



Umpiring Technology and Tactical and Strategic Privacy in Cricket

Suman DC*

Abstract

Each sport has an allotted area for innovative tactics and strategies, while some sports go beyond the sporting rules and regulations. The use of present-day technologies in sports has helped teams and management better understand their rivals' strategies and tactics through tactical and strategic analysis, and the teams always look for such type of resources to prepare their teams accordingly. The use of sports technology at various levels, from training to officiating a match, itself might reveal a team's tactics and strategies to its opponents and to a greater group, which could influence the team's plan and the way it has been executed. For an instance, different umpiring technologies are used in the sports like cricket to execute the game in a fair manner. Imagine a scenario where umpiring technology invades the privacy of the players' tactics and strategies by disclosing them while officiating the game. In the meantime, the implementation of umpiring technology has not been investigated from the perspective of athletes' tactical and strategic privacy. Therefore, this research paper aims to investigate the dimensions of umpiring technology in sports in relation to strategic and tactical privacy and to imply how the responsible uses of sports technology can be made for the betterment of overall sports. In the process, this research investigates concepts of strategy, tactics, and privacy in relation to pertinent ideas like gamesmanship in sports. Following that, these concepts are applied in a couple of cases in international cricket matches, demonstrating whether the sports technology can reveal a team's tactical and strategic privacy to various parties. In a broader sense, this research can assist individuals in comprehending various aspects of using sports technology responsibly.

Keywords: sports technology, strategy, tactics, privacy, cricket, umpiring, gamesmanship

Introduction

Every sport has specific space for strategies and tactics of its own kind. There has been a significant increase in studies on tactical behavior using sports technology in recent years. Nonetheless, both domains have contributed to distinct studies, with the former focusing on

* Consultant (Sports Management), National Sports Council
Email ID : dchemant123@gmail.com

developing theories and practical implications and the latter on developing techniques (Goes et al., 2021, p.483). It shows the close relationship between sports technology and tactical analysis. While doing so, each detail is crucial to analyze a team's strategy holistically. The game of cricket also has no exceptions. The application of modern technology in sports has provided teams and management to prepare their athletes strategically but the inclusion of technology can itself easily expose a team's strategies to the opponent and to the wider audience, which might impact the team's plan and the way it has been executed.

Cricket umpiring tools like Hawk-Eye and Hot Spot have the potential to invade players' tactical and strategic privacy. These tools help umpires reach judgment calls, such as deciding whether a batsman has been dismissed or whether the ball has struck the bat or the ground. While these technologies can enhance judgment accuracy, they can also provide details about the participants' tactics and strategies (International Cricket Council 2021, p.85)). For an instance, the data produced by these technologies can show a bowler how to deliver the ball or a batsman how to play a specific shot. Opponents might be able to take advantage of this information to their advantage. In this way, the umpiring technology is exposing players' strategies and tactics "unintentionally" while officiating the game. Therefore, this paper investigates the on-field technologies usage in international games of cricket, and how those technologies can expose the strategies and tactics of a team.

Methodology

This study applied an interdisciplinary research approach. First, it explicates the concepts of privacy, strategy, and tactics including the surrounding concepts of sports technology and gamesmanship by reviewing the academic literature. Then, the paper provides its observation of a couple of cases from the sport of cricket. This study has investigated several international men's cricket incidents that kept the tactical and strategic privacy of the players or users at stake. After careful consideration of all the available cases, two contrasting cases have been selected, which expose the tactics that bring the concept of gamesmanship into play.

Moreover, this paper inquiries into the relationship between the application of such sports technology and the "privacy of the players" strategies and tactics through case studies: a case study is "a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, or a single document repository, or one specific event" (Yin, 2003, p.33). Then, these cases, along with observations, are examined from the ethical point of view as a discussion. This study can, in a broader sense, assist the stakeholders in comprehending numerous facets of using sports technology responsibly.

The following section discusses the theoretical underpinnings of strategies, tactics, and privacy in sports before applying these ideas to several case studies involving the game of cricket, where players' "strategy" or "tactics" have been employed to overcome their sporting challenges. The implications of integrating strategies or tactics with contemporary sports technologies have been covered in the third part. This paper concludes with any suggestions for additional study or conclusion from this research in its last section.

Conceptual Framework

Before dealing with the qualitative data including observations and case studies, this section prepares a foundation for analysis by providing a functional concept of strategy, tactics, cricket, gamesmanship, sports technology, and privacy. In addition to this, in a few cases in international cricket matches, these concepts are put into play to demonstrate whether sports technology can expose a team's tactical and strategic privacy to different parties including opponents.

Strategies and Tactics in Cricket

Before dealing with strategies and tactics in sports, this paper discusses these concepts in relation to other fields. The concepts of strategies and tactics have been used in the sector such as war. In terms of sports, the concepts of these two terms are closely associated with the concepts used in the military context. Clausewitz admits that a strategist chooses an objective that corresponds with the intended target of the clash for the entire combat action. On the one hand, the strategist establishes a war strategy that is compatible with the State's resources, develops the details of each campaign's plan, arranges its engagements, combines the operations of the military forces, and systematizes them to maintain their coherence (Clausewitz, 1989, p.361). In Clausewitz's perception, all battle involves "a remarkable trinity" of physical, mental, and moral considerations for the strategist. On the other, the challenge is in keeping reflection or theory at the center of these three inclinations as if poised between three magnets. The tactician, on the other hand, concentrates on a more constrained, specific, and typically geographical target that is tailored to the strategic plans. The tactician directs the conflict, and the operation in view, modifying the action, combining moves, and choosing when to use various combat modalities (Clausewitz, 1989, p.363).

It only takes time to distinguish between tactics and strategies. The short-term adaptation required by the changing situation is represented by tactics, whereas strategy seems to be tied to a long-term vision. This is consistent with Gréhaigne, Godbout, and Bouthier's (1999) assertion that "strategic decisions are connected with decisions based on reflections without time limits, while tactical decisions function under heavy time constraints" (p. 166).

In any game, players attempt to achieve their goals while adhering to the rules of the game. Over time, strategies and tactics have been developed to increase the likelihood of success in various situations. These tactics must be tailored based on a variety of factors, including environmental conditions as well as the relative strengths and weaknesses of performers and their opponents. In most situations, the performer has several options for actions. Some actions may be rehearsed, while others may be spontaneous. Different actions present different opportunities and risks, as well as different chances of success and failure. When deciding on an option, the degree of success and failure, as well as the probability of success and failure, must be considered. Decisions about strategy and tactics are mental processes that cannot be observed directly. Patterns of observed behavior can be used to draw conclusions about decisions made (Hibbs & O'Donoghue, 2013, p.248).

Cricket is a team sport that is one of the world's most difficult games, yet it does not even adhere to any clear reasons (Schneider & Popp, 2020). There are three recognized forms for the sport of cricket: Test matches, ODIs, and T20Is, with the possibility of an extra Ten10

(T10) format for the Olympic competition (Dobell, 2021). Five days make up a test match, and each day includes a break for lunch, tea, and beverages. T20 cricket typically lasts three hours, compared to six to eight hours for an ODI (International Cricket Council, 2019, November 19).

Cricket, like many other team sports, includes a variety of strategies and tactics used by the players. Cricket is a battle between the batting and fielding teams. Looking at the common tactical aspects in the game of cricket, the fielding side has more obvious options than the batting side, such as bodyline, bouncer, doosra, flipper, googly Mankad, and zooter, which are used by bowlers against the batters. Batters have tactics as well, but they are limited to reverse sweeps and switch hits. The tactics that fall within the rules are ‘mankading’ by the bowlers and ‘switch hit’ by the batters though these acts are under debate.

One of the tactics used by the cricketers is sledging. However, legitimacy of sledging has a big issue within itself because of its conceptual discrepancy (D.C. et al., 2021, p.1). “Aggressive behaviors and verbal interactions with the objective of disturbing concentration and changing the emotional states of opponents” is how sledging is defined (Davis et al., 2018, p.138). Sledging is used by cricketers to get a tactical advantage in the game (Davis et al., 2018, p.138). In other words, sledging is a verbal or non-verbal communication between players of the teams which is used on the playing field or maybe beyond by the players of the fielding side against the batters to get them out so that the fielding side can get a strategic advantage against the batting side. (Inter)National cricket governing bodies have been trying their best to limit the tactics that go beyond the rules. The record also shows that the number of unacceptable sledging as a tactic in the game has risen significantly (International Cricket Council, 2021). To address such an issue, umpires and broadcasters use cameras and stump microphones to monitor player conversations on the field to address unacceptable sledging. In many cases, players do not calculate the risks of such tactical moves and face sanctions from the governing bodies (Hibbs & O’Donoghue, 2013, p.251). Data has already shown that risky slurs directed at rivals, teammates, referees, or supporters accounted for more than 40% of all code of conduct violations in men’s cricket over the last five years (International Cricket Council, 2021, May 24), which illustrate the error in the mental process of formulating tactics during the play (Hibbs & O’Donoghue, 2013, p.251).

Strategies and Tactics in Gamesmanship

Gamesmanship is an artistic method of gaining a competitive advantage by manipulating the rules without breaking them or by distracting the opponent or officials from the game (Howe, 2004, p. 213). Gamesmanship, according to Potter (1964), is winning without cheating (p.2). Trash-talk or certain form of sledging, for example, can be considered an example of gamesmanship because it is used to distract the opponent from the game to gain a competitive advantage (Howe, 2004, p.213). If a team observes an opponent breaking a rule it is a form of cheating, even if it goes unnoticed (Howe, 2004, p.213). She further remarks that such an act is risky, but it is successful, which qualifies it as gamesmanship. It cannot be unfair if the players’ actions are within the rules. Moreover, she divides gamesmanship into two types: “weak” and “hard” gamesmanship. The weak form of gamesmanship encourages competition for mutual excellence in the spirit of sport, whereas the hard form does the opposite. As a result, the soft form of gamesmanship is acceptable because it invites both parties to participate fully, whereas

the hard form of gamesmanship is considered unacceptable because it impedes personal and athletic development in sports. Duncan (2018) examines sledging as a technique and tactic for winning because winning in the business of sport is everything, and sledging is considered fair to practice in the business modality (p.189).

Nevertheless, Leota and Turp (2020) take opposing positions on gamesmanship. They consider gamesmanship to be a “strategic excellence and proper part of sport “ (p.231) but Howe (2004) considers hard forms of gamesmanship to be against the excellence of sport if they violate the rule. They define “strategic excellence” as practices that “fall within the parameters of what is permissible in competitive sport” (p. 213). There are numerous reasons for saying this. Howe (2004) contends that gamesmanship impedes athletic excellence by allowing players to use non-prescribed skills, but Leota and Turp (2020) contend that there are no prescribed skills in sport, only prescribed goals to achieve (p.234). If the rules do not prescribe a skill to achieve that goal, it must fall under athletic excellence or within the rules. As a result, gamesmanship must be classified as “strategic excellence” (Leota & Turp, 2020, p. 235).

Sports Technology and Tactical Privacy

Sport technology is a tool created and used by people to accomplish sporting objectives and ideals. The introduction of technology into sports has transformed sporting goods, training aids, and biomedical technology, all of which have already threatened sporting fairness (Loland, 2007, p.275)). While officiating the games, the umpires use various technologies in need such as camera images, video replays, ball tracking technology, sound-based edge detection technology and stump microphone technology for the fair operation of the game (ICC, 2021, May 7, p.85). This technological support is provided by home-based broadcasters. It means the broadcasters also have access to the content such as images, videos and sounds created on and off the field, which is itself a threat to privacy.

In the 19th century, attorneys Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis took privacy for “being left alone” with the goal of preventing intrusion into family life. Legal scholar Ruth Gavison emphasized “restricted access to others” as her contribution, emphasizing secrecy, seclusion, and anonymity. Sociologist Alan Westin established “control over personal information” as a concept in the 20th century, at the dawn of the computer and information age. The term “privacy” is frequently employed by laypeople and attorneys to convey substantially broader connotations, even if being left alone, in control of information, and having limited access are all especially relevant to the pleasure of privacy (Allen, 2020).

A person’s “private life” is defined as “a state or condition of limited access,” and the government shouldn’t intrude on that (Beauchamp & Childress, 2009, p.303). According to Beauchamp and Childress (2009), people typically share their personal information in environments like hospitals where people provide medical staff access to their bodies and private data. However, they have distinguished between confidentiality and privacy. When private information is disclosed to a third party without the original party’s authorization, it is said to have violated confidentiality (p.303).

In sports, the use of umpiring technology to officiate the game is compelling but having access to home-based media and sharing it in the public domain is a completely different story, thus raising several ethical concerns. For example, athletes may automatically consent to officials regarding their on-field behaviors, which are monitored by umpiring technology, but sharing them as a “product” to different parties may violate the confidentiality of the original party (Beauchamp & Childress, 2009, p.303; SuperSport, 2019). Do the broadcasters use such content in an ethical manner? Are they concerned about the players’ tactical privacy if they follow the rules? What if explicit content is distributed to people of various ages and cultural backgrounds?

As a result, the ICC must exercise caution when it comes to publicizing on-field tactics along with “unacceptable” on-field communications in the name of “regulating” negative on-field behavior from players and support personnel, because it has already posed a multi-dimensional threat to the sports in general. If stump mics are used to set an example of how to act or not act on the field for lower-level cricket players, there may be other creative and inspiring methods to educate them. So, the scenario can be different if these elements are analyzed from the perspective of privacy and confidentiality evidently.

Case study

A number of cases in sports can be examined from the standpoint of athletes’ tactical and strategic privacy, which may be compromised by the governing body’s unthoughtful implementation of sports technology. However, this paper looks at a couple of case studies in which players used on-field tactics against a certain individual in a specific environment (Hibbs & O’Donoghue, 2013, p.248). While selecting the cases, this paper has considered both tactics that follow the rules of the game and risky tactics that force players to face negative consequences in addition to the sanctions.

Case I: Mohammad Rizwan (Pakistan) Vs Moeen Ali (England)

Background: Pakistan and England were playing a T20I in England in August 2020. England was batting whereas Pakistan was fielding. When Moen Ali from England was batting, England looked in a strong position. Mohammad Rizwan, the wicketkeeper of Pakistani side, started to apply various tactics including “chirping” behind the stumps to bother the batter on strike. “Since the wicketkeeper has the best seat in the box to judge the movement, pitch conditions, a batter’s strengths and weaknesses, a bowler’s mistakes and so on, he must think and act like a leader...he is the second most important person after the captain” (Chopra, 2010). When it comes to wicketkeeping in cricket, the teams strategically make the selection of the wicketkeepers since the selectors widely consider the tactical skills apart from cricketing skills (Brown, 2020). This clearly shows how important tactical wicketkeeping in cricket is.

From behind the stumps, Rizwan began chirping as soon as Tom Banton began destroying the Pakistani bowlers. Rizwan’s primary goal was to raise the spirits of his bowlers, and he was ultimately quite effective in doing so. He assisted spinners Imad Wasim and Shadab Khan with their deliveries. After Tom Banton left, Moeen Ali entered, and Mohammad Rizwan jokingly remarked, “*Ise khud out karna, ise Urdu samajh aati hai.*” It means Rizwan was directing his team in Urdu, but English batter Ali was familiar with the language. As a result, Rizwan

instructed his bowler to trust his instincts, and he was unable to express his strategy because the opposition understood their dialect (Saqib, 2020). Notably, Moeen Ali is of Pakistani heritage, and his grandfather immigrated to England two generations ago. The very next ball, Moeen Ali edged one to Rizwan, and in his second attempt, he made a really challenging catch. In order to accomplish the grab after fumbling the ball on his first attempt, Rizwan ultimately had to dive to his front. Even the pundits couldn't help but compliment the overly engaged wicketkeeper. The rain eventually forced the match to be called off, but Rizwan's efforts weren't ignored (India Today, 2020).

Discussion: A few things can be taken away from this incident. First, a player does not want to reveal his or her tactics to a third party because it may jeopardize the entire team's strategy. In this case, Rizwan appears to be aware of the importance of linguistic privacy in addition to tactical privacy, which he wishes to maintain even during the game. Making such tactical and linguistic privacy public in such circumstances may raise ethical concerns. Moreover, a person has a right to make informational and decisional privacy in his or her own (Allen, 1997, p.37). Second, making such on-field communication available to the wider community without the consent of the first party could be another ethical issue to consider from the standpoint of privacy, or it could be regarded as a violation of confidentiality (Beauchamp & Childress, 2009; Allen, 2020). Unfortunately, there is a lack of discussion on this subject. Without such debate, making such tactics public that falls within the rule may jeopardize the players' desire for privacy. If they want to protect their legitimate privacy in whatever way they want, it must be respected by not violating it in any way (Allen, 2020). The concerned stakeholders, such as the governing body and home-based media, may need to think about it before selling such incidents as 'a product' to a larger public through the media, which serves an unusual purpose in sports. In addition to this, sports consumers must be aware of or made aware of such phenomenon.

Case II: Michael Clarke (Australia) Vs James Anderson (England)

Background: This incident occurred during one of the finest test match battles between Australia and England. The first Ashes test match between Australia and England took place in Brisbane on November 24, 2013. James Anderson and Joe Root, two English batters, were on the field during the game's final moments. Australian fielder George Bailey spoke with English batter James Anderson in between overs. As he stood up for his colleague, Australian captain Michael Clarke uttered one of the most notorious lines in cricket history: "Get ready for a broken (expletive) arm." The verbal threat was followed by actions that were visible on the pitch, including the Australian captain handing the ball to Mitchell Johnson, one of the country's pace attackers, who appeared prepared to bowl to James Anderson. Meanwhile, James Anderson was seen pausing play to speak with his batting partner and umpires about the abusive language and physical threat he had received. He shook his head in dissatisfaction with what he had faced after speaking with his batting partner and the umpires before resuming play (Cricket Australia, 2014). The verbal intimidation was followed by the intent to physically harm (Cricket Australia, 2014), which is referred to as harmful aggression (Dyrel, 2008, p.245). The umpires had intervened on the field, and the Australian captain was later fined for his misconduct, which he accepted (ESPNCricinfo, 2013). All the parts of this event can be regarded as the concerned player's or players' tactics to win the game strategically.

Michael Clarke described that moment as “regrettable” in a follow-up interview for a couple of reasons. He expressed regret for ‘the way language was used’ and the bad example he set for “club cricketers,” or boys and girls who play lower levels of cricket (Cricket Australia, 2014), which had a negative impact on multiple participants on a broader level due to the environment in which it was shared (Haugh, 2016, p.122).

Discussion: This incident is an example of an illegitimate and a flaw in the processing of mental and physical tactics. This is one of the regretful incidents not only for Michael Clarke but also for the whole cricketing community because of several reasons. First, such incidents are beyond the rules of the games that do not adhere to the Code of Conduct (International Cricket Council, 2021, May 24). Second, it defames the sports itself which are against the “spirit of the game” (International Cricket Council, 2021, May 24). Thirdly, it hampers the dignity of those who are directly and indirectly involved in such incident (Cricket Australia, 2014). Fourthly, such type of explicit language is not suitable for the vulnerable or junior age groups who are prone to such languages (Cricket Australia, 2014).

Since the tactics are spontaneous and come within a certain environment of the game according to the situation. When it comes to spontaneity, it gets involved with the human factor first, and human acts are prone to errors, and it can even be worse during the heat of the game—especially among those who cannot handle the professional pressure of the game. When it is shared with third party through the media such as sports technology, it brings several ethical issues in layers such as privacy and responsible usage of sports technology. Rather than publicizing such acts among all the viewers, publishing judicial outcomes towards the conclusion of the incidents could be one of the ways to deal with such a situation because it may, at least, protect the dignity of the involved persons and avoid defamation of the game itself.

On-field tactics applied by the players can be either acceptable or unacceptable based on rules of the games, their usage, users, and the environment (Hibbs & O’Donoghue, 2013, p.248). Some games like cricket might have considered such factors in better ways than any other sports by formulating normative ethics such as the Code of Conduct and Anti-discrimination policies in 2019 and 2021 respectively. The tactics that are created instantly in certain environments to fit in an overall strategy of the game might not adhere to the rules and regulations of the games though the interpretations can exist because the point is that the tactics which are created, formulated, and implemented in on environment might have different meaning in different environments that includes third party from diverse backgrounds because while creating and implementing such tactics by the players might not be thought of wider audiences. For instance, such incidents might be regarded a mild or modest until and unless it brings ethical issues such as defaming the players and games, which is against the “spirit of the game” (International Cricket Council, 2021, November 19). If there is culturally explicit content or content that hampers the dignity of the player, that is also not healthy for any stakeholders.

While the ICC’s approach to overseeing players’ communication via stump mics is understandable, allowing home broadcasters to broadcast such communications is not in many ways justified because it may invite a conflict of interest. Michael Holding, a retired cricketer,

claims that on-field verbal communication (sledging) has been traded as a “product” by using stump mics (SuperSport, 2019). Audiences are always interested in sledging that is backed up by rivalries. First, Holding’s argument cautions against commercializing sledging. Second, how would it affect the vulnerable group if “abusive” communications or on-field “obscenities” were consumed? Third, some cricketers have expressed concern about the risk of home boards or broadcasters manipulating on-field verbal exchanges by broadcasting selective portions of on-field communication (Bal, 2019). Fourth, when such “illicit” content is made public, they automatically defame the game, which is contrary to “The Spirit of Cricket” (International Cricket Council, 2021, May 24). However, the ICC has defended its position by claiming that its actions are intended to curb on-field abusive verbal exchanges between players and to involve fans in the activities that take place in the middle of the playground.

Patterns of the such type observed behavior can be used to draw conclusions about the decisions made regarding the strategy and tactics because this mental process is not visible directly. The above-mentioned case is an example of a flawed mental process because the strategist failed to consider “a remarkable trinity” of physical, mental, and moral considerations (Clausewitz, 1989).

Conclusion

To summarize, this paper has covered several practical concepts such as tactics, strategy, gamesmanship, sports technology, and privacy. Following this, there is no doubt that players employ strategies and tactics in various game environments aimed at their opponents. The question remains whether such on-field instant tactics should be shared with third parties or beyond using sports technology without the consent of the original creators. Should tactics that go beyond the game’s rules and regulations be kept within the prosecution environment or brought into the public domain for public prosecution? If such illegal tactics are used to set a good example of how not to behave in the sporting arena, the shared domain must be cautious in terms of vulnerable consumers if the content is anti-social. Furthermore, such publications should not defame the sport in any way because it goes against the spirit of the game (International Cricket Council, 2021, May 7). In terms of cricket, media, commentators, umpires, and (inter)national cricket governing bodies must address these issues collectively.

The fact that this study only took cricket into consideration as a sport is a limitation. Due to the accessibility of the comprehensive information that was examined in this research, only a small number of examples from an international cricket match were taken into consideration. Despite these limitations, it may still be able to utilize the study’s conclusions to guide discussions and debates concerning the use of umpiring technology and its likely effects on tactical and strategic privacy in sports more generally. Additionally, a limited number of cases can still be thoroughly examined to gain important insights that could be applied to future research on the subject.

In today’s sports, winning is associated with materialistic gain, so sports have been operating under a “business model” (Duncan, 2018, p.189). In this scenario, everything, including tactics, can be sold as a product, or tactical analysis before the game with the help of sports technology has become an important part of any sport in the world to win a game

(Goes et al., 2021, p.483). Meanwhile, players and coaches are aware of such scenarios and attempt to avoid any situation in which they may reveal their team's tactical and strategic privacy, which is critical in modern sports. However, to what extent maintaining strategic and tactical privacy may affect other sports-related factors like fairness, well-being, autonomy, security, and accountability may require additional investigation. In other words, the study of a taxonomy of umpiring technology in sports can be an approach to understanding the overall implications of sports technology. In this context, the sport's governing bodies must start a conversation about the responsible use of sports technology, as well as the protection of tactical and strategic privacy of teams as needed.

References

- Allen, A.L. (1997). Genetic Privacy: Emerging Concepts and Values. In M.A. Rothstein (Ed.), *Genetic Secrets: Protecting Privacy and Confidentiality in the Genetic Era*. New Haven, C.T. Yale University Press.
- Allen, A. (2020). What Is Privacy? *GP Solo*, 37(5). American Bar Association. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A644684562/AONE?u=ussd&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=b29a413d>
- Bal, S. (2021, April 16). Why we're replacing 'batsman' with 'batter.' *ESPNCricinfo*. <https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/sambit-bal-why-we-are-replacing-batsman-with-batter-1259243>
- Beauchamp, T.L. & Childress, J.F. (2009). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, Oxford University Press.
- Brown, A. (Director). (2020). *The Test: A New Era for Australia's Team* [Film]. Amazon Studios.
- Chopra, A. (2010, September 23). The second-most important man in the side. *ESPNCricinfo*. <https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/aakash-chopra-on-wicketkeeping-478286>
- Clausewitz, C. von. (1989). *On War* (P. Paret, Ed. & Trans.). Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691018546/on-war>
- Cricket Australia. (2014, May 21). Clarke opens up on 'infamous' sledge [Video]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iKFPhngOe2s>
- Davis, P.A., Davis, L., Wills, S., Appleby, R., & Nieuwenhuys, A. (2018). Exploring 'Sledging' and interpersonal emotion-regulation strategies in professional cricket. *The Sport Psychologist*, 32(2).
- D.C., S., McNamee, M., & Parry, J. (2021). *Sledging: an ethical issue in sport*. KU Leuven. Faculteit Bewegings- en Revalidatiewetenschappen.
- Dobell, G. (2021, May 14). ICC consider expanding T20 World Cup to 20 teams. *ESPNCricinfo*. <https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/icc-consider-expanding-t20-world-cup-to-20-teams-1263075>

- Duncan, S. K. (2018). The Business of Sport, Sledging and the Corruption of Play – an Interpretation through a Huizingian-Bourdieu Lens. *Physical Culture and Sport Studies and Research*, 80(1).
- Dynel, M. (2008). No aggression, only teasing: The pragmatics of teasing and banter. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 4, 241–261. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10016-008-0001-7>.
- ESPNCricinfo. (2013, November 25). *Clarke fined by ICC over Anderson sledge*. <https://www.espncricinfo.com/story/clarke-fined-by-icc-over-anderson-sledge-692367>
- Goes, F. R., Meerhoff, L. A., Bueno, M. J. O., Rodrigues, D. M., Moura, F. A., Brink, M. S., Elferink-Gemser, M. T., Knobbe, A. J., Cunha, S. A., Torres, R. S., & Lemmink, K. A. P. M. (2021). Unlocking the potential of big data to support tactical performance analysis in professional soccer: A systematic review. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 21(4), 481–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2020.1747552>
- Gréhaigne, J., Godbout, P., & Bouthier, D. (1999). The Foundations of Tactics and Strategy in Team Sports. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 18(2).
- Haugh, M. (2016). ‘Just kidding’: Teasing and claims to non-serious intent. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 95.
- Hibbs, A. & O’Donoghue, P. (2013). Strategy and Tactics in Sports Performance . In T. McGarry, P. O’Donoghue, & J. Sampaio (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sports Performance Analysis*. Routledge. <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9780203806913.ch20>
- Howe, L. A. (2004). Gamesmanship. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 31(2).
- India Today. (2020, August 29). ‘*Ise khud out karna, ise Urdu samajh aati hai*’: Mohammad Rizwan to Shadab Khan while Moeen Ali bats. <https://bit.ly/3NILujp>
- International Cricket Council. (2019, August 1). *Anti-Discrimination Code for Participants*. <https://icc-static-files.s3.amazonaws.com/ICC/document/2019/08/08/f6da6f34-cdc1-454c-88f3-d5d6588c0f6c/ICC-Anti-Discrimination-Code-for-Participants-FV-Effective-1-Aug-2019.pdf>
- International Cricket Council. (2019, November 19). *The Three Formats of Cricket*. <https://www.icc-cricket.com/about/cricket/game-formats/the-three-formats>
- International Cricket Council. (2021, May 7). *ICC Men’s Twenty20 Internationals playing conditions*. <https://resources.pulse.icc-cricket.com/ICC/document/2021/07/05/874a426e-fe06-4415-b0f5-5148a4aa0ef8/ICC-Playing-Conditions-05-Men-s-Twenty20-International-May-2021.pdf>
- International Cricket Council. (2021, May 24). *ICC Code of Conduct Breaches and Penalties*. <https://www.icc-cricket.com/about/cricket/rules-and-regulations/code-of-conduct#:~:text=The%20ICC%20Code%20of%20Conduct,the%20’spirit%20of%20cricket’%3B>

- Leota, J., & Turp, M. (2020). Gamesmanship as strategic excellence. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 47(2), 232-247.
- Lord, R. (2014). Does the Cricket Sledging Have to Stop?; Recent Action by cricket bosses is laudable, but players still need a chance to let off steam. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Loland, S. (2007). Ethics of Technology in Sport. In W. J. Morgan (Ed.), *Ethics in Sport* (pp. 273-286). Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics.
- Potter, S. (1964). *The theory and practice of gamesmanship, or The art of winning games without actually cheating* (Repr. Ed., Penguin books 1826). Penguin Books.
- Saqib, A. [@AnubakarSaqib3]. (2020, August 29). *Mohammad Rizwan to Shadab Khan when Moeen Ali was batting 'isko yeh khud hi karna, isko Urdu samajh aati hai'* (think for yourself what to bowl, I won't tell you, as he understands Urdu) #ENGvPAK [Tweet]. *Twitter*. <https://bit.ly/3DC1afc>
- Schneider, M. (Producer) & Popp, C. (Director). (2020, April 17). Explained | Cricket [Video]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NZGLHdcw2RM>. SuperSport. (2019, January 10). Crossing the Line [Video]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MKcvHAec6GM>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research* (3rd ed.). Sage.