The Special Teams Myth: Why Even Strength Dominates Hockey Success

Hockey fans and analysts have long debated the relative importance of special teams versus even strength play in determining team success. While spectacular power play goals and clutch penalty kills capture headlines and highlight reels, the statistical reality tells a different story about what truly drives a team's path to the playoffs and championships.

Understanding the Fundamentals

Power Play Percentage (PP%) measures the rate at which a team converts power play opportunities into goals, calculated as: *Power Play Goals ÷ Power Play Opportunities × 100*. **Penalty Kill Percentage (PK%)** represents how often a team successfully kills penalties without allowing a goal: *(Shorthanded Situations - Power Play Goals Against) ÷ Shorthanded Situations × 100*.[1]

These percentages, while useful for comparison, can be misleading. A team with a 25% power play might seem dominant, but if they only get 2-3 opportunities per game, the actual impact on scoring is limited compared to a team that scores consistently at even strength throughout 40+ minutes of 5v5 play.[1]

The Volume vs. Efficiency Paradox

Research analyzing NHL data reveals a fundamental truth about hockey: **individual even strength goals and power play goals have similar value, but the larger share of even strength goals scored over a season makes even strength play a more important contributor to team success**. This finding directly challenges the conventional wisdom that special teams determine championships.[1]

The math is straightforward. Teams typically spend approximately 45-50 minutes per game at even strength compared to just 6-8 minutes on special teams. Even with power plays converting at double the rate of even strength situations, the sheer volume of even strength play means most goals come from 5v5 situations.[1]

Advanced analytics have shown that teams perform similarly across different game states. **There is a high correlation between teams that perform above/below average during even strength and powerplay**. This suggests that underlying team quality manifests consistently across all situations rather than teams being dramatically different between even strength and special teams.[1]

The Metrics That Matter: xG, PDO, and Regression to the Mean

Expected Goals (xG) models evaluate shot quality by considering factors like distance, angle, and game situation. Modern xG models in hockey help separate luck from skill by measuring whether teams are generating and allowing high-quality chances. Unlike raw shooting percentage, xG provides context for sustainable performance.[2]

PDO, often called SVSP% (Save Percentage + Shooting Percentage), measures the sum of a team's shooting percentage and save percentage. PDO typically regresses toward 100.0 over large samples, making it useful for identifying teams experiencing unusual luck. Teams with consistently high PDO may be overperforming their underlying metrics, while low PDO teams might be due for positive regression.[3]

Corsi (shots + missed shots + blocked shots for minus against) and **Fenwick** (shots + missed shots for minus against) measure shot attempt differential. These metrics capture puck possession and territorial control better than goals alone, providing more stable indicators of team performance. However, they don't account for shot quality, which is why xG models have gained prominence.[4]

Debunking the "Special Teams Win Championships" Myth

Historical analysis of Stanley Cup winners reveals that championship teams typically excel at even strength play rather than special teams. While no team wins without competent special teams, the correlation between championship success and special teams rank is weaker than many assume.

The notion that "special teams win championships" persists because memorable moments often occur during critical power plays or penalty kills in playoff games. However, **playoff success correlates more strongly with even strength goal differential than special teams efficiency**. Teams that generate more quality chances and prevent them at 5v5 create the foundation for sustained success.[5]

Research indicates that **NHL teams exhibit relative randomness compared to other major sports**, meaning individual games and short playoff series can be influenced significantly by variance. This randomness can make spectacular special teams moments appear more decisive than they statistically are.[5]

Variance and Stability: The Luck Factor

Special teams percentages demonstrate significant year-to-year variance, suggesting luck plays a substantial role. **Shooting percentage in hockey exhibits strong regression to the mean tendencies**, with teams rarely maintaining extremely high or low percentages across multiple seasons.[6]

PDO serves as a useful indicator of this variance. **PDO values far from 100.0 are often unsustainable**, indicating that teams with exceptional shooting or save percentages may experience correction over time. This regression affects special teams more dramatically than even strength play due to smaller sample sizes.[3]

The stability of different metrics varies considerably. Shot-based metrics like Corsi and Fenwick show more year-to-year correlation than percentage-based metrics, suggesting they better capture true team quality than raw conversion rates.[4]

Real-World Examples: When Numbers Tell Different Stories

Teams with Strong Special Teams, Weak Even Strength

Some teams have achieved playoff success despite mediocre even strength play by excelling on special teams, but these examples are increasingly rare in the modern NHL. The additional ice time created by frequent power plays can mask underlying even strength weaknesses temporarily.

Teams with Strong Even Strength, Average Special Teams

The 2019 St. Louis Blues provide an excellent counter-example to the special teams narrative. Despite ranking in the middle of the pack in special teams during their championship run, the Blues dominated possession metrics and goal differential at even strength. Their **superior 5v5 play provided the foundation for playoff success**, with special teams serving as a complement rather than the primary driver.

Similarly, recent analytics research shows that **teams with strong even strength performance maintain more consistent success over multiple seasons** compared to those relying heavily on special teams efficiency.[1]

The Context Problem: When Special Teams Matter Most

Special teams importance isn't uniform across all situations. **In close games and playoff scenarios, special teams can have outsized impact** due to the compressed scoring environment. However, teams still need strong even strength play to reach these crucial moments.

Game state significantly influences the value of special teams opportunities. Power plays late in tied games carry more weight than those in blowout situations, but these high-leverage moments represent a small fraction of total special teams time.

Goal Differential: The Ultimate Arbiter

Goal differential remains the strongest predictor of team success, and even strength play contributes the majority of this differential. Teams that consistently outshoot and out-chance opponents at 5v5 create sustainable advantages that special teams efficiency alone cannot replicate.

Expected goal differential at even strength correlates more strongly with playoff success than special teams conversion rates. This suggests that underlying process metrics at 5v5 are more predictive than special teams results, which can be influenced heavily by small sample variance.[1]

Implications for Team Building and Evaluation

For fans evaluating team performance, **focusing on underlying even strength metrics provides better insight into true team quality** than special teams percentages. Teams with strong Corsi/Fenwick numbers, positive expected goal differential, and neutral PDO at even strength typically outperform teams with excellent special teams but poor 5v5 play.

Sustainable success requires competence across all game states, but the foundation must be built on even strength excellence. Special teams can provide the margin for victory, but they rarely overcome fundamental weaknesses in 5v5 play over a full season.

Looking Forward: The Evolution of Analytics

Modern hockey analytics continue evolving beyond basic percentages toward more sophisticated measures of team performance. **Spatio-temporal tracking data now enables analysis of pace, positioning, and player movement patterns**, providing deeper insights into what drives success.[7] [8]

Machine learning models increasingly incorporate context and game state to provide more nuanced performance evaluation. These advances help separate signal from noise in hockey's inherently random environment.[9]

Conclusion: Where to Focus Your Attention

While special teams remain important components of hockey success, **even strength play provides the primary foundation for sustained team achievement**. Fans seeking to evaluate team quality should prioritize metrics that capture 5v5 performance: goal differential, expected goals, shot attempt rates, and underlying possession metrics.

Special teams serve as amplifiers rather than drivers of team success. Excellent special teams can push a good even strength team toward championship contention, but they cannot sustain a fundamentally flawed 5v5 system over 82 games. The most successful organizations build from even strength excellence outward, treating special teams as crucial complements to their foundational systems.

For hockey analytics enthusiasts, this understanding shifts focus toward the less glamorous but more predictive aspects of team performance. While power play goals generate excitement, the consistent ability to outplay opponents during the majority of game time determines who ultimately raises the Stanley Cup.

⁂

1. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/view/741
2. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2021.624475/full
3. https://nata.kglmeridian.com/view/journals/attr/54/5/article-p527.xml
4. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/1559-0410.1447/html
5. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1701.05976.pdf

6. https://www.authorea.com/users/353001/articles/477052-estimating-probability-with-regression-to-the-mean?commit=a646dd3e0ca614f9a54d753287002c63cce6833e
7. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/27905d9489cccbf015c0ea06f85902988253ddb4
8. https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.02020
9. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1805.11088.pdf
10. https://downloads.hindawi.com/journals/tsmed/2022/7024766.pdf
11. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/474/432
12. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/1/280/pdf
13. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/81d924fda16292e4748b7222ca1261fd0fa6cd23
14. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/484/442
15. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2158244019830008
16. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.02397.pdf
17. https://journals.lww.com/00042752-201011000-00001
18. https://arxiv.org/html/2405.13397
19. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2301.04001.pdf
20. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.06994.pdf
21. https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.0799
22. https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5729/2/1/2/pdf?version=1483254979
23. https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.7635
24. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10569309/
25. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2009.02429.pdf
26. https://www.sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/hukin-2022-000076
27. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/17/7648
28. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40279-023-01985-z
29. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3511808.3557165
30. https://francis-press.com/papers/14797
31. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/4f8fc170348bfb076afa68ceba4de2c2448cb3f3
32. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1810.05118.pdf
33. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/1/280
34. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/GKMC-04-2024-0200/full/html
35. http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2025.01.13.632603
36. https://www.jomh.org/articles/10.31083/j.jomh1809193
37. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e9c064ccb4d4b615195f335822ab60ef1d24a0da
38. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352340924005924
39. https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4663/12/5/124
40. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2502.21242.pdf
41. https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/21/15/5242/pdf
42. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-134-11-200106050-00020
43. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11022766/

44. https://anatomypubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ar.24394
45. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/405e6c33b9871e04b40eb4a05a10d8da7113f7df
46. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d1e44442e9dddf9a1df7ed16df78a63a1fd4a110
47. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/4b40c9a28f2f40f00cd689f9442e4008f721b2ba
48. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/0d8c73516830b1b6dcf8b2d2f7fb8dcdc9673dd9
49. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/37157d82332e192db773c935bfc2268f3a4e07f4
50. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-151-8-200910200-00015
51. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2022.822127/pdf
52. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1307.6539.pdf
53. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8905600/
54. https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/23/12368/pdf
55. https://ejmanager.com/fulltextpdf.php?mno=145882
56. http://www.sportscienceresearch.com/IJSEHR_202261_05.pdf
57. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e5e6a7d447b739c8681a457f2ba1c01d98c9f946
58. https://sportscience.ldufk.edu.ua/index.php/discourse/article/view/1645
59. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/0717b0f50d8ccbe573374cb07153e9174b9629f0
60. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00913847.2020.1782715
61. https://www.cureus.com/articles/109183-the-correlation-between-the-strength-of-the-shoulder-and-trunk-muscular-systems-in-elite-adolescent-water-polo-athletes
62. https://journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/article/view/2749
63. https://tmfv.com.ua/journal/article/view/2796
64. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/9/12/1399/pdf?version=1623923682
65. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1310.4461.pdf
66. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/737/642
67. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6602367/
68. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2112.01267.pdf
69. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10173025/
70. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.04797.pdf
71. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2023.1241014/pdf?isPublishedV2=False
72. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/articlepdf/2812265/hutchison_2023_oi_231295_1700083527.41096.pdf
73. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/740/645
74. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8656812/
75. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/kykl.12073
76. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5590964/
77. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269889
78. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.661179/pdf
79. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/20a45881a83d5ee15d490493fd86587fa40a95e9
80. http://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/ambpp.2016.12905symposium

81. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1527002509336891
82. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/fab6077694db7c05e4df34ccaebe1ef7544a2a87
83. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/6ff40393550e0355f26bc504ea55d3d96cb30c85
84. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/c243c9394313e04776b63540edb3c1cc0508fad8
85. https://research.tue.nl/en/publications/monitoring-emotions-and-cooperative-behavior(aa3b5148-9b01-434c-ae4a-028a0acb2b12).html
86. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1941738113499729
87. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/88cb92da2ab1633ecf0b56ca2e9303ffe856bace
88. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4786585/
89. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/739/644
90. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2409.05714.pdf
91. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/19417381241273219
92. https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4663/9/9/117/pdf
93. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/479/437
94. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2404.06626.pdf
95. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10765453/
96. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1501.07179.pdf
97. https://www.sciendo.com/article/10.2478/ijcss-2023-0010
98. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/22/10390
99. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3606038.3616152
100. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/22150218251324875
101. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/15/2/998
102. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/15/8/4151
103. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/2f976aa16d70b9f10853b1db09621bda1e381613
104. https://journal.esrgroups.org/jes/article/view/3099
105. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ad012e22a050e39d3339e6db1a075b4c63798995
106. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3233/CBM-229001
107. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2025.1504362/full
108. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12055760/
109. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2401.09940.pdf
110. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2311.13707.pdf
111. https://www.mdpi.com/2571-905X/2/2/17/pdf?version=1557897033
112. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1504.05872.pdf
113. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1201.0317.pdf
114. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2024.1348983/pdf?isPublishedV2=False
115. https://ecp.ep.liu.se/index.php/linhac/article/download/480/438
116. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2206.07212.pdf
117. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00665983.2016.1198126
118. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2023.1284613/pdf?isPublishedV2=False

119. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268171
120. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/16184742.2023.2221684?needAccess=true&role=button
121. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2023.1252093/pdf?isPublishedV2=False
122. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/9/3627/pdf?version=1714029364
123. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10850374/
124. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9070925/
125. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fspor.2021.653364/pdf
126. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2102.09689.pdf
127. https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0282788
128. https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4663/10/4/58/pdf
129. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.05107.pdf
130. https://nata.kglmeridian.com/view/journals/attr/51/11/article-p846.xml
131. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1362361318776103
132. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pedi.12411
133. https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-145-7-200610030-00008
134. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/13829fdd9e8eeb47141280f10add823e9fb5f664
135. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1857a86f7aa0a527635a3144140f97518c60b871
136. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0963926821000122/type/journal_article
137. http://www.webofproceedings.org/proceedings_series/article/artId/219.html
138. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/5ff797928f5d13f6a69c9124a92c2a09f6468886
139. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1802.08765.pdf
140. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/36d4bc8746591bff5f61738af93f54ba97bd505f
141. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/0450c5b7566036d817ba52834fda591b4eb42a4b
142. https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1469-8137.1997.00671.x
143. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ddfe7539d5525ec150c90ecc2834cdf0761e6b4c
144. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d02577f82ed897af7356c1c007c90c4e63fea5b1
145. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.02885.pdf
146. https://downloads.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/2021/5524076.pdf
147. https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.02172
148. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2001.04226.pdf