

Looking at football
from a different
point of view

Fund Movements

Heritage Fund ▲ 21.8
Alpha Fund Steady
Beta Fund Steady
Chi Fund ▼ 6.5
Line Fund ▲ 7.0

Rec'd Fund ▲ 6.6

MAFL 2008

29th June
Round #14.1 2008

Round 14 Results

| 65 Correct | | Hawthorn v West Coast (MCG, 27th June 2008) | |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$1.05 | \$8.50 | |
| | 88% - 95% | 5% - 12% | |
| | Hawthorn -43½ pts (\$1.90/\$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | - | - | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | - | - | |
| Line | - | - | |
| Chi | Hawthorn by 15 | | |
| Quila | Hawthorn by 12 | | |
| Shadow | Hawthorn | | |
| CTL | Hawthorn | | |
| MARS | Hawthorn | | |
| MM | Hawthorn (43-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Super MM | Hawthorn (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Hawthorn | | |
| Simplified | Hawthorn | | |
| Result | Hawthorn 18.18 (126) def West Coast 9.15 (69) | | |

| 17 Correct | | Richmond v Carlton (MCG, 28th June 2008) | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$1.62 | \$2.15 | |
| | 53% - 62% | 38% - 47% | |
| | Richmond -6½ pts (\$1.90 / \$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | - | - | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | Lost 6.47% (8.27%) | | |
| Line | - | - | |
| Chi | Richmond by 2 | | |
| Quila | Carlton by 4 | | |
| Shadow | Carlton | | |
| CTL | Carlton | | |
| MARS | Richmond | | |
| MM | Richmond (29-14) (Dissenters: MM3-14, 35 and 36) | | |
| Super MM | Richmond (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Richmond | | |
| Simplified | Richmond | | |
| Result | Carlton 17.16 (118) def Richmond 12.16 (88) | | |

| 7 Correct | | Kangaroos v St Kilda (Gold Coast Stad, 28th June 2008) | |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$1.55 | \$2.35 | |
| | 57% - 65% | 35% - 43% | |
| | Kangaroos -11½ pts (\$1.90 / \$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | Won 10.75% | | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | - | - | |
| Line | Won 7.01% (8.63%) | | |
| Chi | Kangaroos by 15 | | |
| Quila | Kangaroos by 16 | | |
| Shadow | St Kilda | | |
| CTL | Kangaroos | | |
| MARS | Kangaroos | | |
| MM | Kangaroos (37-6) (Dissenters: MMA, 5, 7 and 42-44) | | |
| Super MM | Kangaroos (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Kangaroos | | |
| Simplified | Kangaroos | | |
| Result | St Kilda 12.12 (84) def Kangaroos 9.15 (69) | | |

| 65 Correct | | W Bulldogs v Pt Adelaide (Marrara Oval, 28th June 2008) | |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$1.14 | \$5.25 | |
| | 81% - 88% | 12% - 19% | |
| | W Bulldogs -33½ pts (\$1.90 / \$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | Lost 15.97% | | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | - | - | |
| Line | - | - | |
| Chi | Western Bulldogs by 23 | | |
| Quila | Western Bulldogs by 21 | | |
| Shadow | Western Bulldogs | | |
| CTL | Western Bulldogs | | |
| MARS | Western Bulldogs | | |
| MM | Western Bulldogs (43-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Super MM | Western Bulldogs (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Western Bulldogs | | |
| Simplified | Western Bulldogs | | |
| Result | W Bulldogs 20.15 (135) def. Port Adelaide 11.15 (81) | | |

| 0 Correct | | Melbourne v Bris Lions (MCG, 29th June 2008) | |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$4.20 | \$1.20 | |
| | 17% - 24% | 76% - 83% | |
| | Melbourne +25½ pts (\$1.90 / \$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | Won 26.99% | | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | - | - | |
| Line | - | - | |
| Chi | Brisbane Lions by 16 | | |
| Quila | Brisbane Lions by 11 | | |
| Shadow | Brisbane Lions | | |
| CTL | Brisbane Lions | | |
| MARS | Brisbane Lions | | |
| MM | Brisbane Lions (43-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Super MM | Brisbane Lions (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Brisbane Lions | | |
| Simplified | Brisbane Lions | | |
| Result | Melbourne 14.9 (93) def. Brisbane Lions 13.14 (92) | | |

| 43 Correct | | Fremantle v Essendon (Subiaco, 29th June 2008) | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--|
| Sportsbet | \$1.50 | \$2.50 | |
| | 60% - 67% | 33% - 40% | |
| | Fremantle -12½ pts (\$1.90 / \$1.90) | | |
| Heritage | - | - | |
| Alpha | - | - | |
| Beta | - | - | |
| Chi | - | - | |
| Line | - | - | |
| Chi | Fremantle by 15 | | |
| Quila | Fremantle by 10 | | |
| Shadow | Essendon | | |
| CTL | Essendon | | |
| MARS | Fremantle | | |
| MM | Essendon (25-18) (Dissenters: MM18,20-25,31-33,37-44) | | |
| Super MM | Essendon (14-0) (Dissenters: None) | | |
| Uber MM | Essendon | | |
| Simplified | Essendon | | |
| Result | Essendon 14.11 (95) def. Fremantle 13.13 (91) | | |

Results in Review

MAFL Funds

A few times this season we've arrived at the Melbourne fixture needing a Dees victory to salvage the weekend.

And so it was again this weekend though, thankfully, the ending was more fairy tale and less Roald Dahl than we've grown accustomed to enduring.

Earlier in the round, on Saturday the Saints had come back after trailing by 16 points at the final change to bring home our Heritage and our Line bets thus making the Saints part of a very select group of teams, that being those on which the Heritage Fund has made money across the season (the other teams in the group are Carlton, Collingwood, Melbourne and the Bulldogs).

The weekend's other two bets were unsuccessful. Chi's bet on Richmond looked promising until a fourth quarter burst by the Blues saw them run away with the game by 5 goals, while the Heritage Fund's wager on Port was teetering at the first change and all-but-gone at the major interval, with the Dogs eventually going on to win by 9 goals.

In aggregate – though, with so much red in the table at right, it might not be apparent – the weekend wound up being quite profitable for most Investors.

| Investor # | Profit/Loss (%) |
|------------|-----------------|
| 001 | (42.56%) |
| 002 | (74.23%) |
| 003 | (34.75%) |
| 004 | (34.75%) |
| 005 | (36.22%) |
| 006 | (34.75%) |
| 007 | (34.75%) |
| 008 | (34.75%) |
| 009 | (34.75%) |
| 010 | - |
| 011 | - |
| 012 | (34.75%) |
| 013 | (34.75%) |
| 014 | (34.75%) |
| 015 | (16.25%) |
| 016 | (34.75%) |

Tipping

With just 2 of 6 favourites grabbing the points so far in Round 14, tipsters have struggled. The all-tipster average is just 3.03, a smidgeon over the expected outcome from tossing a coin to determine the tips for each game.

Four tipsters have scored 5 from 6 – Shadow, MM4, MM5 and MM7 – while 18 tipsters, including Chi and BKB, have scored only 2.

Full details will appear next weekend once the round has been completed although a pictorial view of current scores appears, as usual, in Appendix 1.

When Do Teams Score Their Points?

In previous weeks we've looked generally at how teams have fared in each of the four quarters but one thing we've not done is to directly consider the proportion of points that each team scores and concedes in each quarter.

| | % of Points Scored in Each Quarter | | | | % of Points Conceded in Each Quarter | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| <i>Adelaide</i> | 21% | 23% | 29% | 26% | 25% | 21% | 25% | 29% |
| <i>Brisbane Lions</i> | 22% | 26% | 26% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 27% | 27% |
| <i>Carlton</i> | 22% | 25% | 22% | 31% | 23% | 23% | 27% | 27% |
| <i>Collingwood</i> | 21% | 27% | 27% | 25% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 29% |
| <i>Essendon</i> | 21% | 26% | 29% | 23% | 23% | 27% | 23% | 27% |
| <i>Fremantle</i> | 25% | 25% | 27% | 22% | 21% | 27% | 20% | 32% |
| <i>Geelong</i> | 23% | 25% | 28% | 23% | 26% | 26% | 23% | 25% |
| <i>Hawthorn</i> | 20% | 24% | 27% | 29% | 24% | 25% | 29% | 23% |
| <i>Kangaroos</i> | 25% | 23% | 27% | 25% | 20% | 30% | 24% | 25% |
| <i>Melbourne</i> | 23% | 19% | 24% | 34% | 23% | 27% | 24% | 26% |
| <i>Port Adelaide</i> | 27% | 27% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 23% | 29% | 25% |
| <i>Richmond</i> | 25% | 27% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 22% | 28% | 24% |
| <i>St Kilda</i> | 27% | 22% | 22% | 29% | 21% | 28% | 27% | 24% |
| <i>Sydney</i> | 26% | 23% | 24% | 26% | 25% | 25% | 24% | 26% |
| <i>West Coast</i> | 25% | 26% | 23% | 26% | 22% | 26% | 26% | 25% |
| <i>Western Bulldogs</i> | 20% | 28% | 26% | 26% | 25% | 22% | 29% | 24% |
| <i>Total</i> | 23% | 25% | 26% | 26% | 23% | 25% | 26% | 26% |

So, for example, Adelaide has scored 21% of its points in the 1st quarter, 23% in the 2nd quarter, 29% in the 3rd quarter, and 26% in the 4th quarter. As well, of all the points it has conceded, 25% have been conceded in the 1st quarter, 21% in the 2nd quarter, and so on.

You can see from this table, for example, that Hawthorn and the Bulldogs are both slow starters, each scoring only 20% of their points in the 1st quarter. The Bulldogs, however, tend to recover in the 2nd quarter whereas the Hawks tend to wait until the 2nd half.

Leading and Winning

Even though we're only part way through Round 14, I thought it might be interesting to take a look at how teams that have led at the various changes by various amounts have eventually fared in the contest.

| 2008 Data | | | | | | | 2007 Data | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Quarter 1 Summary | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lead | % of Games | Win | Draw | Loss | % Win | Cum % Win | % of Games | Win | Draw/Loss | % Win | Cum % Win |
| 1-5 pts | 22% | 15 | | 8 | 65% | 69% | 23% | 24 | 16 | 60% | 68% |
| 6-11 pts | 24% | 15 | 1 | 9 | 60% | 70% | 23% | 24 | 15 | 62% | 71% |
| 12-17 pts | 18% | 12 | 1 | 6 | 63% | 74% | 19% | 21 | 12 | 64% | 75% |
| 18-23 pts | 12% | 11 | | 2 | 85% | 79% | 16% | 21 | 7 | 75% | 81% |
| 24-29 pts | 15% | 13 | | 3 | 81% | 77% | 9% | 13 | 3 | 81% | 87% |
| 30-35 pts | 6% | 4 | | 2 | 67% | 70% | 5% | 9 | | 100% | 93% |
| 36 pts or more | 4% | 3 | | 1 | 75% | 75% | 4% | 5 | 1 | 83% | 83% |
| Total | 100% | 73 | 2 | 31 | 69% | | 100% | 117 | 54 | 68% | |
| <i>Games tied at the end of the 1st quarter : 4</i> | | | | | | | <i>Games tied at the end of the 1st quarter : 5</i> | | | | |
| Quarter 2 Summary | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lead | % of Games | Win | Draw | Loss | % Win | Cum % Win | % of Games | Win | Draw/Loss | % Win | Cum % Win |
| 1-5 pts | 12% | 6 | | 7 | 46% | 73% | 15% | 15 | 11 | 58% | 80% |
| 6-11 pts | 19% | 12 | 2 | 7 | 57% | 77% | 17% | 19 | 9 | 68% | 85% |
| 12-17 pts | 17% | 12 | | 7 | 63% | 83% | 17% | 24 | 5 | 83% | 89% |
| 18-23 pts | 12% | 11 | | 2 | 85% | 89% | 11% | 12 | 6 | 67% | 91% |
| 24-29 pts | 9% | 9 | | 1 | 90% | 91% | 12% | 20 | | 100% | 97% |
| 30-35 pts | 6% | 6 | | 1 | 86% | 91% | 13% | 19 | 2 | 90% | 96% |
| 36 pts or more | 24% | 24 | | 2 | 92% | 92% | 15% | 26 | | 100% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 80 | 2 | 27 | 73% | | 100% | 135 | 33 | 80% | |
| <i>Games tied at the end of the 2nd quarter : 1</i> | | | | | | | <i>Games tied at the end of the 2nd quarter : 8</i> | | | | |
| Quarter 3 Summary | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lead | % of Games | Win | Draw | Loss | % Win | Cum % Win | % of Games | Win | Draw/Loss | % Win | Cum % Win |
| 1-5 pts | 14% | 6 | 1 | 8 | 40% | 81% | 13% | 17 | 6 | 74% | 89% |
| 6-11 pts | 15% | 14 | | 2 | 88% | 87% | 11% | 16 | 4 | 80% | 91% |
| 12-17 pts | 15% | 11 | 1 | 4 | 69% | 87% | 17% | 21 | 8 | 72% | 93% |
| 18-23 pts | 6% | 6 | | 1 | 86% | 92% | 12% | 21 | | 100% | 99% |
| 24-29 pts | 10% | 10 | | 1 | 91% | 93% | 9% | 15 | 1 | 94% | 99% |
| 30-35 pts | 10% | 8 | | 3 | 73% | 93% | 9% | 15 | | 100% | 100% |
| 36 pts or more | 30% | 33 | | | 100% | 100% | 29% | 50 | | 100% | 100% |
| Total | 100% | 88 | 2 | 19 | 81% | | 100% | 155 | 19 | 89% | |
| <i>Games tied at the end of the 3rd quarter : 1</i> | | | | | | | <i>Games tied at the end of the 3rd quarter : 2</i> | | | | |

Let's focus first on the 2008 data, which appears on the left hand side of the table.

From the table headed "Quarter 1 Summary" we can see that in all the games where there's been a clear leader at the first change, 22% of them have led by 1 to 5 points. Of the 23 teams that have held such a lead, 15 have subsequently gone on to win. This represents a 65% win rate.

The value of 69% under the "Cum % Win" column tells us that teams with leads of 1 to 5 points or more have won 69% of games. (Note that I count draws as non-wins for this calculation.)

Overall then, teams that have led at the first change have won 69% of the time. Teams that have led at the main break have won 73% of the time, and teams that have led at the final change have won 81% of the time.

One statistic that I find illuminating is the size of the lead required such that 90% of teams with a lead as big or bigger have gone on to win. For Q1 the statistic is 38 points (the one team that has lost after leading by 36 points or more was St Kilda and they led by 37 points at the first change). For Q2 the necessary lead is 24-29 points, while for Q3 it's 18-23 points.

One other interesting thing to note from this table is the difference between leading by 1 to 5 points and by 6 to 11 points at the final change. Teams that have led by less than a goal have won only 6 of 15 contests whereas those that have led by between 6 and 11 points have won 14 of 16 contests. That's a massive 48% point difference in success rates.

A comparison of the 2008 data to that for 2007 yields a few more things worth noting:

- In 2008, 24% of games have been led by 4 goals or more at quarter time; in 2007 the figure was 18%. In 2008, 77% of these teams have gone on to win; in 2007 the figure was 87%
- In 2008, 24% of games have been led by 6 goals or more at half time; in 2007 the figure was 15%. In 2008, 92% of these teams have gone on to win; in 2007 the figure was 100%
- In 2008, 29% of games have been led by less than 2 goals at Three Quarter Time; in 2007 the figure was 24%
- In 2008, only 40% of teams that have led by 1 to 5 points at the final change have gone on to win; in 2007 the figure was 74%

In general then, leads have not meant as much this year as they did last year. This is underlined by looking at the size of the lead required such that 90% of teams with a lead as big or bigger have gone on to win. Here's the comparison:

| Quarter | Lead Required in 2008 | Lead Required in 2007 | Approx Difference |
|---------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Q1 | 38 points | 30-35 points | 1 goal |
| Q2 | 24-29 points | 18-23 points | 1 goal |
| Q3 | 18-23 points | 6-11 points | 2 goals |

We'll take another look at this phenomenon later in the year to see if it persists.

Finally for this newsletter, here's the latest competition ladder:

| Team | Pts | % | GF | BF | PF | Rushed | Acc % | Rank | GA | BA | PA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | |
|------------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|--------|-------|------|-----|-----|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Western Bulldogs | 50 | 133.4 | 255 | 187 | 1,717 | 45 | 64.2% | 1 | 189 | 153 | 1,287 | W | W | W | W | D | W | W | W | L | W | W | W | W | W | W |
| Geelong | 48 | 143.5 | 220 | 188 | 1,508 | 48 | 61.1% | 7 | 150 | 151 | 1,051 | W | W | W | W | W | W | W | W | L | W | W | W | W | W | W |
| Hawthorn | 48 | 129.3 | 229 | 194 | 1,568 | 29 | 58.1% | 13 | 176 | 157 | 1,213 | W | W | W | W | W | W | W | W | L | W | W | L | W | L | W |
| Sydney | 38 | 136.5 | 190 | 166 | 1,306 | 35 | 59.2% | 9 | 135 | 147 | 957 | L | W | W | W | L | D | L | W | W | W | W | W | W | W | W |
| Adelaide | 32 | 116.3 | 182 | 184 | 1,276 | 42 | 56.2% | 15 | 158 | 149 | 1,097 | L | W | W | L | W | W | W | W | L | W | W | L | L | L | L |
| Brisbane Lions | 32 | 106.1 | 204 | 210 | 1,434 | 53 | 56.5% | 14 | 197 | 169 | 1,351 | L | W | L | W | L | W | L | W | W | W | W | W | L | W | L |
| Collingwood | 28 | 117.8 | 216 | 171 | 1,467 | 49 | 63.9% | 2 | 182 | 153 | 1,245 | W | L | W | L | L | W | L | W | W | W | W | L | L | L | L |
| St Kilda | 28 | 97.3 | 184 | 160 | 1,264 | 31 | 58.8% | 10 | 190 | 159 | 1,299 | W | W | L | L | W | L | W | L | L | W | L | L | L | W | W |
| Carlton | 28 | 95.4 | 201 | 175 | 1,381 | 53 | 62.2% | 3 | 210 | 187 | 1,447 | L | L | L | W | W | L | W | L | W | L | W | W | L | W | L |
| Kangaroos | 26 | 94.0 | 190 | 170 | 1,310 | 41 | 59.6% | 8 | 201 | 188 | 1,394 | L | W | L | W | W | D | L | W | W | L | L | L | L | W | L |
| Richmond | 22 | 91.3 | 208 | 156 | 1,404 | 29 | 62.1% | 5 | 226 | 182 | 1,538 | W | L | L | W | D | L | L | L | W | L | L | L | W | W | L |
| Essendon | 20 | 78.5 | 192 | 147 | 1,299 | 28 | 61.7% | 6 | 242 | 202 | 1,654 | W | L | W | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | W | W |
| Port Adelaide | 16 | 91.7 | 197 | 158 | 1,340 | 38 | 62.1% | 4 | 215 | 171 | 1,461 | L | L | L | L | W | W | W | L | L | W | L | L | L | L | L |
| Fremantle | 8 | 90.0 | 177 | 168 | 1,230 | 41 | 58.2% | 12 | 198 | 178 | 1,366 | L | L | W | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | W | L |
| West Coast | 8 | 66.5 | 148 | 169 | 1,057 | 43 | 54.0% | 16 | 235 | 179 | 1,589 | W | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | W | L | L | L | L | L | L |
| Melbourne | 8 | 64.4 | 159 | 153 | 1,107 | 40 | 58.5% | 11 | 248 | 231 | 1,719 | L | L | L | L | L | L | W | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | W |

As you can see, both of the remaining fixtures in Round 14 have a direct bearing on the Top 8.

I expect we'll have a wager on both.

~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*

'til Thursday

Tony

29 June 2008

Appendix 1 : Cumulative Tipping Performance – All Tipsters

