Heaney, Dermot

**The construction and collapse of clean cycling discourse : the case of Sir David Brailsford**

*Brno studies in English.* 2023, vol. 49, iss. 2, pp. 31-55

ISSN 0524-6881 (print); ISSN 1805-0867 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2023-2-2
Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.79903

# The Construction and Collapse of Clean Cycling Discourse: The Case of Sir David Brailsford

*Brno Studies in English*
Volume 49, No. 2, 2023

ISSN 0524-6881 | e-ISSN 1805-0867
https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2023-2-2

**Dermot Heaney**

**Abstract**
When Team Sky emerged on the world cycling scene, it proclaimed itself a crusader for clean competition. Team manager David Brailsford was the embodiment of this new ethos, which rested on two concepts: the CORE Principle and the Marginal Gains Theory. However, in 2016 allegations of rule bending in Team Sky emerged in the press and Brailsford was called to testify before a Parliamentary Committee on doping in sport. It was widely agreed that his testimony undermined the 'clean cycling' image constructed during his management.

This paper offers a comparative, qualitative discourse analysis of an interview with Brailsford from the heyday of his 'clean discourse' and his testimony before the Committee. From the perspective of Jørgensen and Isaksson's Ethos model, a CADS approach is followed involving Hallidayan transitivity analysis to understand, first, how Brailsford's clean discourse ethos was constructed, second, why it failed him during his witness session, and how he tried to mitigate this by foregrounding alternative ethos qualities in his statements to the Committee.

**Key words**
*David Brailsford; clean cycling discourse; doping; Ethos model, transitivity*

> "Brailsford was allowed to become the guru of British sport, the sage of sages, the coach whisperer. He knows, you know."
> (Martin Samuel 2018)

## 1. Introduction

Doping in sport is framed as an ethical issue. Those who are against it typically invoke the concept of the level playing field of fair competition for all, the uplifting integrity of non-assisted performance, as well as the need to safeguard athletes from the effects of using banned substances unsupervised. The counterargument, albeit a minority one, also claims an ethical basis and runs that supervised doping would offer far greater health protections to athletes and avoid the abuses of individual privacy and freedoms entailed in the current anti-doping regimes. No matter which side of the debate they are used to support, these views are normally espoused by academics (see Kayser et al. 2007), spokespeople for sporting institutions, politicians

and, by extension, the media. The practitioners of sport, on the whole, behave as though this debate were not raging, tacitly advancing the default assumption that sport is clean and that the performances they turn in or oversee are untainted by suspicion. Of no sport has this been more true than of cycling, where the practice of *omerta*, or code of silence, has prevailed through doping scandal after doping scandal. Sir David Brailsford emerged as an unusual figure in this milieu, principally because he promised, rather vocally, a radically new stance on doping in a sport so frequently associated with it. In addition, he elaborated a 'theory' or 'philosophy' of ethical sports preparation and enthusiastically explained how it would obviate the need for performance enhancement itself.

Holt (2017) identifies the central role of language in Brailsford's zero-tolerance initiative and, although he does not express it in such terms, it is interesting that the qualities he most closely associates with Brailsford's clean cycling discourse are very close to the Aristotelian rhetorical proofs of ethos and logos, the language of which features prominently in a theory that became known as "Marginal Gains". This creed, or 'philosophy' for improving sporting performance was developed and promulgated by Brailsford during his tenure as head of British Cycling and referred to by him to explain the phenomenal success enjoyed by the British Cycling team at Olympic Games and world championships:

> It's something that I came up with a few years ago erm in order to try and describe what was then more of a philosophy than an actual tangible it's this, this, this, and this. And basically the idea was pretty simple. It struck me in all of the work that we were doing trying to improve cycling performances that actually if you stripped back everything that you could think of and improve each one by a small percentage, a marginal percentage, marginal amount, then when you clump it all together, you get this big improvement. (Canty 2015)

Even a cursory glance reveals a concentration of the language of thought and analysis: the verbs 'to come up with', 'it struck me', 'think'; nouns like, 'idea', 'philosophy', and structures commonly used to express logical conclusions, e.g., 'if... then'. This appearance of logical reasoning is complemented by a more declaredly ethical stance in another important element of his emerging clean discourse, the so-called CORE principle, described by Brailsford as follows:

> So I think if you take those four elements: commitment combined with ownership; on top of that you understand and make very clear the responsibility and accountability role that then leads to excellence. And, in fact, it's personal excellence we're talking about. It's not necessarily on the world stage, it's the best that you can be; it's the best that somebody else can possibly be; the best that they can work towards; an excellence for themselves. (Canty 2015)

The assumption of an ethical stance is apparent in the list of abstract virtues that make up the Core Principle: 'commitment', 'ownership', 'responsibility' and 'excellence'; while the notion of personal excellence frames athletic prowess as

an ethical achievement. What is more, the word 'principle' not only has ethical connotations but also strong associations of logic.

However, despite the persuasiveness of this version of ethos, which was enthusiastically greeted by the press and the public at large, it was widely felt that when Brailsford appeared as a witness before the Parliamentary Select Committee hearings about alleged doping irregularities in Team Sky, his answers lacked credibility. At the end of the Select Committee sessions (House of Commons 2018: 32), Brailsford and the Team Sky management were criticized for a lack of awareness and knowledge about what was happening within their organisation:

> Team Sky's statements that coaches and team managers are largely unaware of the methods used by medical staff to prepare pro-cyclists for major races seem incredible, and inconsistent with their original aim of "winning clean", and maintaining the highest ethical standards within their sport. How can David Brailsford ensure that his team is performing to his requirements, *if he does not know and cannot tell* (author's emphasis added), what drugs the doctors are giving to his athletes.

In this paper I pose the following questions: firstly, given the importance of language in the presentation of an ethical identity, what linguistic strategies helped Brailsford achieve that impression pre-2016?; secondly, what were the specific linguistic reasons underlying the loss of credibility in the course of his witness session before the Parliamentary Select committee?, thirdly which alternative "ethos qualities" does Brailsford foreground to repair the damage he sustains in his encounter with the committee?

Given Brailsford's insistence on an ethical approach grounded in logic and analysis, the classical tripartite Aristotelian division of rhetorical proofs (ethos, logos, pathos) might, at first sight, seem the most obvious parameters for gauging how he constructs 'his clean cycling discourse'. However, in the interactions examined here, Brailsford is not really indulging in full argument (logos) nor does he work to an inportant degreee on emotions and feelings (pathos). Jørgensen and Isaksson's (2010: 526) extension of Aristotelian rhetoric to what they call the Ethos Model proposes that credibility, particularly in the corporate sphere, is achieved through three "ethos qualities": "expertise, trustworthiness, and empathy". All of these qualities can be presented in various linguistic forms that lie outside conventional rhetorical language and, therefore, they are the terms I have chosen to use to define Brailsford's clean cycling discourse at crucial junctures of his career.

The back ground (§2) provides a detailed description of the events leading up to the witness session in which Brailsford appeared before the Parliamentary Select Committee. In the data and method section (§3), the selected data is introduced and the choice justified. I also outline the combination of analytical tools underlying my Critical Discourse Analysis approach. As I compare two quite lengthy texts, I use corpus interrogation techniques, particularly keyword analysis, to throw into relief significant lexical and collocational differences in them (§3.3). In the contrastive analysis of keywords, Halliday's transitivity system is also

drawn on (§3.4), as it offered a fruitful perspective for interpreting the results generated by the keyword searches. Referring to Jørgensen and Isaksson's Ethos Model (§3.2), the analysis section (§4) shows how key language used by Brailsford during a podcast interview for the Sport section of an important British online paper is largely indicative of the ethos value of 'expertise'. Secondly, it shows how the collapse of this discourse under close questioning from the members of the parliamentary select committee derives largely from a decrease in the language expressive of expertise, with a consequent loss of credibility. Discussion (§4.5) of these findings reflects on the need to take into consideration the different contexts of these interactions, when coming to conclusions about the reasons why Brailsford lost so much credibility on this occasion. It is also noted that Brailsford exploits the scope allowed him in his answers to compensate for the loss of knowledge-based ethos by shifting to the quality of empathy and attempting to bolster the qualities of 'trustworthiness' (Jørgensen and Isaksson 2010: 526) and concern for the welfare of athletes and fellow professionals on the team.

## 2. Background

Since the last decade of the twentieth-century the sport of cycling has struggled with issues of credibility, particularly in the wake of doping scandals like the Festina affair in 1998 and revelations in 2012 of the systematic doping practiced by Lance Armstrong. The appointment of David Brailsford as the manager of Team Sky in 2010 was styled by the team as a turning point for the sport. This was in large measure due to Brailsford's public insistence on zero tolerance of doping within the organisation and his argument that cycling races could be won without recourse to performance enhancement. Such claims were widely and regularly reiterated and reported across the spectrum of the British national press and specialist journals (see, for example, Benson 2012; Kimmage 2012; Moore 2012; Slater 2012), presenting Brailsford and Team Sky as a clean racing crusaders and raising expectations among the significant number of journalists and fans who had become disillusioned with the sport (see, for example, Griffiths 2012). In Holt's (2017) interpretation, Brailsford emerged as a siren voice within the world of cycling. He refers to Brailsford's zero tolerance message as an "angelic voice crying out in the wilderness" and describes how this policy was based on being "smarter than smart". This ethos of winning clean, grounded on a logical approach, was developed in his time as head coach at British Cycling. It was encapsulated by two concepts that Brailsford elevated to the status of philosophies. The first of these, developed during his stewardship of British Cycling, was 'marginal gains', described by Brailsford as follows: "if you stripped back everything that you could think of and improve each one by a small percentage, a marginal percentage, marginal amount, then when you clump it all together, you get this big improvement" (Canty 2015); the second was the CORE principle, an acronym he glosses as follows: "if you take those four elements commitment combined with ownership; on top of that you understand and make very clear the responsibility and accountability role that then leads to excellence" (Canty 2015).

So influential did these two 'philosophies' become, that they gained credence far beyond the world of sport, particularly in the business consultancy communities (see, for example, Wick 2019; Brooks 2016) but even in lifestyle and health contexts (see, for example, BBC 2015; Ashford and St. Peter's Hospitals 2015), while Brailsford himself became a much sought after and well paid motivational and teamwork speaker in such contexts.

Thus, by the time Brailsford had taken charge at Team Sky he had achieved almost guru-like status (Samuel 2018), accounting for his sporting success as the application of rationality and advanced perspicuity, leading to an ethical achievement or, as we might say in broad Aristotelian terms, ethos attained through logos.

This remained the dominant narrative (both within Sky and the Press) until 2016, when *The Daily Mail* (Lawton 2016) ran a story alleging undue exploitation of TUEs (Therapeutic Use Exemptions) for administration of the powerful drug triamcinolone. UKAD (2018), The UK Anti-doping Agency, describes TUEs as documents that "enable athletes to obtain authorization to use a prescribed prohibited substance or method for the treatment of a legitimate medical condition". However, the system is open to abuse. Some medicines, when not used to treat a genuine condition, can deliver performance enhancement, which is why they appear on the WADA (2018) banned substances list. This is particularly true of a group of drugs used widely in professional cycling to treat asthma or allergy problems. Corticosteroids like triamcinolone, for example, aid weight loss with no reduction in muscle power (see House of Commons 2018: 47), which delivers a considerable advantage in races (see also House of Commons 2018: 19–22). According to Matt Lawton (2016), records leaked by the Russian Fancy Bears hackers showed that Team Sky rider Bradley Wiggins had applied for TUEs for triamcinolone before his previous three Grand Tour appearances, also before the 2012 *Tour de France*, which he won.

Speculation about Team Sky's clean credentials was further fuelled by Matt Lawton's (2016) revelation of possible rule bending by Team Sky and Bradley Wiggins at the close of the 2011 Criterium du Dauphiné. According to an anonymous source within Team Sky, at the end of the race in La Toussuir, Dr Richard Freeman, the team doctor, took delivery of a "mystery package", the contents of which were then allegedly administered to the cyclist, even though no TUE had been granted.

It was not long before UKAD launched an investigation and, given the profile of the scandal, it was inevitable that Brailsford be called as a witness before the Select Parliamentary Committee on combatting doping in sport where, in the view of the committee itself (and the press), Brailsford's testimony did little to dispel the suspicion that his zero tolerance policy was at best undermined by internal incompetence, at odds with the narrative of performance gains based on logic and analysis, and at worst a hypocritical sham involving rule bending and warranting Brailsford's resignation (see Fotheringham 2017; Houses of Commons 2018: 26-27; Holt 2017; MacMichael 2017).

## 3. Data and Method

Both of these texts have been chosen as they represent the kinds of interaction most associated with Brailsford in the media and the public eye during defining phases in the trajectory of his career. The first data set is comprised of the transcript of a lengthy interview with the Team Sky manager on the online *Daily Telegraph's* cycling (2014) podcast (6,685 words) on the eve of the Tour of France. This was selected because it is taken from the heyday of Brailsford's success, when his clean cycling discourse was at its most influential and uncontested. This text is then compared with the transcript (11,329 words) of his examination by the Parliamentary Select Committee (House of Commons 2016). The former is a typical example of the interviews frequently given by Brailsford, both in media contexts and business forums, in the period leading up to 2016, when the Jiffy bag story broke; the latter is his key public interaction in the wake of the scandal. Furthermore, the analysis compares two oral texts, in which Brailsford is asked questions (by multiple interlocutors) and answers them at some length, albeit in different contexts. Despite these differences, in both interactions Brailsford is allowed to answer questions at length and offer his own interpretation, opinions and arguments; while the Committee are less passive listeners than the radio journalists, its members do not harry him or subject his answers to the kind of scrutiny reserved for witnesses in trials in an adversarial judicial system like that in the UK.

### *3.1 Analytical orientation and relevant tools*

Ethos is intrinsically bound with how listeners can be persuaded about the worthiness of an individual's identity. McGannon (2016: 230) describes how linguistic analysis can concern itself with the way certain identities are constructed within the world of sport, particularly gender identities, entailing issues of power and status. She (2016: 232) further suggests that the issue of identity is central to sport and that "self-identity is a discursive accomplishment because it is in discourse that people acquire the resources with which to render their sense of self visible, understood and 'real'". This observation also offers a fruitful analytical perspective on the figure of Brailsford, much of whose discourse was intended to construct an ethical identity for himself and his team as champions, if not paragons, of a zero-tolerance stance on doping.

Concerned as it is with the discursive construction of identity and related issues of power and influence, the present analysis inevitably takes on a more critical orientation, reflecting Fairclough's (1992: 12) conviction that "critical approaches differ from non-critical approaches in not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities". As McGannon (2016: 233) puts it, "to be more critical, those discourses would be explored in terms of what discourse 'does' or can do (i.e., the performative implications of talk and discourse within the context of power issues)". In pursuit of these ends it is orthodox for critical discourse analysts to adopt multiple analyt-

ical perspectives. The analysis presented here draws on a set of complementary analytical approaches that are outlined in the following sections

### *3.2 The Ethos Model*

Reference to Aristotelian rhetoric and the three persuasive components of "logos (the nature of the subject-matter presented by the speaker to the audience), pathos (the emotions of the audience) and ethos (the speaker's character and qualities)" (Jørgensen and Isaksson 2010: 515) is inevitable given the role logic and analysis purport to play in Brailsford's clean cycling discourse. However, Jørgensen and Isaksson (2010: 526) have distilled the Aristotelian proofs into an Ethos Model which they believe is more suited to assessing communication in the corporate sphere, of which Team Sky is undeniably a part. The model rests on three "ethos qualities "labelled as expertise, trustworthiness, and empathy". In their view, each "ethos quality", then, prescribes a particular rhetorical strategy that, in turn, allows the rhetor a selection of different "credibility appeals" (2010: 526). These various appeals are glossed as follows:

> Expertise requires the rhetor to self-promote, which can be done by exhibiting the collective outlook and insights of the organization, by highlighting the competences, skills and abilities of its employees, by taking credit for particular achievements in the past, or by displaying the size and accessibility of its facilities or staff. Trustworthiness instructs the rhetor to self-characterize by emphasizing the organization's high standards of integrity and truthfulness or by applauding the professional courage and passion of organizational members. Empathy signifies an organizational selflessness requiring the rhetor to self-sacrifice by providing assurance of the organization's concern for the welfare and comfort of its stakeholders.

By referring to their model, this study highlights key linguistic strategies used by Sir David Brailsford to present Team Sky as a credible alternative to the tainted ethos of elite cycling, but also to provide a set of appropriate terms to describe how this discourse lost credibility during his appearance as a witness at the Select Committee hearings into doping within British sport. This brings us to the methods of linguistic analysis used within this credibility perspective.

### *3.3 Corpus assisted discourse analysis*

The attempt to place Brailsford's linguistic performances within the Ethos Model described above is carried out by combining elements of corpus linguistics with the techniques of close and qualitative discourse analysis. Partington and Zuccato (2018: 120) term this approach Corpus-assisted Discourse Studies (CADS). It is claimed that its advantages include "the uncovering, in the discourse type under study, of what we might call non-obvious meaning". The concordance software tools used to do this ensure that the analyst does not overlook or underestimate the importance of certain function words or core lexis that can seem opaque

and go unappreciated in a traditional unassisted qualitative appraisal, whereas the software often reveals significant patterns and occurrences at this level of the language.

The Antconc concordance software used in this study features a number of tools for interrogating a corpus. For this analysis the following have been used: (a) concordances, which show patterns of significant lexical co-occurrence, i.e., that is the tendency of certain words to repeatedly appear together with other words; (b) key words, which compares one corpus with another reference corpus in order to understand which words occur statistically more in one corpus compared with another. This tool shows words that are "outstandingly frequent in terms of a reference corpus" (Scott and Tribble 2006: 59) and provides indications concerning the "aboutness" of a corpus (2006: 58). As the data comprises two corpora, each one served as a control corpus for the other and the information from the Keyword tool was the principal tool used for analysis, which was complemented by the concordance tool. Canonical opinion as to the ideal characteristics of a reference corpus has yet to emerge. This choice was made bearing in mind Scott's (2009) opinion that genre is an alternative criterion for the selection of a reference corpus. Despite their generic differences, both texts still shared important similarities: they share subject matter or 'aboutness', they are oral interactions, with multiple interlocutors, based on a question-answer format, in which the interviewee/witness is afforded ample space to answer. As such, using each as a control corpus, was thought likely to reduce the production of superfluous or predictable key words of the kind generated by a more general corpus or one of a completely different genre.

### *3.4 Transitivity analysis*

The significant data produced by concordance software can feature function words or core vocabulary that may, at first sight, appear to offer neither particularly significant nor interesting meanings. One way to recognize the noteworthiness of such outputs is to examine them within framework of Halliday's Functional Grammar (Halliday 1985), which views languages as a system of meanings, in which "when people use language their language acts produce, or more technically construct meaning" and "meanings are built up through the choice of words or other grammatical resources such as singular or plural negative or positive and other linguistic forms such as tone or emphasis" (Bloor and Bloor 2004: 2). That is to say, meaning is constructed by grammatical choices as much as by lexical ones. Proponents of systemic functional grammar consider it "a very useful and descriptive framework for viewing language as a strategic, meaning-making tool" (Eggins 2004: 2). As Eggins (2004: 20) points out, "If language is a semiotic system, then the process of language use is a process of making meanings by choosing". In this study, therefore, besides lexis, attention is also focused on the grammatical structures those lexical choices occur in, as these can reveal the semantic and syntactical building blocks of Brailsford's 'cleanspeak'.

The aspect of Functional Grammar that is central to this analysis of the corpus outputs is the Hallidayan concept of transitivity, which entails viewing the tradi-

tional components of a clause (subject, verb, object) in terms of participants and processes (de B. Clark 2006: 70). There are three major processes in this system: material, mental and relational processes, all expressed by verbs. A verb may express a material process, that is a process of 'doing', or some physical action going on in the external world; mental processes indicate that something is taking place in the sphere of the mind, while relational processes are a process of 'being' and are concerned with the relationship established between two things or concepts (see Koosha and Shams 2005: 118–119). In this system, the traditional subject and object are recast as participants and these change their identity depending on the process involved. As Koosha and Shams (2005: 122) state, "the presence or absence or high/low frequency of these processes and/or participants may have different implications". The present study attempts to show how the construction and loss of credibility occurs also at this level of language use and how this makes it possible to explain more accurately how Brailsford's linguistic performance at the Select Committee hearing was at odds with the dominant ethos qualities underpinning his 'cleanspeak' in the years running up to it.

## 4. Analysis and Discussion

### *4.1 Interview in the online Telegraph Cycling Podcast*[1]

The first one hundred keywords expectedly feature proper names of Team Sky members (e.g., Chris, Froome, Gerraint) and references to aspects of the race (e.g., tour, yellow, jersey, climbing, cobbles, win, teams, ridden, rode, race, stage, defend). Also prominent are lexical items determined by the interview format and characteristics of the spoken medium, such as mention of participants (you), contractions ('ve, 'll), fillers (erm, eh, ehm) and informal register (yeah, ok, etc). Besides these outputs, the high keyness of mental processes is noticeable: 'know', 'knows' 'think', and also material/behavioural processes which are quasi-mental processes, because they are commonly used to express perception and analysis, i.e. 'look' and 'talk'.

### *4.2 Mental processes*

The mental process 'know' is a very key word (ranked 4 with 113 occurrences). However, a distinction has to be made between 'know' used as a discourse marker or as an unambiguous mental process. In over a hundred instances it is part of the discourse marker 'you know' (which also explains the high keyness of 'you'). The frequency of 'you know' is explained by the fact that this is a more informal oral interaction, so it functions as a way of confirming understanding and also, possibly, as a discursive means of securing the agreement and acquiescence of the listeners. Nevertheless, where it does not occur as a discourse marker, the verb is used emphatically, as in the following example.

1 The keyword list is provided in the appendix.

(1) ... I know for a fact that Steve Peters who's actually sits on the TUE commission in the UK is one of the guys who actually you know so he's not this isn't just some some guy who randomly is commenting about TUEs this is a this I a you know a guy who's very experienced and knowledgeable and trusted by his peers and within the community erm or that community about erm about his ethics and doing the right thing

'Knows' (71, 4 occurrences) on the other hand, refers to the Team Sky rider Kyrienka who "knows when to go hard, knows when to back off a bit", which stresses the expertise of the rider.

'Think' ranks 13 in terms of keyness, with 78 occurrences, 59 of which collocate with 'I'. With very few exceptions, this is used by Brailsford with the illocutionary force of 'delivering a considered opinion or assessment', rather than that of expressing uncertainty or for hedging. For example, when asked about team selection for the forthcoming Tour de France, the mental process 'think' is supported by much vocabulary that falls within the semantic field of expertise:

(2) It is a challenge because I think you have is a very logical very clinical what would it take to win process and you take the emotion out of it and then you have an emotional component which you know we all feel and we have certain favourites certain people that we like we'd like to see these people in we'd like to see that player in or whatever it may be but I think my job has been to sit an look at this from a logical point of view...

'Look' (ranked 87 in terms of keyness with 17 occurrences), also present in example 2, is chiefly meant as 'analyse', therefore as a mental process with intellective meaning, as in the following example, in which the element of expertise is extended by accompanying lexis closely associated with calculation and assessment:

(3) you look at evidence and a lot of the decisions we take are to make evidence-based decisions. If we look at the probability to see who is most likely to win the tour of France, we would say that the person with the most probability or the most probable chance of of competing and winning will be Chris Froome.

The verbal process 'talk' is also ranked very high (29 with thirteen occurrences), 12 of them uttered by Brailsford. This is preponderantly deployed to describe a stage in a learning and understanding process:

(4) ....they're the sort of, you know, little margins that your kind of playing with but you gotta, eh ultimately, you get to a certain point in time you then take what you've seen, you talk to 'em, you use your ears , you talk, you listen, you talk to the coaches, you talk to er the riders and then you use numbers and you look at evidence and a lot of the decisions we take are to make evidence-based decisions.

In this case, a lexical cluster associated with enhanced perception combines with vocabulary like 'evidence' and 'numbers', which are associated with logic. Alternatively, 'talk' is used to underline the importance of a process based on reciprocal understanding, communication, and cohesion , as in:

(5) we put so much emphasis on team and we talk about team all the time.

The verb 'take' (ranked 56 in terms of keyness with 16 occurrences) also rendered significant results. If instances of the straightforward material process meaning, of which there are just three, are excluded, it is used in a significant proportion of cases in a way that is close to mental processes like 'analyse', 'recognise' and 'understand', 'discount':

(6) And so erm my role is to sit down and and you know as I've got all I'd like to think that you look at the information in front of you you look at all the cards that are dealt to you and you take that you take the data and you take everything else and then you try and apply what you've got in front of you, the facts and you add a little bit of wisdom and off you go. And and that's what I try and do.

Here it occurs in the same segment of text as 'look'. The contribution of that verb to establishing the ethical element of expertise has been discussed in example 3. In example 7 the mental process is not only accentuated by combining with the verb 'look' pattern but also by the presence of lexical cohesion like 'facts', 'data', and 'wisdom', strongly connotative of expertise. Moreover, 'take' is also used in collocations like 'what it would take', which form the object phrase or (phenomenon) of mental processes like 'know':

(7) We've set out you know what, twelve-fifteen years ago, with the aim of trying to win, what would it take to win? And that's been the priority, when we start; and then you start to work backwards from that in terms of what do well you analyse the demands and then you figure out what what kind of team you need to try and win and you work back from there .

It is of note that the relatively highly ranked 'take' occurs in a segment of Brailsford's discourse that is also rich in lexis from the semantic fields of analysis and understanding: 'analyse' and 'figure out', while 'work' is synonymous with the mental process calculate in this example. It hardly seems a coincidence that when Brailsford incorporates 'take' into the noun phrase "a very logical what would it take to win process", he includes familiar lexis and expressions from the semantic field of logic and quasi-scientific analysis ('clinical', 'logical', 'take the emotion out of it', 'sit and look', 'logical point of view', 'single lens'):

(8) It is a challenge because I think you have is a very logical very clinical what would it take to win process and you take the emotion out of it and then you have an emotional component which you know we all feel and we have

> certain favourites certain people that we like we'd like to see these people in we'd like to see that player in or whatever it may be but I think my job has been to sit an look at this from a logical point of view and and the single lens that I use is to try and address these issues is winning, winning erm and sometimes it leads to some difficult choices.

Moving beyond the language closely associated with key mental processes, the presence of 'so' in such a key position (30 with 45 instances) also warrants comment. Apart from a few instances of substitution and intensification, 'so' is overwhelmingly used as a causative conjunction (often collocating with 'if' and 'then'), explaining or illustrating how courses of actions or scenarios lead to certain decisions or outcomes, as in example 9:

(9) If we look at the probability to see who is most likely to win the tour of France, we would say that the person with the most probability or the most probable chance of of competing and winning will be Chris Froome. So OK we're going to start with that one.

In this case 'so' introduces a decision resulting from careful calculation and analysis.

Because of its high keyness (ranked 10 with 25 occurrences), the adverb 'actually' is also worthy of attention. In many cases, it is used to underline special knowledge or insight into the sport and its athletes, as compared to a superficial impression, while in others it is used as an intensifier-adversative adverb backing up an argument or collocating with mental processes, as in the following example, where it emphasises the verb 'know', possibly with the pragmatic function of stressing the real case, as opposed to a generally accepted, though misleading, impression, which is also framed as a result of calculation, as in the expression 'doesn't always stack up':

(10) ... you look at current form and you say actually we know in cycling a lot happens you know every race somebody crashes so somebody will crash tomorrow in the you know in the in the stage somebody will crash the day after it's going to happen we don't know who it will be we don't know that the impact, So it's select the team a long way out in in in cycling doesn't always stack up.

These examples of relatively highly ranked keywords indicate the role performed by the lexis of knowledge, rationality, calculation and analysis in the formation of Brailsford's cycling discourse. Viewed in context and taken together, they also reveal a feature that is not exposed by narrow keyword analysis of single instances: namely that their force and persuasiveness is increased by the co-occurrence of other lexis and cohesive strings closely associated with analysis, knowledge and expertise. These appear to combine to consolidate an impression of professional acumen, which would appear to be a central strut in Brailsford's construction of a Team Sky ethos. In the next section we will see how these linguistic patterns

fade from view in the context of the Select Parliamentary Committee witness session.

### *4.3 Brailsford's testimony to the Parliamentary Select Committee*

We now turn our attention to Brailsford's performance before the Select Parliamentary Committee (2016). The transcript includes the questions put by the MPs forming the committee. Much of the lexis and function language within the threshold of the first hundred key words reflects the context, the people involved in the event itself and the procedures and linguistic register associated with it. Nevertheless, medical terms and also doping-related language are very conspicuous: 'drug' (13), 'package' (15), 'doctor' (16), 'medication' (18), 'prescribed' (27), 'fluimicil' (34), 'administered' (75), 'corticosteroids' (76), 'triamcinolone' (97). This issue is raised in the Podcast Interview, but with far less concentrated keyness.

### *4.4 Mental processes*

In terms of processes, it is noticeable that there are no immediately recognizable mental processes within the threshold. Scanning these results for lexis or grammar that can be linked to the "ethos quality" of expertise, the most key is 'aware', ranked 32 with 13 occurrences. It is, however, not a process. It appears as the attribute of a relational process (the verb to be) – as a predicative adjective, in terms of conventional grammar – principally in questions, or in negatives. Committee members use 'aware' on four occasions, actually to check Brailsford's knowledge and understanding of events:

(11) Chair: Are you aware that Bradley Wiggins was prescribed corticosteroids out of competition while as a rider at Tea Sky?
Sir David Brailsford: Not to my knowledge.
Chair: Have you asked that question internally?
Sir David Brailsford: No, I would not ask the medical department. That was up to them. I would not push the medical client confidentiality. It is always a bit of a challenge, to be honest. We sit down in meetings where we have the entire staff, and at times it becomes very difficult because the doctors are bound by their own professional code. We have to respect that and we have to make sure that we don't push them to break their own code, but as performance guys and as staff quite often you feel like, "Come on, guys, we want to know what is going on.

Brailsford employs the attribute once to refer to other subjects within the team and twice as an attribute in the collocations 'not that I am aware of' and 'I was not aware of'. In the remaining instances, Brailsford uses it as an attribute in 'we are very aware of public opinion', 'as you become aware'. As can be seen in example 13, there is a considerable difference in the force of the expertise "ethos quality" of a mental process like 'think' and the attribute 'aware', which is predominantly

used to check whether Brailsford is a competent Senser by the committee or by himself to indicate that as a Senser he could do better. By his own admission, he either doesn't know something, or cannot find something out. In addition he stresses the difficulty entailed in gaining knowledge about his team.

Widening the search to the lexis, among the key words that can be associated with the expertise function, 'Information' ranks 71 with 20 occurrences. In one instance it collocates with 'I think', largely conveying uncertainty or indicating a hedging strategy. Six of the instances are to do with the confidentiality of medical information, in which Brailsford stresses the difficulty of acquiring it:

(12) John Nicolson: Is this common in sports or particular to cycling? In other sports, do coaches not know what the athletes are taking?
Sir David Brailsford: At times, in discussions with colleagues from other Olympic programmes, when I ran the Olympic programme, there was sometimes a challenge around medical confidentiality and openness. Coaches are always eager to get every last bit of information, and sometimes the doctors feel compromised in terms of the patient confidentiality and maybe the patient not wanting their medical information to be disclosed.

Here the accent is on the difficulty of accessing information. What is more, the cohesive patterning of related lexis associated with the concept of rationality, evinced in the radio podcast text, is absent. Rather, lexis like 'eager', 'feel' and 'compromised' shifts the focus to feelings and emotions, a word choice that indicates a compensatory shift from the ethos element of expertise to that of empathy, in this case for all concerned: athletes (for reasons of confidentiality) doctor's (for reasons of professional ethics) and coaches (who are prevented from overseeing their athletes properly). Further, Brailsford's testimony reveals that the quality of his information about this incident is poor:

(13) What I decided to do—and, with hindsight, probably was not the wisest thing to have done—was to start gathering information and starting to speak to everybody and trying to piece together what happened. As I was running through the collecting of information and talking to people, they triggered each other's minds and memories. As I went through, I relayed that directly to The Daily Mail as a running commentary. As I went through, it is clear there were some factual inconsistencies in what I was told—that maybe Simon had gone to see Emma in the first instance. It would be very easy to check it. There was no question whatsoever of any cover-up. It was just simply what I was being told, and I was too hasty in relaying that information on.

This example describes a faulty process of information gathering. As in example (14), a word that could be expected to boost the expertise dimension of Brailsford's Ethos, is not consolidated by related lexis in close proximity. Instead, we encounter words that undermine that element: 'not the wisest', 'factual inconsistencies', 'too hasty'. Brailsford's expressions of calculation and analysis are replaced by others that indicate gaps in his knowledge.

It is actually necessary to go beyond the 100 threshold to find any other lexis that can be linked to the mental sphere. "Knowledge", ranked 113, is used exclusively by Brailsford in negative declarative sentence in the expressions like 'Not to my knowledge' (2x). This sounds a note of incompleteness or partialness at odds with the dominant impression of understanding and insight conveyed by the keywords analysed in the podcast data. In all the other instances it is used by members of the Committee who are checking whether athletes have sufficient knowledge about the drugs they take to understand whether they are violating anti-doping rules.

Perhaps no word is so closely linked to ethos as the word 'truth'. Ranked 58, it occurs 9 times, and on all but two occasions is uttered by Brailsford, with the majority of uses occurring in one answer to the commission:

(14) but at the time, when the allegation was made, it seemed to me that it was right to make sure that we got to the truth. In so doing, I had to make quite a difficult decision that I think many people found challenging, insofar as I thought I had been given third-party information. I have given that then to the authorities. They can make sure that that was the truth. I had decided to make the decision that would try to anchor this all in the truth, and let us establish the truth, and, if there are some short-term, obvious difficulties or bad press that is going to come our way, then if that is the price of getting to the truth, so be it, and that is what I have done. There we are.

This is Brailsford's most concentrated expression of ethos. He expresses compliance with the committee's aims and the wish to: 'get to the truth', 'establish the truth'; 'anchor everything in the truth'. However, unlike in his previous discourse, where ethos is based on expertise and intrinsically bound to the possession of knowledge and operation of intellectual processes, here it consists in willingness to establish something that is, as yet, unknown.

In terms of processes, the most key is the verbal process 'told', ranked 14 with 24 occurrences. In four instances it is used in questions by the commission: e.g. 'are you told?'; 'has Dr Freeman told you'. In the remaining twenty occurrences, Brailsford uses it in the passive, with himself as Receiver, as in the following example, where he is questioned about where the drug Fluimicil came from and why it was used to treat Wiggins.

(15) John Nicolson: Thank you very much indeed. Of course, we are all doing a bit of a crash course in Fluimucil at the moment. There is some evidence that it is actually not licensed in the UK. Is that correct?
Sir David Brailsford: I don't know.
John Nicolson: I believe it is not, in which case I just wondered where it came from.
Sir David Brailsford: Like I say, I am just referring to you and relaying to you what I was told by our team doctor.
John Nicolson: You have known about this for a while, have you not?
Sir David Brailsford: I know what has been told to me, yes.

> John Nicolson: I beg your pardon?
> Sir David Brailsford: I am aware of what I was told, yes.
> John Nicolson: Yes, but have you done any independent research on what the drug is?
> Sir David Brailsford: No. It is a drug that we use on a regular basis. It is a frequently used medicine, and we use nebulisers on a regular basis. I have no reason to think and I don't think there is anything wrong with the use of Fluimucil.

In this, and further instances in which 'told' collocates 'with all I know' or 'I only know what', Brailsford conveys the impression of limited knowledge and/or understanding; moreover, with someone else indicated as the source of information or knowledge. This impression is intensified by 'I don't know' and 'I don't think', along with his confession that he has not looked into the effects of the drug.

Another noticeable feature is the keyness of the modal 'might', ranked 73. In 6 out of the twenty cases, it is used by Brailsford to describe reasons why he would not know exactly why a cyclist had applied for a TUE: for example, "where you might have an illness that is quite private". The introduction of this epistemic element is at odds with the note of conviction conveyed in the previous discourse.

'Sure' (59) collocates frequently with 'make' (39) in the collocation 'make sure', this occurs twenty-five times; in nine instances it is uttered by members of the commission either to check that Brailford is conversant with procedure or to underline their purpose in reviewing that proper procedures and practices are observed within the sport. The collocation is used by Brailsford in a similar way, but also to stress adherence to proper procedure, his commitment to the truth, the fulfilment of obligations and the observance of the rules:

(16) We are trying. We are doing our best, and we will be as open and transparent as we can be. We would invite anybody to come and spend time with us, to examine us and scrutinise every single thing that we do to make sure that we are an organisation that people could be proud of, so we can keep doing the country as proud as we can.

In this example it is interesting to note that the intellective mental processes associated with Brailsford in the first data are now assigned to outsiders, who are invited to 'examine and scrutinise every single things that we do', while the Team Sky experts become the focus of that investigation and scrutiny. The key word examples in this section of the analysis also reveal that this reversal is accompanied by compensatory strategies: the ethos elements of empathy, like consideration for athletes, and ethical virtues like transparency that will inspire pride in stakeholders, in other words 'the country'.

### *4.5 Discussion*

Taken as a whole, if we look beyond the most immediate and obvious key lexical words that indicate the 'aboutness' of this data and focus on more seemingly

opaque language, in the interview with the *Telegraph Cycling Podcast* there appears to be a significant emphasis on knowledge and analysis. These qualities underpin the new ethical discourse that Brailsford is so closely associated with. In terms of Jorgensen and Isaksson's Ethos Model, the "ethos qualities" conveyed by this key language, particularly mental processes, appear to fall largely under the heading of expertise, as they communicate acumen, assessment, understanding and interpretation. The use of the concordancer software to analyse this data indicates a discourse in which knowledge, understanding, logic, reasoning, procedure and expertise are in key positions. As such it is typical of the discourse that had been associated with Brailsford and Team Sky since their arrival on the cycling scene: ushering in cycling's age of enlightenment to the dark ages of doping.

By comparison what emerges from the analysis of Brailsford's performance before the Select Committee is a dearth of processes and lexis associated with logos or the "ethos value" of expertise. The fact that the first key word with such a possible function is 'aware', the attribute of a relational processes, reduces the impression of Brailsford as a dynamic Senser, an impression that his drug-free cycling discourse had conveyed to a significant degree. Again, at the level of processes, rather than emerging as an active Senser, in the highest ranking verb, the verbal process 'told', the frequent passives frame Brailsford as the Receiver of information, providing further contrast with all-seeing and all-understanding role constructed by the linguistic choices made in the *Telegraph Podcast* interview. Moreover, lexis like 'knowledge', which one would expect to carry associations of expertise, appears in the negative, again at odds with the impression of understanding and insight that underpins the example of Brailsford's 'cleanspeak' in the *Telegraph Podcast* interview.

Of course, these findings should not be interpreted without acknowledging the presence of mitigating circumstances for Brailsford's inability to equal the kind of linguistic performance typified by his podcast performance. His interlocutors on the committee are by no means as accommodating as those in the podcast. At moments, he is called on to answer a barrage of very specific closed questions of a type that are not key in the podcast. His inability to know the answer to all of them may be understandable, as much information is, strictly speaking, not available to him. In the course of the hearing, his openness about his own shortcomings, his declarations of his desire to get to the truth, and his professions of happiness at being able to help the committee in its investigation shift the foundation of his credibility to the ethical quality of trustworthines. Moreover, by raising the issue of confidentiality, Brailsford is also shifting attention to another strut of the ethos model, i.e. empathy, by which the rhetor demonstrates concern for the welfare of the organisation's stakeholders, in this case the professional athletes and doctors employed by the team. Paradoxically, concern for athletes' privacy and confidentiality is one of the arguments frequently used by advocates of supervised doping; as such it represents a shift of 'ethos quality' that is diametrically opposed to the one employed by Brailsford up to that point and possibly perceived as further evidence of inconsistency.

It may be legitimate to counter the committee's questions in this way, but the impression created is very much at odds with the pre-hearing identity he had

constructed for himself, which was largely achieved by emphasising the ethos quality of expertise. The recourse to other aspects of the ethos model quite possibly struck a false note with the politicians on the committee and the journalists in the press gallery.

## 5. Concluding remarks

This comparative analysis of the two transcripts offers a linguistic account, rather than a factual or forensic one, of why Brailsford's performance in the select committee hearing was deemed so unconvincing and dented not only his own credibility but also that of his team and, possibly, the wider world of cycling.

The telling difference lies in what Brailsford's performance as a witness lacked. Important cracks begin to appear in the dominant narrative of ethos interrelated with and grounded squarely in "ethos qualities" preponderantly expressive of expertise. The language of understanding, certainty, acumen, judgement, control and cohesion, so important to the Team Sky ethical narrative, is much less pronounced in his performance before the select committee. The lapse from those levels of conviction may not be as dramatic as Brailsford's inability to account for the contents of the Jiffy bag, but it certainly strikes a base note that is at variance with the dominant narrative that Brailsford and Team Sky had constructed up to that point. In paragraph 109 of the section on British Cycling and Team Sky (House of Parliament 2018: 32), the final report of the Select Parliamentary Committee criticizes Team Sky for serious shortcomings in awareness about what was happening within its own organisation, a particularly damning criticism, considering the importance of the language of logos and expertise in the construction of the team's credibility as a clean alternative to the tarnished practices of pro-cycling. The fact that the committee was unconvinced by Brailsford's belated attempts to incorporate the trustworthiness and empathy dimensions of the ethos model into his account, suggests that he had possibly staked his and his team's reputation on an unbalanced version of the ethos model; an ill-advised strategy considering that anti-doping regimes are notoriously difficult to impose and certainly involve issues of trustworthiness and empathy. Had these aspects been also adequately developed in Brailsford's anti-doping narrative, he may not have emerged from the committee hearings as such a compromised figure in the eyes of the politician and press who sat in judgement of him.

## References

Ashford and St. Peter's Hospitals (2015) Marginal Gains. *Be the Change*. Retrieved from https://bethechangeasph.com/ (accessed 16.10.2019)

BBC (2015) Viewpoint: Should we all be looking for marginal gains? Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-34247629 (accessed 16.10.2019)

Benson, Daniel (2012) Dave Brailsford's pursuit of Utopia for Team Sky. *Cyclingnews*. Retrieved from https://www.cyclingnews.com/features/dave-brailsfords-pursuit-of-utopia-for-team-sky/. (accessed 14.10.2019).

Bloor,Thomas and Meriel Bloor (2004) *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Brooks, Ian (2016) Fifteen steps to implement Brailsford's 'theory of marginal gains'. *Dnapeople*. Retrieved from http://www.dnapeople.co.uk/fifteen-steps-to-implement-brailsfords-theory-of-marginal-gains/ [16.10.2019]

Canty, Sam (2015) Sir Dave Brailsford –CORE principle and marginal gains. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=THNBIQenywc (accessed 3.3.2021)

Cheney, George, Lars Thøger Christensen, Charles Conrad and Dan Lair (2004) Corporate Rhetoric as Organizational Discourse. In: David Grant, Cynthia Hardy, Cliff Oswick and Linda Putnam (Eds.). *Handbook of Organizational Discourse.* London: SAGE. 79–103.

De B. Clark, Caroline (2006) *Views in the News*. Milan: LED.

Eggins, Susan (2004) *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. New York and London: Continuum.

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fotheringham, William (2017) Team Sky: Sir Dave Brailsford must face the music – and then resign. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/sport/2017/mar/05/team-sky-sir-dave-brailsford (accessed 3.3.2021)

Griffiths, Steve (2012) Sky goes for moral high ground on doping. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from https://www.smh.com.au/sport/cycling/sky-goes-for-moral-high-ground-on-doping-20121021-27zu8.html (accessed 27.5.2020)

Halliday, Michael. A. K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Holt, Oliver (2017) Team Sky was a grand illusion indulged by cheerleaders for too long... they've been caught out in lie after lie. *Mail Online*. Retrieved from Retrieved from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/othersports/article-4282066/Team-Sky-grand-illusion-indulged-cheerleaders.html (accessed 3.3.2021)

House of Commons (2016) *Combatting Doping in Sport*. www.parliament.uk/dcmscom (accessed 3.3.2021)

House of Commons (2018) *Combatting Doping in Sport*. www.parliament.uk/dcmscom (accessed 3.3.2021)

Jørgensen, Poul Erik Flyvholm and Maria Isaksson (2010) Credibility in Corporate Discourse. In: M. Anna Trosborg (Ed.) *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures.* Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 518–541.

Kayser, Bengt, Alexandre Mauron and Andy Miah (2007) Current anti-doping policy: a critical appraisal. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 8. Retrieved from https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-8-2 (accessed 3.3.2021)

Kimmage, Paul (2012) How Bradley Wiggins had to fight against the sport's drug demons in a race I still can't be certain is completely clean, *Mail Online*. Retrieved from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/othersports/article-2177405/Bradley-Wiggins-battle-cyclings-drug-demons–Paul-Kimmage.html (accessed 3.3.2021)

Koosha, Mansoor and Mohammad Reza Shams (2005) A Critical Study of News Discourse: Iran's Nuclear Issue in British Newspapers. *IJAL*, 8, 2, 107–141.

Lawton, Matt (2016) Sir Bradley Wiggins, Sir Dave Brailsford and the package delivered to Team Sky: Sportsmail's investigation into the story behind UK Anti-Doping drugs probe Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/sportsnews/article-3825848/Sir-Bradley-Wiggins-Sir-Dave-Brailsford-package-delivered-Team-Sky-Sportsmail-investigation.html (accessed 3.3.2021)

MacMichael, Simon (2017) From zero tolerance to zero credibility - Team Sky and Sir Dave Brailsford under attack. *Road.cc*. https://road.cc/content/news/218565-zero-tolerance-zero-credibility-team-sky-and-sir-dave-brailsford-under-attack (accessed 3.3.2021)

McGannon, Kerry R. (2016) Critical discourse analysis in sport and exercise: What, why and how. In: Brett Smith and Andrew C. Sparkes (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*. London and New York: Routledge, 230–242.

Moore, Richard (2012) Team Sky staff must sign anti-doping declaration as Brailsford reiterates zero tolerance policy. *Mail Online*. Retrieved from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/othersports/article-2219332/Team-Sky-reiterate-zero-tolerance-drug-policy-Dave-Brailsford.html (accessed 3.3. 2021)

Partington, Alan and Matilde Zuccato (2018) Brexit Before and After. A Corpus-Assisted Study of the Referendum Campaigns and The Immediate Aftermath. *Textus English Studies in Italy* 1, 119–139.

Samuel, Martin (2018) Sir David Brailsford has been the most overplayed hand in British sport. *Mail Online*. Retrieved from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/sport/article-5465379/David-Brailsford-overplayed-hand-British-sport.html (accessed 3.3.2021)

Scott, Mike (2009) In search of a bad reference corpus. In: Archer, Dawn (Ed.) *What's in Word-list? Investigating Word Frequency and Keyword Extraction*. London: Routledge, 79–91.

Scott, Mike and Christopher Tribble (2006) *Textual Patterns: Key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slater, Matt (2012) Team Sky strive for cycling's moral high ground. *BBC*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/sport/cycling/20147726 (accessed 3.3.2021)

Telegraph Cycling Podcast (2014). Retrieved from https://thecyclingpodcast.com/podcast/stage-4-dave-brailsford-opens-up (accessed 29.5.2018)

UKAD (2018) About therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUEs). Retrieved from https://www.ukad.org.uk/medications-and-substances/about-TUE/ (accessed 2.5.2018)

WADA (2018) The International Standard Prohibited List. Retrieved from https://www.wada-ama.org/en/resources/science-medicine/prohibited-list-documents 8accessed 19.7.2018)

Wick, Douglas A. (2019) Measuring ROI - Create Marginal Gains. *Positioning Systems: Strategic Discipline*, March 25, 2019. Retrieved from https://strategicdiscipline.positioningsystems.com/blog-0/measuring-roi-create-marginal-gains (accessed 16.10.2019).

Whittle, Jeremy (2015). Team Sky's zero tolerance policy comes under intense scrutiny. *The Times*. https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/team-skys-zero-tolerance-policy-comes-under-intense-scrutiny-lkw0fdx0rqb (accessed 3.3.2021)

## Appendix 1

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 147 | 169.796 | s |
| 2 | 317 | 164.745 | xd |
| 3 | 277 | 113.516 | you |
| 4 | 113 | 92.725 | know |
| 5 | 40 | 75.908 | erm |
| 6 | 38 | 63.791 | re |
| 7 | 33 | 54.581 | ve |
| 8 | 21 | 39.852 | ll |
| 9 | 287 | 31.647 | and |
| 10 | 25 | 31.313 | actually |
| 11 | 16 | 30.363 | eh |
| 12 | 28 | 29.961 | got |
| 13 | 78 | 29.524 | think |
| 14 | 15 | 28.466 | d |
| 15 | 14 | 26.568 | db |
| 16 | 14 | 26.568 | ehm |
| 17 | 17 | 25.516 | chris |
| 18 | 13 | 24.670 | m |
| 19 | 20 | 23.080 | tour |
| 20 | 12 | 22.772 | tpc |
| 21 | 10 | 18.977 | xc |
| 22 | 13 | 18.445 | kind |
| 23 | 9 | 17.079 | yeah |
| 24 | 16 | 16.727 | together |
| 25 | 8 | 15.182 | climbing |
| 26 | 8 | 15.182 | high |
| 27 | 18 | 14.971 | start |
| 28 | 11 | 14.970 | year |
| 29 | 13 | 14.849 | talk |
| 30 | 47 | 14.727 | so |
| 31 | 71 | 14.651 | he |
| 32 | 7 | 13.284 | certain |
| 33 | 7 | 13.284 | er |
| 34 | 7 | 13.284 | experienced |
| 35 | 7 | 13.284 | froome |
| 36 | 7 | 13.284 | yellow |
| 37 | 42 | 12.073 | t |
| 38 | 6 | 11.386 | change |
| 39 | 6 | 11.386 | decisions |
| 40 | 6 | 11.386 | game |
| 41 | 6 | 11.386 | jersey |
| 42 | 6 | 11.386 | job |
| 43 | 6 | 11.386 | ok |
| 44 | 34 | 11.027 | about |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45 | 17 | 10.142 | well |
| 46 | 8 | 9.882 | same |
| 47 | 8 | 9.882 | yourself |
| 48 | 201 | 9.824 | a |
| 49 | 5 | 9.489 | against |
| 50 | 5 | 9.489 | cohesive |
| 51 | 5 | 9.489 | comfortable |
| 52 | 5 | 9.489 | plan |
| 53 | 5 | 9.489 | type |
| 54 | 11 | 9.265 | win |
| 55 | 24 | 9.240 | right |
| 56 | 16 | 8.952 | take |
| 57 | 12 | 8.695 | teams |
| 58 | 12 | 8.695 | try |
| 59 | 21 | 8.343 | going |
| 60 | 27 | 8.296 | people |
| 61 | 4 | 7.591 | bernie |
| 62 | 4 | 7.591 | brilliant |
| 63 | 4 | 7.591 | champion |
| 64 | 4 | 7.591 | championships |
| 65 | 4 | 7.591 | enjoy |
| 66 | 4 | 7.591 | etc |
| 67 | 4 | 7.591 | gerraint |
| 68 | 4 | 7.591 | goal |
| 69 | 4 | 7.591 | k |
| 70 | 4 | 7.591 | key |
| 71 | 4 | 7.591 | knows |
| 72 | 4 | 7.591 | parts |
| 73 | 4 | 7.591 | ridden |
| 74 | 4 | 7.591 | rode |
| 75 | 4 | 7.591 | scenario |
| 76 | 4 | 7.591 | stage |
| 77 | 4 | 7.591 | sum |
| 78 | 17 | 7.534 | go |
| 79 | 17 | 7.534 | really |
| 80 | 8 | 7.132 | most |
| 81 | 6 | 6.624 | de |
| 82 | 6 | 6.624 | little |
| 83 | 25 | 6.605 | get |
| 84 | 9 | 6.521 | keep |
| 85 | 9 | 6.521 | policy |
| 86 | 22 | 6.480 | race |
| 87 | 17 | 6.461 | look |
| 88 | 11 | 5.897 | into |
| 89 | 3 | 5.693 | characters |
| 90 | 3 | 5.693 | cobbles |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 91 | 3 | 5.693 | competing |
| 92 | 3 | 5.693 | continue |
| 93 | 3 | 5.693 | dany |
| 94 | 3 | 5.693 | defend |
| 95 | 3 | 5.693 | defending |
| 96 | 3 | 5.693 | difference |
| 97 | 3 | 5.693 | eat |
| 98 | 3 | 5.693 | engine |
| 99 | 3 | 5.693 | far |

**Table 1.** Keyword list for Brailsford's online *Telegraph Cycling Podcast* interview

## Appendix 2

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 123 | 110.730 | david |
| 2 | 122 | 109.767 | sir |
| 3 | 115 | 103.029 | brailsford |
| 4 | 99 | 96.959 | q |
| 5 | 150 | 61.710 | was |
| 6 | 149 | 39.376 | not |
| 7 | 40 | 39.175 | chair |
| 8 | 40 | 39.175 | nicolson |
| 9 | 39 | 38.196 | john |
| 10 | 96 | 36.732 | are |
| 11 | 274 | 31.088 | is |
| 12 | 64 | 25.240 | medical |
| 13 | 24 | 23.505 | drug |
| 14 | 24 | 23.505 | told |
| 15 | 22 | 21.546 | package |
| 16 | 29 | 21.531 | doctor |
| 17 | 389 | 21.478 | that |
| 18 | 28 | 20.621 | am |
| 19 | 53 | 19.684 | has |
| 20 | 20 | 19.588 | medication |
| 21 | 165 | 18.545 | have |
| 22 | 44 | 17.787 | any |
| 23 | 47 | 17.661 | by |
| 24 | 18 | 17.629 | farrelly |
| 25 | 18 | 17.629 | paul |
| 26 | 17 | 16.650 | athlete |
| 27 | 16 | 15.670 | prescribed |
| 28 | 15 | 14.691 | matheson |
| 29 | 14 | 13.711 | anti |
| 30 | 14 | 13.711 | christian |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | 28 | 13.404 | did |
| 32 | 102 | 13.304 | there |
| 33 | 13 | 12.732 | aware |
| 34 | 13 | 12.732 | clearly |
| 35 | 13 | 12.732 | fluimucil |
| 36 | 75 | 11.339 | very |
| 37 | 28 | 10.900 | make |
| 38 | 17 | 10.823 | whether |
| 39 | 11 | 10.773 | independent |
| 40 | 11 | 10.773 | thank |
| 41 | 361 | 10.312 | to |
| 42 | 75 | 10.303 | would |
| 43 | 16 | 9.961 | basis |
| 44 | 16 | 9.961 | given |
| 45 | 16 | 9.961 | staff |
| 46 | 58 | 9.900 | had |
| 47 | 10 | 9.794 | correct |
| 48 | 10 | 9.794 | different |
| 49 | 10 | 9.794 | uk |
| 50 | 32 | 9.578 | cycling |
| 51 | 40 | 9.517 | no |
| 52 | 22 | 8.893 | performance |
| 53 | 9 | 8.814 | application |
| 54 | 9 | 8.814 | coach |
| 55 | 9 | 8.814 | courier |
| 56 | 9 | 8.814 | records |
| 57 | 9 | 8.814 | therapeutic |
| 58 | 9 | 8.814 | truth |
| 59 | 25 | 8.806 | sure |
| 60 | 18 | 8.421 | something |
| 61 | 8 | 7.835 | available |
| 62 | 8 | 7.835 | competition |
| 63 | 8 | 7.835 | decision |
| 64 | 8 | 7.835 | granting |
| 65 | 8 | 7.835 | happy |
| 66 | 8 | 7.835 | made |
| 67 | 8 | 7.835 | move |
| 68 | 8 | 7.835 | moving |
| 69 | 8 | 7.835 | ukad |
| 70 | 26 | 7.561 | me |
| 71 | 20 | 7.469 | information |
| 72 | 20 | 7.469 | might |
| 73 | 13 | 7.425 | wiggins |
| 74 | 41 | 7.367 | from |
| 75 | 7 | 6.856 | administered |
| 76 | 7 | 6.856 | corticosteroids |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 77 | 7 | 6.856 | criteria |
| 78 | 7 | 6.856 | mr |
| 79 | 7 | 6.856 | necessary |
| 80 | 7 | 6.856 | regular |
| 81 | 19 | 6.776 | british |
| 82 | 19 | 6.776 | sky |
| 83 | 35 | 6.774 | case |
| 84 | 62 | 6.681 | been |
| 85 | 12 | 6.599 | end |
| 86 | 6 | 5.876 | advice |
| 87 | 6 | 5.876 | cannot |
| 88 | 6 | 5.876 | check |
| 89 | 6 | 5.876 | confidence |
| 90 | 6 | 5.876 | drugs |
| 91 | 6 | 5.876 | grant |
| 92 | 6 | 5.876 | granted |
| 93 | 6 | 5.876 | met |
| 94 | 6 | 5.876 | often |
| 95 | 6 | 5.876 | product |
| 96 | 6 | 5.876 | request |
| 97 | 6 | 5.876 | triamcinolone |
| 98 | 6 | 5.876 | whatsoever |
| 99 | 11 | 5.787 | line |

**Table 2.** Keyword list for Brailsford's testimony to the Select Parliamentary Committee

Dermot Heaney is a retired university lecturer. He formerly taught and carried out research into translation and English language and linguistics at the Università di Roma 'Tor Vergata' and The Università degli Studi di Milano. His recent research interests and publications fall within the field of metaphor studies, medicalisation discourse, and communication in the field of sport and sports journalism in the mainstream print and new media..

Address: Dermot Heaney, Ph.D., Via Fiuggi, 59, 20159-Milano, Italy. [email: heaneydermot0@gmail.com]