# ESTIMATING SUCCESS PROBABILITY OF A RUGBY GOAL KICK AND DEVELOPING A MEASURE FOR RANKING RUGBY UNION GOAL KICKERS 

Jurie NEL<br>Assupol Life, Pretoria, Republic of South Africa


#### Abstract

The objective of this study was firstly to derive a formula to estimate the success probability of a particular rugby goal kick and, secondly to derive a goal kicker rating measure that could be used to rank rugby union goal kickers. Various factors that could influence the success of a particular goal kick were considered. A logistic regression analysis was performed to obtain the significant factors that were found to be the most important factors in the estimation of the success probability of a particular goal kick. The estimated success probability of the goal kick was then used to allocate a difficulty rating for the particular goal kick. The result of goal kicks attempted by the kicker along with the difficulty rating of these kicks was used to derive a measure for the ranking of rugby goal kickers. Goal kicker performances during the 2011 Rugby World Cup Tournament were used to illustrate the workings of the ranking system.
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## INTRODUCTION

Goal kicking in rugby takes place after a try has been scored or a penalty has been awarded. The rugby ball is placed in an upright, static position and the goal kicker then attempts to kick the ball over the crossbar and between the two uprights of the goal posts (IRB, 2012). Berry and Berry (1985) used a data-analytic approach to estimate the probability that a field goal in American Football attempted from a certain distance will be successful for a particular kicker. They proposed measures by means of which to compare two kickers, such as the estimated probability of converting a 40-yard field goal for each of the two kickers.

The probability of a rugby goal kicker being successful with a particular goal kick depends on various factors. Bilder and Loughin (1997) did a study to determine the key factors affecting the success of a field goal in American Football. They found that the distance of the kick is most important, but also that field goal attempts, which could cause a change in lead, were more likely to be missed than others. Other factors that they considered and which were found to be of lesser significance in predicting whether a field goal would be successful include:

- Outside placekicks versus kicks inside a dome;
- Kicks at a kicker's home field versus kicks at the opponent's field;
- Kicks on turf versus kicks on artificial surfaces;
- Temperature at the time of the game;
- Time during the game when a kick was attempted;
- Wind speed when kick was attempted.

Table 1 includes the factors that were considered as explanatory variables to estimate the probability of a rugby goal kick being successful (some explanatory variables were transformed to binary variables for use in the analysis).

## TABLE 1: EXPLANATORY VARIABLES CONSIDERED IN THE LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS

| Variable | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Altitude | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Whether the kick was attempted at below or above 1000m above sea level } \\ \text { (variable was transformed to a binary variable) }\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Distance } \\ \text { Half } \\ \text { Type }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Angle of the kick in degrees } \\ \text { Distance of the kick in meters } \\ \text { Whether the kick was attempted during the 1 }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { or 2 } 2^{\text {nd }} \\ \text { (variable was transformed to a binary variable) }\end{array}$ |
| Pressure the game |  |
| Whether the kick was a penalty kick or a conversion kick. A conversion |  |
| kick is attempted after a try has been scored (variable was transformed to a |  |
| binary variable). |  |
| Whether the kick: |  |
| if successful, will result in the team closing to within one score of the |  |
| opponents; |  |
| if successful, will result in the team remaining within one score of the |  |
| opponents; |  |
| if successful, will result in the scores being level; |  |
| is taken while the team's lead is still within one score of the opponent's (a |  |
| maximum of seven points can be scored at a time in Rugby Union (IRB, |  |
| 2012)) (variable was transformed to a binary variable) |  |$\}$

Data regarding weather conditions, including rain and wind, was not captured. Weather conditions may influence the probability of a kick being successful, but due to a lack of objective data it could not be included in the analysis.

## METHOD

## Sample

Rugby goal kick data was obtained from games played during the 2011 Rugby World Cup Tournament in New Zealand (2011 RWC Tournament), the 2012 Super-15 Tournament played in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia (S15 Tournament) and the 2012, 6Nations Tournament played in Europe (6N Tournament). Data for 1249 goal kicks attempted in these tournaments were hand-captured using video footage and used for the purpose of the study.

## Measurements

Data captured included:

- Approximate angle of kick in degrees;
- Approximate length of kick in meters;
- Date when the game was played;
- Field where the game was played;
- Final score;
- Foot used for goal kicks;
- Player (kicker);
- Score at time of kick;
- Team against;
- Team for;
- Type of goal kick - penalty or conversion;
- When the goal kick was attempted $-1^{\text {st }}$ or $2^{\text {nd }}$ half;
- Whether the kick was successful or unsuccessful;
- Winning team;
- Zone from which kick attempted.


## Rugby field dimensions and zones analysed

| $1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35m 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| . 40 m .12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| 45 m 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 |
| 50 m 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 |
| 55m 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 |
| 1.60m. 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 |
| 65m 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 |

FIGURE 1: RUGBY FIELD DIVIDED INTO 77 ZONES

The length of a rugby field may not exceed 100 m , excluding the in-goal areas behind the goal posts, and it may not be wider than 70 m (IRB, 2012). The kick data was captured in 77 zones on the rugby field (Figure 1). The zones were constructed so that the 77 zones covered the entire rugby field and that all kicks from a particular zone were of the same approximate difficulty. The 77 zones were constructed using some of the lines already on the rugby field to assist with the data capturing. The zones were 5 m long by 5 m wide, except for zones 1 to 11 (these zones were closest to the goal posts and could not only be 5 m in length) and the zones in front of the goal posts.

## Probability of a successful goal kick

Following Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), a logistic regression analysis that included possible explanatory variables that could explain the dependent variable (probability of a successful goal kick) was performed. Results of the logistic regression analysis are summarised in Table 2.

## TABLE 2: RESULTS OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS

| Variable | Coefficient | Standard Error | Wald Chi-Square | Pr> Chi $^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 4.663 | 0.339 | 189.106 | $<0.0001$ |
| Altitude | 0.580 | 0.250 | 5.374 | 0.0200 |
| Angle | -0.016 | 0.004 | 13.191 | 0.0000 |
| Distance | -0.097 | 0.008 | 161.206 | $<0.0001$ |
| Half | -0.036 | 0.140 | 0.066 | 0.7970 |
| Type | -0.100 | 0.178 | 0.312 | 0.5760 |
| Pressure | 0.128 | 0.164 | 0.609 | 0.4350 |

From Table 2, it can be seen that altitude, angle and distance were the significant explanatory variables at a $2.5 \%$ significance level.

## Final model

After the initial variable screening process, the model that best estimates the probability of a successful goal kick was developed (Hosmer \& Lemeshow, 2000).

$$
\hat{\mathrm{y}}_{i}=\frac{1}{\left(1+e^{-\left(\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} \times \text { altitude }_{\mathrm{i}}+\beta_{2} \times \text { angle }_{\mathrm{i}}+\beta_{3} \times \text { distance }_{\mathrm{i}}\right)}\right.}
$$

where
$\hat{y}_{i} \quad=$ probability of a kick i being successful
altitude $_{i}=1$ if kick i attempted at $>=1000 \mathrm{~m}$ above sea level, else 0
angle $_{i}=$ angle of kick $i$ in degrees
distance $_{i}=$ distance of kick $i$ in meters
$\beta_{0}=4.666 \quad \beta_{1}=0.572 \quad \beta_{2}=-0.015 \quad \beta_{3}=-0.098$

This equation can therefore be used to calculate the probability of success of a goal kick based on the altitude above sea level at which the goal kick is attempted, the angle of the goal kick and the distance of the goal kick.

## Difficulty rating of goal kicks

The success probability of a particular goal kick indicates the difficulty of the goal kick (the lower the success probability, the higher the difficulty of the kick). The success probability of a particular goal kick can be used to derive a difficulty rating for the particular goal kick.

Let:

$$
\begin{gathered}
D_{i}=\frac{1}{y_{\mathrm{i}}} \\
\text { where } \\
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{i}}=\text { Difficulty rating of kick i } \\
\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}=\text { Probability of kick i being successful }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Goal kicker performance rating

The performance rating of a goal kicker is an objective measure of the goal kicker's performance based on the success he had with the kicks he attempted and the difficulty of the kicks. The success percentage (the number of successful goal kicks made by a kicker divided by the total number of goal kicks attempted) is combined with the difficulty rating of the kicks attempted by the goal kicker to derive a measure for the ranking of rugby goal kickers.

During a particular rugby game, or over a number of rugby games, the following equation is proposed for kicker j :
goal kicker performance rating ${ }_{j}$
$=$ success_percentage $_{\mathrm{j}} \times$ average difficulty rating of successful kicks $_{\mathrm{j}}$
Where:

$$
\text { success_percentage }_{\mathrm{j}}=\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \text { success }_{\mathrm{kj}}}{n}
$$

goal kicker performance rating $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{j}}=$ Performance rating for goal kicker j for that particular game or over a number of games
success $_{\mathrm{kj}}=1$ if kick k attempted by kicker j was successful, else 0
average difficulty rating of successful kicks $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{j}}=$ Average difficulty rating of kicker j 's kicks for that particular game or over a number of games
$\mathrm{n}=$ number of kicks that goal kicker j attempted for that particular game or over a number of games

The average or expected goal kicker performance rating is 1 . The goal kicker performance rating can be gauged as follows: >1 suggests better than average goal kicker performance; and <1 suggests poorer than average goal kicker performance.

## RESULTS

The three tables to follow indicate the goal kicker performance statistics for the 2011 RWC Tournament.

TABLE 3: RANKING OF PLAYERS BY SUCCESS PERCENTAGE

| Kicker | Country | No. Kicks <br> Attempted | No <br> Successful | Success \% | Success \% Ranking |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | South Africa | 6 | 6 | $100 \%$ | 1 |
| 2 | Wales | 15 | 13 | $87 \%$ | 2 |
| 3 | Ireland | 22 | 19 | $86 \%$ | 3 |
| 4 | France | 14 | 12 | $86 \%$ | 3 |
| 5 | Fiji | 12 | 10 | $83 \%$ | 5 |
| 6 | Australia | 5 | 4 | $80 \%$ | 6 |
| 7 | South Africa | 27 | 21 | $78 \%$ | 7 |
| 8 | Australia | 28 | 20 | $71 \%$ | 7 |
| 9 | England | 14 | 10 | $71 \%$ | 8.5 |
| 10 | Samoa | 10 | 7 | $70 \%$ | 8.5 |
| 11 | Wales | 19 | 13 | $68 \%$ | 10 |
| 12 | France | 22 | 15 | $68 \%$ | 12 |
| 13 | Tonga | 25 | 17 | $68 \%$ | 12 |
| 14 | New Zealand | 12 | 8 | $67 \%$ | 12 |
| 15 | USA | 3 | 2 | $67 \%$ | 16 |
| 16 | Canada | 12 | 8 | $67 \%$ | 16 |
| 17 | Romania | 6 | 4 | $67 \%$ | 16 |
| 18 | Samoa | 12 | 8 | $67 \%$ | 16 |
| 19 | New Zealand | 23 | 15 | $65 \%$ | 16 |
| 20 | Japan | 14 | 9 | $64 \%$ | 19 |
| 21 | Italy | 11 | 7 | $64 \%$ | 20.5 |
| 22 | New Zealand | 24 | 15 | $63 \%$ | 20.5 |
| 23 | USA | 8 | 5 | $63 \%$ | 23 |
| 24 | Scotland | 8 | 5 | $63 \%$ | 23 |
| 25 | Scotland | 13 | 8 | $62 \%$ | 23 |
| 26 | Georgia | 17 | 10 | $59 \%$ | 25 |
| 27 | Russia | 7 | 4 | $57 \%$ | 26 |
| 28 | Italy | 7 | 4 | $57 \%$ | 27.5 |
|  |  |  | 27.5 |  |  |

TABLE 3: RANKING OF PLAYERS BY SUCCESS PERCENTAGE (cont.)

| Kicker | Country | No. Kicks <br> Attempted | No <br> Successful | Success \% | Success \% Ranking |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | Wales | 15 | 8 | $53 \%$ | 29 |
| 30 | Canada | 8 | 4 | $50 \%$ | 31 |
| 31 | Argentina | 16 | 8 | $50 \%$ | 31 |
| 32 | Australia | 8 | 4 | $50 \%$ | 31 |
| 33 | England | 21 | 10 | $48 \%$ | 33 |
| 34 | Argentina | 17 | 8 | $47 \%$ | 34 |
| 35 | Ireland | 14 | 6 | $43 \%$ | 35 |
| 36 | Namibia | 10 | 4 | $40 \%$ | 36 |
| 37 | Romania | 14 | 5 | $36 \%$ | 37 |
| 38 | Russia | 6 | 2 | $33 \%$ | 38 |
| 39 | Italy | 3 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 39 |

TABLE 4: RANKING OF PLAYERS BY THE AVERAGE DIFFICULTY RATING OF GOAL KICKS

| Kicker | Country | Ave. difficulty rating <br> of goal kicks | Ave. difficulty rating <br> of goal kicks ranking |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | Namibia | 2.11 | 1 |
| 24 | Scotland | 1.77 | 2.5 |
| 12 | France | 1.77 | 2.5 |
| 5 | Fiji | 1.71 | 4 |
| 26 | Georgia | 1.61 | 5 |
| 6 | Australia | 1.57 | 6 |
| 37 | Romania | 1.55 | 7 |
| 18 | Samoa | 1.53 | 8 |
| 7 | South Africa | 1.50 | 9 |
| 13 | Tonga | 1.49 | 10 |
| 3 | Ireland | 1.48 | 11 |
| 9 | England | 1.47 | 12.5 |
| 14 | New Zealand | 1.47 | 12.5 |
| 32 | Australia | 1.45 | 14.5 |
| 33 | England | 1.45 | 14.5 |
| 25 | Scotland | 1.41 | 16 |
| 11 | Wales | 1.38 | 17 |

## TABLE 4: RANKING OF PLAYERS BY THE AVERAGE DIFFICULTY RATING OF GOAL KICKS (cont.)

| Kicker | Country | Ave. difficulty rating <br> of goal kicks | Ave. difficulty rating <br> of goal kicks ranking |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | New Zealand | 1.36 | 18 |
| 34 | Argentina | 1.35 | 19.5 |
| 31 | Argentina | 1.35 | 19.5 |
| 4 | France | 1.34 | 21 |
| 16 | Canada | 1.32 | 22 |
| 35 | Ireland | 1.31 | 23.5 |
| 8 | Australia | 1.31 | 23.5 |
| 10 | Samoa | 1.30 | 25 |
| 27 | Russia | 1.29 | 26 |
| 29 | Wales | 1.28 | 27 |
| 38 | Russia | 1.25 | 28 |
| 2 | Wales | 1.24 | 30 |
| 30 | Canada | 1.24 | 30 |
| 22 | New Zealand | 1.24 | 30 |
| 21 | Italy | 1.22 | 32 |
| 20 | Japan | 1.19 | 33 |
| 23 | USA | 1.18 | 34 |
| 17 | Romania | 1.15 | 35 |
| 28 | Italy | 1.10 | 36.5 |
| 1 | South Africa | 1.10 | 36.5 |
| 15 | USA | 1.05 | 38 |
| 39 | Italy | - | 39 |

TABLE 5: RANKING PLAYERS BY OVERALL GOAL KICKER PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND RANKINGS

| Kicker | Country | Goal Kicker <br> Performance Rating | Goal Kicker <br> Performance Ranking |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Fiji | 1.42 | 1 |
| 3 | Ireland | 1.28 | 2 |
| 6 | Australia | 1.26 | 3 |
| 12 | France | 1.21 | 4 |
| 7 | South Africa | 1.17 | 5 |
| 4 | France | 1.15 | 6 |

## TABLE 5: RANKING PLAYERS BY OVERALL GOAL KICKER PERFORMANCE RATINGS AND RANKINGS (cont.)

| 24 | Scotland | 1.11 | 7 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | South Africa | 1.10 | 8 |
| 2 | Wales | 1.07 | 9 |
| 9 | England | 1.05 | 10 |
| 18 | Samoa | 1.02 | 11 |
| 13 | Tonga | 1.01 | 12 |
| 14 | New Zealand | 0.98 | 13 |
| 26 | Georgia | 0.95 | 14 |
| 11 | Wales | 0.94 | 15.5 |
| 8 | Australia | 0.94 | 15.5 |
| 10 | Samoa | 0.91 | 17 |
| 19 | New Zealand | 0.89 | 18 |
| 16 | Canada | 0.88 | 19 |
| 25 | Scotland | 0.87 | 20 |
| 36 | Namibia | 0.84 | 21 |
| 21 | Italy | 0.77 | 23.5 |
| 22 | New Zealand | 0.77 | 23.5 |
| 17 | Romania | 0.77 | 23.5 |
| 20 | Japan | 0.77 | 23.5 |
| 27 | Russia | 0.74 | 26.5 |
| 23 | USA | 0.74 | 26.5 |
| 32 | Australia | 0.73 | 28 |
| 15 | USA | 0.70 | 29 |
| 33 | England | 0.69 | 30 |
| 29 | Wales | 0.68 | 31 |
| 31 | Argentina | 0.67 | 32 |
| 34 | Argentina | 0.64 | 33 |
| 28 | Italy | 0.63 | 34 |
| 30 | Canada | 0.62 | 35 |
| 35 | Ireland | 0.56 | 36 |
| 37 | Romania | 0.55 | 37 |
| 38 | Russia | 0.42 | 38 |
| 39 | Italy | 0.00 | 39 |
|  |  |  |  |

## DISCUSSION

The results in Table 3 indicate that only one player was successful with all his attempts at goal (Player 1: $100 \%$ success). According to Table 4, player 1 was successful with all 6 goal kicks he attempted, but this table shows that the average difficulty rating of goal kicks for Player 1was low (ranked 36.5 out of the 39 players). Player 36 had the highest average difficulty rating of goal kicks. This may be one of the reasons why he only ranked $36^{\text {th }}$ by success percentage. On viewing the results of Table 5, Player 5 was the best goal kicker during the 2011 RWC Tournament based on the success percentage he achieved together with the average difficulty rating of goal kicks. Player 24 ranked $23^{\text {rd }}$ by success percentage, but
much better $\left(7^{\text {th }}\right)$ by the overall goal kicker performance rating. This is due to the relatively high average difficulty rating of his goal kicks (ranked 2.5 out of the 39 players). Considering players ranked in the top 10 by their goal kicker performance rating, Player 5, Player 6 and Player 7 are the only players ranked in the top 10 by success percentage, as well as the average difficulty rating of goal kicks.

## CONCLUSIONS

A formula was derived to estimate the success probability of a rugby goal kick. The most important variables determining the success probability of a particular goal kick were determined as the altitude above sea level at which the goal kick was attempted, the angle of the goal kick and the distance of the goal kick.

The success probability was then used to allocate a difficulty rating for the particular goal kick. The result of goal kicks attempted by the kicker along with the difficulty rating of these kicks is used to derive a performance rating for the goal kicker.

Goal kicker performance ratings provide an objective measure that could be used by rugby analysts and enthusiasts, as well as television broadcasters to better judge the goal kicking performance of goal kickers. By ordering goal kickers' goal kick performance ratings, a goal kicker ranking measure could be established to be used during tournaments or continuously to rank goal kickers objectively.
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