Linguistic Features of 'Alternative' Football Commentary: A Comparative Register Analysis

Paul Mathieson
Lecturer in English for Specific Purposes
Kobe Institute of Computing Graduate School of Information Technology

Abstract: This paper looks at the recent emergence of 'alternative' football (soccer) commentary as a sub-genre of televised football commentary, and examines the extent to which it shares register features with standard football commentary. The analysis focuses on alternative and standard commentaries from a group stage match at the 2014 FIFA World Cup, and draws upon Biber and Conrad's (2009) three-stage register analysis approach (situational features, linguistic features, and functional aspects). Although both forms of commentary share a lot of situational features, one key difference is the direct involvement of viewers in the alternative commentary discourse, particularly via social media. In terms of language features, both forms rely on present tense and simplified constructions, but there is noticeably greater use of ellipsis in the more conversation-like alternative commentary. The more informal and entertainment/amusement focused nature of alternative commentary mark it as a sub-register of standard football commentary, lying somewhere along a continuum between standard commentary and normal conversation.

1. Introduction

Sports commentary is a discourse genre which stands apart from other spoken genres, and even non-sports fans can usually identify it due to its distinctive linguistic and stylistic features. Indeed, because it involves reporting and analysis of events which happen in real time, it is unlike any other kind of narrative discourse, which typically report past events (Crystal, 2003, p. 386).

Since Ferguson's (1983) influential register analysis of baseball commentary, numerous studies have explored linguistic features of sports commentary registers (or sub-registers), such as televised basketball commentary (Reaser, 1993) and online football commentary (Lewandowski, 2012; Perez-Sabater et al., 2008). A recent development in sports commentary discourse is 'alternative' commentary, which is intended to present a light-hearted, humorous take on the action. These alternative commentaries have appeared in numerous sports (including football, cricket, and rugby), and also across various media formats.

This paper explores language features of the BBC's 2014 FIFA World Cup alternative football commentary. Specifically, a comparative register analysis of the contextual and lexical features in a standard football commentary (**SFC**) and those in an alternative football commentary (**AFC**) will be conducted. The aim of this analysis is to determine to what extent AFC shares register features with SFC, and whether AFC can be conceptualised as a unique sports commentary sub-register.

Before that analysis, however, the key aspects of register analysis will be outlined in section two, followed by a survey of the sports commentary register literature in section three. Given the space limitations in this paper, prosodic aspects of the language of sports commentary will not be analysed, as this paper's primary focus is on key lexical features (in particular, terminology, oral formulae, ellipsis and inversion). Finally, the sample texts from the 2014 FIFA World Cup that have been selected for this study will be discussed, and a comparative analysis of the context, language features and functional aspects of both will be undertaken, with a view to isolating the distinctive features of AFC.

2. What is register?

Before going further, it is important to define the term *register*, especially considering the lack of consensus as to its scope, and in particular how it differs from the related terms *genre* and *style* (Biber, 1995; Biber & Conrad, 2009; Ferguson, 1994). In this paper, 'register' refers to distinctive linguistic features which appear in a particular text type in a specific situational context (Biber, 1995; Biber & Conrad, 2009). Thus, a live television commentary of a football game is a specific register which differs from the register of a newspaper report of the same game – the text type, context and language features differ in each. Register can be contrasted with genre, which, as Kuiper (2009) highlights, is largely concerned with the conventional structures which are utilised to construct a complete text (for example, the introductory greeting, followed by anecdotes about the bride and groom, and so on, which form the structure of a wedding speech). Style – like register

– centres on linguistic features, but unlike the functional focus of register analysis, style analysis is concerned with "subtle ways individuals navigate among available [language] varieties and try to perform a coherent representation of a distinctive self" (Irvine, 2001, p. 32). Accordingly, style reflects the speaker's character and personal preferences rather than the conventional linguistic features of a specific discourse context.

In addition to describing context-specific textual features, register analysis also looks at the functional force of such features – why they commonly occur in that particular context, and what communicative ends they serve. Biber and Conrad (2009, p. 47) identify three key elements which should be included in a register analysis:

1. A description of the situational characteristics of the register;
2. An analysis of the typical linguistic features found in the register;
3. Consideration of the "functional forces" that underpin those linguistic features.

These three components will feature in the analysis in section five of this paper, but for now, the writer will turn to look at the literature which has charted the development of sports commentary as a distinct spoken register.

3. The sports commentary register

3.1 The role of the sports commentator

In his seminal study of baseball commentary on radio, Ferguson (1983, pp. 155-156) posited that the sports commentator's role is essentially twofold: reporting the ongoing activity of the game ("play-by-play"), and providing background information and analysis ("colour"). The play-by-play commentator is usually a professional broadcaster employed by the network which broadcasts the game, whereas the colour commentator is often a pundit – typically a former coach or player (Lewandowski, 2012).

However, the nature of play-by-play and colour commentators' roles varies according to the sport and also the broadcast setting. So, as Ferguson (1983) highlights, the audience's expectations of what reporting and explanatory role the commentators should fulfill differs for well-known sports such as football (more assumed knowledge, and therefore less detail) than for less popular sports such as elephant polo (less assumed knowledge, and so more detail). The discursive practices used by commentators will also vary according to the broadcast medium. Accordingly, radio commentators provide more detail in relation

to spatial references, whereas there is less need for television commentators to locate the action within a particular space and time for viewers, who can see the action (Reaser, 2003; Rowe, 2004; Tolson, 2006).

A further commentator role which Ryan (1993, p. 141) identifies is the "demand for continuous entertainment". In terms of traditional sports commentary, it is contended that this role is questionable or at least marginal (other register studies on sports commentary do not identify it), but this issue will be discussed further in section five in relation to the functional aspects of AFC.

3.2 Lexical features of sports commentary

Some sports commentary language is specific to sports commentary, and one example is the terminology used by sports commentators. So in football, we find such terminology as *back-four*, *wall*, *cross*, and even slang terms such as *ref* (referee) and *lino* (linesman), each of which has a set meaning within the context of a football match, and some of which are not used outside of football.

In addition, commentators often use routines or oral formulae for ease of understanding by the audience and to reduce the commentator's mental workload (Crystal, 2003; Ferguson, 1983). Examples of routinised aspects of sports commentaries include starting and finishing sequence formulae (such as "And we're under way", or "The referee blows for full-time"), as well as score recounting (such as "Mexico leads one-nil", or "Sharapova leads five games to four").

Because sports commentary largely involves reporting events which are short in duration and which happen in real time, the simple present tense, and particularly the "instantaneous" present (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 180; Leech, 1987, p. 6), is the predominant verb form (Ferguson, 1983; Ryan, 1993). For example, "Gerard *passes* to Sterling". However, as Ferguson (1983) notes, present progressive constructions are also commonly used for extended periods of play or in colour commentators' analysis (for example, "Argentina throwing all of their players forward in search of an equalizer").

The above example sentence also illustrates another key linguistic feature of sports commentary – the use of ellipsis, particularly deletion of sentence-initial nouns or pronouns, or omission of the copula verb *be*. Ferguson (1983, p. 159) highlights that these techniques "index the moment" in a concise, informal, and exciting way, and he likens their impact to that achieved by newspaper headlines, which also use similarly simplified language.

Subject-predicate inversion is yet another hallmark of sports commentator talk, and the

frequency of its use distinguishes sports commentary from other spoken registers, where it is less commonly utilised (Green, 1980; Reaser, 2003). As with ellipsis, there is a functional element to the use of inversion in sports commentary, which Reaser (2003, p. 314) identifies:

> This process eases the burden of the sportscaster by infusing lag time into the description of the action, whereby the announcer can verify the responsible agent.

Because some of the game action occurs very rapidly (and usually some distance from the commentary box), commentators often use inverted sentences in order to ascertain who did what (for example, "the pass intercepted by Lahm").

A final noteworthy feature of sports commentary language is the use of what Ferguson (1983, p. 162) labels "heavy modifiers". These heavy modifiers are used to furnish additional information about players, and are typically non-finite relative clauses ("Cruden, *who has just come on for Carter*, kicks deep") or appositive noun phrases ("Now it's Kompany, *the centre-half and captain*"). However, Reaser (2003) points out that these modifiers are largely absent from television commentary, where commentators are more free to use other methods of colour description. Given the fact that this paper focuses on television commentary, heavy modifiers will not form a part of the linguistic analysis.

There are other features of sports commentary language which will not be touched upon here due to space constraints, including deictic expressions (see Lewandowski, 2012) and prosodic aspects (see Beard, 1998). Now, the writer will explain the nature of the texts which have been selected for analysis in this paper, and also the transcription method that was used, before moving on to compare the situational and linguistic features of the SFC and AFC registers in section five.

4. The texts and transcription method

Excerpts from the BBC's alternative commentary of the Spain versus Netherlands group game at the FIFA 2014 World Cup (which feature comedians Chris Stark and Scott Mills, and psychic Demian Allan) have been selected for register analysis in this paper (see Appendix A). In the following section, contextual and linguistic aspects of this AFC will be compared with the SFC of the Germany versus United States group game at the FIFA 2014 World Cup, featuring BBC commentator Guy Mowbray and football pundit Mark Lawrenson (see Appendix B). For both commentaries, passages from immediately after

kick-off (part 1) and also from the period before and after a goal (part 2) have been selected in order to capture as representative a sample as possible for each form of football commentary.

The transcription method that has been adopted here draws on considerations identified by Cameron (2001) and Jenks (2011), and is adapted to fit the aims of this paper. An explanation of these transcription features is included in Appendix C.

5. Analysis

5.1 Situational features of the AFC register

It was noted in section two that Biber and Conrad (2009) claim that a register analysis ought to include an account of the situational context of the text. Accordingly, their register indicators (see Biber & Conrad, 2009, pp. 40-47) have been adopted in this paper in order to attempt to iterate the AFC register.

In terms of participants, the addressors in AFC are two non-professional sports commentators, in this case supplemented by a third party psychic. Interestingly (and unlike SFC), the addressees (viewers) also contribute to the discourse by way of in-game comments on social media, as is evident at line 19 of Appendix A, where the AFC commentator refers to online comments of three viewers.

Although there are no personal relations between commentators and viewers, the references to those three viewers ("Dan", "Jess" and "Kirsty") illustrates that the AFC commentators' attempts to build rapport with viewers extends beyond mere reference to football-related matters. In this regard, it is also clear that the AFC commentators lack detailed football knowledge (as shown at lines 16 and 28 of Appendix A). This is unlike SFC, where commentators use their extensive background knowledge of football and football history to appeal to both experienced and novice football fans (as can be seen through lines 8-10 in Appendix B).

The mode of AFC is, of course, spoken, and the medium is television and the Internet – viewers watch the game on television or via the Internet, and listen to the AFC broadcast. The AFC is produced in real time, so the commentators have little time to plan what they say. And although the physical setting is not shared by addressors and addressees, the time of the discourse generally is.

The communicative purpose of AFC is one key area of difference from SFC, the latter's purpose being primarily to describe the action and provide background information and analysis – although instilling an aura of excitement at appropriate points is another functional element which some writers identify (Ferguson, 1983; Lewandowski,

2012). However, AFC's primary purpose appears to be entertainment (particularly through the use of humour). Thus, play-by-play reporting receives less attention in AFC, and providing background information and analysis even less still. This is demonstrated in Appendix A, where the AFC commentators only briefly describe the play on three occasions (lines 22-23 and 30). Compare that with the steady flow of detailed play-by-play descriptions in the SFC (lines 4, 8, 13, 15, 19, 21, 25 and 27 in Appendix B).

This highly informal nature (and often non-football-related focus) of AFC is similar to a situation such as a group of friends watching football on television at home or in a pub or sports bar, where the discourse will largely revolve around non-expert analysis of the match and discussion of non-game-related matters. Such informality is evident in the use of the psychic in the AFC, and his humorous prediction of a "dramatic ten-past-nine event" (line 25 of Appendix A). This informal element to AFC also comes through in the numerous instances of overlapping talk (such as at lines 25-28 and 39-44 in Appendix A), which Sidnell (2010) notes is a common feature of the conversation register. Compare that with the highly structured, role-specific nature of SFC, where there are only two instances of simultaneous talk (lines 13-14 and 17-18 in Appendix B). Indeed, at line 14, the colour commentator even appears to apologise for interrupting the play-by-play description. This informal, conversational nature also comes through in the AFC commentators' language, and I now look at language features of the AFC and SFC in more detail.

5.2 Linguistic features and functional aspects of AFC

Unlike SFC, AFC does not use football jargon extensively. Indeed, the expressions "in the middle of the park" and "keeper" (Appendix A, lines 22 and 23 respectively) are the only instances of football terminology. This may reflect the entertainment function of AFC, where amusing the audience (rather than describing the play, and in doing so relying heavily on football terminology) is the primary aim. However, AFC does seem to make use of oral formulae which are commonly used in SFC, as is shown in the following excerpts from Appendix A:

- And we're off! [Lines 2, 3 and 9]
- It's a goal! [Lines 32 and 34]

Interestingly, such formulae are largely absent in the SFC in Appendix B (the exception being the recounting of the score at line 27). This may

suggest that the SFC commentators want to avoid clichéd expressions, a point which Rowe (2004) states is a source of derision for some sports commentators. Thus, their inclusion in the AFC could be seen as functionally driven – that is, the AFC commentators employ them ironically in order to generate humour. This is shown in lines 47-48 in Appendix A, where the AFC commentators appear to mimic the exaggerated phrasing of Hispanic football commentators when a goal is scored (Santos, 2014).

It was noted earlier that present tense constructions are widely acknowledged as a key feature of the sports commentary register. This is borne out in the SFC and the AFC under consideration here, with present simple tense being used predominantly (although in different ways) in both. In the SFC, instantaneous present tense is used frequently, as the play-by-play commentator describes what is happening in real time on the pitch (for example at lines 4, 8, 13, 21 and 25 of Appendix B). In addition, we also see a number of past tense utterances (such as "Muller went for something special" at line 4 of Appendix B), as both SFC commentators recap in-game events and also discuss events from previous games. Present tense constructions also feature predominantly in the AFC, but unlike the SFC, instantaneous present tense hardly features at all. This is because the AFC commentators spend very little time describing events on the pitch, instead focusing largely on their immediate surroundings (for example "the screen is now so small" at line 18 of Appendix A), as well as on other non-match-related matters (such as "the conversation seems to be dwindling slightly" at line 20). This is perhaps yet another reflection of the differing functional forces in SFC (description and analysis) and AFC (entertainment and amusement).

The fact that both AFC and SFC are broadcast live means that commentators often simplify their utterances in a number of ways. The writer has already identified subject deletion and copula *be* deletion as key register markers of sports commentary, and there are numerous instances of both in the SFC in Appendix B, including the following extract from line 4, in which both subject deletion and copula *be* deletion occur:

- [*The ball is*] lifted out by Thomas Mueller

Both of these features are less evident in the AFC, which is yet another indicator of the lack of a reporting function in AFC (meaning less of a need to be economical with phrasing in order to report match events efficiently, which underpins the use of ellipsis in SFC). Interestingly, the clearest examples of such ellipsis in the AFC are the brief passages of play-by-play description at

lines 3 ("Spain [*are*] playing in white") and 22 ([The] ball [*is*] in the middle of the park").

Other elliptical statements – particularly incomplete phrases – are more evident in the AFC when compared with the SFC, which perhaps emphasizes the closer proximity of AFC to normal conversation, which is full of incomplete sentences and false starts (Cameron, 2001; Brown, 1983). The following passage from line 32 of Appendix A demonstrates this point:

- we'd like to … as … the Netherlands get the b- … he's turns …

In a similar vein to subject and copula *be* deletion, subject-predicate inversion is another feature of sports commentary that is almost completely absent from AFC, which this author contends is also due to the differing functional necessities of AFC and SFC. In SFC, as highlighted earlier, inversion is used to help the commentator clearly identify the agent. There are numerous examples of inversion in the SFC in Appendix B, including the following (both from line 4):

- he's caused a little bit of a problem by Mesuit Ozil
- Lifted out by Thomas Mueller

However, the limited descriptive element in AFC means that the AFC commentators do not need to rely on inversion as a register marker. Furthermore, inversions are not commonly used in spoken conversation (Green, 1980), which reinforces this writer's contention that AFC is perhaps closer to spoken conversation than SFC.

6. Conclusion

Although AFC and SFC share most situational features (notably participants, mode and setting), and some register markers (such as oral formulae and ellipsis), other aspects of AFC, such as its informality, lack of subject-predicate inversion and prevalence of overlapping talk, suggest that it is a sub-register of sports commentary that lies somewhere between SFC and conversation. As has been shown in this paper, this is most probably a reflection of the functional aspects of AFC, where narrating in-game events and providing analysis (the core functions of the SFC register) are relegated to the background in favour of amusing and entertaining the addressees.

Of course, the limited scope of this paper makes it difficult to make definitive statements about the AFC register – the excerpts being analysed here are mere fragments of complete texts. Future research could add a quantitative element to AFC (or indeed alternative commentaries of other sports), which would provide a more complete picture of where alternative sports commentary stands in relation to the well-established sports commentary register.

References

[1] Beard, A. (1998). *The Language of Sport*. London: Routledge.
[2] Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of Register Variation: a Cross-linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[3] Biber, D. & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[4] Brown, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[5] Cameron, D. (2001). *Working With Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage.
[6] Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[7] Ferguson, C. A. (1983). Sports announcer talk. *Language in Society*, *12*(2), 153-172.
[8] Ferguson, C. A. (1994). Dialect, register, and genre: working assumptions about conventionalization. In D. Biber & E. Finegan (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register* (pp. 31-56). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[9] Green, G. M. (1980). Some wherefores of English inversion. *Language*, *56*(3), 582-601.
[10] Irvine, J. T. (2001). Style as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic variation. In P. Eckert & J.R. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 21-43). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[11] Jenks, C J. (2011). *Transcribing Talk and Interaction: Issues in the Representation of Communication Data*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
[12] Kuiper, K. (2009). *Formulaic Genres*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
[13] Leech, G. N. (1987). *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman.
[14] Lewandowski, M. (2012). The language of online sports commentary in comparative perspective. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, *54*(1), 65-76.
[15] Perez-Sabater, C., Pena-Martinez, G., Turney, E., & Montero-Fleta, B. (2008). A spoken genre gets written: Online football commentaries in English, French, and Spanish. *Written Communication*, *25*(2), 235-261.
[16] Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
[17] Reaser, J. (2003). A quantitative approach to (sub)registers: The case of 'sports announcer talk'. *Discourse Studies*, *5*(3), 303-321.
[18] Rowe, D. (2004). *Sport, Culture and the Media: The Unruly Trinity*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
[19] Ryan, M-L. (1993). Narrative in real time:

Chronicle, mimesis and plot in baseball broadcast. *Narrative*, *1*(2), 138-155.

[20] Santos, F. (2014). A chorus of 'goooooool,' the siren song of soccer. *The New York Times*. Retrieved on 8 July, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/20/sports/worldcup/a-chorus-of-goooooool-the-siren-song-of-soccer.html?r=0.

[21] Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

[22] Tolson, A. (2006). *Media Talk: Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Appendix A

Excerpt from BBC 1 'alternative' commentary – Spain v Netherlands, 13 June, 2014 (3 minutes, 45 seconds)

Part 1 (2 minutes, 25 seconds)

1   *Chris Stark*: Here we go then Spain Netherlands here on the BBC (…) ((Network announcement introducing the commentators))

2   *Scott Mills*: You can also watch us on the hilariously on the BBC sport website there is a feed there (.) and we're off=

3   *Chris Stark*: =And we're off here we go (.) So Spain playing in white here (…) ah the Netherlands in blue=

4   *Scott Mills*: =Why aren't they orange (.)

5   *Chris Stark*: ((Laughing)) I don- (.) the problem being I'm wearing ah the Spain (.) red shirt that they would normally wea- ((laughing)) (.) and Scott's wearing the orange ((laughing)) (.) no (it was it was) pointless buying the shirts=

6   *Scott Mills*: =Right (…)

7   *Chris Stark*: Les- (.) finally we're off anyway (...) we're watching it here on um quite a small screen ((laughing)) (...)

8   *Scott Mills*: Don't say that=

9   *Chris Stark*: =It's quite hard to see the ah (.) which player is actually kicking the ball which is g- ((laughing)) (.) a problem we've o- ((laughing)) only just realised ((laughing)) (…) and we're off (...) Spain here probably favourites (…)

10   *Demian Allan*: Spain should s- start off really strong=

11   *Scott Mills*: =Okay thanks Demian (…)

12   *Chris Stark*: Oh we've got a number of sound effects for tonight as well to sort of um (.) see us {through this one}

13   *Scott Mills*: {Why do you have to} announce everything just let it (.) happen (.)

14   *Chris Stark*: What do y- ((laughing)) (.) what do you {mean}

15   *Scott Mills*: {Oh we've} got a small TV (.) like you're ruining the magic for loads of people we've got some sound effects just play them don't let them (.) don't announce {everything}

16   *Chris Stark*: {I'll be} brutally honest (.) I spent (.) the last couple of days trying to (.) memorise as many players as I could=

17   *Scott Mills*: =Okay {go}.

18   *Chris Stark*: {Um} (.) the problem is the screen is now so small ((laughing)) (.) I can't ((laughing)) (.) (To b- to be brutally honest) I can't see (.) who's who which is obviously a flaw but we'll um (.) we'll crack on like the professionals that we are (…)

19   *Scott Mills*: Hello to Dan sat at home eating Chinese watching the alternative commentary after being at work all day (...) peanuts and football with the lads there's Jess I've made them put your commentary on instead of the normal commentary (…) Kirsty says as if I'm on my own and actually choosing to watch the football (.) to be fair it's just for Scott and Chris (…)

Part 2 (1 minute, 20 seconds)

20   *Scott Mills*: The conversation seems to be dwindling slightly at the moment so if you could ah (.) pick that up back up again thank {you}

21   *Chris Stark*: {Thank} you to Match of the Day who've ah who've just tweeted (.) a couple of minutes ago reminding everyone that they can of course listen to the

alternative commentary=

22   *Scott Mills*: =Thanks Match of the Day one minute (.) one minute to go now until this dramatic event here (.) could be some incredible scenes (.) Spain versus Netherlands (.) ball in the middle of the park (…)

23   *Chris Stark*: It's gonna go back to the keeper here I predict (...) no (.)

24   *Scott Mills*: ((Laughing)) (…)

25   *Chris Stark*: We're all looking forward to the dramatic (.) ten past nine event which is ah (.) {surely}

26   *Scott Mills*: {Rain on the camera (.) rain on the camera}

27   *Chris Stark*: {Surely ah due in the} (.) next thirty seconds (.) {(try ah)}

28   *Scott Mills*: {Who's} that dude (.) who's he=

29   *Demian Allan*: =That's the manager of (.) Holland=

30   *Chris Stark*: =As we've dropped off the worldwide trends with um (.) hashtag R1 commentary we'd like to (.) as (.) the Netherlands get the b- (.) he's turns=

31   *Scott Mills*: =Goal (.)

32   *Chris Stark*: It's {a goal}

33   *Scott Mills*: {Yes} (.)

34   *Chris Stark*: It's a goal=

35   *Scott Mills*: =Yes=

36   *Chris Stark*: =It's Arjen Robben=

37   *Scott Mills*: =Yeeeees (.) and you said (.) mate=

38   *Chris Stark*: =It's a ten past nine event=

39   *Scott Mills*: ={Ten past nine}

40   *Chris Stark*: {Oh my god} (.)

41   *Demian Allan*: {Game changer}

42   *Chris Stark*: {I cannot}

43   *Scott Mills*: {Game changer}

44   *Chris Stark*: {I cannot} believe this (.)

45   *Scott Mills*: Thank you Demian=

46   *Chris Stark*: =It's a {goooooal} ((Background music))

47   *Scott Mills*: {Goooooal}

48   *Chris Stark*: Go-go-go-go-go-go-go-go-go-go-al (.) Arjen Robben=

49   *Scott Mills*: =Yes you oranges (.)

50   *Chris Stark*: Ooh I lose my bet (…)

Appendix B

Excerpt from BBC 'standard' commentary – Germany v USA, 26 June 2014 (6 minutes, 36 seconds)

Part 1 (3 minutes, 10 seconds)

1   *Guy Mowbray*: Who of the USA and Germany perhaps both of them will make it through to the last 16 (.) both on four points from their opening two games (.) Ghana and Portugal have a-point-a-piece (.) we will of course keep you posted on the picture as the two games go on concurrently (…)

2   *Guy Mowbray*: Philip Lahm (.) Germany in their (.) red and black Dennis the Menace change strip (.)

3   *Mark Lawrenson*: Yeah it's also a classic way of playing now isn't it push your two fullbacks on and your central midfield player the holding player almost goes and plays in a back-three (…)

4   *Guy Mowbray*: Lahm comfortable wherever he's asked to play on the field (...) there's Schweinsteiger (...) Beasley (...) he's caused a (.) little bit of a problem by Mesuit Ozil and forced to pop it out for a Germany throw-in (…) Mertesacker allowed time to ponder (...) Lahm (...) lifted out by Thomas Muller (.) nowhere else to go for Ozil (.) it's Boateng's cross (.) Muller went for something special and Podolski (.) has blazed it (…)

5   *Mark Lawrenson*:   Just a little bit surprised with er Thomas Muller the way he went for that unless he didn't see it until quite late (.) love the early cross as this great ball in first plays one touch (.) you watch now early comes in (…) set himself but didn't make great contact (…)

6   *Guy Mowbray*: What a record Thomas Muller has (.) eight world cup appearances eight goals and four assists (.) his eight goals have come from just nine efforts on target (.)

7   *Mark Lawrenson*:   Both teams'll love these conditions (.) (obviously) no sun not quite as hot (.) little bit of rain in their faces as well probably get a quicker game hopefully (…)

8   *Guy Mowbray*: The tackles will have to be measured (.) there will be a few (.) sliding efforts (.) looking at Jermaine Jones might just have to watch his step in particular (.) Beckerman's in to that one and the whistle has already gone for offside anyway (.) and it will be a USA freekick (...) can see the ah (.) plaster covering the stitches (…) crunching (.) coming together with John Boye at the end of the Ghana game=

9   *Mark Lawrenson*:   =It's one of those accidental ones one of that looks really bad (.)

10   *Guy Mowbray*: The thought was at the time that he might've fractured his cheekbone it it was an absolute belter that he took (…) no real harm done (.) Muller can continue doing harm to opposing sides (…) it somehow seems appropriate that he wears the number thirteen (.) that his namesake Gerd did all those years ago (.) I think one day he might be threatening his goals total=

11   *Mark Lawrenson*: =Little bit different in stature methinks (.)

12   *Guy Mowbray*: He's got about a foot on him hasn't he (…)

Part 2 (3 minutes, 26 seconds)

13   *Guy Mowbray*: Klose (.) closes down Howard (.) it's out towards Davis (.) Mertesacker (.) Schweinsteiger (.) lost out to Bradley Beckerman in to Jones (.) and Bradley can't find Dempsey {(the ball is loose)}

14   *Mark Lawrenson*: {No (.) I'm sorry} (.) no the right back was on (.) righ- right was on all day coz Zusi had taken his marker away (…)

15   *Guy Mowbray*: Howedes (…) Lahm was caught late by Bradley that will be a Germany free kick=

16   *Mark Lawrenson*:   =Yeah (.) good decision by the ref (.) he was late (…) can't complain about that can you=

17   *Guy Mowbray*: =He's quite fortunate not to get a yellow {card}

18   *Mark Lawrenson*: {Yeah} possibly=

19   *Guy Mowbray*:   =(A few) world cups past he might've got one (.) there's a feeling the refs have been on the lenient side by and large (…) Tony Kroos has ah (.) got himself ready for this (.) Mesuit Ozil is another contender to (.) put the right ball in (…)

20   *Mark Lawrenson*: Such a long distan- do they actually really need a (.) three-man wall (…) the keeper might be actually better able to see it (.)

21   *Guy Mowbray*: Kroos (...) defended by Johnson (…) Schweinsteiger keeps the ball rolling (.) Klose
can't get to it (.) Davis heads behind Germany corner Germany pressing (…)

22   *Mark Lawrenson*: Yeah and there's no real pressure on the crosser at the moment is there (.) the the Amercians starting to get a little bit deep (.) only needs one lack of concentration (.)

23   *Guy Mowbray*: If the crosses are allowed to keep coming in to Miroslav Klose he will score=

24   *Mark Lawrenson*:   =Yeah (.) or at very worst he'll set somebody up to score (.) (but) here they've gone to sleep again a bit the Americans too again (.)

25   *Guy Mowbray*:   Ozil in (.) Howard beaten away (.) it was Mertesacker's header (.) back it comes (.) straight in (.) Thomas Muller with a beauty (…)

goalkeepers do not stop those (…) didn't have long to think about it (.) Thomas Muller doesn't' need long he knows where the goal is (.)

26   *Mark Lawrenson*: What a good (.) save as well from (...) Howard (.) punched it away and it's just a great strike isn't it but they were caught two g- they were just a little bit asleep America from the er original corner (.) that's a super strike that's what he does he drifts into places nobody picks him up (.) (You see) his target's made for him (isn't it) outside of the defender Kesler (.)

27   *Guy Mowbray*: Germany aren't playing for a draw (.) forget about that (.) Germany one the United States of America nil (.) Beasley down but no free kick (.) that might just make Germany go up another one or two gears (.) Muller away from Bradley (.) Schweinsteiger looking for Muller again (.) and Beasley clears (…)

Appendix C

Transcription symbols used in Appendices A and B

(.) Short pause (less than two seconds)

(…) Longer pause (longer than two seconds)

= Latching of two phrases

{   } Simultaneous talk between two or more people

- Part of a word is cut off

(word or phrase) The exact wording or phrasing is unclear

((   )) Describes behaviour such as laughter or other non-verbal action or activity