**TRENDS IN LIMITED OVER CRICKET**

**1980/81 to 2010/11**

***Summary 2010/11 Season***

*Canterbury had an excellent season, leading the competition in almost all statistics.*

*They had seven team scores over 250, the same as Auckland. However they only had three scores over 250 against them while Auckland had seven.*

*They batted first on seven occasions winning five and losing two. Batting second they chased down Otago’s score of 220 in 44.3 overs and almost reached Auckland ‘s 335 in the final game.*

*Two defeats occurred while defending scores of 255 and 295*

*The team scored at the highest rate, 5.54 runs/over,of all six teams and had the lowest run rate of 5.09 against them.*

*They scored just over 39 runs for every wicket lost, the highest, and at 27 runs took a wicket more frequently than any other team.*

*They took a wicket every 32 balls, the best rate, while they lost a wicket every 41 balls which was very similar to the Otago figure.*

*Three centuries were scored, Auckland registered six, and two were scored against them. With 17 scores over fifty they were the best with Otago next with 12.*

*Canterbury had six century partnerships, second to Auckland with eight, and there were 11 fifty run partnerships.*

*Canterbury scored almost 42% of their runs in boundaries, which was the highest percentage and at 9.7% had the highest percentage of sixes.*

**History**

A limited over competition first began in *1971/72* but it was not until *1980/81* that a full roundwith a final was held. These matches from *1980/81* were played in conjunction with the 3 day matches but from the *1985/86* season they have been played over the Christmas period separate from the Trophy matches.

No final wasplayed after the 1985/86 season until the concept of semi-final and finals were introduced in 1989/90.

In *1993/94* a greatly expanded format was introduced which included a series of 10 rounds followed by 3 semi-finals and a final, 34 matches.

In *1999/00* and *2000/01* after 10 rounds the leading team went straight to the final with 2nd and 3rd placed teams playing off to reach the final. Finals were the best of 3 matches, 34 matches possible maximum.

From*2001/02* to *2008/9* a change of format reduced the finals to 1 match, 32 matches.

The *2009/10 and 2010/11* seasons saw a round robin of only eight rounds which was followed by the top four teams playing off in a series of three semi finals and a final, a total of 28 matches

1.

Graph 1 shows scores over 200 as a percentage of innings. The first 3 years produced high ratios in the region of 40% or more. A low period followed for the next 7 years until the 1990/91 season when the ratio jumped to 39%. A high level was reached in the 1998/99 season at 63% of innings. The following 4 seasons saw the percentage drop to an average of 45. The following 6 seasons from 2002/03 the ratio climbed dramatically and at 86% for 2006/07 and 2007/08 it was the highest on record. The 2008/09 season saw the ratio fall to 73% but in the past two seasons it has climbed to reach almost 90% of innings. 44 scores over 200 in 49 innings.

2.

Graph 2 shows scores over 250. A high of 15% in 1982/83 was followed by 11 years of low ratios until the 1994/95 season when it reached 13%. It then remained around the 15% figure except for 1997/98 when in a remarkable year the percentage soared to almost 30%. In 4 years from 2003/04 the ratio rapidly increased to reach 38% for 2005/06. The following two years the ratio was 20% but over the last three seasons there have been consistently high scores with Canterbury and Auckland each registering seven scores over 250 in the 2010/11 season. 25 scores over 250.

3.

Graph 3 shows the run rate over the period. It shows similar trends to team scores with a high initial rate for 3 years followed by a lowered rate for the next 7 years. Between 1994/95 and 2002/03 the rate was in around 4.20. Since that time the rate has increased virtually every year to reach its highest rate in 2009/10 at 5.44 runs per over. The rate fell slightly in 2010/11 to 5.26 compared to 5.44 the previous year. Wellington and Central had the poorest rate at under 5.

4.

Graph 4 shows the number of runs scored for every wicket taken. The graph has been shortened for effect but in general the rate has varied over the period from 1980/81 to 2002/03 at 21 to 27 runs for every wicket. A high rate of 28 runs was achieved in 1997/98, but for the next five years there was a noticeable fall in the runs made for every wicket taken. In season 2003/04 the batsmen dominated and the runs/wicket at 29 was the highest on record at that time. Since then, except for a one off fall in 2004/05, the rate has remained around the rate of 32 runs for every wicket fallen.

5.

Graph 5 indicates the frequency at which wickets have fallen. The highest rate of 40 balls/wicket occurred in the second season. The rate then stabilised at an average of 36 over the next 19 seasons. The 2003/04 season stopped a trend of batsmen beginning to dominate with a rise to 37. It stabilised around that figure over the next four years until 2009/10 season when the batsmen dominated and the rate fell to 35 balls

or a wicket every 5.8 overs. It rose in 2010/11 to 37 or a wicket every 6 overs.

6.

Graph 6 shows the average team scores over the 31 years. From a high of 212 in 1997/98 the average team score fell for 5 years to 192 in 2002/03. The past 6 seasons has seen the average score rise to well over 200 with the highest on record of 254 being achieved in this past year.

**Conclusion**

The first three years of one day cricket indicate a dominance of bat over ball followed by a reverse period of seven years where captains and bowlers clearly learned how to contain and place defensive fields. This changed quite dramatically during the *1990/91* season and the bat came into dominance again. Over the next twelve years the competition changed little, there were periods when the relationship between the bat and ball varied, but it is only over the past seven years and more particularly in the last three years that the game has become dominated by the batsmen. Clearly the influence of the T 20 competition is having an immense influence?

**Team Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **2008/09** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Team** | **Inns** | **Runs** | **Balls** | **200+** | **250+** | **Wkts** | **Runs/Over scd** | **Runs/wkt scd** | **Balls/wkt lost** | **Position** | | Auckland | 9 | 2066 | 2534 | 7 | 3 | 76 | 4.89 | 27.18 | 33.34 | 6 | | Canterbury | 10 | 2283 | 2841 | 8 | 4 | 72 | 4.82 | 31.71 | 39.46 | 3 | | CD | 10 | 2445 | 2800 | 8 | 5 | 75 | 5.24 | 32.60 | 37.33 | 4 | | ND | 11 | 2568 | 2972 | 8 | 5 | 68 | 5.18 | 37.76 | 43.71 | 1 | | Otago | 10 | 2198 | 2567 | 6 | 3 | 72 | 5.14 | 30.53 | 35.65 | 2 | | Wellington | 10 | 2194 | 2856 | 7 | 2 | 79 | 4.61 | 27.77 | 36.15 | 5 | | **Total** | **60** | **13754** | **16570** | **44** | **22** | **442** | **4.98** | **31.12** | **37.49** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **2009/10** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Team** | **Inns** | **Runs** | **Balls** | **200+** | **250+** | **Wkts** | **Runs/Over scd** | **Runs/wkt scd** | **Balls/wkt lost** | **Position** | | Auckland | 10 | 2585 | 2793 | 9 | 6 | 77 | 5.55 | 33.57 | 36.27 | 2 | | Canterbury | 9 | 2475 | 2584 | 8 | 8 | 69 | 5.75 | 35.87 | 37.45 | 4 | | CD | 10 | 2380 | 2708 | 9 | 5 | 80 | 5.27 | 29.75 | 33.85 | 3 | | ND | 11 | 2656 | 2954 | 10 | 5 | 75 | 5.39 | 35.41 | 39.39 | 1 | | Otago | 8 | 1917 | 1947 | 6 | 3 | 61 | 5.91 | 31.43 | 31.92 | 5 | | Wellington | 8 | 1500 | 1931 | 3 | 1 | 61 | 4.66 | 24.59 | 31.66 | 6 | | **Total** | **56** | **13513** | **14917** | **45** | **28** | **423** | **5.44** | **31.95** | **35.26** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **2010/11** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Team** | **Inns** | **Runs** | **Balls** | **200+** | **250+** | **Wkts** | **Runs/Over scd** | **Runs/wkt scd** | **Balls/wkt lost** | **Position** | | Auckland | 10 | 2789 | 2878 | 9 | 7 | 76 | 5.81 | 36.70 | 37.87 | 1 | | Canterbury | 9 | 2464 | 2667 | 9 | 7 | 63 | 5.54 | 39.11 | 42.33 | 2 | | CD | 6 | 1449 | 1741 | 5 | 2 | 49 | 4.99 | 29.57 | 35.53 | 5 | | ND | 8 | 1962 | 2344 | 8 | 3 | 70 | 5.02 | 28.03 | 33.49 | 4 | | Otago | 9 | 2153 | 2630 | 8 | 3 | 68 | 4.91 | 31.66 | 38.68 | 3 | | Wellington | 7 | 1637 | 1951 | 5 | 3 | 56 | 5.03 | 29.23 | 34.84 | 6 | | **Total** | **49** | **12454** | **14211** | **44** | **25** | **382** | **5.26** | **32.60** | **37.20** |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

On average Canterbury has been one of the best performing team over the last eight years but has won the competition on only one occasion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2010/11** | **Runs/Wicket** | **Runs/Wicket** | **Balls/Wicket** | **Balls/Wicket** | **Runs/Over** | **Runs/Over** |
|  | **For** | **Against** | **Lost** | **Taken** | **For** | **Against** |
| Auckland | 36.70 | 31.12 | 37.87 | 34.89 | 5.81 | 5.35 |
| Canterbury | 39.11 | 27.08 | 42.33 | 31.92 | 5.54 | 5.09 |
| Central Districts | 29.57 | 31.70 | 35.53 | 35.98 | 4.99 | 5.29 |
| Northern Districts | 28.03 | 43.73 | 34.99 | 50.39 | 5.02 | 5.21 |
| Otago | 31.66 | 35.71 | 38.68 | 40.76 | 4.91 | 5.26 |
| Wellington | 29.23 | 31.29 | 34.84 | 35.07 | 5.03 | 5.35 |

**Individual Scores and Partnerships**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2009/10** | **Centuries** | |  | **Fifities** | |  | **Century Partnerships** | | | **50 Partnerships** | |
|  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |
| A | 3 | 3 |  | 12 | 6 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 15 | 14 |
| C | 5 | 3 |  | 11 | 13 |  | 3 | 2 |  | 12 | 16 |
| ND | 1 | 3 |  | 15 | 9 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 15 | 15 |
| CD | 2 | 0 |  | 14 | 14 |  | 5 | 0 |  | 10 | 17 |
| O | 2 | 2 |  | 8 | 14 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 13 | 7 |
| W | 0 | 2 |  | 7 | 11 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 12 | 8 |
| **Total** | **13** | **13** |  | **67** | **67** |  | **13** | **13** |  | **77** | **77** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2010/11** | **Centuries** | |  | **Fifities** | |  | **Century Partnerships** | | | **50 Partnerships** | |
|  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |  | **for** | **against** |
| A | 6 | 2 |  | 10 | 15 |  | 8 | 4 |  | 12 | 10 |
| C | 3 | 2 |  | 17 | 11 |  | 6 | 4 |  | 11 | 9 |
| ND | 3 | 2 |  | 10 | 12 |  | 2 | 5 |  | 10 | 6 |
| CD | 1 | 4 |  | 8 | 5 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 6 | 9 |
| O | 2 | 3 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 8 | 13 |
| W | 0 | 2 |  | 11 | 13 |  | 3 | 5 |  | 8 | 8 |
| **Total** | **15** | **15** |  | **68** | **68** |  | **25** | **25** |  | **55** | **55** |

An interesting comparison showing how much the 2007/08 season was dominated by the batsman. Although the figures for 2008/09 were down, except for 50 run partnerships, they were well above the results for the 2006/07 season. The 2009/10 season with the reduced games is difficult to compare but centuries have risen while the remaining categories are very similar to the 2008/09 season.

**Team** **Comparison of Fours and Sixes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2008/09** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Team** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four total** | **Fours %** | **Team** | **Runs** | **Sixes** | **Sixes total** | **Sixes %** | **Total %** |
| Central Districts | 2445 | 248 | 992 | 40.57% | Canterbury | 2283 | 44 | 264 | 11.56% | 52.14% |
| Otago | 2198 | 207 | 828 | 37.67% | Otago | 2198 | 37 | 222 | 10.10% | 47.77% |
| Auckland | 2066 | 178 | 712 | 34.46% | Auckland | 2066 | 29 | 174 | 8.42% | 42.88% |
| Canterbury | 2283 | 195 | 780 | 34.17% | Wellington | 2194 | 25 | 150 | 6.84% | 41.00% |
| Northern Districts | 2568 | 215 | 860 | 33.49% | Central Districts | 2445 | 26 | 156 | 6.38% | 39.87% |
| Wellington | 2194 | 172 | 688 | 31.36% | Northern Districts | 2568 | 25 | 150 | 5.84% | 37.20% |
|  | **13754** | **1215** | **4860** | **35.34%** |  | **13754** | **186** | **1116** | **8.11%** | **43.45%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2009/10** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Team** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four total** | **Fours %** | **Team** | **Runs** | **Sixes** | **Sixes total** | **Sixes %** | **Total %** |
| Otago | 1917 | 183 | 732 | 38.18% | Canterbury | 2475 | 55 | 330 | 13.33% | 51.52% |
| Canterbury | 2475 | 218 | 872 | 35.23% | Otago | 1917 | 36 | 216 | 11.27% | 46.50% |
| Auckland | 2585 | 213 | 852 | 32.96% | Cental Districts | 2380 | 41 | 246 | 10.34% | 43.30% |
| Cental Districts | 2380 | 191 | 764 | 32.10% | Auckland | 2585 | 40 | 240 | 9.28% | 41.39% |
| Northern Districts | 2656 | 211 | 844 | 31.78% | Wellington | 1500 | 23 | 138 | 9.20% | 40.98% |
| Wellington | 1500 | 117 | 468 | 31.20% | Northern Districts | 2656 | 38 | 228 | 8.58% | 39.78% |
|  | **13513** | **1133** | **4532** | **33.54%** |  | **13513** | **233** | **1398** | **10.35%** | **43.88%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2010/11** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Team** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four total** | **Fours %** | **Team** | **Runs** | **Sixes** | **Sixes total** | **Sixes %** | **Total %** |
| Northern Districts | 1962 | 161 | 644 | 32.82% | Canterbury | 2464 | 40 | 240 | 9.74% | 42.56% |
| Otago | 2153 | 176 | 704 | 32.70% | Wellington | 1637 | 24 | 144 | 8.80% | 41.50% |
| Auckland | 2789 | 228 | 912 | 32.70% | Auckland | 2789 | 37 | 222 | 7.96% | 40.66% |
| Canterbury | 2464 | 197 | 788 | 31.98% | Cental Districts | 1449 | 19 | 114 | 7.87% | 39.85% |
| Cental Districts | 1449 | 114 | 456 | 31.47% | Northern Districts | 1962 | 24 | 144 | 7.34% | 38.81% |
| Wellington | 1637 | 122 | 488 | 29.81% | Otago | 2153 | 18 | 108 | 5.02% | 34.83% |
|  | **12454** | **998** | **3992** | **32.05%** |  | **12454** | **162** | **972** | **7.80%** | **39.86%** |

Percentage wise more sixes hit in the 2009/10 season but less fours and Canterbury rate highly in both years for the proportion of boundaries.

**Ground Comparison of Fours and Sixes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2008/09** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four total** | **Four %** |  | **Runs** | **Sixes** | **Sixes total** | **Sixes %** |
| Fitzherbert Park | 1102 | 113 | 452 | 41.02% | University Oval | 451 | 13 | 78 | 17.29% |
| University Oval | 451 | 44 | 176 | 39.02% | Seddon Park | 1365 | 31 | 186 | 13.63% |
| Eden Outer | 1938 | 186 | 744 | 38.39% | Trafalgar Park | 488 | 9 | 54 | 11.07% |
| Trafalgar Park | 488 | 46 | 184 | 37.70% | Queens Park | 489 | 9 | 54 | 11.04% |
| Seddon Park | 1365 | 125 | 500 | 36.63% | Pukekura Park | 1110 | 20 | 120 | 10.81% |
| Pukekura Park | 1110 | 101 | 404 | 36.40% | Village Green | 1495 | 23 | 138 | 9.23% |
| Village Green | 1495 | 135 | 540 | 36.12% | Mainpower Oval | 510 | 7 | 42 | 8.24% |
| Queens Park | 489 | 44 | 176 | 35.99% | Eden Outer | 1938 | 26 | 156 | 8.05% |
| Mainpower Oval | 510 | 45 | 180 | 35.29% | Eden Park | 455 | 5 | 30 | 6.59% |
| Eden Park | 455 | 39 | 156 | 34.29% | Basin Reserve | 2389 | 24 | 144 | 6.03% |
| Basin Reserve | 2389 | 194 | 776 | 32.48% | Fitzherbert Park | 1102 | 10 | 60 | 5.44% |
| Alexandra | 717 | 53 | 212 | 29.57% | Alexandra | 717 | 5 | 30 | 4.18% |
| Cobham Oval | 1245 | 90 | 360 | 28.92% | Cobham Oval | 1245 | 4 | 24 | 1.93% |
|  | **13754** | **1215** | **4860** | **35.34%** |  | **13754** | **186** | **1116** | **8.11%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2009/10** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four total** | **Four %** |  | **Runs** | **Sixes** | **Sixes total** | **Sixes %** |
| Oamaru | 640 | 68 | 272 | 42.50% | Timaru | 781 | 24 | 144 | 18.44% |
| University Oval | 535 | 51 | 204 | 38.13% | Oamaru | 640 | 19 | 114 | 17.81% |
| Timaru | 781 | 73 | 292 | 37.39% | Pukekura Park | 663 | 16 | 96 | 14.48% |
| Basin Reserve | 1627 | 146 | 584 | 35.89% | Seddon Park | 929 | 22 | 132 | 14.21% |
| Colin Maiden | 2810 | 244 | 976 | 34.73% | Fitzherbert Park | 1078 | 25 | 150 | 13.91% |
| Pukekura Park | 663 | 56 | 224 | 33.79% | Queens Park | 429 | 9 | 54 | 12.59% |
| Queens Park | 429 | 36 | 144 | 33.57% | University Oval | 535 | 11 | 66 | 12.34% |
| Village Green | 1682 | 141 | 564 | 33.53% | Queenstown | 307 | 6 | 36 | 11.73% |
| Seddon Park | 929 | 76 | 304 | 32.72% | Village Green | 1682 | 32 | 192 | 11.41% |
| Mainpower Oval | 587 | 47 | 188 | 32.03% | Basin Reserve | 1627 | 21 | 126 | 7.74% |
| Queenstown | 307 | 24 | 96 | 31.27% | Mainpower Oval | 587 | 7 | 42 | 7.16% |
| Fitzherbert Park | 1078 | 76 | 304 | 28.20% | Cobham Oval | 1445 | 16 | 96 | 6.64% |
| Cobham Oval | 1445 | 95 | 380 | 26.30% | Colin Maiden | 2810 | 25 | 150 | 5.34% |
|  | **13513** | **1133** | **4532** | **33.54%** |  | **13513** | **233** | **1398** | **10.35%** |

Due to the high variation in runs scored at the various grounds difficult to make an accurate comparison. However of interest to note is that more sixes were scored in 2009/10. Also the wide variation between grounds with Cobham Oval recording a low ratio in boundaries in both years and notable for few sixes hit at Colin Maiden Oval in the 2009/10 season.

**Home and Away Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2010/11** | **Canterbury** | | **Northern** | | **Wellington** | | **Otago** |  | **Central** |  | **Auckland** | | **Total** |  |
|  | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss |
| Home | 3 | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 12 |
| Away | 3 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 11 |
| **Total** | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 23 | 23 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **15 years** | **Canterbury** | | **Northern** | | **Wellington** | | **Otago** |  | **Central** |  | **Auckland** | | **Total** |  |
|  | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss | Win | Loss |
| Home | 46 | 34 | 38 | 36 | 39 | 34 | 30 | 42 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 41 | 212 | 221 |
| Away | 42 | 30 | 45 | 34 | 33 | 39 | 28 | 39 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 33 | 221 | 212 |
| **Total** | 88 | 64 | 83 | 70 | 72 | 73 | 58 | 81 | 64 | 71 | 68 | 74 | 433 | 433 |

212 wins by the home team and 2021wins by the away team. Auckland and Otago have the worst home record. Canterbury and Northern have the best away records. There is no pattern that suggests playing at home insures a better opportunity of victory, particularly in the case of Wellington and Auckland which play their home games at one venue.

**New Zealand One Day Cricket Grounds 1996/97 to 2009/10**

32 grounds have been used over the past 14 years, 23 of those have had more than 10 innings but the number being used each year is now around 13. 414 result matches with 195 wins batting first and 219 wins batting second. In most seasons there is little difference in the final result whether batting first or second. The only season where a clear difference arose was in 2008/09 when the side batting second won 22 of the 30 matches . A significant difference occurs at 6 of 13 grounds .

**Batting First** Hamilton, Invercargill, Timaru

32 victories out of 49 matches (65.3%)

**Batting Second** Basin Reserve, Cobham Oval, Palmerston North

58 victories out of 92 matches (63.0%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2009/10** | **Inns** | **runs** | **200-250** | **250+** | **Bat 1st** | **Bat 2nd** | **Balls** | **wkts** | **r/o** | **r/wkt** | **r/inns** |
| Basin Reserve | 8 | 1627 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2053 | 55 | 4.75 | 29.58 | 203 |
| Cobham Oval | 6 | 1445 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1749 | 51 | 4.96 | 28.33 | 241 |
| Colin Maiden | 12 | 2810 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3255 | 97 | 5.18 | 28.97 | 234 |
| Fitzherbert Park | 4 | 1078 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1180 | 29 | 5.48 | 37.17 | 270 |
| Mainpower Oval | 2 | 587 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 596 | 19 | 5.91 | 30.89 | 294 |
| Oamaru | 2 | 640 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 581 | 15 | 6.61 | 42.67 | 320 |
| Pukekura Park | 4 | 663 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 880 | 29 | 4.52 | 22.86 | 166 |
| Queenstown | 2 | 307 |  |  |  | 1 | 258 | 11 | 7.14 | 27.91 | 154 |
| Queens Park | 2 | 429 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 355 | 16 | 7.25 | 26.81 | 215 |
| Seddon Park | 4 | 929 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1102 | 30 | 5.06 | 30.97 | 232 |
| Timaru | 2 | 781 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 600 | 12 | 7.81 | 65.08 | 391 |
| University Oval | 2 | 535 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 565 | 20 | 5.68 | 26.75 | 268 |
| Village Green | 6 | 1682 |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1743 | 39 | 5.79 | 43.13 | 280 |
|  | **56** | **13513** | **17** | **28** | **13** | **14** | **14917** | **423** | **5.44** | **31.95** | **241** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **1 tie** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Full Ground Analysis from 2004/05 to 2009/10**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ground** | **r/wkt** |  | **Ground** | **r/inns** |  | **Ground** | **r/o** |  |
| Timaru | 37.95 |  | Timaru | 270 |  | Timaru | 5.57 |  |
| Palmerston North | 37.34 |  | Oamaru | 266 |  | Oamaru | 5.46 |  |
| Oamaru | 36.25 |  | Rangiora | 254 |  | Rangiora | 5.34 |  |
| Rangiora | 35.83 |  | Palmerston North | 251 |  | Queenstown | 5.34 |  |
| Village Green | 34.01 |  | Hamilton | 244 |  | Village Green | 5.21 |  |
| Hamilton | 33.07 |  | Village Green | 241 |  | Palmerston North | 5.21 |  |
| Basin Reserve | 30.07 |  | Colin Maiden | 234 |  | Hamilton | 5.19 |  |
| Colin Maiden | 28.97 |  | University Oval | 231 |  | Colin Maiden | 5.18 |  |
| University Oval | 28.90 |  | Basin Reserve | 226 |  | University Oval | 5.13 |  |
| Cobham Oval | 28.54 |  | Cobham Oval | 225 |  | Invercargill | 5.08 |  |
| New Plymouth | 27.35 |  | Invercargill | 218 |  | Basin Reserve | 4.99 |  |
| Invercargill | 25.01 |  | New Plymouth | 205 |  | New Plymouth | 4.98 |  |
| Queenstown | 24.62 |  | Queenstown | 179 |  | Cobham Oval | 4.72 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ground** | **200+ inns** |  | **Ground** | **250+ inns%** |  | **Ground** | **Bat 1st** | **Bat 2nd** |
| Rangiora | 100.00% |  | Colin Maiden | 75.00% |  | Hamilton | 7 | 5 |
| Oamaru | 100.00% |  | Timaru | 62.50% |  | Timaru | 4 | 0 |
| Invercargill | 90.00% |  | Rangiora | 60.00% |  | Invercargill | 4 | 1 |
| Palmerston North | 88.89% |  | Palmerston North | 55.56% |  | University Oval | 6 | 5 |
| Cobham Oval | 83.33% |  | Hamilton | 53.85% |  | Rangiora | 3 | 2 |
| Village Green | 81.25% |  | Village Green | 50.00% |  | Colin Maiden | 3 | 2 |
| Hamilton | 80.77% |  | University Oval | 40.91% |  | Oamaru | 2 | 1 |
| Basin Reserve | 75.93% |  | Basin Reserve | 38.89% |  | Queenstown | 1 | 1 |
| Timaru | 75.00% |  | Oamaru | 33.33% |  | New Plymouth | 5 | 5 |
| Colin Maiden | 75.00% |  | New Plymouth | 31.82% |  | Basin Reserve | 8 | 19 |
| University Oval | 72.73% |  | Cobham Oval | 11.11% |  | Palmerston North | 2 | 7 |
| New Plymouth | 59.09% |  | Invercargill | 10.00% |  | Cobham Oval | 3 | 6 |
| Queenstown | 50.00% |  | Queenstown | 0.00% |  | Village Green | 7 | 9 |

**Canterbury averages 2009/10**

**Batting**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **M** | **Inns** | **NO** | **HS** | **Runs** | **Balls** | **Ave** | **S/R** | **100** | **50** | **Ct** | **St** |
| CJ Anderson | 2 | 2 | 1 | 52\* | 73 | 55 | 73 | 132.73 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HK Bennett | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7\* | 7 | 9 |  | 77.78 |  |  |  |  |
| SE Bond | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 28.57 |  |  |  |  |
| DG Brownlie | 3 | 3 | 1 | 86\* | 112 | 90 | 56.00 | 124.44 |  | 1 |  |  |
| RD Burson | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1.00 | 40.00 |  |  |  |  |
| LM Burtt | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| AM Ellis | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5\* | 5 | 4 |  | 125.00 |  |  |  |  |
| C Frauenstein | 7 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 40 | 37 | 10.00 | 108.11 |  |  | 3 |  |
| PG Fulton | 9 | 9 | 0 | 88 | 279 | 339 | 31.00 | 82.30 |  | 2 | 8 |  |
| CZ Harris | 8 | 7 | 3 | 32 | 97 | 113 | 24.25 | 85.84 |  |  | 2 |  |
| CD McMillan | 3 | 3 | 0 | 57 | 66 | 71 | 22.00 | 92.96 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| CS Martin | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0.50 | 16.67 |  |  |  |  |
| JG Myburgh | 9 | 9 | 0 | 112 | 281 | 370 | 31.22 | 75.95 | 1 |  | 3 |  |
| RJ Nicol | 9 | 9 | 0 | 132 | 327 | 370 | 36.33 | 88.38 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  |
| MHW Papps | 9 | 9 | 0 | 150 | 511 | 562 | 56.78 | 90.93 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |
| SL Stewart | 9 | 9 | 0 | 101 | 401 | 371 | 44.56 | 108.09 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |
| LV Van Beek | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| CFK Van Wyk | 9 | 9 | 4 | 46 | 172 | 182 | 34.40 | 94.51 |  |  | 9 | 2 |
|  | **99** | **82** | **15** | **150** | **2376** | **2591** | **35.46** | **91.70** | **5** | **11** | **40** | **2** |

**Boundaries**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Runs** | **Fours** | **Four %** | **Sixes** | **Six %** | **Total %** |
| CJ Anderson | 73 | 10 | 54.79% | 2 | 16.44% | 71.23% |
| HK Bennett | 7 | 1 | 57.14% |  |  | 57.14% |
| SE Bond | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DG Brownlie | 112 | 9 | 32.14% | 3 | 16.07% | 48.21% |
| RD Burson | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| LM Burtt | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Ellis | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| C Frauenstein | 40 | 3 | 30.00% | 1 | 15.00% | 45.00% |
| PG Fulton | 279 | 33 | 47.31% | 8 | 17.20% | 64.52% |
| CZ Harris | 97 | 4 | 16.49% | 1 | 6.19% | 22.68% |
| CD McMillan | 66 | 5 | 30.30% | 2 | 18.18% | 48.48% |
| CS Martin | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| JG Myburgh | 281 | 19 | 27.05% | 4 | 8.54% | 35.59% |
| RJ Nicol | 327 | 32 | 39.14% | 6 | 11.01% | 50.15% |
| MHW Papps | 511 | 56 | 43.84% | 8 | 9.39% | 53.23% |
| SL Stewart | 401 | 31 | 30.92% | 16 | 23.94% | 54.86% |
| LV Van Beek |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CFK Van Wyk | 172 | 15 | 34.88% | 4 | 13.95% | 48.84% |
|  | **2376** | **218** | **36.70%** | **55** | **13.89%** | **50.59%** |

**Bowling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Overs** | **Balls** | **Mdns** | **Runs** | **Wkts** | **Ave** | **Best** | **R/O** | **R/100 balls** | **S/R** |
| CJ Anderson | 15 | 90 | 2 | 61 | 6 | 10.17 | 5/26 | 4.07 | 67.78 | 15.00 |
| HK Bennett | 16 | 96 | 1 | 119 | 1 | 119.00 | 1/57 | 7.44 | 123.96 | 96.00 |
| SE Bond | 34 | 204 | 3 | 183 | 5 | 36.60 | 3/54 | 5.38 | 89.71 | 40.80 |
| DG Brownlie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RD Burson | 48.1 | 289 | 2 | 293 | 7 | 41.86 | 2/23 | 6.09 | 101.38 | 41.23 |
| LM Burtt | 12 | 72 | 0 | 106 | 1 | 106.00 | 1/45 | 8.83 | 147.22 | 72.00 |
| AM Ellis | 10 | 60 | 0 | 66 | 2 | 33.00 | 2/66 | 6.60 | 110.00 | 30.00 |
| C Frauenstein | 47.2 | 284 | 0 | 304 | 11 | 27.64 | 4/48 | 6.44 | 107.04 | 25.82 |
| PG Fulton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CZ Harris | 62.1 | 373 | 0 | 322 | 4 | 80.50 | 2/25 | 5.19 | 86.33 | 93.15 |
| CD McMillan | 9 | 54 | 0 | 58 | 3 | 19.33 | 3/47 | 6.44 | 107.41 | 18.00 |
| CS Martin | 52.4 | 316 | 5 | 306 | 10 | 30.60 | 3/56 | 5.84 | 96.84 | 31.44 |
| JG Myburgh | 33 | 198 | 0 | 143 | 5 | 28.60 | 2/22 | 4.33 | 72.22 | 39.60 |
| RJ Nicol | 51 | 306 | 0 | 258 | 3 | 86.00 | 1/24 | 5.06 | 84.31 | 102.00 |
| MHW Papps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SL Stewart |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LV Van Beek | 2 | 12 | 0 | 25 | 0 |  |  | 12.50 | 208.33 |  |
| CFK Van Wyk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Team Comparison last three years**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **M** | **Inns** | **NO** | **HS** | **Runs** | **Balls** | **Ave** | **S/R** | **100** | **50** | **Ct** | **St** |
| 2009/10 | 99 | 82 | 15 | 150 | 2376 | 2591 | 35.46 | 91.70 | 5 | 11 | 40 | 2 |
| 2008/09 | 110 | 82 | 16 | 120 | 2118 | 2847 | 29.42 | 74.39 | 2 | 13 | 30 | 1 |
| 2007/08 | 110 | 91 | 18 | 104 | 2177 | 2859 | 29.82 | 76.15 | 1 | 17 | 48 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Overs** | **Balls** | **Mdns** | **Runs** | **Wkts** | **Ave** | **Best** | **R/O** | **S/R** |
| 2009/10 | 392.32 | 2354 | 13 | 2244 | 58 | 38.69 | 5/26 | 5.72 | 40.59 |
| 2008/09 | 434.5 | 2609 | 22 | 2165 | 61 | 35.49 | 4/56 | 4.98 | 42.77 |
| 2007/08 | 465.5 | 2795 | 27 | 2363 | 68 | 34.75 | 6/45 | 5.07 | 41.10 |

This comparison clearly shows how the batting has improved while the bowling figures have deteriorated in

line with the overall trend of the competition.