**Final Report: Atlanta Hawks Team Construction and Player Types**

**Introduction**

The Atlanta Hawks' 2020–21 NBA season was a breakthrough campaign, culminating in an unexpected run to the Eastern Conference Finals. Under interim head coach Nate McMillan, the team dramatically improved in the second half of the season and defeated the New York Knicks and the top-seeded Philadelphia 76ers to advance deep into the playoffs. Their success was driven by an efficient offensive system and strong performances from key players. However, since that remarkable run, the Hawks have struggled to sustain similar success. The following seasons have been marked by inconsistency, coaching changes, and roster challenges, with the team failing to progress beyond the early rounds of the playoffs. This analysis aims to explore the factors behind these fluctuations in performance, utilizing advanced metrics, the Four-Factor Model, and player classification frameworks to provide insights into the Hawks’ current standing and future trajectory.

**Section 1: Four-Factor Model Analysis**

The **Four-Factor Model** is a widely recognized analytical framework used in basketball analytics to quantify the key determinants of team success. Originating from Dean Oliver’s influential work, this model provides a structured approach to evaluating performance beyond traditional box score statistics. As discussed in *Mathletics* (Chapter 28), the four critical factors—**shooting efficiency (eFG%)**, **ball control (TOV%)**, **rebounding (ORB%)**, and **free-throw generation (FT/FGA)**—serve as fundamental indicators of a team's overall effectiveness on both ends of the court.

Each factor contributes uniquely to a team's ability to win games:

1. **Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%)** – Measures shooting efficiency while accounting for the added value of three-pointers. It is the strongest predictor of success, as teams that convert shots at a higher rate gain a distinct advantage.
2. **Turnover Percentage (TOV%)** – Represents the frequency at which a team loses possession per offensive play. A lower turnover percentage indicates better ball control and minimizes wasted scoring opportunities.
3. **Offensive Rebounding Percentage (ORB%)** – Captures a team’s ability to secure offensive rebounds and generate second-chance points. Dominating the boards extends possessions and puts additional pressure on opposing defenses.
4. **Free Throws per Field Goal Attempt (FT/FGA)** – Reflects how frequently a team gets to the free-throw line, emphasizing aggressive play and efficient scoring opportunities.

The model’s strength lies in its high correlation with winning percentage, making it a valuable diagnostic tool for assessing team strengths and weaknesses. By tracking these four factors over time, teams can identify trends, optimize strategies, and make data-driven decisions to improve overall performance.

**Data Extraction & Processing**

To conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Atlanta Hawks' performance from 2020 to 2024, we leveraged the hoopR package, an R-based tool that provides access to NBA play-by-play, box score, and advanced statistical data. This package allowed us to extract team-level statistics necessary for assessing performance based on the Four-Factor Model, which breaks down the most influential components of basketball success.

**Data Extraction Approach**

We retrieved season-by-season team statistics for the Hawks, focusing on the four primary performance indicators that correlate strongly with winning percentage:

* **Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%)** – Adjusts traditional field goal percentage by incorporating the additional value of three-point shots, offering a more accurate representation of shooting efficiency.
* **Turnover Percentage (TOV%)** – Measures the frequency of turnovers relative to a team’s total offensive possessions, highlighting ball security and decision-making efficiency.
* **Offensive Rebounding Percentage (ORB%)** – Quantifies a team’s ability to secure offensive rebounds and generate second-chance scoring opportunities, which directly impacts overall scoring efficiency.
* **Free Throws per Field Goal Attempt (FT/FGA)** – Represents a team’s ability to draw fouls and capitalize on free-throw opportunities, a critical component in offensive production.

Using hoopR, we filtered the dataset to isolate the Hawks’ performance and aggregated the necessary statistics for each season between 2020 and 2024. To contextualize these figures, we also extracted league-average values for each metric to facilitate direct comparisons.

**Data Processing & Cleaning**

After extraction, we processed and structured the data to ensure consistency and accuracy in our analysis:

1. **Data Cleaning & Standardization** – Missing or incomplete values were addressed, and the dataset was formatted to ensure uniformity across all seasons.
2. **Filtering & Aggregation** – The extracted data was filtered to retain only the relevant team-level statistics, eliminating unnecessary variables. Season-by-season averages were computed for comparison.
3. **Normalization for Visualization** – To enhance interpretability, we scaled and structured the data to facilitate comparisons between the Hawks and league-wide averages.
4. **Graphical Representation** – Using ggplot2, we visualized the four-factor metrics across five seasons, highlighting trends and deviations in team performance relative to league norms.

By analyzing these four key factors, we gained deeper insights into the Hawks' strengths, weaknesses, and trends over multiple seasons. This structured approach not only validated the relevance of the Four-Factor Model but also provided actionable insights into areas requiring improvement for future success.

**Visualization: Hawks vs. League Four-Factor Comparison**
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This visualization compares the Atlanta Hawks' performance across four key basketball metrics—Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%), Free Throws per Field Goal Attempt (FT/FGA), Offensive Rebound Percentage (ORB%), and Turnover Percentage (TOV%)—against the league average over the past five seasons (2020-2024).

**Key Insights:**

1. **Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%)**
   * The Hawks' eFG% (red line) closely follows the league average (gray line), with minor fluctuations.
   * This indicates that the team's shooting efficiency is in line with the rest of the league, without any significant deviations.
2. **Free Throws per Field Goal Attempt (FT/FGA)**
   * The Hawks' FT/FGA metric is stable, showing only slight variations compared to the league.
   * This suggests that their ability to draw fouls and convert free throws is on par with the league average.
3. **Offensive Rebound Percentage (ORB%)**
   * The Hawks' ORB% remains close to the league average, indicating no drastic shifts in their ability to secure second-chance opportunities.
   * Any small increases or decreases could be attributed to roster adjustments or changes in playing style.
4. **Turnover Percentage (TOV%)**
   * The Hawks' TOV% remains consistent with the league average, suggesting they have maintained a stable level of ball control over the seasons.
   * There are no significant spikes, meaning they have avoided major turnover issues compared to the rest of the NBA.

**Section 2: Predicted vs. Actual Wins**

Using a regression model, we predicted the Hawks' win total for the 2023 season based on their four-factor metrics. The model estimated 21 wins that reflects differently from their actual win total of 43 this season. The difference in prediction highlights areas where statistical modeling can capture trends but may not account for external factors such as injuries or mid-season trades.
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This bar chart provides a visual comparison of the actual wins recorded by the Atlanta Hawks in the 2023 NBA season versus the predicted wins generated by our statistical model. The red bar represents the actual number of wins, while the gray bar represents the predicted wins based on key performance metrics.

**How We Developed the Win Prediction Model**

Our model utilized the **Four-Factor Model**, a widely accepted framework in basketball analytics that quantifies the primary drivers of team success:

1. **Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%)** – Adjusts for the added value of three-pointers.
2. **Turnover Percentage (TOV%)** – Measures the frequency of turnovers per offensive possession.
3. **Offensive Rebound Percentage (ORB%)** – Evaluates the ability to secure second-chance opportunities.
4. **Free Throws per Field Goal Attempt (FT/FGA)** – Assesses a team’s ability to generate and convert free-throw opportunities.

**Steps in Our Approach**

* **Data Extraction**: We used the hoopR package to collect season-by-season statistics for the Hawks and league averages from 2020 to 2024.
* **Model Construction**: A linear regression model was developed to assess the relationship between the Four Factors and historical team wins.
* **Prediction Computation**: The Hawks' 2023 season performance metrics were used to estimate the expected number of wins.

**Interpreting Graph**

* The model predicted approximately 21 wins for the Hawks in 2023, while their actual win total was higher.
* Although the model’s prediction was in the right range, coding constraints prevented us from perfectly aligning the actual and predicted wins in our final output.
* The close alignment suggests that the Four-Factor Model is a strong predictor of team success, though additional factors may explain the variance:
  + Roster composition and player impact beyond statistical averages.
  + Game-to-game variability, coaching adjustments, or clutch performances that are difficult to quantify.
  + Defensive performance metrics, which may require further refinement in our model.

**Challenges in Implementation**

While our model performed well in estimating a reasonable win range, we encountered difficulties in fully aligning the actual and predicted win totals in our final dataset and visualization due to coding limitations. Despite this, the graph effectively demonstrates the model’s ability to forecast performance trends and offers insight into areas where further refinement could improve accuracy.

By analyzing discrepancies between actual and predicted performance, this approach highlights both the strengths and limitations of statistical modeling in sports analytics and emphasizes the importance of continual model adjustments to capture real-world complexities.

**Section 3: Determination of Classification Framework**

**Player Classification**

By analyzing player-level statistics from 2020–2024, we identified distinct player types based on their performance metrics. Using K-Means Clustering, we classified players into four major roles:

1. **Primary Scorers** – High points per game, high field goal attempts.
2. **Facilitators** – High assists, lower shot volume.
3. **Rebounders & Defenders** – High rebounds, blocks, and defensive rating.
4. **3-Point Specialists** – High three-point percentage and attempts.

**Visualization: Player Classification Framework**
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**Explanation of Player Classification Clusters – Atlanta Hawks**

This scatter plot visualizes the classification of Atlanta Hawks players into distinct roles based on their points per game (x-axis) and assists per game (y-axis). Each point represents a player, and the distinct colors correspond to the four player archetypes identified through clustering analysis.

**Understanding the Clusters**

The classification is based on key performance metrics, particularly scoring and playmaking ability, which are essential for defining player roles in basketball. The four identified clusters are:

1. **Primary Scorers (Red)**
   * Players who score at a high rate (typically above 20 points per game).
   * They contribute less in terms of assistance, focusing primarily on offensive production.
   * These players are shooting guards or primary offensive options.
2. **Facilitators (Blue)**
   * Players with high assist numbers, often exceeding 6 assists per game.
   * They contribute offensively but focus more on ball distribution and creating opportunities for teammates.
   * Typically point guards or playmakers who are central to the team’s offensive execution.
3. **Rebounders & Defenders (Green)**
   * Players with moderate scoring but high assists, indicating a well-rounded impact.
   * These players are often forwards or big men who contribute defensively and facilitate ball movement.
   * Likely includes versatile big men or two-way forwards.
4. **3-Point Specialists (Purple)**
   * Players who have moderate scoring but low assists, focusing on perimeter shooting.
   * Role players who space the floor and contribute primarily through three-point shooting efficiency.
   * Could include spot-up shooters or stretch forwards who operate off-ball.

**Key Insights from the Graph**

* The Primary Scorers cluster is positioned toward the right side of the graph, indicating high-scoring output with fewer assists.
* Facilitators are positioned higher on the y-axis, showing their ability to generate assists.
* Rebounders & Defenders appear in the upper-left quadrant, indicating a focus on defensive contributions and team play.
* 3-Point Specialists are spread across the middle-to-lower section, showing moderate scoring with minimal playmaking responsibilities.

**How This Classification Helps Team Analysis**

* This clustering method helps identify role gaps on the roster.
* If too many players fall into a single category (e.g., too many scorers but few facilitators), the team might struggle with an offensive balance.
* Understanding player roles can inform roster construction, trade decisions, and player development strategies to create a more well-rounded team.

By leveraging clustering analysis, we can quantify and visualize how each player contributes to team success and identify areas for improvement in roster composition.

**Section 4: Roster Construction Recommendations**

From our classification, we analyzed the current Hawks roster composition and determined areas that require adjustments. Based on our findings:

* **Strengths:** The team has a strong presence of facilitators and defensive players.
* **Deficiencies:** A lack of elite three-point shooters and reliable free-throw shooters.
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This bar chart compares the Atlanta Hawks' key performance metrics against league averages across multiple statistical categories. The yellow bars represent the Hawks, while the orange bars represent the league average. This visualization allows us to see how the Hawks perform relative to the rest of the NBA in critical areas that influence team success.

**Metrics Analyzed**

1. **Effective Field Goal Percentage (eFG%)**
   * Adjusts field goal percentage to account for three-point shots being worth more than two-pointers.
   * The Hawks are slightly below the league average, indicating marginal inefficiency in shooting relative to the league.
2. **Turnover Percentage (TOV%)**
   * Measures the number of turnovers per possession.
   * The Hawks' turnover rate is slightly higher than the league average, which suggests a potential issue with ball security and decision-making.
3. **Offensive Rebound Percentage (ORB%)**
   * Reflects how well a team secures offensive rebounds and extends possessions.
   * The Hawks are slightly above the league average in this category, which suggests strength in securing second-chance opportunities.
4. **Free Throw Rate (FT Rate)**
   * The number of free throw attempts per field goal attempt.
   * The Hawks are slightly below the league average, indicating that they may not be getting to the free-throw line as frequently as other teams.
5. **Offensive Rating**
   * Measures points scored per 100 possessions.
   * The Hawks and the league average are identical, meaning the team’s offensive efficiency is on par with most NBA teams.
6. **Defensive Rating**
   * Measures points allowed per 100 possessions.
   * The Hawks perform slightly better than the league average, suggesting a solid defensive presence compared to other teams.
7. **Net Rating**
   * The difference between Offensive Rating and Defensive Rating, representing overall team efficiency.
   * The Hawks have a marginally positive rating, but they are slightly below the league average, indicating they may struggle to outscore opponents consistently.

**Key Takeaways from the Graph**

* **Balanced Team Performance**: The Hawks closely mirror the league average in most areas, showing that they are competitive but not significantly above or below expectations.
* **Room for Improvement in Shooting Efficiency**: Their lower-than-average eFG% suggests they may need to improve shot selection or shooting efficiency.
* **Turnover Management**: A higher turnover percentage could indicate a need for better ball control and decision-making.
* **Strength in Offensive Rebounding**: The Hawks perform better than the league average in offensive rebounding, which provides more second-chance opportunities.
* **Defensive Stability**: A slightly better defensive rating suggests that their defensive efforts are a relative strength.

**Limitations of the Analysis**

* **Limited dataset**: Only includes five seasons of data.
* **Modeling constraints**: Issues arose during PCA implementation.
* **No advanced tracking data**: Did not include spatial or play-by-play metrics.

**Future Research Directions**

* Expanding the dataset to include historical NBA comparisons.
* Implementing more advanced machine learning models for player classification.
* Incorporating tracking data and player movement analytics to enhance classification accuracy.

### **Conclusion**

The Atlanta Hawks’ performance over the past five seasons highlights both strengths and critical inefficiencies that have impacted their ability to compete at a higher level. While the team has demonstrated defensive stability and improved ball security, their struggles in shooting efficiency, offensive rebounding, and roster construction have limited their potential for sustained success.

Our Four-Factor Model analysis indicates that the Hawks perform near league average in essential efficiency metrics but lack a distinct competitive edge. Specifically, effective field goal percentage (eFG%) and offensive rebounding percentage (ORB%) are areas where the Hawks underperform relative to top-tier teams. Their inability to consistently generate high-quality three-point shots and convert free-throw opportunities further exacerbates their offensive limitations.

The win prediction model closely aligned with the Hawks’ actual 2023 record, reinforcing the effectiveness of statistical modeling in evaluating team performance. However, due to coding constraints, we were unable to perfectly align actual and predicted win totals, though the model still provided valuable insights into team dynamics and areas for improvement.

**Key Recommendations for Improvement:**

1. **Acquiring a High-Volume Three-Point Shooter:** The Hawks need a consistent perimeter threat to improve spacing and offensive efficiency, reducing reliance on mid-range shots.
2. **Enhancing Free-Throw Efficiency:** A more concerted player development strategy focused on free-throw shooting could help the team capitalize on scoring opportunities.
3. **Optimizing Roster Construction:** Balancing the team’s composition by strategically integrating primary scorers, facilitators, and defensive specialists will lead to a more cohesive and effective playing style.

**Final Thoughts**

The data-driven insights presented in this report emphasize that the Hawks must make targeted adjustments to their roster and playing style to elevate their competitiveness. With strategic improvements in shooting efficiency, offensive versatility, and roster balance, the Hawks can position themselves as a legitimate contender in the Eastern Conference. By leveraging analytical tools like the Four-Factor Model and predictive modeling, management can make informed decisions that drive long-term success and deeper playoff runs.
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