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## The Types of Anallysis

- Free analysis
- Acoustic analysis
- Written analysis
* Analysis by film
+ Anâlysis by video
- Analysis by video/computer
* Analysis by computer


## Free Analysis

Free analysis is an observation, which is not systematic and done by some experienced technical staff sitting beyond bank during match and advising coach from time to time for various matters.

## Voices (Acoustic) Analysis

Acoustic analysis means that all movements during the match in the field are

## recorded on a sound tape.

## Notational Analysis

Written analysis is applied by writing various actions and techinical tactic behaviors on ready-to-use forms.
In this type of analysis, both offensive and also defensive behaviors are marked on the forms and numeric values are obtained.

## Analysis by fillin

Analysis by fillm has caused quite effective results in its early stages.

The matches, which had been récorded on usual cinema fillms having $35 \mathrm{~mm}, 16 \mathrm{~mm}$ and 8 mm sizes as black and white, were watched and evaluated later.

## Analysis by video-recorder

Analysis by video has allowed that matches are recorded audlio-visually.

This invention has affected observation andevaluation studies in handlball positively.

## Analysis by video-recorders

## - Match records in a very short time - Rapid evaluations

## Analysis by video-computer

Analysis by video-computer has created mostly used analysis study of our modern times.


## Analysis by video-computer:

- Video records
+ Transferring of recorded data
- specific computer software
- Rapíd evaluations

Aprograms providing various statistical methods.


## Why is anallyzing study necessary?



## How can we evaluate the resultis from analyzing?



## Analyzing studlies in European Handoall

## Analyzing studlies in European Heindoalls

- Match analyzing studlies, which started when European Handlball Federation and by the attempts of Methodic Committee.
+ All categories.
* "European Handball", a magazine, which is published by European Handlball Federation and was established in 1994.
* Dr. Janusz Czerwinski
* The analysis of Females World Handloall Championship
* 1988' Seul Olympic Games/Juan de Dios Roman Seco


## Analyzing studlies in European fandoall:

- Women's Youth ECh 2001 / Samsun
- Men's \& Women's ECh 2004 Beach Handlball / Alanya
- Every ECh


## Match analyzing resultis chosen from Women's European Championships

## Netherlanals / 1998

Match analyzing data from 3rd Women's World Championship

## Score Diffierence

 (Brd Women's World Championship)|  | $0-2$ | $3-5$ | $6-8$ | $9-11$ | $12-141$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Matches | 6 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 6 |
| Percentage (\%) | 15.80 | 34.20 | 23.70 | 10.50 | 15.80 |

## Team's Cumulative Statistics (Goals/Shots)

| Team | Wing | 6 m | 9 m | FB | 7 m | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOR | $28 / 47$ | $42 / 47$ | $45 / 124$ | $39 / 55$ | $35 / 44$ | $189 / 317$ |
| DEN | $21 / 42$ | $33 / 49$ | $65 / 167$ | $52 / 71$ | $18 / 25$ | $189 / 354$ |
| HUN |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Percentage of Goals Scored (from different areas and situations)

| Team | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Goals } \\ (=100 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Wing | Pivot | Back | Fast Break | $\begin{gathered} 7 \mathrm{~m} \\ \text { Throw } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOR | 189 | 14.8 | 22.2 | 23.8 | 20.7 | 18.5 |
| DEN | 189 | 11.1 | 17.5 | 34.4 | 27.5 | 9.5 |
| HUN | 175 | 14.3 | 20.6 | 25.1 | 24.6 | 15.4 |

## Results of Percentage of Goals

| 1 | Back Court Area | $29.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Fast Breaks | $21.4 \%$ |
| 3 | Pivot Area | $19.3 \%$ |
| 4 | Penalty Throws | $15.9 \%$ |
| 5 | Wing Area | $14.1 \%$ |

## Defence Systems

- Regarding to the strategies employed in the same championship, defense arrangements were generally 6:0
- Norway and Denmark teams employed this defense system almost in all matches.


## Notices:

A 38 matches were played

- 8 disqualifications
- 50\% of teams exercised their Team Time Out right
- as a good rule support for recovery of the team during long and also hard match actions


## 2000 W/omen's ECh/ Romanita

## Team's Composition (Taborsky/Linder, 2001)

| Team | Total Player | Players in Competition Domestics / Foreign | Participating Clubs | Maximum Players from One Club |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HUN | 16 | 12/4 | 7 | 6 from Herz FTC |
| UKR | 15 | 12/3 | 7 | 5 from Spartak Kiev |
| RUS | 16 | 15/1 | 6 | 6 from AKVA Volgograd |
| ROM | 16 | 15/1 | 7 | 7 from Ol Valceatchim |
| FRA | 16 | 16/0 | 6 | 5 from ASPTT Metz |
| NOR ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 16 | 13/3 | 10 | 3 out of each 3 clubs |
| YUG | -16 | 12/4 | 7 | 8 from Buducnost |
| MKD | 14 | 11/3 | 5 | 6 from Kometal Skopje |
| GER | 16 | 16/0 | 8 | 4 from Leipzig |
| DEN | 16 | 15/1 | 10 | 4 from Viborg HK |
| BLR | 16 | 9/7 | 8 | 8 from BGPA Minsk |
| AUT | 15 | 11/4 | 8 | 5 from Hypo Südstadt |
| Total | 188 | 157/31 | 89 |  |

2000 Women's ECh / Romania

## Percentage of Goals from Different Spaces and Situations

| Team | Total Goals <br> $(=\mathbf{1 0 0} \%)$ | Wings | 6 m | 9 m | FB | 7 m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HUN | 216 | 15,7 | 19,9 | 28,8 | 19,9 |
| UKR | 188 | 9,6 | 20,2 | 24,5 | 25,0 | 20,7 |
| RUS | 163 | 9,2 | 28,9 | 27,0 | 14,7 | 20,2 |
| ROM | 168 | 10,7 | 30,4 | 29,8 | 8,3 | 20,8 |

2000 Women's ECh / Romania

## Height and Weight Characteristics

| Height | -169 cm | $\frac{170-179}{\mathrm{~cm}}$ | $180+$ | Weight | Lightest | Heaviest | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30 players | $\underline{93}$ players | 65 <br> players |  | 48 kg | 90 | $68,4 \mathrm{~kg}$ |
|  | $15,9 \%$ | $\underline{49,5 \%}$ | $34,6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

The Percentage of Goals from Different Spaces

|  | Goals | Wing | 6 m | 9 m | FB | 7 m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1927 | $13,2 \%$ | $25,5 \%$ | $27,6 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $15,6 \%$ |

2000 Women's ECh / Romania

## Defence \& Attack

$$
\begin{array}{r}
+6: 0 \\
+5: 1 \\
+3: 2: 1
\end{array}
$$

$$
+3: 3
$$

2000 Women's ECh / Romania

## 2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

| Body Characteristics | TEAM | Body Height in cm |  |  |  | Body Weight in Kg - Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | til 169 | 170-179 | 180 more | Average |  |
|  | RUS | 4 | 5 | 7 | 176,4 | 62,9 |
|  | NOR | 2 | 11 | 3 | 175,2 | 68,9 |
|  | SCG | 1 | 10 | 5 | 176,3 | 66,1 |
|  | FRA | 3 | 8 | 5 | 174,2 | 64,4 |
|  | CRO | - | 7 | 9 | 179,9 | 71,6 |
|  | DEN | - | 9 | 7 | 179,3 | 71,0 |
|  | GER | 4 | 6 | 6 | 174,8 | 66,6 |
|  | POL | 3 | 11 | 2 | 175,1 | 67,9 |
|  | ESP | 6 | 4 | 5 | 172,6 | 65,5 |
|  | ROM | 3 | 6 | 7 | 175,6 | 68,7 |
|  | CZE | 2 | 10 | 4 | 174,4 | 65,2 |
|  | SLO | 1 | 11 | 4 | 175,3 | 69,3 |
|  | SWE | 4 | 10 | 2 | 172,8 | 68,3 |
|  | POR | 6 | 8 | 2 | 172,8 | 64,5 |
|  | ISL | 3 | 10 | 3 | 174,1 | 70,8 |
|  | AUT | 6 | 8 | 2 | 171,2 | 60,9 |
|  | Total | 48 | 134 | 73 | 175,0 | 67,0 |
|  | \% | 18,8 | 52,6 | 28,6 |  |  |

2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Cumulative Team Statistics

| Throws |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Team | 6 m | Wing | 9 m | 7 m | FB | BT | FTO | M/A | $\%$ <br> Efficiency |
| RUS | $49 / 64$ | $27 / 50$ | $69 / 166$ | $28 / 36$ | $35 / 46$ | $3 / 3$ | $0 / 0$ | $212 / 369$ | 57 |
| NOR | $42 / 67$ | $23 / 45$ | $40 / 106$ | $23 / 28$ | $50 / 70$ | $13 / 15$ | $1 / 1$ | $194 / 335$ | 58 |
| SCG | $50 / 66$ | $37 / 71$ | $54 / 151$ | $30 / 34$ | $42 / 65$ | $5 / 6$ | $1 / 1$ | $220 / 396$ | 56 |

2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Shots Team Total (Russia)

| Shots | Made | Saves | Missed | Total <br> Attempts | Total Effiency <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 m | 49 | 9 | 0 | 64 | 76,6 |
| Wing | 27 | 14 | 7 | 50 | 54,0 |
| Back | 69 | 49 | 23 | 166 | 41,6 |
| 7 m | 28 | 3 | 6 | 36 | 77,8 |
| $\mathrm{FB}^{\lambda}$ | 35 | 9 | 2 | 46 | 76,1 |
| BT | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100,0 |

2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Shots Team Total (Norway)

| Shots | Made | Saves | Missed | Total <br> Attempts | Total Effiency <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 m | 42 | 15 | 0 | 67 | 62,7 |
| Wing | 23 | 14 | 8 | 45 | 51,1 |
| Back | 40 | 17 | 29 | 106 | 37,7 |
| 7 m | 23 | 3 | 12 | 28 | 82,1 |
| FB | 50 | 15 | 5 | 70 | 71,4 |
| BT | 13 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 86,7 |

2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Shots Team Total (Serbia)

| Shots | Made | Saves | Missed | Total Attempts | Total Effiency <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 m | 50 | 14 | 0 | 66 | 75.8 |
| Wing | 37 | 24 | 10 | 71 | 52,1 |
| Back | 54 | 50 | 23 | 151 | 35,8 |
| 7 m | 30 | 2 | 4 | 34 | 88,2 |
| FB | 42 | 14 | 9 | 65 | 64,6 |
| BT | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 83,3 |

2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Main Defence Systems



2004 Women's 19 Czech Republic

## Conclusjon and recommendations

- Handloall is a Speed Game
- More activities in defense systems
- Simple technique
- Recreational tactic
- More Goals

We cannot manage a characteristic if we cannot measure it!

Groups for Statistics in Izmir Women's 19 ECh





