# Attractive football's effect on media coverage

Seth Caroline

# Introduction

- The idea of a media bias is on the forefront of football fans mind, particularly Manchester City Football club and Liverpool Football club fans
- Having won the last two league titles, City fans have felt their achievements are being unrecognized
- Liverpool FC's recent resurgence and historical precedent have prompted many to laud over this team
- Research is necessary because a media bias could cost clubs in broadcasting revenue, fan base growth and player transfers and acquisitions
- Attractive football is the best way to gain a following in football, we look to explore whether the attractiveness of a clubs football affect media coverage

# Hypothesis

- Null h0: the attractiveness of a clubs football influences the media to increase coverage of the club
- Alternative h1: The attractiveness of a clubs football does not influence the media's coverage of a club

# Observations

- We looked at two of the biggest clubs in England, Manchester city
- There are 53 observations for each variable
- The 2019/20 season was cut short due to COVID-19 precautions, only allowing teams to complete 28 games

# Dependent Variable

- Our dependent variable is twitter followers
- This variable looks at how many followers the clubs have and gain throughout the season
- This will allow us to gauge whether or not the attractiveness of the football being played garners media attention through social interactions

# Independent Variables

- Matchday Attendance
- Articles written about clubs
- Goals per game
- Goals conceded per game
- Shots per match
- League position
- Teams Lp-0 Mc-1

# Regression

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUMMARY OUTPUT | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Regression Statistics | | | | | | | | |
| Multiple R | 0.994990041 | | | | | | | |
| R Square | 0.990005182 | | | | | | | |
| Adjusted R Square | 0.988450432 | | | | | | | |
| Standard Error | 348574.5972 | | | | | | | |
| Observations | 53 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | | | | |
| | df | SS | MS | F | Significance F | | | |
| Regression | 7 | 5.41585E+14 | 7.73693E+13 | 636.761867 | 8.40029E-43 | | | |
| Residual | 45 | 5.46769E+12 | 1.21504E+11 | | | | | |
| Total | 52 | 5.47053E+14 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Coefficients | Standard Error | t Stat | P-value | Lower 95% | Upper 95% | Lower 95.0% | Upper 95.0% |
| Intercept | 14286164.41 | 273648.9301 | 52.20617674 | 6.5479E-42 | 13735007.17 | 14837321.65 | 13735007.17 | 14837321.65 |
| match attendance | 5.582703523 | 3.591865796 | 1.554262837 | 0.12712734 | -1.65168555 | 12.8170926 | -1.65168555 | 12.8170926 |
| goals per game | -67637.9238 | 36030.34575 | -1.87724881 | 0.06697559 | -140206.765 | 4930.917705 | -140206.765 | 4930.917705 |
| goals conceded per game | -40224.5949 | 63627.56564 | -0.63218818 | 0.53046298 | -168377.09 | 87927.90073 | -168377.09 | 87927.90073 |
| shots per match | -6857.83676 | 10074.92339 | -0.68068376 | 0.49955922 | -27149.7741 | 13434.10058 | -27149.7741 | 13434.10058 |
| league position | -135348.955 | 99251.21529 | -1.36370074 | 0.17944502 | -335251.164 | 64553.2538 | -335251.164 | 64553.2538 |
| teams Lp-0 Mc-1 | -6277327.96 | 178075.5103 | -35.2509334 | 2.0291E-34 | -6635990.45 | -5918665.48 | -6635990.45 | -5918665.48 |
| articles published about team | -7774.9051 | 3728.470993 | -2.08527976 | 0.04274615 | -15284.4312 | -265.379036 | -15284.4312 | -265.379036 |

# Data

| | match attendance | twitter followers | goals per game | goals conceded p | shots per match | league position | teams Lp-0 Mc-1 | articles published about team |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 53,330 | 12,879,618 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| 2 | 31,712 | 12,970,294 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 36 |
| 3 | 53,298 | 13,064,355 | 3 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 52 |
| 4 | 21,762 | 13,180,417 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| 5 | 51,430 | 13,327,338 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 32 |
| 6 | 40,638 | 13,477,099 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| 7 | 31,774 | 13,624,999 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| 8 | 53,322 | 13,757,755 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 28 |
| 9 | 73,737 | 13,792,841 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 87 |
| 10 | 53,222 | 13,801,673 | 2 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 28 |
| 11 | 41,878 | 13,849,899 | 2 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 38 |
| 12 | 53,324 | 13,920,243 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 40 |
| 13 | 25,486 | 13,923,646 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 35 |
| 14 | 53,319 | 13,964,311 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| 15 | 53,094 | 13,989,487 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 47 |
| 16 | 10,832 | 14,070,566 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 34 |
| 17 | 53,311 | 14,102,728 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| 18 | 59,959 | 14,135,108 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| 19 | 32,211 | 14,187,379 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 35 |
| 20 | 53,326 | 14,231,092 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 38 |

# Final equation

$$Y=6.5479E\text{-}42+.1271273X1+.06697559X2+.53046298X3+.49955922X4+2.0291E\text{-}34X6+.04274615X7+e$$

# Conclusion

- Our variable that represents the role the media plays, Twitter followers, was found NOT significant
- In our circumstances we would NOT accept our null hypothesis of whether or not football attractiveness plays a role in media attention