FIVB Beach Volleyball Historic Top 8 Teams **Analysis Tyler Widdison** Dec 2019 • 1 Project description 1.1 Source of data set • 1.2 Data dictionary • 2 Preparation of Data o 2.1 FIVB data 2.2 Ranking of teams data 2.3 Final web scrapped data summary • 3 Exploring the data • 3.1 Places explored • 4 Machine learning • 4.1 Decided predictors • 5 Conclusion 0 5.1 1 Project description Evaluation of winning trends related to court and hour for the top 8 FIVB Beach volleyball teams per gender since 2001. The concluding hypothesis is that teams ranked within the top 8 have a higher probability at winning on court 1 at 09:00. Generalized linear model is used in support of the hypothesis. Notes: ^Court records are not kept by FIVB until 2009. **^^Hour records are not kept by FIVB until 2004**. This project has given me the skills necessary to add new insight to other projects I work on in the future. 1.1 Source of data set This data set was webscrapped from 2 sources. First from FIVB Beach competiton database. http://www.fivb.org/EN/BeachVolleyball/Competitions/Competitions.htm Second, FIVB Beach rankings from http://www.fivb.org/Vis/Public/JS/Beach/SeasonRank.aspx?Gender=1&id=BTechPlayW&Date=20191001. Numerous more links were accessed between these two links. But ultimatly I was able to access the data I was looking for. I will provide the final CSV I used for this project. I did end up doing a lot more work to get this final csv than I originally planned. ^Note: The team variable is already melted. One match is listed twice. For example if it was USA vs GER, I have the 'team' be 'USA' and the opp team be 'GER', the next time this match appears the team is 'GER' and the opp is 'USA'. I did this so I can look at specific teams results. I wouldn't be able to get a true reading on how many matches 1 team played if I had kept it seperated. I call this 'The focus team.' 1.2 Data dictionary Variable Name **Description** Match number of specific tournament no date Date of match Time of match time Court match is played on court Result of the played match result Duration of the played match duration Tournament name tourn year Year of tournament phase Phase of tournament the match was played winning\_team Winning team of the match losing\_team Losing team of the match gender Gender of teams The focus team team team\_country The focus team country team\_rank The rank of the focus teams at the end of that played year The focus teams opponent oppThe focus teams opponent country opp\_country matches\_played This is always listed as '1'. Each row is one match. I wanted to be able to sum the total of matches played for my hypothesis If the focus team had won the match this will be a '1' team\_match\_won otherwise it is a 'o' opp\_match\_won If the opponent team had won the match this will be a '1' otherwise it is a 'o' team\_player\_1 First listed player in the played match for the focus team team\_player\_2 Second listed player in the played match for the focus team opp\_player\_1 First listed player in the played match for the opp team Second listed player in the played match for the opp team opp\_player\_2 Each variable was considered and ultimatley I decided to do my hypothesis on my level. The main variables used were: date, court, year, gender, team\_rank, matches\_played, team\_match\_won, team\_player\_1 and team\_player\_2. 2 Preparation of Data There was a lot of data munging I had to do in order to get to my final hypothesis. I had to change classes, column names, get rid of columns, replace strings, melt the players variable and get the hour of the time. This is a few things I did. There was more munging I originally did before I came to my final hypothesis. 2.1 FIVB data I webscrapped all the data from the FIVB websites. With the amount of links (about 750) one can guess there was errors I found. I had to nix all the matches that ended in a 'injury' result. Player names were different across multiple tournaments, time of day was bad in some cases. For example: 01:00, 02:00, 04:00, 04:57 were all times I had to make correct. There were a couple of matches which still had the live score on the result. For example: LIVE (21-12, 13-15). It shouldn't have that 'LIVE' potion on the result. 2.2 Ranking of teams data I webscrapped the rankings on Oct 1 of each year. After consulting with a friend we decided Oct 1 would be the final rank for that played year. Jan - Oct. The naming convention between the rankings and the FIVB schedule were different. So I had to spend some time doctoring in Excel in order to get the names, and rankings, of the player in the top 8 correct for each year. Also there were special charecters that caused some issues that I dealt with in this way: unescape\_html <- function(str) {</pre> xml2::xml\_text(xml2::read\_html(paste0("<x>", str, "</x>"))) 2.3 Final web scrapped data summary summary(df) match no date time court Min.: 1.00 Min.: 2001-04-04 Length: 226126 Min.: 1.00 1st Qu.: 12.00 1st Qu.:2006-07-19 Class :character 1st Qu.:1.00 Median: 25.00 Median: 2010-08-24 Mode: character Median: 2.00 Mean : 29.38 Mean :2011-02-19 Mean :2.45 3rd Qu.:3.00 Max. :8.00 3rd Qu.: 45.00 3rd Qu.:2016-03-18 Max. :136.00 Max. :2019-11-09 NA's :2086 NA's :105034 duration tourn year tourn rank Min. : 300 Length:226126 Min. :2001 Min. : 7.20 1st Qu.: 2100 Class :character 1st Qu.: 2006 1st Qu.: 18.63 Median: 2400 Mode: character Median: 2010 Median: 23.41 Mean :2011 Mean : 49.55 3rd Qu.:2016 3rd Qu.: 41.50 Mean : 2538 3rd Qu.: 2940 Max. :14940 Max. :2019 Max. :479.09 ## winning\_team losing\_team gender
Length:226126 Length:226126 Length:226126 Mode :character Mode :character Mode :character ## ## ## Min. : 1.00 Mode :character Mode :character Median : 35.00 ## Mean : 66.84 3rd Qu.: 84.00 ## Max. :1976.00 ## NA's :18 team match score team game one team game two team game three Length: 226126 Min. : 0.00 Min. : 0.00 Min. : 0.000 Class :character 1st Qu.:17.00 1st Qu.:17.00 1st Qu.: 0.000 Mode :character Median :21.00 Median :21.00 Median : 0.000 Mean :18.89 Mean :18.86 Mean : 4.496 ## 3rd Qu.:21.00 3rd Qu.:21.00 3rd Qu.:12.000 ## Max. :41.00 Max. :42.00 Max. :35.000 # #opp opp\_country opp\_match\_score opp\_game\_one Length:226126 Length:226126 Min. : 0.00 Class: character Class: character 1st Qu.:17.00 Mode :character Mode :character Median :21.00 :18.89 ## 3rd Qu.:21.00 ## Max. :41.00 ## ## opp game two opp\_game\_three opp\_team\_rank matches played : 0.00 Min. : 0.000 Min. 1.00 Min. 1st Qu.:17.00 1st Qu.: 0.000 1st Qu.: 15.00 1st Qu.:1 Median :21.00 Median : 0.000 Median : 35.00 Median :1 ## :18.86 Mean : 4.496 66.98 Mean Mean Mean 3rd Qu.:21.00 3rd Qu.:12.000 3rd Qu.: 84.00 3rd Qu.:1 :1976.00 :42.00 Max. :35.000 ## Max. Max. Max. ## NA's :18 team\_match\_won opp\_match\_won opp\_player\_1 opp\_player\_2 :0.0 Min. :0.0 Length:226126 Length: 226126 1st Qu.:0.0 ## 1st Qu.:0.0 Class :character Class :character Median :1.0 Median :0.0 Mode :character Mode :character :0.5 Mean :0.5 Mean 3rd Qu.:1.0 3rd Qu.:1.0 ## Max. :1.0 Max. :1.0 ## score diff game\_one score\_diff\_game\_two score\_diff\_game\_three :-2.1e+01Min. :-2.1e+01 1st Qu.:-4.0e+00 1st Qu.:-4.0e+00 1st Qu.: 0.0e+00 Median : 2.0e+00 Median :-2.0e+00 Median : 0.0e+00 : 5.3e-05 Mean :-2.7e-05 Mean :-2.7e-053rd Qu.: 4.0e+00 3rd Qu.: 4.0e+00 3rd Qu.: 0.0e+00 ## : 2.1e+01 Max. : 2.1e+01 Max. Max. : 1.5e+01 ## team\_final\_score opp\_team\_final\_score variable Min. : 3.00 Min. : 3.00 team\_player\_1:113063 1st Qu.:35.00 1st Qu.:35.00 team\_player\_2:113063 Median :42.00 Median:42.00 ## Mean :42.24 Mean :42.24 3rd Qu.:49.00 3rd Qu.:49.00 :85.00 :85.00 ## Max. Max. ## ## player game three amount hour Length:226126 :0.0000 Length: 226126 : 8.00 Class : character 1st Qu.:0.0000 Class : character 1st Qu.:11.00 ## Mode :character Median :0.0000 Mode :character Median :13.00 ## Mean :0.3311 :13.18 Mean ## 3rd Qu.:1.0000 3rd Qu.:16.00 ## :1.0000 Max. Max. :23.00 ## NA's :28864 3 Exploring the data I ended up spending time exploring areas I didn't dive deeper into. A big part was trying to figure out how I could use 'score\_difference' and how likely a team was to win the match as a varaible for a hypothesis. Other areas I explored: 3.1 Places explored • Players density charts 0.4 -0.3 density 0.2 density 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.0 avg\_g2\_diff avg\_g1\_diff 0.75 density 0.50 density 0.25 0.00 20.0 19.0 0.6 8.0 18.0 18.5 19.5 0.5 0.7 avg\_points\_set match\_win • Points difference in game 1 and match won 60 match\_won 40 -20 -200 100 300 points\_diff\_g1 • Matches played per year for mens top 8 matches\_played • 102 -99 -90 -87 -84 -81 -75 -72 -69 -66 -60 -57 matches played 54 -39 -36 -2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 • Point diff and correlation value (Intercept) points\_diff\_g1 0.04305242 ## 51.67797528 Point Differential vs Wins for FIVB Beach 2001-2019 90 -80 60 Correlation Value: 0.45 200 100 300 400 **Point Differential** • Teams ranked 20 and higher, coorlation of match wins based on average point diff in game 1 Manual Legend for Stat Smooth 30 -Fit Type match\_lost match\_lost match\_won Relationship match\_lost 10 match\_won -10 0 10 avg\_g1 • Tougher tournaments have longer matches ## `geom\_smooth()` using method = 'gam' and formula 'y ~ s(x, bs = "cs")' ## Warning: Removed 5508 rows containing missing values (geom\_point). 01:00:00 tourn\_rank 00:50:00 400 duration 300 200 100 00:40:00 -00:30:00 -2005 2010 year • Toughest year to play beach volleyball? 'geom smooth()' using method = 'gam' and formula 'y  $\sim$  s(x, bs = "cs")' 500 -400 -300 tourn\_rank 100 -2005 2010 2015 year • Which year avg the longest match duration? 2015 year - 0102 2005 -50 200 100 250 duration/60 • Men teams ranked 1st played how well? 0.6 density 0.2 density 0.2 -0.0 avg\_g2\_diff avg\_g1\_diff 0.8 -0.6 density density 0.4 0.2 avg\_score\_diff match\_win • All first ranked teams score diff  $'geom\_smooth()$  using method = 'gam' and formula 'y ~ s(x, bs = "cs")' 20 score\_diff -20 -2005 2010 2015 2020 date • All first place team final points difference FIVB First Place Team Point Differentials samoilovs/smedins, j. mol a./sørum, c. may/walsh ludwig/walkenhorst lima/talita larissa/talita juliana/larissa humana/paredes-pavan harley/pedro gibb/rosenthal felisberta silva/frança emanuel/tande -Score Diff emanuel/ricardo dalhausser/rogers green dalhausser/lucena brink/reckermann baracetti/conde antonelli/juliana andre/evandro ana paula/shelda ana paula/sandra pires alison/emanuel alison/bruno schmidt agatha/duda agatha/barbara adriana behar/shelda -2000 4000 6000 **Point Differential** • Point difference in first place teams ## (Intercept) ## 43.50886944 160 -120 orrelation Value: 0.86 80 400 1200 800 1600 **Point Differential** ## Warning: Removed 1 rows containing missing values (geom text). Residuals for Wins and Point Difference Model harley/pedro 25 -



## FIVB top 8 team probability of winning by court and hour Data from 2009 - 2019 20 -

f\$prob<-format(round(f\$prob,3))</pre>

f\$match win perce <- NULL f\$total matches <- NULL

prob <- predict(mhlm, newdata=f, type="response")</pre>

geom point(aes(color = prob), size = 7, alpha = 0.5) +

labs(title = 'FIVB top 8 team probability of winning by court and hour',

scale y continuous(breaks = seq(8, 22, by = 1)) +

subtitle = 'Data from 2009 - 2019',

prob <- round(prob, 3)</pre>

ggplot(aes(court, hour)) +

scale size(range = c(.5, 9)) +

size = 'Probability%', color ='Probability',

scale color viridis(option="C") + scale x continuous(breaks = 1:6)

x = 'Court',y = 'Hour') +

f\$prob <- prob

f %>%

18 -17 -

16 -

In 15 - 14 -

13 -12 -0.65

**Probability** 0.80

0.75

0.70

f<-f[order(-prob),]</pre> colnames(f) <- c('Hour', 'Court', 'Probablity')</pre> **kable**(f) %>% kable\_styling(bootstrap\_options = "striped", full\_width = F, position = 'left', fixed\_thead = T) % scroll box(width = '200px', height='500px') 11 5 0.808 15 6 0.806 8 4 0.803 12 5 0.801 9 4 0.796 13 5 0.795 10 4 0.790 11 4 0.783 8 3 0.778

Court

16 5 0.775 9 3 0.772

12 4 0.777

5.1

5 Conclusion There is an apparent trend of teams in the top 8 winning more and having higher probility of winning on lower courts earlier in the day. And lower probility later in the day on higher courts. This trend is likely due to teams in the top 8 advancing further

13 4 0.770 into tournaments and playing other teams in the top 8.