ARE NBA STATISTICS PREDICTIVE OF PLAYING POSITION?

Camden Miller CS 777



Introduction

- Research Question: Can you predict whether any given NBA player is a frontcourt or backcourt player based on their per game statistics?
- Can a player's basketball position limit potential statistical output and are a reliable identifier for position?
 - Relevance in today's game with social media and betting
- Data Overview
 - NBA Historical Player Per Game data set
 - 30+ per game statistics such as ppg, rpg, apg, fg%, etc. for 31,870 player seasons
 - Ability to label positions as frontcourt or backcourt
- Limitations
 - Game evolution → Positional Evolution
 - Positional anomalies
 - Records from players with limited minutes

Methodology

- Data Preprocessing
 - Two dataset versions: backcourt vs. frontcourt / point guards vs. centers
 - Player seasons 1980+
 - Exclusion of limited multi-positional players
 - Over 10 minutes played per game on average
- Feature Selection
 - 18 numerical features
 - Excluded categorical variables

```
Features:

fg_per_game | fga_per_game | fg_percent | x3pa_per_game | x3p_percent | x2pa_per_game | x2p_percent |
fta_per_game | ft_percent | orb_per_game | drb_per_game | trb_per_game | ast_per_game | stl_per_game | btk_per_game |
tov_per_game | pf_per_game | pts_per_game |
```

Methodology

• Exploratory Data Analysis

Row	Labels	Average of trb_per_g	game	Average of ast_per_gar	ne	Average of pts_per_game
Back	court		3.92	2	2.00	8.88
Front	court		3.90	1	99	8.84
Gran	d Total		3.91	1	L .99	8.86
	10.00 —					_
	9.00 —					_
	8.00 —					
	7.00 —					_
Action Per Game	6.00 —					
	5.00 —					Average of trb_per_game
Action	4.00					Average of ast_per_gameAverage of pts_per_game
	3.00 —					■ Average of pts_per_game
	2.00 —					_
	1.00 —					_
	0.00					_
		Bac kco urt	Positi	Frontcourt on		



Methodology

- Model Selection
 - Binary nature of research question → Classification
 - Logistic Regression: Sigmoid function to map predicted values to classes
 - Support Vector Machine: Optimal plane to separate classes
- Training and Performance Metrics
 - 80/20 Training and Test Data Split
 - No need for stratification
 - Backcourt vs. Frontcourt Log Reg: 100 iterations and regParam = 0.000001
 - Backcourt vs. Frontcourt SVM: 100 iterations and regParam = 0.00001
 - Point Guards vs. Centers Log Reg: 100 iterations and regParam = 0.0001
 - Point Guards vs. Centers SVM: 100 iterations and regParam = 0.0001
 - Metrics: Precision, Recall, Fl Score, Confusion Matrix

Results

Logistic Regression Results:				
Precision:	0.0013	1 = Backcourt		
Recall:	0.75	0 = Frontcourt		
F1 Score:	0.0027			
Total Time(s):	10.18			
Confusion				
Matrix	Positive (1)	Negative (1)		
Positive (1)	TP: 3442	FP: 2257		
Negative (0)	FN: 1	TN: 3		

Support Vector Machine Results:					
Precision:	0.013	1 = Backcourt			
Recall:	0.6	0 = Frontcourt			
F1 Score:	0.0026				
Total Time(s):	6.21				
Confusion					
Matrix	Positive (1)	Negative (1)			
Positive (1)	TP: 3334	FP: 2305			
Negative (0)	FN:2	TN: 3			

Logistic Regression Results:					
Precision:	0.9685	1 = Point Guard			
Recall:	0.9685	0 = Center			
F1 Score:	0.9685				
Total Time(s):	9.87				
Confusion					
Matrix	Positive (1)	Negative (1)			
Positive (1)	TP: 1145	FP: 35			
Negative (0)	FN: 35	TN: 1076			

Support Vector Machine Results:					
Precision:	0.9658	1 = Point Guard			
Recall:	0.9684	0 = Center			
F1 Score:	0.9671				
Total Time(s):	5.44				
Confusion					
Matrix	Positive (1)	Negative (1)			
Positive (1)	TP: 1145	FP: 38			
Negative (0)	FN: 35	TN: 1073			

Discussion + Conclusion

- First model training trial
- Potential issues based on results
- Changes to data labeling and filtering
- Second model training trial
- Model success and performance
- Comparison of model runtime
- Limitations
 - Frontcourt vs. Backcourt
 - Coaching and Playing Styles
- Next steps with clustering