

Home advantage of European major football leagues under COVID-19 pandemic

EIJI KONAKA

Meijo University
konaka@meijo-u.ac.jp

March 9, 2021

Abstract

Since March 2020, the environment surrounding football has changed dramatically because of the COVID-19 pandemic. After a few months' break, re-scheduled matches were held behind closed doors without spectators. The main objective of this study is a quantitative evaluation of "crowd effects" on home advantage, using the results of these closed matches. The proposed analysis uses pairwise comparison method to reduce the effects caused by the unbalanced schedule. The following conclusions were drawn from the statistical hypothesis tests conducted in this study: In four major European leagues, the home advantage is reduced in closed matches compared to than in the normal situation, i.e., with spectators. The reduction amounts among leagues were different. For example, in Germany, the home advantage was negative during the closed-match period. On the other hand, in England, statistically significant differences in home advantage were not observed between closed matches and normal situation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since March 2020, the environment surrounding football has changed dramatically — because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Similar to many other crowd-pleasing events, most football leagues were suspended. Some of the leagues had even been cancelled, whereas others resumed after a few months' break. With regard to the resumed leagues, however, no decision as before the suspension, has been announced. Re-scheduled matches have therefore been held behind closed doors without spectators.

The objective of this study was to analyze how this unfortunate closed-match situation affected the match outcomes of football. In particular, our main objective was a quantitative evaluation of "crowd effects" on home advantage.

Today, the existence of "home advantage" in sports, especially football, seems unquestionable [1][2][3]. However, definitive evidence on the factors that produce home advantage remains elusive. Of course, the quantitative impact of each of these factors on home advantage has also been discussed.

"Home advantage" can be defined as the benefit that induces home teams to consistently win more than 50 percent of the games under a balanced home-and-away schedule [4]. Quantitative research on home advantage in football dates back nearly 40 years to Morris [5], followed by Dowie [6] and Pollard [2]. In a very brief and thorough review paper on home advantage [7], consisting of only three pages, Pollard presented eight main factors that could generate home

advantage and explained conventional studies for each (of course, he did not forget to mention interactions and other factors). The first one is “crowd effect,” i.e., effect caused by spectators. In [7], he wrote, “This is the most obvious factor involved with home advantage and one that fans certainly believe to be dominant [8][9].” Studies by Dowie [6] and Pollard [2] were also able to find very little evidence that home advantage depends on crowd density (spectators per stadium capacity).

This study utilizes the results of matches conducted behind closed doors during the COVID-19 pandemic to determine the relationship between the presence of spectators and home advantage. A similar study had already been performed by Reade et al., who used the results of matches conducted behind closed doors since 2003 and reported the results of their investigation on crowd effect [10]. The number of matches in empty stadiums, however, were small (160, out of approximately 34 thousand matches). In addition, in these closed matches, teams were banned from admitting supporters into their stadiums typically as punishments for bad behavior off the football pitch (e.g., because of corruption, racist abuse, or violence). Therefore, in this analysis, the characteristics of the spectators could be biased, e.g., they were excessively violent or exhibiting overly aggressive supporting behavior.

When the results of closed matches are used in such a study, it should also be noted that the schedule is unbalanced. For example, many European league matches were already approximately two-thirds completed by the mid-March suspension. Therefore, a possible bias for the strength of home teams in the resumed matches after the break should be considered. By contrast, most famous and extensive previous studies on home advantage [11] and the most recent report [12] used only a number of basic statistics, e.g., number of goals, fouls, and wins. These data could be biased if obtained under an unbalanced schedule.

For the problem on biased schedule, in this study, a statistical model that determines match results based on the team strength parameters for each team and a home advantage parameter that is common for every team in the league was assumed. Through the fitting of the parameters in this model to minimize explanation error, the home advantage was separated even when the schedule was unbalanced.

The specific techniques used in this study were as follows: Each team i had one strength evaluation value r_i , referred to as the “rating.” Furthermore, each league had one parameter, $r_{homeAdv}$, that expressed the home advantage. The strength difference Δr was defined as the difference in rating values between the teams, indexed by i and j , added to the home advantage, i.e., $\Delta r = r_i + r_{homeAdv} - r_j$. The strength difference then explained the score ratio in a match via logistic regression model, i.e., $1/(1 + \exp(-\Delta r))$.

The rating values r_i and the home advantage value $r_{homeAdv}$ at a particular date were estimated using the most recent match results, e.g., for five matchweeks. This calculation process was repeated for every matchweek. The home advantage values estimated only from the closed matches were then compared to those from past “normal” match results.

This paper is organized as follows: Section II describes the data and the detailed algorithm used in this study. An analysis on the five major top divisions of European football leagues, i.e., England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain (in France, the top division has not resumed after suspension), is then presented. The match results were collected from 2010–2011 season. Section III then discusses statistical analysis. The following conclusions were able to be drawn from the statistical hypothesis tests that were performed in this study.

- In the four major European leagues that were examined, the home advantage was reduced when there were no spectators compared to that for a normal situation, i.e., with spectators.
- The reduction amounts among the leagues were different.
- For all four leagues, the home advantage remained even in closed matches.

Lastly, Section IV summarizes and concludes this paper.

II. METHODS

In this section, the leagues that were investigated and the content of the used data are described. A mathematical method for estimating home advantage is then explained.

i. Data set

Table 1 outlines the leagues and the numbers of matches examined in this study.

Table 1: *Numbers of matches examined in this study*

Country	League	Teams	Matches (2010/11 — 2018/19)	Matches (2019/20)	
				Normal	Closed
England	Premier League	20	3420	290	90
France	Ligue 1	20	3420	279	0
Germany	Bundesliga	18	2754	216	90
Italy	Serie A	20	3420	240	140
Spain	LaLiga	20	3420	270	110
Total			16434	1295	430

This study analyzed the home advantage among the top divisions in five European countries, i.e., England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, which are considered as the most major and highest-quality football leagues around the world. The match results from the 2010/11 season were collected from worldfootball.net (<https://www.worldfootball.net/>). The number of matches analyzed was 17729, including 430 closed matches.

All five leagues were suspended from mid-March because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Four of the leagues, i.e., excluding France, resumed by late June, and finished by early August. Ligue 1 in France, on the other hand, quickly decided and announced its cancellation at the end of April [13].

Table 2 summarizes their closed-match periods.

Table 2: *Closed period*

Country	League	Matchweeks	Closed from	Closed matchweeks
England	Premier League	38	30	9
Germany	Bundesliga	34	25	10
Italy	Serie A	38	25	14
Spain	LaLiga	38	28	11

ii. Mathematical model

We propose a unified and simple statistical estimation method for scoring ratios based on the scores in each match, which are always officially recorded and are subject to a scoring system common to all the games. This method extends [14] by incorporating home advantage. The study

[14] reported that this proposed method achieved higher prediction accuracies for ten events of five sports, i.e., basketball, handball, hockey, volleyball, and water polo, in the Rio Olympic Games compared to those of official world rankings.

The scoring ratio of a home team i in a match against an away team j (i and j are team indices), denoted as $p_{i,j}$, is estimated as follows:

$$p_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(r_i + r_{homeAdv} - r_j)}}, \quad (1)$$

where r_i is defined as the *rating* of team i , and $r_{homeAdv}$ is the quantitative value of home advantage.

Given (s_i, s_j) , the actual scores in a match between i and j ,

$$s_{i,j} = \frac{s_i + 1}{s_i + 1 + s_j + 1} = p_{i,j} + \epsilon_{i,j}, \quad (2)$$

where $s_{i,j}$ and $\epsilon_{i,j}$ are the modified actual scoring ratio and the estimation error, respectively. In football, shut-out results such as 1 – 0 or 3 – 0 occur frequently. Thus, a simple scoring ratio, i.e., $s_{i,j} = \frac{s_i}{s_i + s_j}$, can result in an invalid strength evaluation. Therefore, the score of each team is increased by one. This modification is known as Colley's method [15], and was originally used to rank college (American) football teams.

This mathematical structure is the well-known *logistic regression model*. It is widely used in areas such as the winning probability assumption of Elo ratings in chess games [16], and the correct answer probability for questions in item response theory [17].

The update method is designed to minimize the sum of the squared error E^2 between the result and the prediction, defined by the following equation:

$$E^2 = \sum_{(i,j) \in \text{all matches}} (s_{i,j} - p_{i,j})^2. \quad (3)$$

It is straightforward to obtain the following update based on the steepest-descent method:

$$r_i \leftarrow r_i - \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial E^2}{\partial r_i}, \quad r_{homeAdv} \leftarrow r_{homeAdv} - \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial E^2}{\partial r_{homeAdv}}, \quad (4)$$

where α is a constant.

By definition, the rating is an interval scale. Therefore, its origin, $r = 0$, can be selected arbitrarily, and a constant value can be added to all r_i . For example,

$$\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{r} - (\max \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{1} \quad (5)$$

implies that $r = 0$ is always the highest rating, whereas $r < 0$ is the distance from the top team.

ii.1 Conversion of rating on scoring ratio to winning probability

The rating r_i in (1) determines the scoring ratio. Once we have the scoring ratio $p_{i,j}$ given in (1), the following independent Bernoulli process is executed N times, starting from $(s_i, s_j) = (0, 0)$ and with the parameter $0 < \beta \leq 1$:

$$\begin{cases} s_i \leftarrow s_i + 1 & \text{with probability } \beta p_{i,j}, \\ s_j \leftarrow s_j + 1 & \text{with probability } \beta (1 - p_{i,j}), \\ s_i \leftarrow s_i, s_j \leftarrow s_j & \text{with probability } (1 - \beta). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

This is a unified (and approximated) model of a scoring process for all ball games, where s_i and s_j model the scores of teams i and j , respectively.

The parameters N and β vary among the sports and between definitions of a unit of play. For example, in basketball, if a unit of play is defined as 10 [s], we have $N = 40[\text{min}] \times 60[\text{s}/\text{min}]/10[\text{s}] = 240$. In football, if a unit of play is defined as 1 [min], we have $N = 90$. For both sports, β is determined to be $\beta = E(s_i + s_j)/N$.

At the end of the match, $s_i > s_j$ indicates that team i wins against team j . Figure 1 shows the simulated winning probability for different values of $N\beta$ and rating gap ($r_i - r_j$), with $N = 240$. This probability is expressed by as a cumulative distribution function for a normal distribution. In many applications, it is common to use a logistic regression model rather than a cumulative distribution [18].




Figure 1: Winning probability with respect to rating gap

Based on the previous discussions, we convert the rating on the scoring ratio to that of a winning probability, as follows:

$$w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ (} i \text{ wins), } 0.5 \text{ (draw), or } 0 \text{ (} j \text{ wins),} \quad (7)$$

which denotes a win, draw, or loss, respectively, for team i against team j . Afterward, D_k^* , where k is an index of sports, that satisfies

$$\hat{w}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-D_k(r_i + r_{homeAdv} - r_j))}, \quad (8)$$

$$D_k^* = \arg \min_{D_k} \sum (w_{i,j} - \hat{w}_{i,j})^2, \quad (9)$$

is obtained. r_i is then converted as follows:

$$\bar{r}_i = D_k^* r_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N_T, \text{ and } homeAdv, \quad (10)$$

where N_T denotes the number of teams. Therefore, $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ is a quantitative home advantage estimation that explains the effect on the winning probability.

In Equations (3) and (9), the sum of squared errors, instead of the cross-entropy, is used as a loss function. This is because these problems are regression problems, not classification ones.

iii. Short-term estimation of home advantage

The proposed method in the previous section was used to estimate the rating of each team and the home advantage in the league for every matchweek using the results of the last five matchweeks, including itself.

By using five matchweeks, we were able to estimate the average of each team’s strength and league-wide home advantage over periods ranging from approximately three weeks to one month.

The calculated home advantage was classified into the following four classes based on spectator attendance.

- Past: The home advantage calculated using the matches from the 2010/11 to the 2018/19 seasons. This value includes closed matches as punishments, if they exist.
- Normal: The home advantage calculated using the matches before suspension in the 2019/20 season. These matches all included live spectators. Note that closed matches as punishments are also included here, if they exist.
- Mixed: The home advantage calculated using both the matches that included spectators and those without spectators.
- Closed: The home advantage calculated using the matches without spectators.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter describes the analysis results and discussions.

i. Basic statistics

Figure 2 depicts the basic statistics, e.g., goals difference per match and win ratio difference, in normal and closed-match periods.

According to these data, home teams goaled approximately from 0.3 to 0.5 more per match than away teams on average under “past and normal” situations. As a result, home teams won approximately 0.15 to 0.25 more against away teams. In addition, the home advantage was apparently reduced under closed-match situations. In particular, in Bundesliga, the goals difference and win ratio difference were both negative in the closed matches. In this part of the study, however, possible schedule unbalance for the closed matches was not considered. In other words, it is possible that the most of the home teams were consistently weak (or strong) in the closed matches.

ii. Estimation of home advantage

Figure 3 shows the results of the estimation of home advantage $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ for five leagues. The medians were all positive for every four classes. This result indicates that the home advantage remained even for matches that were closed and without spectators. The medians in the past and normal periods appeared similar. On the other hand, the median in the closed period was smaller than those of the past and normal periods.

We tested a null hypothesis that the home advantage $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ from two different categories were samples from continuous distributions with equal medians. Wilcoxon’s rank sum test [19, 20] was used as a test method because any assumption on the shape of the distribution of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ could be posed. The p -values between classes are depicted in Figure 3, whereas the test results are summarized in Table 3.

From these test results, the following can be concluded.




Figure 2: Win ratio difference with respect to goals difference

Table 3: Test results: Overall

Sample X	Sample Y	N_X	N_Y	p -value	z -value	ranksum
Past	Normal	1494	112	2.72×10^{-1}	1.097	1.207×10^6
Past	Mixed	1494	16	3.27×10^{-3}	2.941	1.134×10^6
Past	Closed	1494	28	5.44×10^{-7}	5.010	1.149×10^6
Normal	Mixed	112	16	2.72×10^{-2}	2.208	7531
Normal	Closed	112	28	1.98×10^{-4}	3.722	8611
Mixed	Closed	16	28	5.34×10^{-1}	0.622	386

- There was no significant difference in home advantage between the past's and 2019/20 season's normal matches ($p > 0.1$).
- There was significant difference in home advantage between the normal and closed matches ($p < 10^{-3}$). The significance of the difference was even more obvious between the past and closed matches ($p < 10^{-6}$). The median of the home advantage in the closed matches was clearly smaller.

Therefore, this study provides strong quantitative evidence of the impact of the crowd effect on home advantage among the top leagues in Europe. It should be noted, however, that all of the closed matches in this season have been with several months' suspension, and conducted in the summer, when matches are normally not played. Therefore, the possible effect of these factors on the home advantage should not be neglected.




Figure 3: Distribution of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ in five major European football leagues

ii.1 Detailed analysis for each league

The previous section described the results for all five leagues. In this section, the estimation results for each league will be explained. Table 4 lists the results of Wilcoxon’s rank sum test for each league in detail. Figure 4 visualizes the number of home matches in the closed-match period. The teams are ordered based on their the final standings. Figures 5 to 9 show the estimated value of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ for each league from the 2010/11 season.

England In England, the home advantage value obtained via the proposed method for the closed-match period had no significant difference to those of the past and normal periods. This result demonstrates that the basic statistics, such as the goals difference and win ratio difference shown in Figure 2, were smaller in the closed-match period because of the unbalanced schedule. In other words, most of the home teams were consistently weak (or strong) in the closed matches. Figure 4 supports this assertion. In England, there were weak correlation between the number of home matches in the closed-match period and the final standings. The correlation value was 0.4052. By contrast, for the other leagues, i.e., Germany, Italy, and Spain, the correlation values were much smaller (0.2863, 0.0867, and -0.1561).

France In France, there was not a significant difference in $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ between the past and normal periods.

Germany In Germany, the home advantage value in the closed-match period had significant difference to those in the past and normal periods. Both p -values were less than 1.00×10^{-2} . In the closed-match period, Bundesliga demonstrated a home “dis”advantage, i.e., $\bar{r}_{homeAdv} < 0$.

Table 4: Test results: League breakdown

League	Sample X	Sample Y	N_X	N_Y	p -value	z -value	ranksum
England	Past	Normal	306	25	2.23×10^{-1}	-1.218	3589
England	Past	Closed	306	5	2.13×10^{-1}	1.246	47985
England	Normal	Closed	25	5	5.78×10^{-1}	0.556	398
France	Past	Normal	306	24	9.35×10^{-1}	0.081	4009
Germany	Past	Normal	270	20	1.63×10^{-1}	-1.394	2405
Germany	Past	Closed	270	6	3.98×10^{-5}	4.109	38190
Germany	Normal	Closed	20	6	3.84×10^{-3}	2.891	318
Italy	Past	Normal	306	20	2.85×10^{-2}	-2.190	2375
Italy	Past	Closed	306	10	6.46×10^{-2}	1.848	49027
Italy	Normal	Closed	20	10	7.75×10^{-1}	-0.286	303
Spain	Past	Normal	306	23	2.06×10^{-2}	2.315	4814
Spain	Past	Closed	306	7	4.10×10^{-4}	3.533	48879
Spain	Normal	Closed	23	7	8.76×10^{-5}	3.923	437

Italy In Italy, the home advantage value obtained via the proposed method for the closed-match period had no significant difference to those of the past period ($p = 6.46 \times 10^{-2}$). In this season, the home advantage value was smaller even in the normal period.

Spain In Spain, the home advantage value in the closed-match period had significant difference to those in the past and normal periods. Both p -values were less than 1.00×10^{-2} . In the closed-match period, similar to Bundesliga, LaLiga demonstrated home disadvantage.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, the results of matches conducted behind closed doors during the COVID-19 pandemic were used to determine the relationship between the presence of spectators and home advantage. To reduce the effect of schedule unbalance in the closed-match period, this paper proposed a short-term (e.g., five matchweeks) rating method that considers the home advantage. The proposed method was applied to the match results in five major European football leagues (England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain) from the 2010/11 to the 2019/20 seasons. The distributions of home advantage for both the past normal and closed-match periods were calculated. Their median values were compared using statistical hypothesis tests. A null hypothesis, "the home advantage $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$ from two different periods are samples from continuous distributions with equal medians," were rejected because of sufficiently small p -value ($p < 10^{-3}$). More simply, the home advantage became smaller when the games were conducted behind closed doors

Our future work is to extend the proposed method to match results from all over the world. This future study could then clarify the crowd effect on home advantage.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alan M Nevill and Roger L Holder. Home advantage in sport. *Sports Medicine*, 28(4):221–236, 1999.




Figure 4: *Number of home matches in closed-match period*

- [2] Richard Pollard. Home advantage in soccer: A retrospective analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 4:237–248, 02 1986.
- [3] Alan Nevill, Sue Newell, and Sally Gale. Factors associated with home advantage in English and Scottish soccer matches. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 14:181–186, 04 1996.
- [4] Kerry S Courneya and Albert V Carron. The home advantage in sport competitions: A literature review. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 14:13–27, 1992.
- [5] Desmond Morris. *The Soccer Tribe*. Jonathan Cape, 1981.
- [6] Jack Dowie. Why Spain should win the World Cup. *New Scientist*, 94:693–695, 01 1982.
- [7] Richard Pollard. Home advantage in football: A current review of an unsolved puzzle. *The Open Sports Sciences Journal*, 1:12–14, 06 2008.
- [8] Sandy Wolfson, Delia Wakelin, and Matthew Lewis. Football supporters’ perception of their role in the home advantage. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23:365–374, 05 2005.
- [9] Matthew Lewis and Vicki Goltsi. Perceptions of contributions to the home advantage by English and Greek football fans. 2007.
- [10] J James Reade, Dominik Schreyer, and Carl Singleton. Echoes: what happens when football is played behind closed doors? https://www.carlsingletonconomics.com/uploads/4/2/3/0/42306545/closeddoors_reade_singleton.pdf. accessed 2020/7/26.




Figure 5: History of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$: England

- [11] Richard Pollard and Gregory Pollard. Long-term trends in home advantage in professional team sports in North America and England (1876–2003). *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23:337–350, 05 2005.
- [12] 21st Club. Empty stadiums have shrunk football teams’ home advantage. <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/07/25/empty-stadiums-have-shrunk-football-teams-home-advantage>, July 2020. accessed 2020/7/29.
- [13] Ligue 1. PSG champions as season ended. <https://www.ligue1.com/Articles/NEWS/2020/04/30/psg-champions-season-ended-ligue-1>, April 2020. accessed 2020/7/29.
- [14] Eiji Konaka. A unified statistical rating method for team ball games and its application to predictions in the Olympic Games. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E102-D(6):1145–1153, 06 2019.
- [15] Wesley N Colley. Colley’s bias free college football ranking method: The Colley matrix explained. *Princeton University, Princeton*, 2002.
- [16] Arpad E. Elo. *Ratings of Chess Players Past and Present*. Harper Collins Distribution Services, 1979.
- [17] Ronald K Hambleton, Hariharan Swaminathan, and H Jane Rogers. *Fundamentals of Item Response Theory (Measurement Methods for the Social Science)*. Sage Publications, Incorporated, new. edition, 9 1991.




Figure 6: History of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$: France

- [18] Jan Lasek, Zoltán Szilávik, and Sandjai Bhulai. The predictive power of ranking systems in association football. *International Journal of Applied Pattern Recognition*, 1(1):27–46, 2013.
- [19] MathWorks. ranksum (Wilcoxon rank sum test). <https://mathworks.com/help/stats/ranksum.html>, 2020. accessed 2020/7/31.
- [20] Jean Dickinson Gibbons and Subhabrata Chakraborti. *Nonparametric Statistical Inference, Fifth Edition*. Taylor & Francis, 2010.




Figure 7: History of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$: Germany




Figure 8: History of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$: Italy




Figure 9: History of $\bar{r}_{homeAdv}$: Spain