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Abstract - Adopting methods of literature review, video observation and mathematical statistics the paper made a research on five games between China and rivals participating in the London Basketball Olympic Games and compared offensive and defensive indexes with top 8 in order to find out the causes of Chinese men’s basketball team landslide. The results of study showed that many indexes of Chinese team were inferior to rivals and top 8.


1. Introduction

In London Olympic Games Chinese men's basketball team has lost all five games and ranked 12th, especially in game against Britain leading to 32 points gap, which created the worst record in the last 20 years from taking part in the Olympic Games. Obviously, the gap between Chinese team and world basketball is gradually widening. Under rivals high intensity body confrontation a series of problems were exposed. The study aimed to analyse five games between China and rivals, referring to top 8 teams statistic indicators and performance, find out offense and defense shortcomings to provide theoretical reference for Chinese team to rise.

2. Study Subjects and Methods

A. Study Subjects

Taking Chinese men’s basketball team, rivals (Spain, Russia, Australia, Brazil, Britain) and top 8 team as objects, analysing 29 technical statistics indexes and field performance.

B. Study Methods

Consulted literature about the Olympic Basketball Games and visited London Olympics and FIBA official website to collect rivals and top 8 teams technical statistics. Coped with related data using Spss20.0 and comparatively analysed results combining with game videos.

3. Result and Analysis

A. Basic situation analysis of Chinese and foreign men's basketball team

1) Analysis of players height, weight, age: Top 8 teams average height was 200.1 cm, average weight 99.6 kg, average age 28.0 years, Quetlet index 496.5; Chinese team average height was 203.3 cm, average weight is only 96.3 kg, average age was 26.1 years, Quetlet index was 472.2, no significant differences in all. In every position, top 8 guards average height, weight and age were separately 192.3 cm, 89.1 kg, 27.8 years; forwards 203.4 cm, 103.1 kg, 28.9 years; centers 209.9 cm, 114.6 kg, 26.8 years. Chinese team three position height (guards 194.8 cm, forwards 206.0 cm, centers 218.0 cm) all exceeded top 8, in center very significant difference (P < 0.01) existing; average weight (guards 87.2 kg, forwards 99.8 kg, centers 110.0 kg) was below top 8; in forward average age(25.0) there was a significant difference (P < 0.05).

2) Analysis of leagues that players take part in: Game between two teams is ostensibly confrontation between players, but from a deeper level is the cultivation mechanism at work. In top 8 teams and British team there are 33, 21, 15 players to play for NBA, ACB, TVB league respectively. In addition to team USA, in Spain, France, Argentina, Braizil NBA players exceeded 3. Besides Spain seven teams had ACB players; Besides Russia, France, Australia, Lithuania and Britain also had TVB players. although in team Australia and Britain domestic tournament development are not ideal, most players went to high level league abroad to experience. We may see that the world basketball development trend is in a state of fusion and inclusiveness. Therefor, Chinese basketball team should open minds and absorb quintessence.

B. Offensive capability analysis of Chinese and foreign men's basketball team

1) The overall scoring ability analysis: In PPG (points per game) there was very significant difference (P < 0.01) between China and rivals, compared with top 8 significant difference (P < 0.05) existing; Team China PPG were less than rivals’ (87.8 points) by 25.2 point, top 8 (84.2 points) by 21.6 point; 62.6 points was the lowest score since in 1948 (51.9). In FGM (field goal made), FGA (field goal attempted) and 2PP (2 points percent) there were very significant differences (P < 0.01), and by contrasting with top 8 in FGM, FGA 3PA(3 points attempted), FTP (free throw percent) there were significant differences (P < 0.05). The main reasons led to two points and three points shooting poor were technique and tactical system unestablishing, overdepending on Yi jianlian, shooting inadaptibility under oppressive and aggressive defense, poor quality and effect offense basic tactics, etc.
2) Methods and regions of scoring analysis: By homogeneity test of variance and t-test there was a significant difference (P < 0.05) in points from fast break and turnovers, very significant difference (P < 0.01) in points from second chance and the paint between team China and rivals (TABLE I). There was a very significant difference (P < 0.01) in four items between team China and top 8. Points in region from paint to 3points line was not obvious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Fast Break</th>
<th>From Turnovers</th>
<th>Second Chance</th>
<th>In the Paint</th>
<th>From Paint to 3points Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Spain</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>13/11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Russia</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Australia</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Brazil</td>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>6/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Britain</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Top8</td>
<td>4.6/12.8**</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>7.2/15.6**</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>5.6/16.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-3.168</td>
<td>-3.109</td>
<td>-5.591</td>
<td>-3.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China/Top8</td>
<td>4.6/12.7**</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>7.2/16.4**</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>5.6/11.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>-3.205</td>
<td>-3.531</td>
<td>-3.265</td>
<td>-5.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Different position scoring ability analysis: Guards scored lower than rivals and top 8 by 5.2 points and 4.9 points average per game, forwards by 7.4 points and 11.4 points, centers by 12.6 points (P < 0.05) and 5.3 points. Therefor, different position scoring in team China were unbalanced.

4) Assists ability analysis: Team China assists only 9.2 time and there was very significant difference (P < 0.01), gap with rivals and top 8 were 13.8 times and 9.8 times. The main problems were the weaker offensive and defensive grasping vision of point guard and low quality pick and roll.

5) Turnovers analysis: Team China turnovers reached 14.0 times average per game, more than rivals and top 8 by 4.8 times and 1.3 time, but there was no significant difference. The main problems were weak ball controlling and protecting, inferior ball passing and catching

6) Offensive rebound grabbing ability analysis: Team China offensive rebounds were only 6.0 times, insufficient of half of rivals’(16.4 times) and lower than top 8 by 4.8 times, very significant difference (P < 0.01) existing. The main problems were effete traditional tactics and outside player unawareness

C. Offensive ability analysis of Chinese and foreign men's basketball team

1) Defensive rebound grabbing ability analysis: Team China defensive rebounds average per game was 25.8 times, less than rivals and top 8 by 4.6 times and 2.0 times respectively, but there was no significant difference. The main problem was lack of relation between inside and outside.

2) Stealing ability analysis: Average per game steals of team China were 3.4 times, lower than the competition opponent by 2.8 times, and than top 8 by 2.9 times, there was significant difference (P < 0.05). The main problem was obvious passing intention, slow speed ball moving.

3) Blocking ability analysis: By contrast the gap was not large, averaging 4.2 blocks average per game of team China were only less than rivals by 0.2 times, higher than top 8 teams by 1.1 times, there was no significant difference. But height advantage of team China did not translate into air superiority.

4) Personal fouls analysis: China team foul average per game were 17.8 times, lower than rivals by 3.2 times, and than top 8 by 3.7 times, there was significant difference (P < 0.05). The main problem is lack of defense fiereness, oppression and pertinence.

4. Conclusion and Suggestions

If the Chinese men’s basketball team wants to become a strong one in the future, there are many roads to go. In London Olympics many indexes were inferior to rivals and top eight team. On the offensive ability, main gap lies in PPG, 2PA and 2PP, 3PA, FTP, fast-break points, turnovers points, secondary attack points, points in the paint, points of center, assists, offensive rebounds. On the defensive ability, the team in the defensive rebounds, steals, and fouls had a certain gap with opponents, but there was no significance; in comparison to top
8 in fouls and steals a significant difference existed, in blocks slightly higher than the top 8. Suggest arranging core and maximum strength training, normalizing fitness training, insisting “going global” principle, etc.

References