 contributed 13 to this total, then this player's relative contribution to the team was calculated
12 as 6.5%. This descriptive conversion process of data from an absolute to relative format
13 (Ofoghi, Zeleznikow, MacMahon & Raab, 2013) allowed for multiple matches to be
14 included in the modelling process, as different team totals for each performance indicator
15 were anticipated for each game.

16 By descriptively converting data for all 22 players in a match, multiple features
17 could then be extracted to provide a representative profile of each performance indicator for
18 a given team. For instance, consider 'kicks' as the performance indicator of interest and the
19 total number of kicks recorded in a game be M between m players. Let m_i be the number of
20 kicks recorded by i th ($i=1,2,\dots,m$) player. Define the weight of the i th player w_i as
21 $[m_i/M]$. The profile of the team for kicks can then be quantified by m dimensional
22 vector $w=(w_{(1)},w_{(2)},\dots,w_{(m)})$. From vector w we can extract the features of the kick profile for
23 the team by obtaining percentiles at levels being set at (0.05, 0.10, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 0.90,
24 0.95) respectively. The levels of the percentiles chosen for use in the study were selected
25 heuristically. Therefore, the 11 features extracted for each performance indicator consisted
26 of the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation as well as each of the abovementioned

seven percentile levels. This meant that 143 features in total (11 features x 13 performance indicator) were extracted for each game played by each team. All features were then propagated forward for modelling, subject to validity screening. Following this, the ordered weight vector was then constructed for each performance indicator and match, with the corresponding features extracted for subsequent modelling. The complete information extracted in this manner was then collated along with match outcome (Win/Loss) and team identity.

Statistical Analysis

The method of generalized estimating equations (GEE) (Halekoh, Hojsgaard & Yan, 2006) was employed to construct a model explaining match outcome as a function of the feature set for the performance indicators. For the analysis, the family was set as binomial with an exchangeable correlation structure. Considered as an extension of the generalised linear model, GEE has recently shown increased use in sporting contexts (see van Ark *et al.*, 2015; Robertson, Burnett & Gupta, 2014; Young *et al.*, 2015 for examples). It is particularly useful in situations where longitudinal data are being considered, as many similar modelling techniques do not take into account the correlations between repeated measures on the same participants or group (Zeger, Liang & Albert, 1988; Ziegler & Vens, 2010). Further, GEE has been shown to show higher classification accuracy in comparison to methods such as logistic regression in such instances (Önder, 2015). In this study, the GEE method was used to explain the relationship between the match outcome and the corresponding feature set, whilst adjusting for the dependence of the 18 teams.

For the validity screening of predictors, only those features showing significantly different ($P < 0.05$) means for match outcome (via ANOVA and not exhibiting a multicollinearity problem ($r = < 0.80$ with another feature)) were included in the model. The parsimonious model was selected using the backward search method. The match outcome of win was set at predicted probability level of 0.7, due to overall classification performance

1 being higher comparative to iterations using alternate levels (i.e., 0.5 = 56.3% and 0.6 =
2 58.1%). The proposed model was then evaluated by computing the overall accuracy for
3 match outcome via 10 fold cross-validation for a random selection of 33% of the data.
4 Analyses were undertaken using R (version 3.0.1, R Core Team, Australia) using the
5 *Geepack* package (Yan, Højsgaard, & Halekoh, 2012).

6

7 **Results**

8 The reliability assessment revealed very high agreement between the author's and Champion
9 Data's coding (ICC range = 0.947 to 1.000) for all performance indicators used in the study
10 (Table II). Validity results showed low absolute error for the author's coding with respect to
11 the Champion Data values (RMSE range = 0.0 to 4.5) Consequently, AFL reported values
12 were used in all subsequent analyses.

13 **** INSERT TABLE II ABOUT HERE****

14 The validity screening resulted in the removal of 107 of the 143 features initially extracted,
15 leaving 36 for inclusion in the modelling process. This feature set was further reduced to
16 eight features based on each providing a significant ($P < 0.05$) contribution to the GEE
17 model.

18 ****INSERT TABLE III ABOUT HERE****

19 Table III provides an overview of the contribution of the eight features to the model,
20 based on their model estimate, standard error and corresponding Wald statistic. The three
21 features providing strongest contributions to the model all related to the performance
22 indicator Goals, with lower P_{75} , P_{90} and P_{95} values all most strongly linked with a winning
23 team outcome. Lower P_{90} for Behinds and P_{95} values for Inside 50's were also positive
24 contributors to the model. In contrast, higher P_{25} and P_{50} values for Disposals and P_{25} for

1 Marks were related with winning (Table III). Overall classification accuracy of the model
2 (median \pm SD) was reported at $63.9 \pm 4.2\%$ for the 10 fold cross-validation.

3 ***** INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE *****

4 The individual influence of each feature on match outcome is presented in the
5 Tornado plot shown in Figure 1. Each bar in the graph indicates the influence of the feature
6 value when keeping all other variables constant (at their mean level) in the GEE model. The
7 bars in blue represents the win probability for the lowest realised value of the feature for
8 2014, while the red bar relates to the win probability for highest realised value of the feature
9 in the sample. Using Goals.P₇₅ as an example, it can be seen that the probability of win is
10 reduced from 83.84% to 18.94% as relative goal contributions to the team total decrease
11 from the highest observed value to the lowest. Considering that the outcome of win is set at
12 a probability level of 0.7 (or 70%), this example illustrates that lower P₇₅ team values are
13 preferable in order to maximise the probability of winning. In contrast, Figure 1 shows that
14 for the feature Disposals.P₂₅, the probability of win is improved from 5.99% to 72.64% as
15 team relative disposal contributions increase from the lowest observed value to the highest.

16 ***** INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE *****

17 Figure 2 presents an example of the vector w for a win and loss scenario, in this
18 instance for the performance indicator Goals. Figure 2a depicts the raw mean distribution of
19 goals for each player in the 2014 AFL season, prior to conversion to a relative format. The y
20 axis relates to the mean goals contribution per match, whilst the 22 players are represented
21 on the x axis ordered by magnitude of their contribution. Unsurprisingly, winning teams
22 displayed higher mean values for goals for all 22 players in the season. Specifically, Figure
23 2a shows that the leading individual player for winning teams contributed almost four goals
24 per game to the team, whereas this value was less than three for losing sides. The figure also
25 shows that a greater number of players typically contributed to the number of goals kicked
26 for winning sides. Specifically, Figure 2b reveals the same data shown in Figure 2a, having

1 been converted to relative values for each player (i.e., percentage contribution to team total).
2 As is shown in the area curve, higher relative contributions to the team goal total is noted for
3 the top six players for losing teams. This reflects the findings from the GEE model showing
4 that lower P_{75} , P_{95} and P_{90} values are advantageous. In contrast, the tail of the Win curve is
5 larger comparatively to that of the Loss, showing the importance of having greater
6 contributions to team goals from multiple players. Specifically, it can be noted that during
7 the 2014 season winning teams recorded up to 13 goal scorers, whereas this value was rarely
8 higher than 10 for losing sides (Figure 2b).

9 ***** INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE *****

10 Figure 3 shows an example of the strongest feature of the model, Goals.P75, with respect to
11 its mean value for each of the 18 AFL teams in both wins and losses. The sides have been
12 ranked from left to right based on their final ladder position at the end of the regular season.
13 With the exception of one team (Melbourne) Goals. P75 values were typically lower in
14 losses compared to wins, further emphasising the generalisability of this particular feature's
15 influence.

16

17 Discussion

18 This study aimed to develop a method of quantifying relative contributions from each of the
19 22 players on an AFL team, with respect to the influence on winning a match. To achieve
20 this aim, each player's individual contribution was measured using 13 commonly-reported
21 performance indicators, with the data then converted to a relative format and expressed as a
22 percentage of the team total. Multiple features were then extracted from each performance
23 indicator in this relative format, in order to represent the distributions across the 22 players
24 in a team.

1 Results showed that only eight of the 143 extracted features contributed
2 meaningfully to a model capable of explaining match outcome in the AFL. In particular,
3 features relating to Goals and Disposals were prominent, with both providing multiple
4 estimates to the model in the negative and positive direction respectively. Based on these
5 estimates, it is apparent that players capable of playing both midfield and forward roles
6 respectively should be considered by coaches when undertaking team selection. Specifically,
7 the proposed model suggests that a comparatively more even contribution of individual goal
8 scorers is beneficial to team success, whilst higher median (P_{50}) player disposal
9 contributions are desirable. Given the three strongest features included in the model all
10 related to the performance indicator Goals, it can be surmised that AFL sides should look to
11 select a team capable of producing multiple goal kickers. In Australian Rules football
12 typically six forwards will compete on the ground at any given time, along with same
13 number of midfielders and defenders (18 in total). However, these results illustrate the
14 importance of players other than forwards contributing to team goal scoring, particularly for
15 winning sides.

16 This paper also provides a new insight into the manner in which performance
17 indicator distributions across a team can be understood in order to maximise the likelihood
18 of winning. Practically, team scouts, recruiting staff and list managers may use such
19 information in order to identify potential deficiencies within their playing roster.
20 Specifically, the findings relating to goal distribution potentially point to a need for the
21 development of empirical position-specific models for Australian football, which have been
22 previously considered as important to define in sport (Reilly, 2001). Specifically, it may be
23 pertinent for list managers and coaches to compare the relative contributions from different
24 positional groups based on match outcome or when competing against different opponents.
25 This could then allow these staff to make more informed decisions relating to the type of
26 player which should be recruited to their particular club, potentially maximising
27 considerable time and financial investment in the process. It may also further inform the

1 structure of team training, to focus on player and ball movement patterns which facilitate
2 achieving these player contribution distributions. Based on the findings from this study
3 specifically, it is clear that sides should look to practice situations which readily facilitate
4 opportunities for a wide range of players to contribute to team scoring.

5 It should be noted that the GEE model proposed in this paper represents a
6 population-averaged approach to addressing the question of explaining team sport match
7 outcome. Although recent work has used the GEE method successfully for various purposes
8 in both team and individual sports (van Ark *et al.*, 2015; Robertson, Gupta, Kremer &
9 Burnett, 2014; Young *et al.*, 2015), the overall model performance in the present study could
10 be considered as only fair. Specifically, just under two thirds of matches from the 2014 AFL
11 were correctly classified. However, considering that the model takes into account only the
12 differences in player performance distribution for winning and losing matches and not the
13 magnitude (i.e., raw values), the results are nonetheless encouraging. Consequently, the
14 methodology proposed could be implemented in a variety of team sports, particularly those
15 with a similar number of players competing as in Australian football (i.e., rugby or football).

16 A limitation relating to this study was the lack of inter- and intra-rater reliability as
17 well as validity data available for each of the performance indicators used. However, results
18 from the comparison with our own analysis of a subset of data revealed generally high
19 agreement for each performance indicator along with corresponding low RMSE values. The
20 process undertaken by the commercial provider used by the AFL involves numerous human
21 statistical coders working on multiple matches in a given week. Whilst previous research has
22 also reported the validity of this data as high (O'Shaughnessy, 2006), unfortunately the inter-
23 and intra-rater reliability of this information is not available. It is also possible that the
24 addition of more sophisticated performance indicators currently used by AFL clubs (i.e.,
25 metres gained) or those from other domains (i.e., physical performance) may have improved
26 the accuracy of the GEE model. Further studies could look to include the team distribution
27 of high intensity running or the total distance covered by players. It may also be of interest

1 to determine the success of this analysis approach in sports which include fewer players on
2 the field at any one time.

3 Future work may look to undertake investigation into the external validity of this
4 model by evaluating its performance on new data obtained over subsequent seasons.
5 Specifically, it may be of interest to determine whether similar player contribution
6 distributions have been associated with winning in previous years. Obtaining such
7 information would serve to further elucidate any longitudinal changes in the game (see
8 Norton, Craig & Olds, 1999 for previous work in this area). For instance, it would be
9 beneficial to determine whether previous successful sides were more or less reliant on
10 forwards providing the majority of scoring, or midfielders providing the majority of
11 disposals. Further, the use of an alternative dependent variable in the modelling (i.e., score
12 margin) may also yield different results and presents another future avenue for investigation.
13 The use of machine learning analysis approaches may represent an alternative option to GEE
14 in being able to identify multiple player performance distribution profiles for different
15 teams. However, it is important to recognise that such analysis techniques do not adjust their
16 output based on the level of correlation between multiple same-team performances which
17 would likely be present in a sample typical of that used here. Nonetheless, these types of
18 analyses may hold value in identifying non-linearity in the performance behaviour both
19 between and within different teams and thus may have future applicability.

20

21 **Conclusions**

22 The findings of this study represent a novel approach to understanding the relative
23 contributions of individual players in team sports with respect to match outcome. By
24 extracting features relating to performance indicators in sport, a more thorough
25 understanding of how different players contribute to a team's success can be achieved. The
26 accuracy of the model proposed in this study could potentially be further improved in future

Influence of player performance distribution on match outcome

- 1 through the addition of data from previous AFL seasons, along with the inclusion of more
- 2 sophisticated team performance indicators. Future work should focus on the application and
- 3 refinement of this model to other team sports.

1 **References**

- 2 Bourbousson, J., Deschamps, T., & Travassos, B. (2014). From players to teams: towards a
3 multi-level approach of game constraints in team sports. *International Journal of*
4 *Sports Science and Coaching*, 9, 1393-1406. doi: 10.1260/1747-9541.9.6.1393
- 5 Buszard, T., Farrow, D., & Kemp, J. (2013). Examining the influence of acute instructional
6 approaches on the decision-making performance of experienced team field sport
7 players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31, 238-247. doi:
8 10.1080/02640414.2012.731516
- 9 Castellano, J., Casamichana, D., & Lago C. (2012). The use of match statistics that
10 discriminate between successful and unsuccessful soccer teams. *Journal of Human*
11 *Kinetics*, 31, 137-147. doi:10.2478/v10078-012-0015-7
- 12 Cervone, D., D'Amour, A., Bornn, L., & Goldsberry, K. (2014). A multiresolution stochastic
13 process model for predicting basketball possession outcomes. *arXiv*, preprint
14 arXiv:1408.0777.
- 15 Clemente, F. M., Martins, F. M. L., Couceiro, M. S., Mendes, R. S., & Figueiredo, A. J.
16 (2014). A network approach to characterize the teammates' interactions on football:
17 a single match analysis. *Cuadernos de Psicología del Deporte*, 14, 141-147.
18 <http://revistas.um.es/cpd/article/view/211401/168071>
- 19 Duch, J., Waitzman, J. S., & Amaral, L. A. N. (2010). Quantifying the performance of
20 individual players in a team activity. *PloS one*, 5, e10937. doi:
21 10.1371/journal.pone.0010937
- 22 Gomez, M. A., Lorenzo, A., & Barakat, R. (2008). Differences in game-related statistics of
23 basketball performance by game location for men's winning and losing teams.
24 *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 106, 43-50. doi: 10.2466/pms.106.1.43-50
- 25 Halekoh, U., Hojsgaard S., & Yan, J. (2006). The R Package geepack for generalised
26 estimating equations. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 15, 1-11.
- 27 Heasman, J., Dawson, B., Berry, J., & Stewart, G. (2008). Development and validation of a
28 player impact ranking system in Australian football. *International Journal of*
29 *Performance Analysis in Sport*, 8, 156-171.
- 30 Hughes, M. D., & Bartlett, R. M. (2002). The use of performance indicators in performance
31 analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 20, 739-754. doi:
32 10.1080/026404102320675602
- 33 Kempton, T., Sirotic, A. C., Cameron, M., & Coutts, A. J. (2013). Match-related fatigue
34 reduces physical and technical performance during elite rugby league match-play: a
35 case study. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31, 1770-1780. doi:
36 10.1080/02640414.2013.803583
- 37 Newell, K. M. (1986). Constraints on the development of co-ordination. In M. G. Wade &
38 H. T. A. Whiting (Eds.), *Motor development in children: Aspects of co-ordination*
39 *and control* (pp. 341-360). Dodrech: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 40 Norton, K. I., Craig, N. P., & Olds, T. S. (1999). The evolution of Australian football.
41 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 2, 389-404. doi:10.1016/S1440-
42 2440(99)80011-5

- 1 Ofoghi, B., Zeleznikow, J., MacMahon, C., & Raab, M. (2013). Data mining in elite sports:
2 a review and a framework. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise*
3 *Science*, 17, 171-186. doi:10.1080/1091367X.2013.805137
- 4 Önder, H. (2015). Comparative study of generalized estimating equations and logistic
5 regressions on different sample sizes and correlation levels. *Communications in*
6 *Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, doi: 10.1080/03610918.2015.1010000
- 7 O'Shaughnessy, D. M. (2006). Possession versus position: Strategic evaluation in AFL.
8 *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine*, 5, 533-540.
- 9 Passos, P., Davids, K., Araujo, D., Paz, N., Minguéns, J., & Mendes, J. (2011). Networks as
10 a novel tool for studying team ball sports as complex social systems. *Journal of*
11 *Science and Medicine in Sport*, 14, 170-176. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2010.10.459
- 12 Reilly, T. (2001). Assessment of sports performance with particular reference to field games.
13 *European Journal of Sport Science*, 1, 1-12. doi: 10.1080/17461390100071306
- 14 Robertson, S., Back, N., & Bartlett, J. D. (2015). Explaining match outcome in elite
15 Australian Rules football using team performance indicators. *Journal of Sports*
16 *Sciences*, doi: 10.1080/02640414.2015.1066026
- 17 Robertson, S., Burnett, A. F., & Gupta, R. (2014). Two tests of approach-iron golf skill and
18 their ability to predict tournament performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32,
19 1341-1349. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2014.893370
- 20 Robertson, S. J., Burnett, A. F., Newton, R. U., & Knight, P. W. (2012). Development of the
21 Nine-Ball Skills Test to discriminate elite and high-level amateur golfers. *Journal of*
22 *Sports Sciences*, 30, 431-437. doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.654398
- 23 Robertson, S., Gupta, S., Kremer, P., & Burnett, A. F. (2015). Development and
24 measurement properties of a putting skill test for high-level golf. *European Journal*
25 *of Sport Science*, 15, 125-133. 10.1080/17461391.2014.932014
- 26 Sargent, J., & Bedford, A. (2013). Evaluating Australian Football League player
27 contributions using interactive network simulation. *Journal of Sports Science &*
28 *Medicine*, 12, 116-121.
- 29 Stewart, M., Mitchell, H., & Stavros, C. (2007). Moneyball applied: Econometrics and the
30 identification and recruitment of elite Australian footballers. *International Journal*
31 *of Sport Finance*, 2, 231-248.
- 32 Tangelos, C., Robertson, S., Spittle, M., & Gatin, P. B. (2015). Predictors of individual
33 player match performance in junior Australian football. *International Journal of*
34 *Sports Physiology and Performance*. doi:10.1123/ijsp.2014-0428
- 35 Tavana, M., Azizi, F., Azizi, F., & Behzadian, M. (2013). A fuzzy inference system with
36 application to player selection and team formation in multi-player sports. *Sport*
37 *Management Review*, 16, 97-110. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2012.06.002
- 38 van Ark, M., Docking, S. I., van den Akker-Scheek, I., Rudavsky, A., Rio, E., Zwerver, J., &
39 Cook, J. L. (2015). Does the adolescent patellar tendon respond to 5 days of
40 cumulative load during a volleyball tournament? *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine*
41 *and Science in Sports*. doi:10.1111/sms.12426
- 42 Vaz, L., Van Rooyen, M., & Sampaio, J. (2010). Rugby game-related statistics that
43 discriminate between winning and losing teams in IRB and Super twelve close
44 games. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine*, 9, 51-55.

- 1 Vilar, L., Araújo, D., Davids, K., & Travassos, B. (2012). Constraints on competitive
2 performance of attacker–defender dyads in team sports. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,
3 30, 459-469. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2011.627942
- 4 Yan, J., Højsgaard, S., & Halekoh, U. (2012). Generalized estimating equation package.
5 Geepack version, 1-0.
- 6 Young, W. B., & Pryor, L. (2007). Relationship between pre-season anthropometric and
7 fitness measures and indicators of playing performance in elite junior Australian
8 Rules football. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 10, 110-118.
9 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2006.06.003
- 10 Young, J. A., Symons, C. M., Pain, M. D., Harvey, J. T., Eime, R. M., Craike, M. J., &
11 Payne, W. R. (2015). Role models of Australian female adolescents: a longitudinal
12 study to inform programmes designed to increase physical activity and sport
13 participation. *European Physical Education Review*, 1-16.
14 doi:10.1177/1356336X15579574
- 15 Zeger, S. L., Liang, K. Y., & Albert, P. S. (1988). Models for longitudinal data: a
16 generalized estimating equation approach. *Biometrics*, 44, 1049-1060.
- 17 Ziegler, A., & Vens, M. (2010). Generalized estimating equations. *Methods of Information*
18 *in Medicine*, 49, 421-425. doi:10.3414/ME10-01-0026

