# STAT STUFF 

By Bob Carroll

A while ago I was reading Bill James' Baseball Abstract and feeling inferior. Bill makes me feel less ferior than any James since Henry. He's broken down baseball stats into fascinating minutia and made just about everybody re-examine all those baseball things that people always preface with "Everybody sez." I mean, he'll tell you how many times Steve Kemp beat out a high chop to a lefthanded pitcher on natural grass with a slow runner on third, two out, a cool breeze from the south, and a first baseman who's planning to eat Chinese after the game. Then James takes that stat and a couple of others, projects Kemp's whole career, the first baseman's chances of being named to the Hall of Fame, and the lefthander's winter residence. I may not have James' system down pat. but it's something like that.

Shucks, by the seventh inning I always have trouble remembering the score.
So, while James is doing all this brilliant statistical STUFF for baseball, there I am frittering away my time on pastimes to pay the rent, instead of doing some equally brilliant football STUFF. I blushed, considered how much work was involved, and decided the hell with it. But I DID feel bad.

Well, just as my ego limboed under the coffee table, along came John Thorn and Pete Palmer with The Hidden Game of Baseball which is a whole book carefully crafted to make me feel like a wastrel. I'll bet even Bill James liked it!

Okay. I know when a gauntlet has been flung down (though I'm not sure what a gauntlet is - some kind of cup?). I took out my trusty pocket calculator, wiped off the lint, and went after something I always wondered about.

Everybody alwayz sez that a lot of those big passing stats are racked up in losing games. The quarterback is throwing almost every down to catch up, while the defense "buys time" by giving up yards. The results are great stats and few wins. A friend of mine even refers to "300-yard losers."

To really look into this, you'd need to know the field situation for every pass. That would take more time than I care to give, more space than we have, and more information than anyone wants to send me.

However, it seems to me that by simply checking a passer's marks in the games his team won, against those in the games his team lost, we should come up with an indication.

The results were interesting, but - I hasten to add - based on a very small sample. I used the starting quarterbacks for the AFC in 1979. I used 1979 because it was the most recent season for which I had game-by-game stats, and not - as some might say - because that was the last time the Steelers won the Super Bowl. (Actually, I consider any season the Steelers do not win the Super Bowl as "exhibition games".)

If you'll check CHART I, you'll see the raw data I started with - the attempts, completions, yards, TDs, and interceptions for the starting quarterbacks of the 14 AFC teams. The first group of stats give the QB's season record, the second gives the totals for the games his team won, and the third for the team losses. Because of injuries and such, every QB did not play in every game, but I decided for the sake of simplicity to ignore cases where a QB threw only one or two passes in a game. Anyone wanting a more exact breakdown should send $\$ 237.46$ in check or money order to The Coffin Corner. Be sure to add $\$ 50$ to cover postage.

I think CHART I is hard to read.
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CHART II is more like it. Here we can see the per game averages for the season, wins, and losses. Eight of the QBs gained more when they lost than when they won, a couple by quite a bit.

The big problem with this chart is that I rounded the numbers off to make them more intelligible. But I may have obscured the most significant stats - the TDS and interceptions. Example, Fuller threw three touchdowns in six wins but that's .5 or a rounded "one". His three interceptions in the six wins give him another "one", but his eleven interceptions in eight losses also round to one. The true difference is between . 5 and 1.38.

On the other hand, despite the occasional blurring, the real difference in winning and losing is obvious. Speaking generally, a field general throws two touchdown passes and one interception in a win but only one TD and two interceptions in a loss.

CHART III proves the case. The completion percentages all went down but often very slightly. The average gains per pass varied widely but in two cases actually went up. But every TD percentage went way down. Every interception percentage went up and some more than doubled.

Zorn must have been two guys. The winning Zorn could have beaten anybody. The losing Zorn would have had trouble against James Buchanan Junior High.

About this time I realized that I'd come up with something I hadn't expected. Without trying, I'd convinced myself the NFL Passer Rating System works pretty well.

As you know, the NFLPRS is critcized as being complicated. Well, of course it is! The simplest system is to rank the passers alphabetically. Guess which Cincinnati QB would like that. But whether the NFLPRS is cimplicated doesn't matter. The question is does it work?

I always thought the NFLPRS penalized the passer who threw a lot of passes. That does not seem to be true in this study. Of the four passers who threw the least often per game, none finished better than fifth from the bottom. Of the most prolific, three are in the top four spots. Additionally, we can see that everyone threw more in losses, just not as well.

And, I always thought the NFLPRS put too much emphasis on touchdowns and interceptions. Well, that shows what I know! The study seems to indicate TDs and interceptions are just about directly proportional to wins and losses.
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CHART I: 1979 Passing Stats - AFC
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