WAKE FOREST, N.C. - The goal of this undertaking was to pull back the curtain on the best mid-major players and achieve a sense of what made them successful and why/how they flew under the radar. One can argue - and in many cases correctly - that these players were successful because they picked the proper level to maximize their talents. While that argument has great merit, it's not the purpose of this study.

Drew Cannon, my summer intern, took up this project and is responsible for the hard data and the conclusions that have been drawn. His diligence and hard work represent the bulk of this study. My focus was to keep him on task and help guide him as he navigated the waters. We sincerely hope that you get as much out of this as we did. It's food for thought as you continue to build your program and succeed in recruiting.

In order to gather the information, we had to identify a pool of candidates. First-team allconference players from the Colonial, Missouri Valley and Atlantic-10 were used to form the subject pool. Cannon interviewed the high school coaches of 32 of the 39 all-league players. "The first point to be made about any mid-major first-teamer is that they need to meet two qualifications. The player has to be good enough to merit all-conference selection, but unlike their BCS conference brethren, questionable enough to slip through the cracks," Cannon wrote.

Cannon assigned the 32 players into the following categories:
Identifiable High-Major Talent In H.S.: Marc Egerson (Delaware), Gary Forbes (Massachusetts), B.J. Raymond (Xavier)

Fortunate Foreign Find: Stephane Lasme (UMass), Gerald Lee (Old Dominion)
Hidden Gen: Shy Ely (Evansville), Aaron Jackson (Duquesne), Valdas Vasylius (Old Dominion), Dionte Christmas (Temple)

Skinny, Ultra-Quick SG: Josh Young (Drake), Loren Stokes (Hofstra), Jamaal Tatum (Southern Illinois), Jamal Shuler (VCU)

Skinny/Slow Shooter: Jeremy Crouch (Bradley), Nate Funk (Creighton), Booker Woodfox (Creighton), Stephen Curry (Davidson), Brian Roberts (Dayton), Antoine Agudio (Hofstra), Blake Ahearn (Missouri St.), Matt Janning (Northeastern), Jim Baron (Rhode Island)

The Skinny, Skilled Big Man: Anthony Tolliver (Creighton), Nick Fazekas (Nevada), Adam Koch (Northern Iowa), Pat Calathes (St. Joseph's), Justin Doellman (Xavier)

Undersized Power Forward: Theron Wilson (Bradley), Will Thomas (George Mason)
Late Arriving Big Man: Ahmad Nivins (St. Joseph's), Larry Sanders (VCU)
Intangibles Freak: Adam Emmenecker (Drake)

* Sanders wasn't first-teamer and Fazekas is from another league but Cannon was asked to include each in study for profiling purposes


# Cannon's Analysis 

THE HIGH MAJOR TALENT<br>(Marc Egerson, Gary Forbes, B.J. Raymond)

The first category breaks one of the two cardinal rules - the High Major Talent isn't a questionable recruit who slips through the cracks. Egerson transferred out of Georgetown and Forbes (\#67 Scout) transferred from Virginia. Raymond was on the very edge of the Top 100 while committing, before his sophomore year of high school, to a college has assumed high-major status. They barely influence the study.

## THE FORTUNATE FOREIGN FIND

(Stephane Lasme, Gerald Lee)
Easy to understand but nearly impossible to track down. Nothing hid their ability, and they were underrecruited because nobody knew about them - the Fortunate Foreign Find is the even more mysterious cousin of the Hidden Gem. Lasme was enrolled at an English as a Second Language school in Boston that had no athletics when he qualified, then showed up at the East Coast Invitational. UMass won the sweepstakes because their Director of Basketball Operations was working the camp and was one of the few eyes watching as Lasme exploded. Former UMass assistant coach Andrew Theokas said the time that elapsed between first setting eyes on him and signing him was about two weeks. ODU was recruiting a player in France when another coach - who had played with Old Dominion head coach Blaine Taylor in college - brought up Lee. Valparaiso eventually also got in touch with Lee, and a few smaller Boston schools also talked to Lasme, but karma seems to have played a factor in the find.

## THE HIDDEN GEM

(Dionte Christmas, Shy Ely, Aaron Jackson, Valdas Vasylius)
These guys just weren't seen enough for people to get a clear picture of their skills. They played at under-the-radar schools and for under-the-radar AAU teams (Vasylius played for Boo Williams, but we'll get to that in a minute). Mid-majors were the only schools that liked what they saw in quick glances enough to take longer looks in smaller-scale venues. Christmas, Ely, and Jackson all were young for their class (Christmas was a September ' 86 birthday and Jackson a May ' 86 birthday in the Class of 2004 while Ely was a May ' 87 birthday for the Class of 2005), although Jackson and Christmas both took prep years in 2005 to change that. Their youth could help explain why they didn't play bigger roles on bigger AAU teams, though Ely hardly played any AAU ball at all. All four were described as having incredible work ethic. Ely's coach said he was the hardest worker he'd coached. Jackson was described as always "working at the game with great passion." Vasylius's work ethic: "off the charts." Christmas showed up early before school as a tenth grader for all the JV practices - and he was on varsity.

Vasylius played AAU with Boo Williams, which means exposure shouldn't have been his issue. The combination of relentlessly shooting guards, an injured ankle at the end of his junior year, and a late arrival to America from Lithuania means that he was largely lost in the shuffle, so l'm terming him a Hidden Gem. Also, Vasylius was described as very introverted (one of the few times someone was placed so strongly on one side of the introversion/extroversion spectrum), which means he likely wasn't demanding the ball from those Boo Williams teammates, either.

## THE SKINNY/SLOW SHOOTER

(Antoine Agudio, Blake Ahearn, Jimmy Baron, Jeremy Crouch, Stephen Curry, Nate Funk, Matt Janning, Brian Roberts, Booker Woodfox)

This group was actually understood pretty well as high school players - they didn't really change opinions of their skills while in college. Everyone agreed that they could absolutely shoot lights out even in high school, but were considered either too slight (Curry, Funk, Janning, Roberts) or too slow (Agudio, Ahearn, Baron, Crouch) to be true high major talents - and likely correctly. This type of player at a high major school is a super-efficient role player, ala Lee Humphrey, Michael Roll, Anthony Morrow, or Ryan Ayers.

# Dave Telep Scouting - Drew Cannon's Mid-Major Study 

But at a mid-major school, the drop in defensive athleticism and strength means that they can consistently get their shots off enough to be the focal point of a good offense. Multiple high school coaches expressed shock at the continued ease with which players in this group got open and adjusted to the increased physicality of college ball.

Probably the biggest reason this group isn't as recruitable on the high major level is defense - coaches are rightfully afraid of putting these guys on the Gerald Henderson-type 2-guards of Big Six basketball. But they're all serviceable enough defenders to still be huge net positives at the mid-major level due to their offense - and the fact that they were consistently described as very strong off the ball defenders if average on the ball. All eight of these guys (not including Roberts) also had off the charts intangibles - six of eight (plus Roberts) were described as excellent students, and all were illustrated as team leaders and fiery competitors who were extremely coachable with outstanding basketball IQs (Woodfox's basketball IQ wasn't on quite the same level as the others', but he was still quite strong in the other makeup categories). Literally, all nine were described as being standouts in all four of those categories by their high school coaches. Coach Ed Reilly said, "If there were more Jim Barons on the circuit, there'd be more coaches wanting to coach." Matt Janning was a two-time captain, "the best captain l've ever coached," described as always being the first at practice and last to leave.

Blake Ahearn was an "amazing kid" with "off the charts basketball IQ," the "most competitive kid" with the "best work ethic" Coach Bob Steiner had encountered. Stephen Curry was magna cum laude at Charlotte Christian, a "very good leader both by communication and example - and always in the right tone," "10 out of 10 on coachability and basketball IQ," with a work ethic that was "unbelievable - if he's working out it's like there's five NBA scouts in the gym all the time." Nate Funk: "coach on the floor," "basketball IQ one of the highest ever in the program," "one of the most competitive players and hardest workers I've coached." Jeremy Crouch: "very high work ethic," "standout coachability," "standout basketball IQ - his dad and his uncle are both coaches." Booker Woodfox: extremely competitive," "excellent coachability," "extremely hard worker." Their intangibles were so consistently outstanding that they're almost defined by them as much as shooting.

The top scorer who relies on shooting could be said to need most of these things, though. He needs to have an outstanding work ethic just to get his shot to the level it's at. He has to be smart, and have a high basketball IQ, to get open for the shots he needs and to play strong enough off the ball defense to justify his playing time. They need to be coachable to learn the form for that perfect shot and how to move without the ball on offense. And without that competitive edge, what drives them to become outstanding shooters?

I eventually included Brian Roberts in this category, but he doesn't fit 100\% perfectly and is kind of a strange mixture of a few categories. He was never big (high school coach Ed Heintschel described him as "naturally wiry") and was certainly more of a point than a 2-guard. However, shooting was given as his greatest strength, and that really is the key to this category. On the makeup side, he was described as an excellent student, a serious but quiet competitor, and a good, quiet leader with strong coachability and a very high basketball IQ. His work ethic, while Heintschel didn't exactly question it, didn't get the same outstanding response these other shooters did. I'm not sure he was quite thin enough, or had quite strong enough intangibles, to fit this category exactly, but I think he had enough of the High Major Talent in him to be called understandable. Scout.com had him rated a three-star prospect and Dave Telep said he had a lower opinion of Roberts as a prospect than the consensus at the time. In summary, Roberts is here because he fits the general sense of this category and his being "wiry" rather than truly skinny was the difference between him being a typical mid-major prospect and a borderline high major prospect.

Another note - Agudio's description didn't necessarily fit this category because high school coach Tom Fitzpatrick never mentioned his shooting during the interview. As far as the skinny/slow half of the equation, though, Fitzpatrick said of Agudio, "people probably didn't think he was quick enough or strong enough." And as for the other half, when I checked out his numbers, shooting clearly carried the day in Agudio's game: in both his 2008 and 2009 First Team All-CAA seasons he shot 200+ three pointers and while hitting better than $40 \%$ from behind the arc. Funk also had exposure issues, playing at a small Missouri high school and for a smaller AAU program. He never appeared in the Scout.com database.

# Dave Telep Scouting - Drew Cannon's Mid-Major Study 

## THE SKINNY, ULTRAQUICK 2-GUARD

(Jamal Shuler, Loren Stokes, Jamaal Tatum, Josh Young)
This group's skills are also understood as high school players. They just get projected as tweener guards - too short or too thin to play off guard but vision or ballhandling skills not strong enough to play point. And at the high major level, this is generally true. But at the mid-major level, quickness can be dangerous enough offensively and opposing guards are small enough defensively that these players can thrive. In college, they never really played the one - the highest assist per game season among the five was Loren Stokes' 3.5 as a sophomore - but of their fifteen 25+ minute per game seasons, twelve saw assist averages over 2.0 and eight cracked the 2.5 mark. There was certainly not a blatant lack of passing skills.

As far as the lack of size goes, in high school their heights ranged from 5'10-6'3 and their weights from 155-175. Tatum gained 20 pounds in college and Shuler was listed 10 pounds heavier at VCU, but Young was listed exactly the same and Stokes only went from 170 to 175. This means that the slightness of build cannot be considered acceptable only because of potential weight gain. There is something intrinsic about mid-major basketball that allows thinner, smaller guards to succeed (although l'm sure nobody would argue that the potential for weight gain would be a negative). Common qualities for the undersized, ultra quick 2-guard: all four were black, scored 20+ points per game in high school, and were described as standouts in terms of competitiveness, coachability, basketball IQ, and work ethic. Woodfox and Curry both have arguments for being in this group rather than the shooter group.

## THE SKINNY, SKILLED BIG MAN

(Pat Calathes, Justin Doellman, Nick Fazekas, Adam Koch, Anthony Tolliver)
Third of four groups partially founded on frame, the skinny, skilled big man also is largely understood. They are generally seen as tweener forwards - clearly not big enough to bang with high major big men, while equally obviously not quick enough to deal with the typical high major wing. In the mid-major game, though, the players have the chance to flourish. The forwards are able to play underneath effectively on offense and defense due to a better than expected ability for thinner big men to adapt to the more physical college game. Nick Fazekas's high school coach, Mitch Conrad, said the most surprising improvement in Fazekas's game was how "easily he adjusted to physical play."

The three makeup characteristics that these players had in common were top-notch coachability, excellent basketball IQ's, and outstanding work ethic. They had the work ethic and coachability to become skilled, and they played enough basketball over the years to turn into smart players. These guys were all basketball players who happened to be tall enough to play inside.

Anthony Tolliver was 6'9, 220, in high school, but could shoot the three ball and was still a surprisingly effective rebounder and shot blocker. High school coach Roy Green said that he really didn't have a weakness - his work ethic was such that any weakness in his game was worked on until it disappeared. He was a little bigger than the other four in this group, but he's included here (rather than the Hidden Gems category; he wasn't listed in the Scout database) because he played for a decent sized AAU program, even if he wasn't featured in the offense, and because Green made a point to talk about how young Tolliver was for his class and how late he developed physically. Nick Fazekas was 6'10, 190 pounds, coming out of high school, and his high school coach called athleticism his weakness. Even then, though, he was really good with the ball, a capable shooter and passer with great hands. Adam Koch was 6'8, 200, coming out of high school and was very young for his class. His greatest strength was said to be his offensive versatility. High school coach Jeff VandeLoo reported that Koch was excellent in the paint or on the perimeter.

Pat Calathes grew six inches between his sophomore and senior years in high school and was only 6'4, 135 when that growth spurt started. His biggest strength was given as shooting and guard skills - he had played point pre-growth spurt. Justin Doellman was 6'7, 180, with his greatest weakness being "quickness," and strength, like Koch, being offensive versatility - he was able to hit jumpers consistently but also had a post-up game.

## THE UNDERSIZED FORWARD

(Will Thomas, Theron Wilson)
This group would be larger than two if I could have gotten in touch with more coaches - Randal Falker of Southern Illinois and Will Daniels of Rhode Island would almost certainly have ended up here as well. The only really strong links between Thomas and Wilson seem to be the fact that they were undersized with fantastic rebounding ability, outstanding instincts, and great coachability. Wilson was more of a Division II/junior college recruit out of high school, and understandably so as he was extremely undersized (his coach listed him at 6'3, 175, even though he played power forward). Then he grew a few inches and put on 25 pounds in junior college while improving his shooting. Suddenly, Wilson was big enough and quick enough to defend almost any position on the floor even at 6'5-6'6. He played mostly 4 but had the skills to play 3 and maybe even 2 in college, though that would have negated some of his rebounding prowess. Thomas was more of a tenacious, junkyard dog type. Some quotes from high school coach Pat Clatchey: "tough as nails," "max effort and intensity," "biggest strength was winning," "off the charts competitiveness," "we would practice for $21 / 2$ hours and he would go lift for another hour and a half after." "Rudy Gay was in our high school conference and went 0-8 against Will."

The more powerful, smaller forwards also need to have some basketball skills. Clatchey was really impressed with Thomas's passing skills and high school coach Ken Darting saw a lot of improvement in Wilson's shooting ability to go with already strong ballhandling. This is one category that I feel like I haven't really cracked yet - more in depth information about Falker and Daniels might eliminate more of the mystery.

## THE LATE ARRIVAL BIG MAN

(Ahmad Nivins, Larry Sanders)
Note: Sanders wasn't first team All-CAA, but he was second team as a sophomore and his late season performance prompted Dave Telep to ask me to include him in this study.

This type of player started playing the game late, so his developing basketball IQ can appear to just be poor decision-making. His unremarkable ball skills can be taken as a lack of ability or work ethic rather than a lack of time to develop. But Nivins and Sanders make one think that the Late Arrival Big Man can be spotted by excellent instincts, strong athleticism, shot blocking ability, coachability, and work ethic.

So, then the question becomes, why shot blocking rather than, say, rebounding? Let me start by saying that this could be unimportant altogether - there are only two guys to work off here. But I have two theories. One is that shot blocking reveals other abilities that are more important to future success: namely, athleticism, an understanding of the flow of basketball, the coachability to take off the ball defensive techniques to heart, and the work ethic required to continue to put out maximum work ethic on the defensive end. A second theory is that standout shot blocking ability can highlight a prospect that otherwise wouldn't be highly recruited, and this enables mid-major coaches to learn that the reason for the player's other ordinary skills is due to a short time around the game.
Basically, this type of player shows his talent with good makeup to go with high-major level athleticism and size and avoids the high-major schools with his lower level of pure basketball skill. The lack of experience means that the player can develop into a strong player on a much sharper curve than the typical player with his high school skill set, who likely disappears upon reaching college.

## THE INTANGIBLES FREAK

(Adam Emmenecker)
I'm not even going to begin to try and guess how someone could have been able to see Adam Emmenecker coming. He averaged 4.7 points per game at a high school with a strong basketball program. He walked on at Drake. Four years later, he's MVC player of the year. Here are his stats at Drake:

Freshman (2005): 12 games, 2 MPG, 0.3 PPG, 0.4 APG, 0.1 RPG
Sophomore (2006): 29 games, 7.3 MPG, 0.8 PPG, 0.9 APG, 0.9 RPG
Junior (2007): 23 games, 11.3 MPG, 1.3 PPG, 1.6 APG, 1.4 RPG
Senior (2008): 33 games, 33.1 MPG, 8.6 PPG, 6.5 APG, 4.6 RPG
In John Feinstein's The Last Amateurs, he talks about a Holy Cross player named Chris Spitler, who at one point described himself as the worst player on the worst team in the worst conference in Division l. Feinstein discussed the three stages of Chris Spitler (paraphrased): 1. There's no way in hell you're making this team. 2. OK, you're on the team, but you'll never play. 3. You're starting. Adam Emmenecker added a stage: 4. You're the Conference Player of the Year.

High school coach Greg McMath on Emmenecker: "very intelligent," "great student," "great teammate," "by far the best leader l've had," "standout competitor," "excellent coachability," "extremely high basketball IQ," "tremendous instincts." Emmenecker was the starting quarterback on the football team. He played varsity baseball. Every year now, McMath hands out the Adam Emmenecker Award for work ethic. His greatest weakness in high school was shooting. McMath expected more improvement in his ballhandling. He was surprised at Emmenecker's speed improvement. This kid had nothing. He could pass. Outside of that, he was all makeup.

I'm generally a stat guy. I'm a Bill James/Dean Oliver disciple. I laugh at the thought of a kid completely willing his way to become a college basketball player, talent irrelevant. But there's really no other explanation for Chris Spitler turning into a viable D-I guard. And it looks like Adam Emmenecker became the best player in the Missouri Valley Conference on nothing but the strength of his character.

## WHAT WE'VE LEARNED

> Frame/body should be treated very, very differently when dealing with a mid-major prospect than a high major prospect. It seems that, for guards, size in both directions isn't correlated with success. For forwards, rather than needing both height and bulk, one or the other is enough if the other skills are there (Undersized Forward, Skinny Skilled Big Man). It appears to me that frame is weighted the same when considering mid-major prospects as it is when considering high major prospects, and this simply shouldn't be the case.
$>$ Big-time shooters are huge assets on the mid-major scale. A full quarter of the First Team AllConference players of the MVC, CAA, and A-10 in the last three years (l'm counting two of Eldridge, Maynor, and Neal - take your pick) were known to be serious shooters in high school and became weapons in college. Shooters should be under attack with mid-major offers.
$>$ Transfers are your friend. Strong talents who didn't fulfill expectations at the high major level (see: Forbes, Gary and Egerson, Mark) can turn into studs with a simple conference change.
$>$ Don't be scared of quick looks. If you get a rare chance to pick up a Stephane Lasme or a Shy Ely because of an accidental glance, you shouldn't be wary of recruiting someone just because they're off the beaten path. If you show up at a no-name tournament and a no-name kid looks great, maybe he's only still available because he's hidden...not that l'm saying offer someone on one look.
$>$ I will never pretend to have all the answers here. This isn't a huge sample size, but I feel pretty good about the types of players l've highlighted and the reasons they became what they became. But I could analyze every piece of information about every college recruit ever and I'd still laugh at the person who showed me Adam Emmenecker's resume with the name whited out.

## BY THE NUMBERS

1. The sample sizes are too small to make any solid judgments on how well, for example, introverted players perform - especially with the knowledge that the 40-person set is incomplete. And, just as importantly, the numbers all reflect players who were All-Conference players. In other words, there is no control group to show how common these characteristics are. Maybe 17 of the 32 were at least on the introverted side, but if, on average, only $20 \%$ of college basketball players are described as being on the introverted side, then that would become a much more significant number.
2. These numbers are all from interviews with coaches who are all working from different rating systems and with different levels of sugarcoating. Additionally, there could be some tilting towards better makeup players because their coaches may have been more willing to spend time supporting them (i.e. call me back).

Foreign-born: 3 of 32 (9.4\%)
Took Prep year: 5 of 32 (15.6\%)
Junior College: 2 of 32 (6.3\%)
Age: The only players older than 19 years, 0 months in May of their HS grad year were foreign-born Vasylius and Lasme. 30 of 32 ( $93.7 \%$ ) were 19 years, 0 months or younger. 11 of 32 (34.4\%) were 18 years, 0 months or younger. Due to transfers, redshirts, and prep years, the same group projects to graduate 27 of 32 ( $84.4 \%$ ) by age 23 years, 0 months and 7 of 32 ( $21.9 \%$ ) by 22 years, 0 months in college.

Height: of the 27 players who had high school heights listed in the database, five (18.5\%) were listed at two or more inches taller in college, and one was listed at more than two inches taller.

Weight: 12 of 25 ( $48 \%$ ) who had high school weights listed in the database were listed at 20 or more pounds heavier in college, and 19 of 25 ( $76 \%$ ) were listed at least ten pounds heavier.

Rankings: Only Gary Forbes (\#39) was ranked in the RSCI Top 100 for his class. Only Gary Forbes (\#67) was ranked in the Scout.com Top 100 for his class. B.J. Raymond was a Scout four-star. 11 of 32 (32.4\%) were Scout three-stars, and 11 more (32.4\%) were Scout two-stars. Adam Koch was a one-star, and seven (21.9\%) were not in the Scout.com database.

Race: 20 of 32 (62.5\%) were black.
Scoring Average: of the 28 who I found HS scoring averages for: 27 ( $96.4 \%$ ) scored more than 15 PPG, 18 (64.3\%) scored more than 20 PPG, 9 (32.1\%) scored more than 25 PPG, and 3 ( $9.4 \%$ ) scored more than 30 PPG. Adam Emmenecker scored 4.7 PPG.

Public vs. Private: 17 (56.7\%) of the 30 non-foreign players went to public high schools.
Recruiting: Ten (31.3\%) were legitimately recruited by at least one high-major school.
AAU: yes (28, 87.5\%), big-time AAU program (16.5, 51.6\%)
On-ball defense: below average (7, 21.9\%), good (15, 46.9\%), exceptional (10, 31.3\%)
Off-ball defense: below average (4, 12.5\%), good (16, 50\%), exceptional (12, 37.5\%)
Position switches: scale (i.e. went from playing $2-5$ in HS to $3-4$ in college) ( $7,21.9 \%$ ), offensive change only (1), defensive change only (1), legitimate change (5, 15.6\%)

Extroversion: introverted (11, 31.3\%), on introverted side (6, 18.8\%), middle (3, 9.4\%), on extroverted side (3, 9.4\%), extroverted (9, 28.1\%)

Academics: weak (3, 9.4\%), good (17, 53.1\%), excellent (12, 37.5\%)
Teammate: good (8, 25\%), great (24, 75\%)
Likeability (no Lasme/Lee): teammates (30, 100\%), students (28.5, 95\%), teachers (28.5, 95\%)
Competitiveness: low (2, 6.3\%), good (5, 15.6\%), exceptional (25, 78.1\%)
Leadership: none (4, 12.5\%), good (usually quiet/by example) (9, 28.1\%), exceptional (18, 56.3\%)
Coachability: good (6, 18.8\%), exceptional (26, 81.3\%)
Basketball IQ: low (2, 6.3\%), good (8, 25\%), standout (22, 68.8\%)
Instincts: good (12, 37.5\%), exceptional (20, 62.5\%)
Work Ethic: subpar (2, 6.3\%), adequate (3, 9.4\%), exceptional (27, 84.4\%)
Age at HS graduation (May of grad year): 17 years, 8 months (1), 17 years, 9 months (1), 17 years, 10 months (1), 17 years, 11 months (4), 8 years, 0 months (4), 18 years, 1 month (1), 18 years, 2 months (2), 18 years, 3 months (3), 18 years, 4 months (1), 18 years, 5 months (3), 18 years, 6 months (4), 18 years, 8 months (2), 18 years, 9 months (1), 18 years, 11 months (1), 19 years, 0 months (1), 19 years, 8 months (1), 20 years, 5 months (1)

Age at college graduation (or projected age): 21 years, 10 months (1), 21 years, 11 months (4), 22 years, 0 months (2), 22 years, 1 month (1), 22 years, 2 months ( 2 ), 22 years, 3 months ( 2 ), 22 years, 4 months (1), 22 years, 5 months (3), 22 years, 6 months ( 2 ), 22 years, 8 months (3), 22 years, 9 months (2), 22 years, 11 months (1), 23 years, 0 months (3), 23 years, 3 months (1), 23 years, 6 months (2), 23 years, 8 months (1), 24 years, 5 months (1)
Signed: pre-Soph year (1), pre-Jr year (1), spring of Jr year (1), pre-Sr year (2), fall Sr year (12), winter Sr year (3), spring Sr year (3), summer before college (3), walk-on (1), prep (1), JC (2), always assumed to follow head coach father (1)

## Extroversion/introversion by position:

Bigs: introverted (5, 32.3\%), on introverted side (3, 25\%), on extroverted side (1, 8.3\%), extroverted (3, 25\%)
Wings: introverted ( $5,31.3 \%$ ), on introverted side ( $3,18.8 \%$ ), middle ( $2,12.5 \%$ ), on extroverted side (1, 6.3\%), extroverted (5, 31.3\%)

Points: introverted (1, 25\%), middle (1, 25\%), on extroverted side (1, 25\%), extroverted (1, 25\%)

Drew Cannon crafted this study. He's currently a sophomore at Duke University and has worked with me each of the past three summers. He's a tremendously gifted and intelligent young man. His commitment to this project was amazing and I think you'll agree, he has a bright future!

Thanks for being a subscriber to the service. The goal is to attempt to breakdown one element of recruiting a year. If you have an idea for a study or comments on this issue, please feel free to share your thoughts!

## Best wishes,

