Analysing coach–athlete 'talk in interaction' within the delivery of video-based performance feedback in elite youth soccer

Ryan Groom, Department of Exercise & Sport Science, Manchester Metropolitan University
Christopher J. Cushion, School of Sport and Exercise Science, Loughborough University
Lee J. Nelson, Department of Sport, Health and Exercise Science, University of Hull

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to explore coach–athlete 'talk in action' during performance analysis feedback sessions. Our goal was to examine how interactional tasks are accomplished through the use of talk. Coach–athlete interactions were recorded within six home match video-based feedback sessions, over the course of a 10-month English Premier League Academy season. Interactions within the sessions were recorded and transcribed using a conversation analysis approach. Analysis of the interactions revealed that the coach attempted to exercise control over the sequential organisation of the sessions, via asymmetrical turn-taking allocations, an unequal opportunity to talk, control over the topic of discussion within the interactions and the use of questioning to select speakers to take turns to talk. The findings are principally theorised through the work of Bertram H. Raven in an attempt to explain the social organisation of power within the institutional context. The conclusion emphasises the importance of coaches becoming more aware of the likely impact of such interactional practices upon athlete learning.

Notes on contributors

Ryan Groom is a senior lecturer in sports coaching at Manchester Metropolitan University. He has previously worked for a number of Premier League and international football teams. His main research interest is in coaching pedagogy.

Chris Cushion is a senior lecturer in sports coaching at Loughborough University, where he is the programme leader for the MSc in sports coaching. He is also an ex-professional football coach and holds the UEFA A Licence. His main research interests are in understanding the coaching process.

Lee Nelson is a lecturer in performance analysis and coaching at the University of Hull. He previously worked as a consultant to a number of Premier League football clubs regarding the use of video-based performance analysis. His main research interest is in exploring how learning and educational theory can help to inform coaching practice.

Introduction

Increasingly, coaching scholars have illustrated the value of a socio-pedagogical analysis of practice to better understand the 'messy realities' *of* sports coaching (e.g. Potrac *et al*. 2002, Jones *et al*. 2003, Cushion and Jones 2006, Purdy *et al*. 2008). However, within the performance analysis literature, little attention has been paid to how such socio-pedagogical factors impact upon coaching practice (Stratton *et al*. 2004). Alternatively, idealistic and unproblematic representations *for* the use of performance analysis within the coaching process (i.e. Franks *et al*. 1983, Robertson 1999) have continued to dominate the literature (e.g. Hughes and Franks 1997, 2004, 2008). Recognising this difference would seem important because, 'the current set of models result in a presentation of the coaching process that is often reduced in complexity and scale, and the essential social-cultural elements of the process are often underplayed' (Cushion *et al*. 2006, p. 83).

Indeed, within the performance analysis literature to date, more attention has been paid to performance analysis as a method to record sports performance data in an 'accurate' and 'reliable' manner (Hughes and Franks 1997, 2004, 2008). Consequently, it has been suggested that this situation has lead to a disconnection between the academic study of performance analysis and the realities of the application of performance analysis in practice by coaches in the field (Franks 2002, Groom *et al*. 2011). This is particularly surprising given the increased use of video-based performance analysis technology within elite sporting environments (Carling *et al*. 2005, James 2006), and that performance analysis has been firmly located within the coaching process (e.g. Carling *et al*. 2005, Hughes 2008, Hughes and Franks 2008).

However, recent work taken from the perspective of both the coach and athlete has highlighted some of the complexities inherent within the delivery of video-based performance analysis (Groom *et al*. 2011, Nelson *et al*. in press). For example, effects on athlete learning have been found to relate to different preferences for receiving performance analysis feedback, thus demonstrating the importance of understanding athletes as individuals (Groom *et al*. 2011, Nelson *et al*. in press). In addition, the effectiveness of coach–athlete interactions has been highlighted to be effected by a number of complex interacting social factors such as coaching knowledge, power, respect and the suitability of the learning environment (Groom *et al*. 2011, Nelson *et al*. in press).

Whilst these early investigations (e.g. Groom *et al*. 2011, Nelson *et al*. in press) have provided some rich initial insights about coaches' video-based practices and an athlete's perceptions and experiences of receiving video-based coaching, respectively, the data from both studies relied upon retrospective interview data. Consequently, many 'blank spaces' remain in relation to our understanding the pedagogical use of video-based performance analysis within sports coaching (Stratton *et al*. 2004, Groom *et al*. 2011, Nelson *et al*. in press). Therefore, additional investigation is required 'in situ', if we are to further understand the applied use of video-based performance analysis and the interactions that occur between coach and athlete during these sessions. Indeed, Jones *et al*. (2010) have highlighted the need for the use of innovative and diverse methodologies that capture the nuances, initiation and reaction sequences within coaching's temporal process, as traditional research methods often miss these important features, on which much of the reality of coaching actually rests.

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to provide a detailed examination of the pedagogical interactions that occurred between an elite-level youth football coach and his players during

the team's video-based performance analysis coaching sessions. In this respect, this paper principally focuses on exploring coach–athlete 'talking in action' by drawing upon analytical concepts from conversation analysis (Sack *et al*. 1974, Schegloff 2007, Heritage and Clayman 2010). Indeed, within the social science literature, a large body of work exists which highlights the value of presenting a detailed analysis of talk in action, within such settings as calls to emergency services, doctor–patient interactions and courtroom trials (for a review see Heritage and Clayman 2010). Importantly, using such an approach has enabled researchers to be in more direct touch with the very phenomena under investigation (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2011).

This paper therefore attempts to extend existing understanding in relation to how practitioners use video-based technologies along with verbal communication in an attempt to coach athletes. The goal here is to examine how interactional tasks are accomplished through the use of talk (Halkowski 1990, Heritage and Clayman 2010). Moreover, in an attempt to further our theoretical understanding of coaching and provide more than a description of 'what happened', a theoretical framework is suggested to 'make sense' of the interactions between the coach and athletes (Jones 2009). Based upon the findings of previous research highlighting the value of a 'social power' analysis of coach behaviour (e.g. Jones *et al*. 2002, 2004, Potrac *et al*. 2002, 2007), the work of Raven (1992, 1993, 2001) is used to interpret the findings of the present study. Raven's work was selected to compliment the analytical concepts of CA, at the micro level of social interaction in coaching.

Theoretical framework

'Social power can be conceived as the resources one person has available so that he or she can influence another person to do what that person would not have done otherwise' (Raven *et al*. 1998, p. 307). French and Raven's (1959) classic social power typology has been characterised as the most frequently utilised model of dyadic power in the social psychological and industrial/organisational literature (Podsakoff and Schriesheim 1985, Raven *et al*. 1998). As such, it has been described as the most comprehensive and insightful theory in social influence research (House 1993), and has been used in a number of social settings such as family relations, education, health and medicine (Koslowsky and Schwarzwald 2001).

However, French and Raven's (1959) original typology has been subject to methodological and substantive concerns regarding the single measurement of each power base (e.g. Podsakoff and Schriesheim 1985). In addition, it is recognised that a number of sources of power are evident in a constellation (e.g. 'expert power' and 'informational power') with higher and lesser degrees of each basis, rather than any one single source of power (Koslowsky and Schwarzwald 2001). As such, the original unidimensional typology of social power was reconceptualised by Raven (1992, 1993, 2001) into a multidimensional power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. For example, *coercion* (e.g. 'threaten some punishment such as loss of pay', Raven 2001, p. 218) was developed to include personal coercion (i.e. threat of disapproval or dislike) and impersonal coercion (i.e. threat of punishment). In addition, *reward* (e.g. 'offer of promotion or salary increase', Raven 2001, p. 218) was developed to include impersonal reward (i.e. 'promise of monetary or non-monetary compensation', Raven 2001, p. 218) and personal reward (i.e. promise to like or approve). *Legitimacy* (e.g. 'emphasises that the supervisor has the right to prescribe such behaviour and the subordinate has an obligation to comply', Raven 2001, p. 218) was developed to include positional (i.e. 'supervisor has the right to influence a subordinate', Raven 2001, p. 220),

reciprocity (i.e. 'returning of a favour or good turn', Raven 2001, p. 218), equity (i.e. 'requires that something should be done to compensate hard work or harm', Raven 2001, p. 220) and dependence (i.e. 'obligation to help those who cannot help themselves', Raven 2001, p. 220). While *expert power* (e.g. 'the supervisor knows what is best', Raven 2001, p. 218) and *reference power* (e.g. 'appeal to a sense of mutual identification, or for a desire for such identification', Raven 2001, p. 218), which were originally considered only in a positive form, were developed to include positive (i.e. the influence attempt produces the intended change) and negative (i.e. the influence attempt produces a change in the opposite direction) dimensions (French and Raven 2001). Finally, *informational power* (e.g. 'carefully explain to the subordinate why the changed behaviour is ultimately preferable', Raven 2001, p. 218) was developed to include direct (i.e. direct communication – 'you need to do this') and indirect (i.e. suggestive communication – 'I have heard that this works well in this situation') dimensions (Raven 2001). Importantly, the target 'understanding the reason' differentiates *informational power* from *expert power* (Raven 2004).

Drawing upon Raven's (1992, 1993, 2001) power/interaction model of interpersonal influence, Koslowsky and Schwarzwald (2001) have suggested that the tactics available to an influencing agent can be said to emanate from either personal (i.e. education, experience and popularity) or positional/organisational factors (i.e. granted to the agent by the institutional role). Additionally, it has been suggested that such power tactics can be further differentiated as 'hard-soft', referring to the amount of freedom that the target feels in choosing whether or not to comply. 'Hard tactics' (i.e. coercion, reward, legitimacy of position, equity and reciprocity) have been highlighted to be relatively unfriendly, controlling and coercive (Pierro *et al*. 2008). Alternatively, 'soft tactics' (i.e. expert, referent and informational power as well as legitimacy of dependence) represent influence with the target feeling freer in their decision to comply with the influencing agent (Pierro *et al*. 2008). 'Hard' and 'soft tactics' differ in the origin of the resource, with 'hard tactics' stemming from organisational resources, whereas 'soft tactics' are considered personal (Schwarzwald *et al*. 2006).

From the perspective of the influencing agent, Raven's (1992, 1993, 2001) framework consists of: (1) The motivation to influence (e.g. a need for power, a need to demonstrate independence, a need to satisfy a role requirement, a need to enhance one's self-esteem and self-efficacy, a desire to harm or benefit the target and a desire for status in the eyes of a third party); (2) The assessment of available power resources and cost associated with evoking each resource (e.g. coercion, reward, legitimacy, expert, reference and informational); (3) Preparing the stage for influence, via the use of impression management, to set the scene for particular power strategies (e.g. expertise through self-promotion, authoritisation to establish formal legitimate power of equity and surveillance); (4) Implementing the power strategy and its aftermath, which questions whether the target, post influence, feels resentful towards the agent (e.g. what was the cost of the influence attempt?). Based upon an evaluation by the agent of the cost of the influence attempt, the agent will re-evaluate their basis of social power.

Moreover, in relation to the present study, Raven (2001, pp. 225–226) has highlighted that 'there are concerns that an overemphasis on experimental control and quantification had lead researchers to ignore richer data that could be obtained from ongoing observations in the real world'. Indeed, more recently, Schwarzwald *et al*. (2006) have suggested that future studies should consider developing a more direct observational approach to examining social power that does not rely on self-report measurements. The reconceptualised model is of particular utility for the purposes of the present study as Raven (1992) highlights that 'this model was

developed as a guide for research, and for an analysis of on-going interactive situations' (p. 239). We would advise those desiring a more detailed understanding to read the work of Raven (1992, 1993, 2001, 2004) and Koslowsky and Schwarzwald (2001).

Context and method

A Football Association English Premier League soccer academy [1] U18 team was selected using purposive sampling as the context for the present case study. Access to the context was negotiated by Chris Cushion, an academy coach who was working with a different age-group team within the context. This allowed for a greater degree of access, because of a previous rapport with the research team (Athens 1984). Within such settings, the interactions between coaches and players during traditional 'on pitch' coaching sessions have been demonstrated to be highly influenced by power (Cushion and Jones 2006). Furthermore, that 'players in these academies are constantly scrutinised by coaches who are in-turn predominantly judged, despite the official developmental ethos, on game results' (Cushion and Jones 2006, p. 146). In such settings, the production of institutional discourse can be described as an interaction between participants current institutional role (i.e. coach/athlete) and their current discursive role (i.e. coach questioner/athlete respondent).

Participants

A 34-year-old male U18 team Head Coach (HC) was observed in his interactions with 22 academy players (P1–P22) within six video-based performance analysis feedback sessions. All players were full-time professionals, aged between 16 and 19 years. HC held the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) Advanced Licence award. However, he was an inexperienced user of video-based performance analysis feedback in his coaching practice at the outset of the study. That is, the present study represented HC's early practice experiences of using video-based feedback. Following institutional ethical approval, informed consent was obtained from the coach and players before commencement of the study.

Procedure

An ethnographic framework enabled Ryan Groom to analyse behaviours and interactions between the coach–athlete 'in situ' during video-based performance analysis feedback sessions (Cushion and Jones 2006). This involved immersion in the context as a member of the staff undertaking the role of performance analyst, providing technical video analysis support for a 10-month season. Previous experience as a performance analyst with international youth teams allowed Ryan Groom to be accepted by the coaching staff and engage in 'shop talk' and related topics with the coaching staff (Cushion and Jones 2006).

The study followed six home match–debrief cycles over the 10-month competitive season. On match days (Saturday), Ryan Groom filmed the games for analysis. Following each game, HC highlighted 'critical incidents' that he would like to explore in the post-match debrief session (the following Monday). The games were analysed by using a Sports Tec™ SportsCode™ *Pro* digital video analysis system. During this process, key match incidents were marked ('coded') for future recall by the coach, based around actions in both the attacking and defending thirds of the pitch (e.g. attacking entries, crosses, shots, free kicks, corners and throw-ins, etc.).

Interactions within six video feedback sessions were recorded (audio and visual) via a video camera that was placed at the back of the classroom. The camera was placed in such a way that it captured the coach (HC), the players (P1–P22), Ryan Groom and the video content on a SMART board™ (interactive screen). The video recordings were transcribed verbatim and checked for accuracy by Ryan Groom and Lee Nelson [2].

Data analysis

Data collection and analysis of 'talk' were conducted using an applied CA approach (Sacks *et al*. 1974, Schegloff 2007, Heritage and Clayman 2010), with the aim of understanding educational interactions. CA is 'the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction' (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008, p. 11). CA was historically developed within ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967), principally by the sociologists Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, with the purpose of studying 'talk in action' or 'speech-exchange systems' (Sacks *et al*. 1974). Sack *et al*. (1974) have suggested that as conversations can accommodate a wide range of situations, an analysis of conversation can reveal the twin features of being context free (as a 'speech-exchange system') and yet be capable of revealing extraordinary context sensitivity (i.e. sensitive to places, times and identities of parties within interactions).

Epistemologically, ethnomethodology is located within a phenomenological paradigm, with the aim of examining 'common-sense thinking' (Seedhouse 2005, p. 257). Ontologically, ethnomethodology's position is associated with constructionism, in that; social phenomena and meanings are constantly being accomplished by social actors (Seedhouse 2005). As such CA puts educational events at the centre of the study, examining the social organisation of such activities. In this regard, the examples of talk and interaction can be used to show concrete illustrations of data analysis (Mercer 2010). Importantly, CA has been described as being able to demonstrate how participants build mutual understanding from one action to the next (Have 2000), to 'portray the progress of the participant's intersubjectivity' (Seedhouse 2005, p. 263).

CA as an analytical tool

Actions accomplished by talk operate through turns at talk (Schegloff 2007). Turn taking is a process by which interactants allocate the right or obligation to participate in an interaction, which is interactionally managed (locally within the interaction) and structurally constrained (Sacks *et al*. 1974). The building blocks by which turns are created are known as turn constructional units, which consists of *grammar* (i.e. sentences, clauses, phrases and lexical items), *phonetics* (i.e. rising and falling of intonation) and a recognisable action within a *context* (Schegloff 2007). When analysing talk in interaction 'one wants to write down not only *what* has been said, but *how* it has been said' (Have 2007, p. 94) thus capturing phonetic properties of utterances. Therefore, the transcription includes details such as spaces and silences, overlapping speech, pace, stretches, stresses and volume (Sacks *et al*. 1974, Have 2007, Schegloff 2007). In addition to the transcription of 'words spoken' in standard orthography, vocal sounds that can be interpreted as words (i.e. 'mmm', 'eh', 'uh', etc.) or that might play a role in the interaction are also transcribed (Sacks *et al*. 1974, Have 2007, Schegloff 2007). See Table 1 for the conventions used in transcription.

Insert Table 1 here

Basic turn allocation respondents are selected in one of two ways. First, those in which next turn is allocated by current speaker's selecting next speaker or second those where a next turn is allocated by self-selection (Sacks *et al*. 1974). The allocation of turns is governed by a basic set of rules, firstly: (a) when turns are allocated by the current speaker, the 'party selected has the right and is obliged to take the next turn to speak' (Sacks *et al*. 1974, p. 704); (b) 'If the turn-so-far does not select a party to take the next turn, then self selection may but need not be instituted' (Sacks *et al*. 1974, p. 704). The first starter acquires the right to a turn and transfer occurs at that place and (c) 'If the turn-so-far is constructed in a way as not to involve the use of a current speaker selects next technique, then the current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-selects' (Sacks *et al*. 1974, p. 704). Secondly, if at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit neither a nor b has operated, and following the provision of c, the current speaker has continued, then the rule-set a–c re-applies at the next transition-relevance place, and recurs at each transition-relevance place until transfer is effected. (Sacks *et al*. 1974, p. 704)

In addition, Schegloff (2007, p. 13) suggests that *conversational sequences* can be understood to comprise of 'adjacency pairs', composed of a minimum of: (a) two turns, (b) by different speakers, (c) adjacently placed; that is one after the other, (d) that these two turns are relatively ordered (first part – initiation/second part – response) and (e) that the pair types are related (i.e. greeting–greeting, question–answer, offer – accept/decline, etc.).

Mercer (2010) highlights that a particular strength of CA is that transcribed talk remains throughout the analysis, rather than being reduced to categories at an early stage. Therefore, researchers do not need to make initial judgments about the meaning of the data which cannot be revised (Mercer 2010). Consequently, CA differs from critical discourse analysis (CDA) in that CA is interested in what is going on in exchanges between participants, whilst CDA begins with imposing the analyst's own concerns upon the research project (Schegloff 1997). However, CA as an approach has not been without its criticisms. Indeed, despite CA having its 'origins in the discipline of sociology', CA is 'frequently criticised for being unresponsive to what might be called the sociological agenda' – concerned with the analysis of class, power, ideology and related social structures (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008, p. 208). Although,

CA can be seen as dealing with a possible analysis of power, where power is viewed in terms of differential distributions of discursive resources which enable certain participants to achieve interactional effects that are not available, or are differentially available, to others in the settings. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008, pp. 216–217)

It is the 'pure' CA approach to describing conversation without the use of such theoretical frameworks which has caused CA to remain a relatively unused approach within modern social research. However, applied (or institutional) CA has been outlined as a variation from 'pure' CA, whereby 'institutional talk' as opposed to 'everyday talk' is examined within a broader theoretical framework (Heritage 2005, Have 2007). Have (2000, p. 189) further explains that

in pure CA, the focus is on the local practices of turn-taking, sequential organisation, etc. in and for themselves, while in applied CA attention shifts to the tensions between those local practices and any larger structures in which these are embedded, such as institutional rules, instructions, accounting obligations, etc.

Here, Heritage (2005, p. 106) outlines three features of institutional talk that may be considered to be different from 'everyday conversation':

1. The interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations that are tied to their institutional-relevant identities (i.e. coach–athlete).

2. The interaction involves special constraints upon what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business in hand (i.e. topic focus and sequential organisation).

3. The interaction is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts (i.e. English Premier League Academy).

Furthermore, Heritage (2005, p. 110) highlighted that 'the challenge has been to identify and describe the range of practices through which identities – and whatever form of power and inequality may be associated with them – are linked to specific actions in interaction'. More recently, CA has been described as 'an evolving field of inquiry' (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008, p. 182), with many extensions to early CA approaches evident within the literature (Richards 2005, Seedhouse 2005, Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008). In this regard, it has been suggested that CA is able to provide 'a "holistic" portrayal of language use that reveals the reflexive relationship between form, function, sequence and social identity and social/institutional context' (Seedhouse 2005, p. 263). Whilst typical early CA research does not include a theoretical basis, the application of CA to classroom research has seen an amalgamation of different theoretical frameworks (Mori and Zuengler 2008). However, this method should not be interpreted as an attempt to generalise coach–athlete interactions from the present study to all coach–athlete relationships. The purpose here is to examine and explain how the social world operates locally through peoples actions (Mercer 2010), through a detailed analysis of the interactions of the participant coach (HC) with a group of athletes (P1–P22).

Theoretical considerations

Following an applied CA approach to analysing the classroom interactions, the work of Raven (1992, 1993, 2001) was selected in an attempt to explain the origins of the social organisation of power within the context (Jones 2009). However, in selecting one theoretical framework over another, it is important to recognise that as researchers our positions are not value free and the direction of this paper and the language and terminology used clearly reflects preferences for particular theoretical positions (Wright 2008). Consequently, as readers of differing theoretical orientations read and engage in our data and consider our findings and conclusions, they may find themselves drawn to other potential interpretations of the data. In an attempt to address this issue, Ryan Groom engaged in reflexive conversations with Chris Cushion and Lee Nelson, where the data prompted the need for explanation (Wright 2008). During these conversations, alternative theoretical interpretations were discussed. Indeed, Wright (2008, p. 6) suggests 'the ontological and epistemological positions underpinning most contemporary qualitative methodologies take reality to be contingent on context and meaning constituted through the interactions of participants and researchers'. In this regard, we concur with the views of Potrac and Jones (2009) that as researchers we have the final responsibility for the text and that we should consequently engage in rigorous interpretation.

Results and discussion

Insert Extract 1 here

In the interactional example [3] in lines 1–8, HC augments the video picture of the situation in which a goal was conceded from a free kick. HC uses a combination of 'expert power' and 'direct informational power' (Raven 1992, 1993) to persuade the players that his analysis of the unfolding events is correct. Such an approach is theorised to relate to a soft tactic, emanating from the coach's personal resources (i.e. coaching knowledge). In line 11, HC questions the players to identify a player in the picture. P1 starts to speak to identify himself as the player in question (line 12), thus responding to the invitation to speak (adjacency pair). In line 13, HC rejects P1's analysis of his position and again invites P1 to re-respond to the question to which P1 responds affirmatively in line 14 (adjacency pair). Again in line 15, HC questions the group as to the identity of a player, to which P3 accepts the invitation to speak (adjacency pair), offering P4 as the response (line 16). In lines 18 and 19, HC further explains his reasoning for highlighting the players as being 'unmarked' via a combination of 'direct informational' and 'expert power' (Raven 2001). In an attempt to correct player understanding, 'surveillance' is suggested to be unimportant, as future reward or punishment based on the influence attempt is not offered (Raven 2001).

Again in the closing remark of line 19, HC asked a closed question to the group, with a particular emphasis on the point ('↑ is he marked?') to which P1 accepts HC's invitation to speak (adjacency pair), in a quieter tone ('°I was (?) (at the back)°'), identifying himself as marking the player in question (line 20). However, in line 21, HC directly challenges P1's ('You just said you were marking 'im'), to which P1 responds affirmatively (adjacency pair), in a markedly softer tone (line 22). In line 22, P1 corrects his previous interaction (Jefferson 1974), in agreement with HC ('°Yeah°'). Jefferson (1974) describes such an error as an 'interactional' error, when one party is attempting to speak appropriately to a co-participant. In line 24, HC reinforces this correction ('Right both those players unma:rked'). In line 25, one of the players mumbles inaudibly. To which HC, responds ('Right'). At this point P6 explains that the referee is blocking off one of the players that should be marked (lines 27–29). In line 30, HC responds in an attempt to understand P6's assessment ('There = '). To which P6 confirms HC's understanding of the situation in line 31 (adjacency pair), 'latching' [(=)] onto HC's utterance (' = Yeah screening off'). In lines 32–52, HC continues with a tactical analysis of the unfolding situation on the video screen using both 'direct informational' and 'expert power' to influence the players to accept his evaluation of the event (Raven 1992, 1993).

In lines 46–53, HC highlights the players that are not performing their roles and responsibilities in the situation ('now chaps we've got too many players that aren't getting in amongst them and getting tight enough'). Similarly, in lines 47–49, HC highlights how the players are doing 'nothing' ('look at this here (.)<one (.) two > three players (.) doing nothing (.) nothing at all (1.8) an overload here, (.) players that aren't getting marked'). HC's utterances are delivered with pauses in talk [(.)], communicating a disbelief in the unfolding tactical situation. This form of influence maybe understood as 'legitimate power of responsibility' (Raven 1992, 1993), where unless the players fulfil their defensive roles individually (lines 52 and 53 'players on the fringes of things (.) outside of everything (0.6) one two three four'), the collective defensive roles and responsibilities of the team and HC's goals as coach cannot be achieved. Indeed, the lexical choice of 'we' rather than 'you' throughout (lines 1, 2, 33, 40, 46, 49 and 50) suggests that HC is trying to create a sense of shared responsibility within the group as a collective identity (Heritage 2005). A similar desire for control 'over' athletes to achieve 'work-task-related identity' (Heritage 2005, p.

111), has been demonstrated in a number of investigations into elite-level coach–athlete interactions (e.g. Potrac *et al*. 2002, Jowett and Cockerill 2003, Jones *et al*. 2004, Cushion and Jones 2006, Purdy *et al*. 2008). Indeed, research by Jowett (2003, p. 455) highlighted that the coach 'explained the importance of being able to influence and exert power on the athlete in a constructive way in order to make the athlete benefit [teach/coach/instruct]'. However, it has been suggested that such power struggles can compromise the quality of the coach–athlete relationship and its effectiveness (Jowett 2003, Jowett and Cockerill 2003), which may lead to coach–athlete conflict and the 'withdrawal of best efforts' from athletes (Purdy *et al*. 2008). Therefore, future research may consider the long-term impacts of the prolonged use of institutional power by coaches and how this affects the coach–athlete relationship.

Insert Extract 2 here

In the opening monologue of Extract 2 (lines 1 and 2), HC counts how many of the opposition players are marked by the team. HC uses a forceful 'mode' of communication (Raven 2001) in an authoritarian manner to address the team ('STRAIGHT awa:y from the start again (.) we're outnumbered in the middle'). This can be seen as a display of 'legitimate power of responsibility' (Raven 1992, 1993) by HC (hard power tactic), with the players for 'failing him', and not fullfilling their roles within the team. In lines 6–20, HC attempts to capture the players' attention ('look right listen') and continues with an influence attempt using both 'expert power' and 'direct informational power' (soft power tactics, Raven 1992, 1993). In line 16, HC directly challenges P2 ('that's your man. Yeah? You just let him come right off you') for not fulfilling his role via a 'legitimate power of responsibility' influence attempt (Raven 1992, 1993). However, no transition relevancy place or invitation to talk is offered to P2 to explain his actions and HC's talk remains continuous (Sacks *et al*. 1974).

In lines 17–20, HC summarises the three mistakes that he felt lead to the goal ('we don't get marked up early enough in the box, (.) man for man we don't win that header, (0.4) and people swi:tching off') and proceeds to directly challenge players within the team through using the 'hard tactic' of 'legitimate power of responsibility' (Raven 1992, 1993, 2001). In line 21, P1 starts to talk but stops prematurely ('I ju-') thus repairing the trouble (Jefferson 1974, Sacks *et al*. 1974, Schegloff 1992), and allowing HC to continue (lines 22–24). In lines 25–27, P1 takes a turn to speak (adjacency pair) when invited by HC ('what were you saying P1?'). In response to lines 25–27, P1 initiates a preparatory resistance attempt, developing a counter argument (Raven 1992, 1993, French and Raven 2001). In line 28, HC attempts to understand the point that was made in lines 25–27, which P1 continues in line 29 (adjacency pair). In line 30, HC's overlaps P1's, causing P1 to repair this trouble by stopping (Jefferson 1974, Sacks *et al*. 1974, Schegloff 1992, Heritage and Clayman 2010). HC offers a question to P1 and invites P1 to speak again ('did you stay with that man'), to which P1 responds (adjacency pair) negatively (line 31). HC again invites P1 to speak and clarify his decision (line 32). In lines 33, 35 and 37 P1 tries to explain the reason behind his decision to change the player that he is marking ('there were two runners, and that 'his man runs out, and P2's man runs across'), to which HC offers verbal encouragement (lines 34 and 36). Through this interaction, P1's resistance to the influence attempt can further be understood by a 're-evaluation of others' (Raven 1992, 1993, French and Raven 2001), in respect to the actions of fellow teammates.

In line 38, HC questions P1 ('So why didn't y- (.) wh- my question is why don't you stay with your man'), to which P1 responds (adjacency pair), in lines 40 and 41 with an explanation of his decision to change the player that he is marking (i.e. that the player that ran

into the box is more dangerous). Therefore, resisting HC's interpretation of the event and associated influence attempt, through a counter argument (Raven 1992, 1993). In lines 42 and 43, both HC and P1 start to talk, whereby P1 repairs the error to enabling HC to speak (Jefferson 1974, Sacks *et al.* 1974, Schegloff 1992, Heritage and Clayman 2010). Following this repair, in lines 44–46, HC 'presents himself' (Goffman 1959, Strauss 1959) in an authoritative ('we need to sta:y with our men (.) in the box') and sarcastic manner ('we can't even get marking right (.) never mind switching across people and passing people on in the box (.) we can't even get ↑that right'), with emphasis upon the 'mode' of delivery (Raven 1992). Here, HC 'managed the disagreement' with a display of institutional authority (Greatbatch 1992, Clayman and Heritage 2002a, 2002b, Heritage 2005), in an attempt to retain respect and control over the group interactions (Potrac *et al.* 2002, Jowett 2003, Jowett and Cockerill 2003, Purdy *et al.* 2008, McArdle *et al.* 2010). Here, P1 can be seen to be responsive to the interactional constraints which are institutional in character and origin by refraining to talk (Heritage 2005). Such interactional practices are in contrast to findings from alternative coaching contexts, which highlight the importance of fostering respect and developing athletes' autonomy (d'Arripe-Longueville *et al.* 2001). Importantly, Raven (1992) suggests that the agent not only chooses the power base, but also the power 'mode', in which the influence is exerted (i.e. loud, forceful, threatening or in a soft, friendly and light-hearted approach). Whilst the empirical evidence on the effects of 'mode' is still quite limited, this has been suggested to be even more important at times than the basis of power (Raven 1992). Consequently, the relationship between the nature of the influence attempt and the aftermath upon the target appears a salient area for future research.

Finally, in line 46 HC gives the instruction 'to view the goal again'. This may be viewed as a 'coercive power' influence attempt (Raven 1992, 1993), or punishment for poor performance, given that the players have already watched and discussed the video a number of times. This may also be viewed as an attempt by HC to reassert his authority over the group to 'soften the players up' for future influence attempts (Raven 1992, 1993). Similar exercises of power, using 'preparatory devices' and 'manipulation strategies' have previously been demonstrated within the coaching literature (Jones *et al.* 2004, Cushion and Jones 2006, Potrac and Jones 2009).

Towards an understanding of institutional talk in performance analysis feedback sessions

The present paper demonstrates that the coach could be seen to have 'presented himself' through speech (Goffman 1959, Strauss 1959), in his institutional role (Heritage 2005) of 'Head Coach' via his interactions with the players in an authoritarian manner. Specifically, the coach could be seen to exercise control over the sequential organisation of the sessions, via asymmetrical turn-taking allocations, control over the topic of discussion and the use of questioning (i.e. adjacency paired interactions; coach request for information – athlete response) to reinforce his social basis of power (Raven 1992, 1993). The sequential organisation of the interaction was the primary means by which HC's institutional identity was established and maintained (i.e. Head Coach). This was demonstrated in the asymmetry in institutional talk, which 'both reflects and embodies differential access to resources and to power' (Heritage 2005, p. 114). As such, the interaction of the players was 'constrained' to predominately answering questions and responding to invitations to speak from HC (Heritage 2005). Indeed, within the context of a large group, control over topic and speakership is often restricted to a single guiding individual, whose authority is thereby reinforced (Heritage 2005). That is, the turn-taking system offers the participants constrained interactional

affordances (Heritage 2005). Here, the participants (i.e. players) recognised that they should follow these interactional rules as a moral obligation, therefore the turn-taking system can be seen to be an act of normative organisation in its own right (Heritage 2005). As such, a local social structure was created within the interaction between HC and the players, in which a particular 'work-task-related identity' (Heritage 2005, p. 111), that of the HCs role being instructional, correctional and to modify behaviour, was sustained by HC within the interactions (Halkowski 1990, Potrac *et al*. 2002, 2007, Jones *et al*. 2003, 2004, Jowett 2003, Heritage 2005, Cushion and Jones 2006, Purdy *et al*. 2008, McArdle *et al*. 2010).

Conclusion

This paper examined the interactions that occurred between a coach and group of athletes within the delivery of video-based performance analysis feedback in an elite-level junior soccer environment. Analysis of the interactions revealed that the coach attempted to exercise control over the sequential organisation of the sessions, via asymmetrical turn-taking allocations, an unequal opportunity to talk, control over the topic of discussion within the interactions and the use of questioning to select speakers to take turns to talk and reinforce his interactional goals. The work of Raven (1992, 1993, 2001) was used to understand and critique coaching discourse 'in situ'. Raven's (1992, 1993, 2001) work illuminated the origin of the power sources of a number of interactional practices. For example, to achieve the desired interactional tasks, the participant coach used a combination of 'expert' (i.e. the coach knows best) and 'informational' power (i.e. the coach carefully explains preferable behaviour), emanating from the coach's personal knowledge (soft power tactics). The agent's power resource here is one of 'credibility' (Koslowsky and Schwarzwald 2001). In addition, within the interactions, the participant coach drew upon his institutional role to highlight a 'legitimate power of responsibility' (i.e. the institutional role of the coach affords the right to prescribe behaviour) in that, the athletes should adhere to his interactional requests (hard power tactic). Within this institutional role, the agent drew upon a 'normative' power resource for such influence attempts (Koslowsky and Schwarzwald 2001). Finally, the multiple viewing of negative past performances can be understood to be a 'coercive power' influence attempt, as a form of punishment for poor performance (hard power tactic). Here, negative images of poor performance were used by the coach to reassert his authority over the group to 'soften the players up' for future influence attempts (Raven 1992, 1993). In such instances, the agent's power resource was one of 'control' (Koslowsky and Schwarzwald 2001).

These findings add to the growing body of research in sports coaching, which highlight the dominant authoritarian discourse within coach–athlete relationships (e.g. Potrac *et al*. 2002, Cushion and Jones 2006, Purdy *et al*. 2008). Specifically, 'coaching content' or a 'coaching agenda' was delivered 'to athletes' within an asymmetrical power relationship, which was produced and legitimised within a hierarchical institutional context. Here, recent research has highlighted how openness and honesty from athletes receiving post-performance debriefing was constrained by the perceived power of the coach (McArdle *et al*. 2010). Similarly, within the present study substantive 'discrepancies in experience, technical knowledge, and rights to express knowledge' restricted the athletes' interactions within the institutional context (Heritage 2005, p. 114), which may result in unintended consequences (i.e. loss of respect, athlete resistance, non-learning, cf. Nelson *et al*. in press). Therefore, future studies should consider how coaches' beliefs regarding athlete learning impact upon their coaching behaviour (Cushion 2010), particularly with the evolving use of video-based performance analysis feedback.

Given the case study approach undertaken in the present paper, the research findings speak specifically of the context and relationships investigated. In addition, it is important to recognise that the exchanges presented represent the early practice experiences of the participant coach using video-based performance analysis feedback. Therefore, generalising the findings of the present study to other contexts and different coach–athlete relationships should be treated carefully. Indeed, despite the strength of CA as method for providing a rich account of patterns within micro-level interactions with specific illustrative examples, like other forms of qualitative research, employing CA often leaves researchers open to the charge of selecting particular examples to support their arguments (Mercer 2010). As such, it is important to acknowledge that the interactions that were recorded 'in shot' are only part of a much wider range of social interactions (Hammersley 2003). In this regard, Sacks (1984) highlighted that 'other things, to be sure, happened, but at least what was on the tape had happened' (p. 26).

Building upon this work, future research wishing to understand broader interactional practices of coaches should look to move beyond the current tendency to treat coaching as a series of unconnected episodes, which can be dissected and its parts aggregated (Potrac *et al.* 2000, Jones *et al.* 2002). That is, whilst coaching scholars have started to build a valuable picture of the behaviours of coaches in practice environments (e.g. Potrac *et al.* 2007), game situations (e.g. Smith and Cushion 2006) and within performance feedback sessions (e.g. Nelson *et al.* in press), limited consideration has been paid to what happens between such episodes. Methodologically, such an approach remains challenging, and will no doubt require the utilisation of sensitive methodologies (i.e. grounded theory, ethnographic observations, CA, narrative analysis and visual methods, etc.), potentially in combination with more established methods for analysing coaching practice (i.e. systematic observation, interviews and focus groups, etc.). For example, within the pedagogical use of video-based performance analysis feedback, researchers could consider the utility of combining such methods to illuminate a 'truer' picture of realities of coaching practice and the subsequent effects of such practices upon the athlete (Potrac *et al.* 2002, Jones 2009). Of particular interest for the purposes of coach education, future study may consider how coaching knowledge is constructed and related to a 'coaching identity', in an attempt to illuminate how such interactional practices are culturally produced and reproduced (Goffman 1959, Strauss 1959, Jones *et al.* 2002, 2003, Cushion *et al.* 2003). Indeed, Raven (1992) suggests that the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence 'may be useful for those who are in positions of influence, to help them understand more clearly the bases for their own actions, and the possibilities of alternatives' (p. 240). Here, coaches' should be mindful of how the power relations within such feedback sessions may impact upon athlete learning. Interrogating practice in this way could impact upon the nature of the coach–athlete relationship (Cushion and Jones 2006).

Notes

1. A Premier League Academy is the highest ranking youth development scheme within England, and is a mandatory requirement for membership to the English Premier League. Premier League Academies aim to provide education and support to young players during their transition into and out of, full-time professional football.

2. We would like to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Christianne Pollock in the transcription process.

3. Coach–athlete talk is discussed in the present tense as the interactions unfold (cf. Halkowski, 1990, Schegloff, 2007, Heritage and Clayman, 2010).

References

Athens, L. H., 1984. Scientific criteria for evaluating qualitative studies. In: N. Denzin, ed.

Studies in symbolic interaction. London: JAI Press, 5, 245–268.

Carling, C., Williams, A.M., and Reilly, T., 2005. Handbook of soccer match analysis: a systematic approach to improving performance. London: Routledge.

Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J., 2002a. The news interview: journalists and public figures on the air. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, S.E. and Heritage, J., 2002b. Questioning presidents: journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conference of Eisenhower and Regan. Journal of communication, 52 (4), 749–775.

Cushion, C.J., 2010. Coach behaviour. In: J. Lyle and C.J. Cushion, eds. Sport coaching: professionalization and practice. London: Elsevier, 43–61.

Cushion, C.J. and Jones, R.L., 2006. Power, discourse, and symbolic violence in professional youth soccer: the case of Albion Football Club. Sociology of sport journal, 23 (2), 142–161.

Cushion, C.J., Armour, K.A., and Jones, R.L., 2003. Coach education and continuing professional development: experience and learning to coach. Quest, 55 (1), 215–230.

Cushion, C.J., Armour, K.A., and Jones, R.L., 2006. Locating the coaching process in practice: models 'for' and 'of' coaching. Physical education and sport pedagogy, 11 (1), 83–99.

d'Arripe-Longueville, F., Saury, J., Fournier, J., and Durand, M., 2001. Coach–athlete interaction during elite archery competitions: an application of methodological frameworks used in ergonomics research to sport psychology. Journal of applied sport psychology, 13 (3), 275–299.

Franks, I.M., 2002. Evidence-based practice and the coaching process. International journal of performance analysis in sport, 2 (1), 6–20.

Franks, I.M., Goodman, D., and Miller, G., 1983. Analysis of performance: Qualitative or Quantitative? Sports, March.

French, J.P.R.Jr. and Raven, B.H., 1959. The bases of social power. In: D. Cartwright, ed. Studies in social power. Ann Arbour, MI: University of Michigan Press, 150–167.

French, J.P.R.Jr. and Raven, B.H., 2001. The bases of social power. In: I. Asherman and S. Asherman, eds. Negotiation sourcebook. 2nd ed. Amherst, MA: HRD Press, 61–74.

Garfinkel, H., 1967. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Goffman, E., 1959. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Greatbatch, D., 1992. The management of disagreement between news interviewees. In: P.

Drew and J. Heritage, eds. Talk at work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 268– 301.

Groom, R., Cushion, C.J., and Nelson, L.J., 2011. The delivery of video-based performance analysis by England youth soccer coaches: towards a grounded theory. Journal of applied sport psychology, 23 (1), 16–32.

Halkowski, T., 1990. 'Role' as an interactional device. Social problems, 37 (4), 564–577.
Hammersley, M., 2003. Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or para-

digms?. Discourse and society, 14 (6), 751–781.

Have, P.T., 2000. Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Have, P.T., 2007. Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heritage, J., 2005. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In: K.L. Fitch and R.E. Sanders, eds. Handbook of language and social interaction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 103–147.

Heritage, J. and Clayman, S., 2010. Talk in action: interactions, identities, and institutions.

Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

House, J., John, R., and French, P.Jr., 1993. A Lewinian's Lewinian. Journal of social issues, 49 (4), 221–226.

Hughes, M. and Franks, I.M., 1997. Notational analysis of sport. London: E & FN Spon.
Hughes, M. and Franks, I.M., 2004. Notational analysis of sport: systems for better coach-

ing and performance in sport. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Hughes, M., 2008. Notational analysis for coaches. In: R.L. Jones, M. Hughes, and K. Kingston, eds. An introduction to sports coaching: from science and theory to practice. London: Routledge, 101–113.

Hughes, M. and Franks, I.M., 2008. The essentials of performance analysis: an introduction.

London: Routledge.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R., 2008. Conversation analysis. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

James, N., 2006. Notational analysis in soccer: past, present, future. International journal of performance analysis in sport, 6 (2), 67–81.

Jefferson, G., 1974. Error correction as an interactional resource. Language and society, 2 (2), 181–199.

Jones, R.L., 2009. Coaching as caring ('the smiling gallery'): accessing hidden knowledge.

Physical education and sport pedagogy, 14 (4), 377–390.

Jones, L., Amour, K.M., and Potrac, P., 2002. Understanding the coaching process: a framework for social analysis. Quest, 54 (1), 34–48.

Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M., and Potrac, P., 2003. Constructing expert knowledge: a case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. Sport, education and society, 8 (2), 213– 229.

Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M., and Potrac, P., 2004. Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory. London: Routledge.

Jones, R.L., Bowes, I., and Kingston, K., 2010. Complex practice in coaching: studying the chaotic nature of the coach–athlete interactions. In: J. Lyle and C. Cushion, eds. Sports coaching: professionalisation and practice. London: Elsevier, 15–25.

Jowett, S., 2003. When the 'honeymoon' is over: a case study of a coach–athlete dyad in crisis. The sport psychologist, 17 (4), 444–460.

Jowett, S. and Cockerill, I.M., 2003. Olympic medallists' perspective of the athlete–coach relationship. Psychology of sport and exercise, 4 (4), 313–331.

Koslowsky, M. and Schwarzwald, J., 2001. The power interaction model: theory, methodology, and empirical applications. In: A.Y. Lee-Chai and J.A. Bargh, eds. The use and abuse of power: multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption. London: Taylor Francis Group, 195–214.

McArdle, S., Martin, D., Lennon, A., and Moore, P., 2010. Exploring debriefing in sports: a qualitative perspective. Journal of applied sport psychology, 22 (3), 320–332.

Mercer, N., 2010. The analysis of classroom talk: methods and methodologies. British journal of educational psychology, 80 (1), 1–14.

Mori, J. and Zuengler, J., 2008. Conversation analysis and talk-in-interaction in classrooms. In: M. Martin-Jones, A.M. de Mejia, and N. H. Hornberger, eds. Encyclopaedia of language and education. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer, 3, 15–26.

Nelson, L.J., Potrac, P., and Groom, R., in press. Receiving video-based feedback in elite ice-hockey: a player's perspective. Sport, education and society. DOI: 10.1080/ 13573322.2011.613925

Peräkylä, A. and Ruusuvuori, J., 2011. Analyzing talk and text. In: N.K. Dezin and Y.S. Lincoln, eds. The Sage handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 529– 543.

Pierro, A., Cicero, L., and Raven, B.H., 2008. Motivated compliance with bases of social power. Journal of applied social psychology, 28 (7), 1921–1944.

Podsakoff, P.M. and Schriesheim, C.A., 1985. Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. Psychological bulletin, 97 (3), 387–411.

Potrac, P. and Jones, R.L., 2009. Micropolitical workings in semi-professional football. Sociology of sport journal, 26 (4), 557–577.

Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R., Armour, K., and Hoff, J., 2000. Towards an holistic understanding of the coaching process. Quest, 52 (2), 186–199.

Potrac, P., Jones, R., and Armour, K.M., 2002. 'It's all about getting respect': the coaching behaviours of an expert English soccer coach. Sport, education and society, 7 (2), 183– 202.

Potrac, P., Jones, R., and Cushion, C., 2007. Understanding power and the coach's role in professional English soccer: a preliminary investigation. Soccer and society, 8 (1), 33– 49.

Purdy, L., Potrac, P., and Jones, R., 2008. Power, consent and resistance: an autoethnography of competitive rowing. Sport, education and society, 13 (3), 319–336.

Raven, B.H., 1992. A power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. French and Raven thirty years later. Journal of social behavior and personality, 7 (2), 217–244.

Raven, B.H., 1993. The basis of social power: origins and recent developments. Journal of social issues, 49 (4), 227–251.

Raven, B.H., 2001. Power/interaction and interpersonal influence: experimental investigations and case studies. In: A.Y. Lee-Chai and J.A. Bargh, eds. The use and abuse of power: multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption. London: Taylor Francis Group, 217–240.

Raven, B.H., 2004. Six bases of power. In: G.R. Goethais, G.J. Sorenson, and J.M. Burns, eds. Encyclopaedia of leadership. London: Sage, 1241–1248.

Raven, B.H., Schwarzwald, J., and Koslowsky, M., 1998. Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. Journal of applied social psychology, 28 (4), 307–322.

Richards, K., 2005. Introduction. In: K. Richards and P. Seedhouse, eds. Applying conversation analysis. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–15.

Robertson, K., 1999. Observation, analysis and video. Leeds: The National Coaching Foundation.

Sacks, H., 1984. Notes on methodology. In: J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, eds. Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21– 27.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G., 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50 (4), 696–735.

Schegloff, E.A., 1992. Repair after next turn: the last structurally provided place for the defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. American journal of sociology, 95(5), 1295– 1345.

Schegloff, E.A., 1997. Whose text? Whose context? Discourse and society, 8 (2), 165–185.

Schegloff, E.A., 2007. Sequence organization in interaction: a primer in conversation analysis (Volume 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M., and Brody-Shamir, S., 2006. Factors related to perceived power usage in schools. British journal of educational psychology, 76 (3), 445–462.

Seedhouse, P., 2005. Conversation analysis as research methodology. In: K. Richards and P. Seedhouse, eds. Applying conversation analysis. London: Palgrave Macmillian, 251–266.

Smith, M. and Cushion, C.J., 2006. An investigation of the in game behaviours of professional, top-level youth soccer coaches. Journal of sports sciences, 24 (4), 355–366.

Stratton, G., Reilly, T., Williams, A.M., and Richardson, D., 2004. Youth soccer: from science to performance. London: Routledge.

Strauss, A.L., 1959. Mirrors and masks: the search for identity. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Wright, J., 2008. Reframing quality and impact: the place of theory in educational research [online]. Available from: http://ro.uow.edu.au/edupapers/54 [Accessed 15 February 2011].

Table 1. Transcription symbols (Schegloff 2007, Heritage and Clayman 2010).

Symbol   Meaning

Symbol	Meaning
[	Beginning of overlapping talk
]	End of overlapping talk
=	Lines connected by two equals signs by different speaker indicate that the second followed the first with no discernable silence between them, or was 'latched' to it
(0.5)	Number in parentheses indicates silence, represented in tenths of seconds
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a 'micropause', audible but not readily measurable; ordinary less than 0.2 s
.	Punctuation marks are not used grammatically, but to indicate intonation, The period indicates a failing, or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question
,	A comma indicates continuing intonation not necessarily a clause boundary
::	Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just proceeding them. The more colons the longer the stretching
<u>word</u>	Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or pitch. The more underlining the greater the emphasis. Underlining sometimes is placed under the first letter or two of a word
WOrd	Especially loud talk is indicated by upper case. The louder, the more letters in upper case
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption The up and down arrows mark sharper intonation rises or falls
><	The combination of 'more than' and 'less than' symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed
	The degree sign indicates that the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft When there are two degree signs, the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it
( )	When all or part of an utterance is in parentheses, or the speaker identification is, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber's part, but represents a likely possibility. Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said inaudibly (or in some cases, speaker identification can be achieved)
(( ))	Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber's description of events, rather than representations of the. Thus ((coughs)), ((sniff)), etc

Extract 1, players and coach watch the first of the three goals conceded on Saturday from a free kick:

1   HC: Alright inswinging free kick (.) we have ↑two on 'im initially (0.4) one

2   comes off i:t, (1.2) >so we don't< need two out there (.) cos it's >not a sh-<

3   (.) it's not a shot so he's done the right thing coming off i:t (.) but then, (.)

4   whoever it is (.) I'm >not exactly< sure who it is runs back in and (0.4) doe:s)

5   (.) does nothing (.) look at this (3.6) one player here unmarked (1.0) marked

6   by him (0.8) °(?)° (0.6) one player here (2.4) unma::rked (.) so o:ne for one

7   man (0.4) one for one man (.) >one for one man< (2.8) >(another) one< (0.8)

8   one for one (man)/(there)

9   P1:   ((coughs))

10   (0.4)

11   HC: °Is that (one of ours)°

12   P1:   No: °no° (.) that's me I come across

13   HC: That's you, (.) no that's you there isn't it

14   P1:   °Yeah°

15   HC: So who's that

16   P3:   [(Player 4 plays there (.) Player 4 was there)]

17   P?:   [(?)]

18   HC: Right (.) so he:'s, (.) we have to say that he's unmarked (then)/(man) (.) he's

19   not marked the right side (0.8) okay, (0.6) ↑is he marked?

20   P7:   °I was (?) (at the back)

21   HC: You just said you were marking 'im,

22   P7:   °Yeah°

23   HC: Okay

24   HC: Right both those players unma:rked

25   P?:   (?)

26   HC: Right

27   P6:   One of the refs (.) blocking o:ff (.) the deep one

28   (0.8)

29	P6:	One of our players (near the) refs
30	HC:	There=
31	P6:	=Yeah screening off
32	HC:	°Yeah° (.) this playe:r (we'll) take that that's a (?) the ball that's okay (.) SO
33		BASically we've gone ONE (.) two (.) three (.) FOUR players unmarked
34		(0.6) four players unmarked (.) in a set piece (2.8) from the sta:rt
35		(13.8)
36	HC:	Now wha:t they do: he:re (.)just pause it there (.) they swing the ball to the
37		back po:st (.) and >they already got< two against o:ne and our player gets
38		stuck right under it ca:n't get their feet sorted out t- to head it away (.) our
39		central players get dra::wn to that ba:ll (.) and ↑ they leave the other two at
40		the back post (1.2) so we 'ave (.) two against one he:re and then we end up
41		wi:th, (.) well it ends up with all these three are not ma:rked (.) cos all the
42		players get drawn to the ball and don't think anything about ma:rking the:m,
43		(0.4) °>just run it again<°
44		(13.8)
45	HC:	°Just run it back just a second plea:se° (3.8) °just go slow (.) go slow° (3.8)
46		°and stop there° (2.0) now chaps we've got too many players that aren't
47		getting in amongst them and getting tight enough look at this here (.) <one (.)
48		two> three players (.) doing nothing (.) nothing at all (1.8) an overload here,
49		(.) players that aren't getting marked (.) I mean here (.) it seems like we:'re (.)
50		we're tight enough but there's two agains- see we've got two against one
51		he:re (.) and then two against one there, (.) in the two most crucial areas of
52		the goal, (11.8) players on the fringes of things (.) outside of everything (0.6)
53		one two three four (?) next one

Extract 2, players and coach watch the second of the three goals conceded on Saturday (the second from a free kick).

The video plays and the coaches and players watch in silence. Once finished, Ryan Groom returns to the start of the clip with the set up of the free kick paused: in the opening section, HC counts the players on the SMART board™ interactive screen.

1   HC: One for one he:re, (2.8) one for one the:re, (0.8) TWO (0.6) on the one

2   ↑ there, (2.2) one for one (0.4) ° one for one°   (.) one for one (.) so STRAIGHT

3   awa:y from the start again (.) we're outnumbered in the middle.

4   (10.4)

5   HC: >C'n you stop there<, (1.0) °one (.) two (.) three° (.)°°one (two three)°° (.)

6   right look listen (.) we got ONE (1.2) t:wo (.) three (.) four (.) five (.) six (0.4)

7   sev:en (.) and I'm not sure but- (0.6) on the (ball) we should have one (that

8   would be ei:ght) (0.4) (and then) two (.) (up sorting out there) I assume that's

9   we might have have two on the ball one there (1.4) ↑ if they' ve got one on the

10   edge, (0.4) one on the edge (.) do we need two players here (.) (there and

11   there) (1.8) (who's got) (.) one's got to go back onto him, (.) you can't have a

12   free player (0.4) okay (.) just run that again slowly, (.) now Player 8 has got

13   to better on that he's not in here but he has to do better here on thi:s first

14   (header) (he lets) them get across the front of him, (.) but thi:s, (.) so ↑ that

15   has to be better and now the next bit now the next bit now the next bit (0.4)

16   keep going (3.8) (°is he here°) (P8 that's your man) just let 'im go (0.4) just

17   come ri:ght off (you)/(him) (2.8) three mistakes <number one we don't get

18   marked up early enough in the box, (.) man for man we don't win that

19   header, (0.4) and people swi:tching off <again look stop there >just a<

20   minute (.) just ↑ (peo-), (.) you' re not near anybody,

21   P1:   (I ju-)

22   HC: You' re not (.) you' re not (.) and ↑ you' re not (.) there' s too many players that

23   a:ren't (bu:y) people locking in on people >getting< goalsi:de of people (0.4)

24		what were you saying P1?
25	P1:	Cos I was ma:rking (?)(the man) (?) (my 'ead) (.) (and as I was marking the)
26		sta:rt 'ee runs out (.) and another person runs in now look (.) (here) (look)
27		look what's going on there
28	HC:	Your man runs out
29	P1:	Yeah (.) he runs ou:t and another [(one)]
30	HC:	[So did] you stay with that (man)
31	P1:	No
32	HC:	Why not
33	P1:	No I (tr-) what's that (.) P2 had two (runners)
34	HC:	Yeah
35	P1:	And I 'ad one
36	HC:	Yeah
37	P1:	My man runs out, and P2's man runs across and I stayed with 'im
38	HC:	So why didn't y- (.) wh- my question is why don't you stay with your man.
39		(0.4)
40	P1:	Cos 'ees run out to: (.) (to look he's on the edge of the box now, and the
41		other man is more dangerous) hasn't followed in
42	HC:	It's
43	P1:	(?)
44	HC:	We need to sta:y with our men (.) in the box (0.4) we can't even get marking
45		right (.) never mind switching across people and passing people on in the box
46		(.) we can't even get ↑ that right (.) ↓ show them that one more time.
47		(18.0)