

Science, Movement and Health, Vol. XXI, ISSUE 2, 2021

June 2021, 21 (2): 120 - 128

Original article

## ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN TACTICAL ELEMENTS IN FOOTBALL COACHES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

EKREM ČOLAKHODŽIĆ<sup>1</sup>, JASMIN BUDIMLIĆ<sup>2</sup>, NAIM ĆELEŠ<sup>2</sup>, ANES NUSPAHIĆ<sup>2</sup>, ŽELJKO SEKULIĆ<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

**Objective.** Modern football is characterized by dynamism, high rhythm of the game and requires from the players exceptional physical preparation, good technique of movement, tactical maturity and mental stability. Tactics is designed to solve moving tasks in order to achieve the best possible sports results. By the term "element" we mean the objective and subjective factors that we take into account when compiling any tactical plan. The aim of this paper is to analyse the application of certain tactical elements in coaches in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Methods.** The sample of respondents are UEFA-licensed football coaches from the Una-Sana Canton in BiH. Twenty-seven (N = 27) participated in the survey, of which with a UEFA PRO license (N = 2), with a UEFA A license (N = 10), with a UEFA B license (N = 7) and with a UEFA C license (N = 8). The sample was divided into three groups, the first group of trainers with Pro and A license, the second group with B and the third group with C license. The basic criterion of the sample is that the coach has one of the UEFA licenses, to work for at least 5 years as a coach of a team that competes in the competition system in BiH. The research was conducted through a survey consisting of 19 questions (13 questions related to game systems, player type preference, while 6 questions related to standard situations).

**The results.** 63% of trainers base their training twice a week on tactics and solving tactical tasks. The most common game system they use in practice is 1: 4: 2: 3. It was found that 92.6% of coaches prefer offensive style of play with their teams, while 92.6% analyse the opponent during each game. It was noticed that 66.7% of respondents prefer a combined method of defence, then zone defence 25.9%, and individual only 7.4%! 70.4% of respondents agreed that they would like to have a lower striker in the team, but who has more dynamic movements and is quite mobile. The largest number of coaches (66.7%) differentiate between tactical preparation depending on playing at home or away, and this percentage is the highest for PRO and A licenses (91.7%) and the lowest percentage for coaches with a C license (37.5 %). 92.6% of surveyed coaches change their tactical ideas and adapt the team to weather conditions, field conditions, the influence of the audience, referees and others.

**Conclusion.** We conclude that there are differences in the application of tactical knowledge, tactical elements and game systems between coaches with different degrees of acquired UEFA license. The identified differences may be the result of the level of acquired education and football education, but certainly also the acquired experience in practical playing and coaching work.

Key words: Football, tactics, game system, UEFA.

### Introduction

Football game is a complex kinesiological activity that belongs to the group of polystructural acyclic movements, and is characterized by a high variability of motor actions that players use to achieve the basic goals of the game: scoring and winning (Barišić, 2007). We are witnessing that modern football is developing rapidly in all components of the football game, but especially in terms of the physical quality of the players (Bangsbo, 2014). Success in football requires a large number of abilities, characteristics and knowledge, the most important of which are anthropological characteristics (health status, morphological characteristics, motor and cognitive skills), specific abilities and knowledge of footballers (technical

abilities, specific motor skills, tactical abilities and knowledge), theoretical knowledge as well as characteristics important for social adaptation) and situational efficiency and results in competition (Dujmović, 2000; Čolakhodžić, Rađo and Alić, 2016; Čolakhodžić, Đedović, Skender, Novaković and Popo, 2017). The subject of this study is tactics and tactical knowledge and their application in football coaching practice. Tactics in general means planned and goal-oriented activities that an individual, group or team perform in order to achieve success, taking into consideration their own and opponents' abilities (Nožinović, Halilović and Midžić, 2002). The tasks of tactical preparation consist of the acquisition of theoretical knowledge about the rational use and application of motor skills

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Education, Dzemal Bijedić University in Mostar, University Campus bb, 88 104 Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Education, University of Bihać, Luke Marjanovića bb; 77 000 Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Email: ekrem.colakhodzic@unmo.ba

Received 04.03.2021 / Accepted 8.05. 2021

and elements of technique in certain specific conditions (Bunčić and Stanković, 2015). In each situation, the footballer evaluates the options before receiving or passing the ball to choose the action that will best help his team. It also requires an understanding of how, when and where to go without the ball (Caligiuri and Herbst, 1998). Football is characterized by the alternation of attack and defence, so we can talk about defensive tactics and attacking tactics. The relationship between attack and defence takes place through individual and collective actions (between attack and defence). Football game tactics are divided into individual, group (several players) and collective tactics (whole team). Individual defence tactics are the basic form of defence in football (Novitović, 2006). Čolakhodžić et al. (2016) believe that individual defence is a way of playing defence in which each defensive player has the task of guarding one player of the opposing attack. This defence is usually used by teams that are superior to opponents in individual abilities. Nožinović et al. (2002) define group tactics as planned actions in defence by two or more players, which are aimed at a specific goal, in order to successfully resolve the situation in the game. According to Novitović (2006), group defence tactics imply a group of players acting together, helping each other in order to neutralize the opponent's attack. Nožinović et al. (2002) define team defence tactics as directed, planned and precisely defined actions of defence of all players of one team. According to Novitović (2006), team defence tactics is an organized action against an opponent, in which all 11 players of one team will participate in some way. In this type of defence, individual, zonal, and combined defence tactics are constantly intertwined. Team defence, i.e., defence in which all players of one team participate, is very effective, but only under the condition that all players fulfil their part of the task, and that they complete it on time. The characteristic of this defence is that the players do not guard a certain opposing player, but a certain space. It is used by teams that are inferior to the opponent. There is a passive zone defence when players stand in two rows at a distance of 20-30 meters from their own goal and depending on which side the ball comes from, they move in that direction (Čolakhodžić et al., 2016). Its main characteristic is that a number of players cover a certain area, and the others play individual defence. This way of playing dominates in modern football, except that there is much greater coordination between defensive and offensive players. In order to perform these very fast transformations, players must possess high tactical, technical and physical skills. The principles of attack roughly coincide with the principles of defence, they have the same meaning, but opposite characteristics. According to Čolakhodžić et al. (2016) the

principles of attack are: adapting the attack to the opponent's defence, organizing players positioning and distribution in the field in the attack, leading the opponent to make mistakes, movement of players, numerical superiority of the attack, surprise in the game and mutual help. According to Novitović (2006), attack tactics can take place as individual, group and team attack tactics. Individual attack tactics is led by only one player, who participates in it, and the team has 10 other players who influence this type of attack in different ways with their position, movement and distraction of the opponent. In some phases, group and team attack tactics are intertwined with individual attack tactics, involvement in group or team attack tactics necessarily leads through individual tactics (Novitović, 2006). Čolakhodžić et al. (2016) believe that in an individual attack, one player, using his technical-tactical-physical abilities, overcomes defensive players and completes the action himself. Group attack tactics is the basic content of a football game that is constantly repeated and renewed, changed, abandoned and reverted to, depending on the possession or non-possession of the ball in the game. The proximity of the opponent's goal at the beginning of the attack determines in a way the number of players who participate in it. Team attack tactics imply the direct or indirect participation of all players in the attack. It requires discipline and coordination in performing the tasks of attack tactics with constant conscious participation in the game with maximum adaptation to the requirements of all individual phases of the game. It is the culmination of cooperation in the game of one team. The team that achieves greater coordination, which has a larger number of universally trained disciplined and responsible footballers, and at the same time creative footballers, will be all the closer to the ideal of attacking tactics which implies a certain contribution of all players of a team to the attack (Novitović, 2006). The goalkeeper occupies a special place in the team and the tactics of the team. On the field, he should be the absolute authority and bring security to the rest of the team with his behaviour, interventions and attitude. In modern football, the goalkeeper is often in the situation of a player on the field, so he also has to be good at playing with his feet. The game system represents the basic structure of collective tactics, and based on it, the differences between the parts of the game and the position in the team are determined. The meaning of the game system is narrower than the word tactics, because the tactics of one team during one game consist of several game systems (Čolakhodžić et al., 2016). Nožinović et al. (2002) consider that through the game system, players are primarily assigned basic game spaces for their defence and attack actions. Toplak (1985) defines the game system as a specific way of playing that

determines the place of each player on the field, as well as their general tasks. The system also has its basic characteristics: it must be simple, understandable, easy to apply and easily accessible for training, it must be balanced, elastic and usable against each opponent, it must make the correct distribution of forces on the field, evenly distribute tasks to all players. It must enable focus on those parts of the field where the greatest need arises in certain phases of the game, and the division of tasks must emphasize the responsibility towards the team (Novitović, 2006). Each game system has certain variants, and variants of the game system are changes in the arrangement of players in the same game system. The forerunner of modern game systems is considered to be the WW system, in which players were positioned in a 1: 2: 3: 2: 3 formation. The game in this system was very slow, so new changes took place. A WM system was created in which the game was much faster and more dynamic, with offensive and defensive variants. Defensive variants of the system are "catenaccio", "bunker", "lock", etc., while the attacking variants are withdrawn wings and withdrawn wing (Novitović, 2006). An attempt to break the closed game in defence, which almost completely prevented playing the middle, led to game from the flanks, which provided the best opportunities and places to break through the defence. In this way the game from the flanks gained more and more importance. The characteristic of modern game systems is that three lines are obtained from the previous four lines. Thus, a system of four defenders was created in which the players were positioned in formation 1: 4: 2: 4. Modifications that were made to this system, resulted in systems that are used in modern football. One of these is the 1: 4: 3: 3 system where one player from the midfield is added to the attack. Side players also get attacking tasks depending on the conditions on the field. Three midfielders in addition to the organizing role, become alternately defensive players and attackers, depending on the situation on the field, unlike previous systems where their role was primarily to organize attacks. The need to control the midfield produced a 1: 4: 4: 2 system, where one striker retreats to the midfield, the two remaining strikers act on the entire opposing half, playing without the classic wingers whose place is filled by offensive defenders. At the beginning of the attack, a small number of players are in the attack, but through the transformation, a large number of players take part in the attack. The reduction of the number of players in the attack, led to the creation of the 1: 4: 5: 1 system. In addition to this more defensive system, a more offensive one is being created, the 1: 3: 5: 2 system. It is applied by those teams that opt for a more offensive game, i.e., those that have such individuals who can rhythmically attack the

opponent's goal during the match and at the same time bind a larger number of opposing players, leaving the opponent the opportunity to attack with only one, possibly two players. Side players with defensive and offensive tasks are introduced next to the outline. In addition to these systems, there are some modified systems such as 1: 3: 4: 3, 1: 4: 1: 4: 1, 1: 5: 3: 2, 1: 5: 4: 1 (Novitović, 2006). The aim of this research is to analyse the application of certain tactical elements and game systems by coaches in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## Methods

### Sample of respondents

The sample consisted of football coaches with the appropriate UEFA license from the Una-Sana Canton in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The total number of coaches with a UEFA license, who participated in the survey is twenty-seven ( $N = 27$ ), of which two coaches with a UEFA PRO license ( $N = 2$ ), ten coaches with a UEFA A license ( $N = 10$ ), seven coaches with UEFA B license ( $N = 7$ ) and eight coaches with UEFA C license ( $N = 8$ ). The sample was divided into three groups. The first group of coaches with Pro and A license, the second group with B license and the third group with C license. The following criteria were taken into account when selecting the sample: that the coaches have a UEFA license, that they have at least five years of work experience as a coach of the team competing in the competition system in BiH (FBiH First League, FBiH Second League, Una-Sana Canton Cantonal League), to have previous experience in working with youth schools in clubs.

### Measuring instruments

In this research the survey method was used, as well as data collection, attitudes and opinions on the subject of research. The research was based on the survey questionnaire as a measuring instrument. The respondent answers in writing to questions related to facts that are known to them. The survey questionnaire consisted of nineteen (19) questions covering elements of tactics and game systems. All trainers were educated on how to fill out the survey.

### Data processing

Statistical data processing was performed using the IBM SPSS 26 statistical data processing program for Windows. The answers to each question from the applied questionnaire are presented for each group of respondents (coaches with different licenses), and the results are presented numerically and tabularly.

### Results

In this chapter, the results obtained within the research are presented in tabular and textual form.

Table 1. Frequency of training to solve tactical tasks

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Once a week	1 8.3%	2 28.6%	2 25%	5 18.5%
Twice a week	8 66.7%	4 57.1%	5 62.5%	17 63%
Three times in a week or more	3 25%	1 14.3%	1 12.5%	5 18.5%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

*Legenda: UPL/ UAL-UEFA PRO A license; UBL-UEFA B license; UCL-UEFA C license; OIZA – response from the survey questionnaire*

Table 1 lists the answers, for the first group of trainers. We can state that one respondent (8.3%) plans his training once a week to solve tactical tasks, eight respondents (66.7%) plan their training that relates to solving tactical tasks twice a week, and three respondents (25%) plan their training to solve tactical tasks three or more times a week. In the second group, two respondents (28.6%) plan their trainings once a week to solve tactical tasks, four respondents (57.1%) twice, and three or more times only one respondent (14.3%). Two respondents (25%) in the third group plan their trainings on solving tactical tasks once, five respondents (62.5%) twice and one respondent (12.5%) three or more times. The analysis of the overall results shows that seventeen respondents (63%) based their weekly plan on two trainings based on solving tactical tasks, five respondents (18.5%) based their trainings on solving tactical tasks once a week, which is the case with coaches who based trainings on solving tactical tasks three or more times.

Table 2. The most common game system used by coaches

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
1:4:4:2	0 0%	0 0%	1 12.5%	1 3.8%
1:4:3:3	3 25%	4 57.1%	3 37.5%	10 38.5%
1:4:2:3:1	8 66.7%	3 42.9%	2 25%	13 46.2%
1:3:5:2	1 8.3%	0 0%	1 12.5%	2 7.7%
1:4:5:1	0 0%	0 0%	1 12.5%	1 3.8%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

Table 2 refers to the question of which game system they most often use in their work. Five possible answers were offered and the coaches of the first group presented the following results: three respondents (25%) answered that they most often

use the game system 1: 4: 4: 3, eight respondents (66.7%) answered that they most often use the game system 1: 4: 2: 3: 1, and one respondent (8.3%) stated that he uses the 1: 3: 5: 2 game system. We can state that the coaches from the first group do not use game systems 1: 4: 4: 2, 1: 4: 5: 1. The results of the second group of coaches show different data in contrast to the first group of coaches. The 1: 4: 4: 3 system is used by four respondents (57.1%), while three respondents (42.9%) most often use the 1: 4: 2: 3: 1 system. The other group of coaches does not use the 1: 4: 4: 2, 1: 3: 5: 2 and 1: 4: 5: 1 game systems at all. In the third group of coaches, the results are as follows: one respondent (12.5%) most often uses the game system 1: 4: 4: 2, three respondents (37.5%) most often use the game system 1: 4: 4: 3, two respondents (25%) most often use the 1: 4: 2: 3: 1 game system, one respondent (12.5%) most often uses the 1: 3: 5: 2 system and one respondent (12.5%) uses the 1: 4 system : 5: 1. Coaches most often use the game system 1: 4: 2: 3: 1 (46.2%), and the game system 1: 4: 4: 3 (38.5%).

Table 3. The style of play used by the coach

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	9 75%	5 71.4%	7 87.5%	21 77.8%
NO	3 25%	2 28.6%	1 12.5%	6 22.2%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

The results related to team training in a secondary game system, in the first group of coaches show that 9 respondents (75%) train the team in addition to the primary game system and in a secondary game system, while 3 respondents (25%) train the team only in the primary system games. Inspecting the results of the second group of coaches, we can conclude that 5 respondents (71.4%) train the team in both the primary and secondary game system, while 2 respondents (28.6%) train the team only in the primary game system. The results of the third group of coaches show that 7 respondents (87.5%) train the team in the secondary system, while one respondent (12.5%) trains the team only in the primary system of the game. The overall results in Table 4 show that twenty-one respondents (77.8%) train the team in addition to the primary and secondary game system, while six respondents (22.2%) train the team only in the primary game system.

Table 5. Do the coaches analyse the next opponent?

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	12	6	7	25

	100%	85.7%	87.5%	92.6%
NO	0 0%	1 14.3%	1 12.5%	2 7.4%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

When asked whether the respondents analyse the next opponent before the game, in the first group all twelve respondents (100%) analyse the next opponent before the game. Six respondents (85.7%) of the second group analyse the next opponent, while one respondent (14.3%) does not analyse the next opponent before the game. The results of the third group of respondents show that 7 respondents (87.5%) analyse the next opponent before the game while one respondent (12.5%) does not analyse the next opponent. By inspecting Table 5, we can conclude that the vast majority of respondents, twenty-five (92.6%) analyse the next opponent before the game and only two respondents (7.4%) from the second and third groups of coaches do not analyse the next opponent.

Table 6. The method of defence that coaches prefer

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Individual defence	1 8.3%	1 14.3%	0 0%	2 7.4%
Zone defence	4 33.3%	2 28.6%	1 12.5%	7 25.9%
Combined defence	7 58.3%	4 57.1%	7 87.5%	18 66.7%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

Table 6 refers to the preference of the defence of their team and shows that one respondent (8.3%) from the first group prefers individual defence man to man, four respondents (33.3%) prefer zone defence and seven respondents (58.3%) prefers combined defence. In the second group, one respondent (14.3%) prefers individual defence man to man, two respondents (28.6%) prefer zone defence while four respondents (57.1%) prefer combined defence. One respondent in the third group (12.5%) prefers zone defence, and seven respondents (87.5%) prefer combined defence. By inspecting Table 6, we conclude that 2/3 (66.7%) of the total respondents prefer combined defence in their teams, seven respondents (25.9%) prefer zone defence in their teams, while only two respondents (7.4%) prefer individual defence man to man.

Table 7.- Preference of types of side players

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
	11	7	7	25

Offensive side player	91.7%	100%	87.5%	92.6%
Defensive side player	1 8.3%	0 0%	1 12.5%	2 7.4%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

Insight into the results related to the preference of types of side players in three groups of coaches, shows that in the first group eleven respondents (91.7%) prefer the offensive type of side players, while one respondent (8.3%) prefers the defensive type of side players who is more focused on defending his own goal. The results of the second group show that seven respondents (100%) prefer the offensive type of side players who actively participate during all offensive actions. By inspecting the results of the third group, we conclude that seven respondents (87.5%) prefer the offensive type of side players and only one respondent (12.5%) prefers the defensive type of side players. Analysing the results of all three groups of coaches, we come to the conclusion that the majority of respondents, twenty-five of them (92.6%) in their formations prefer the offensive type of side players and only two respondents (7.4%) prefer the defensive type of side players.

Table 8. Placing players on the wing positions

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Right wing/left footed	6 50%	5 71.4%	3 37.5%	14 51.9%
Left wing/right footed	6 50%	2 28.6%	5 62.5%	13 48.1%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

Table 8 shows that the respondents from the first group of coaches usually place left footed players on the right-wing position, and right footed players on left wing as well as right footed on right wing and left footed on left wing as six respondents (50%) decided as stated. The second group of trainers gave different results to this survey question, so that five respondents (71.4%) answered that they usually place left footed player on the right-wing position, and right footed player on left wing position, and two respondents (28.6%) prefer right footed player on right wing, and left footed on left wing. The third group gave opposite answers unlike the second group of coaches. Three respondents (37.5%) preferred left footed player on right wing and right footed player on left wing while five respondents (62.5%) preferred to place right footed player on right wing and left footed on left wing positions.

Table 9.- The type of attacker you prefer

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
A	3 25%	2 28.6%	3 37.5%	8 29.6%
B	9 75%	5 71.4%	5 62.5%	19 70.4%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

*UPL/UAL-UEFA PRO A license; UBL-UEFA B license, UCL-UEFA C license, OIZA – response, A- static, dominant in jump and higher striker, B- dynamic, inferior in jump and lower striker*

When asked which type of striker they prefer, nine coaches of the first group prefer a lower striker (75%). Three respondents (25%) of the first group prefer a higher player in attack. A similar result was given by the coaches from the second group because five respondents (71.4%) answered that they prefer a lower type of attacker and only two respondents (28.6%) stated that they prefer a higher type of attacker. In the third group of trainers, five respondents (62.5%) stated that they also prefer a lower type of attacker and three respondents (37.5%) prefer a lower type of attacker.

Table 10. Method of performing the initial kick

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Initial kick A	3 25%	1 14.3%	3 37.5%	7 25.9%
Initial kick B	9 75%	6 85.7%	5 62.5%	20 74.1%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

*UPL/UAL-UEFA PRO and A license UBL-UEFA B license, UCL-UEFA C license, OIZA–response, A- with a long pass behind the back of the opponent's defence, B- passing the ball to midfielders*

In Table 10 we see that a total of twenty respondents (74.1%) prefer to perform the initial kick by adding midfielders and building attacks with short passes, the first group - nine respondents (75%), the second group - six respondents (85.7%), the third group-five respondents (62.5%). Seven respondents (25.9%) require a long pass behind the opponent's defensive line in order to exert initial pressure and, with a possible mistake by the defence, get a chance to score. The first group of three respondents (25%), the second group one respondent (14.3%), the third group of three respondents (35.7%).

Table 11. Using patch players as a tactical tool

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Patch players YES	5 41.7%	0 0%	7 87.5%	12 44.4%
Patch players NO	7 58.3%	7 100%	1 12.5%	15 55.6%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

Seven respondents (58.3%) from the first group of coaches stated that they do not use the patch player option as a tactical tool over the best opposing player knowing that he is an individual who makes a difference on the field, and five respondents from the same group of coaches) uses the same option. From the second group, all seven respondents (100%) also do not use the stated player patch option. The third group answered the opposite of the second group and seven respondents (87.5%) use the player patch option over the best opponent player and only one respondent (12.5%) does not use this option as a tactical tool.

Table 12. Differentiation of tactical tasks depending on playing at home or away

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	11 91.7%	4 57.1%	3 37.5%	18 66.7%
NO	1 8.3%	3 42.9%	5 62.5%	9 33.3%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

When it comes to tactical tasks depending on playing a football match at home or away, the first group of coaches or eleven respondents (91.7%) adjust their tactical tasks on the visiting field and one respondent (8.3%) has the same tactical tasks regardless of whether he plays at home or away. Three respondents (42.9%) in the second group have the same tactical tasks at home and away and four respondents (57.1%) change tactical tasks on the visiting field. Five respondents (62.5%) of the third group do not change tactical tasks on the visiting field, and three respondents (37.5%) do not change tactical tasks. Two thirds (66.7%) of all respondents change tactical tasks depending on whether they play at home or away and one third (33.3%) of all respondents do not adjust tactical tasks regardless of which field they play.

Table 13. Adaptation of tactical ideas with regard to specific conditions (weather conditions, field conditions, audience influence, etc.)

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	12	6	7	25

	100%	85.7%	87.5%	92.6%
NO	0	1	1	2
	0%	14,3%	12,5%	7,4%
Total	12	7	8	27
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The results show that 92.6% of respondents change tactical ideas with regard to specific field conditions, and only two respondents (7.4%) do not change tactical ideas regardless of field conditions. All 12 respondents (100%) of the first group change their tactical ideas with regard to the specific conditions that may occur. Six respondents (85.7%) of the second group also change their tactical tasks, and one respondent (14.3%) does not change his tactical ideas regardless of the playing conditions. Seven respondents (87.5%) of the third group of coaches, as well as most respondents in the first and second groups, believe that they will change their tactical ideas in case of adverse weather conditions, field conditions, audience influence, etc., and one respondent (12.5 %) believes that he would not change his tactical ideas regardless of the specific conditions of playing a football match.

Table 14. Placing players during a defensive throw from the corner

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Zone guarding	3	1	1	5
	25%	14.3%	12.5%	18.5%
Man on man	2	1	1	4
	16.7%	14.3%	12.5%	14.8%
Combined defence	7	5	6	18
	58.3%	71.4 %	75%	66.7%
Total	12	7	8	27
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Two thirds (66.7%) of respondents use combined defence (Table 14), while four respondents (14.8%) opt for a combination of man on man, and five respondents (18.5%) would use a combination of guarding the zone. In the first group, seven respondents (58.3%) use combined defence, two respondents (16.7%) use strictly man-on-man, and three respondents (25%) use zone guarding. Five respondents (71.4%) of the second group opt for the combined variant, one respondent (14.3%) strictly man to man and one respondent (14.3%) guarding the zone. Six respondents (75%) of the third group opt for combined defence, one respondent (12.5%) strictly human to human and one respondent (12.5%) guarding the zone.

Table 15. Number of players who go to the jump during the offensive corner kick

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
	1	1	1	3

3-4 players	9.1%	14.3%	12.5%	11.5%
5 players	6	4	5	15
	54.5%	57.1%	62.5%	57.7%
6 players	4	2	2	8
	36.4%	28.6%	25%	30.8%
Total	12	7	8	27
	100%	100%	100%	100%

By inspecting Table 15, we see that, in the first group of coaches, four respondents (36.4%) use six players during the offensive corner kick, six respondents (54.5%) use five players, one respondent (9.1%) uses three to four players on the offensive break. Two respondents (28.6%) of the second group use six players, four respondents (57.1%) use five players and one respondent (14.3%) uses three to four players when throwing from the corner. In the third group, two respondents (25%) use six players, five respondents (62.5%) use five players, and one respondent (12.5%) uses three to four players during an offensive corner kick.

Table 16. Tactical solution when defensive corner kick - Knowing that the opponent is dangerous from corner kick, would one of your tactical solutions be to leave 2-3 players in the middle of the field, to force the opponent to keep more players in defence?

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	10	5	5	20
	83.3%	71.4%	62.5%	74.1%
NO	2	2	3	7
	16.7%	28.6%	37.5%	25.9%
Total	12	7	8	27
	100%	100%	100%	100%

All three groups of coaches, twenty respondents (74.1%), gave an affirmative answer, which refers to leaving two to three players in the middle of the field as a tactical solution, knowing that the opponent is dangerous when throwing the ball from the corner. Less than a third of all respondents (25.9%) believe that it is not necessary to leave two to three players in the middle of the field to force the opponent to keep more players in defence, despite having information that the opponent is dangerous from a corner kick.

Table 17. Tactical solution during a defensive corner kick - how many players would you leave in a situation if you had an offensive corner kick and the opponent left 2-3 players in the middle of the field?

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
1-2 players	2	1	0	3
	16.7%	14.3%	0%	11.1%
2-3 players	5	1	4	10
	41.7%	14,3%	50%	37%

3-4 players	5 41.7%	5 71.4%	4 50%	14 51.9%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

By analysing Table 17, all three groups of coaches conclude that the majority of respondents (51.9%) would leave 3-4 players in the middle of the field in case their team has an offensive corner kick and, in a situation, where the opponent would leave 2-3 attackers in the middle of the field. In the same situation, 37% of respondents would leave two to three defensive players in the middle of the field, and 11.1% of respondents would leave only 1-2 defensive players in the middle of the field.

Table 18. The trajectory of the ball during the offensive throw in from a corner

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
Input throw in	11 91.7%	7 100%	6 75%	24 88.9%
Output throw in	1 8.3%	0 0%	2 25%	3 11%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

By analysing Table 18 of the first group of coaches, we see that eleven respondents (91.7%) use the input, and only one respondent (8.3%) uses the output throw in from a corner. All seven respondents (100%) of the second group of coaches use the input throw in. Six respondents (75%) of the third group of coaches also use input throw in and two respondents (25%) use output throw in. Analysing the complete table, we come to the data that twenty-four respondents (88.9%) prefer the input throw in from a corner, i.e., that the right-handed throws in from the left and the left-handed uses throw in from the right, and only three respondents (11.1%) use right-handed player to perform throw in from the right side, and left-handed player to perform throw in from the left side.

Table 19. Short play variants during offensive throw in from a corner

OIZA	UPL/UAL	UBL	UCL	Total
YES	7 58.3%	3 42.9%	5 62.5%	15 55.6%
NO	5 41.7%	4 57.1%	3 37.5%	12 44.4%
Total	12 100%	7 100%	8 100%	27 100%

In the case of short play variants during offensive throw in from a corner, in the first group of coaches seven corner players (58.3%) use frequent short plays when, and five respondents (41.7%) do not use

this way of throw in from a corner. Four respondents (57.1%) of the second group do not use short plays and three respondents (42.9%) use frequent short plays. Five respondents (62.5%) of the third group use frequent short plays, and three respondents (37.5%) do not use this type of throwing the ball from the corner. In the total sample, fifteen respondents (55.6%) use short plays, and twelve respondents (44.4%) do not often use short plays during throw in from a corner, but use other tactical ideas in such situations.

### Discussion

The results show that a larger number of coaches in all three groups (63%) base their training on tactics and solving tactical tasks twice a week. The most common game system used in practice is 1: 4: 2: 3: 1, and it is used by (46.2%) coaches. It is mostly used by coaches with PRO and A license (66.7%) as the primary game system, while the same system is used by only 1/4 of the third group of respondents. It was found that 92.6% of coaches prefer offensive style of play with their teams. 77.8% of coaches practice the secondary system of play in training and this percentage is the highest among coaches with a C license (87.5%). A large number of coaches of all three groups (92.6%) agree to analyse the opponent during each game to see their strengths and weaknesses (scouting opponents). We notice that 66.7% of respondents in all three groups prefer a combined method of defence. Zone defence is preferred by (25.9%) of coaches, and only two coaches or (7.4%) prefer individual defence. Evidence that confirms the use of combined defence are the answers to the question about the type of side players and attackers, where 92.6% of respondents from all three groups agree that they prefer a more offensive type of side players, who actively participate in both organization and performance of defence and also move as wing players. Coaches in both wing positions usually place both variants of a side player. Fourteen respondents (51.9%) prefer on right wing / left footed player, left wing / right, footed player and thirteen respondents (48.1%) prefer the right wing / right footed player, left wing / left footed player. Analysing the overall result of the respondents, we conclude that nineteen respondents (70.4%) prefer a lower type of attacker who is inferior in the jump game but with more dynamic movements, therefore it is a type of attacker who can play quality defence with his movements, and eight respondents (29.6%) prefer a higher type of striker because they think they are more dominant in the jump game. Nearly 3/4 of the coaches had an extra briefing during the break, and after that their players had solid organization. The largest number of coaches in all three groups (66.7%) differ in tactical preparation depending on whether they are playing at home or away, but this percentage is the highest in PRO and A licenses



(91.7%) and decreases, so the lowest percentage is with a C-licensed coaches (37.5%). 92.6% of the surveyed coaches change their tactical ideas and adapt the team to such conditions as weather conditions, field conditions, the influence of the audience, referees and many others. In tactical actions in standard situations, which refers to the placement of players during a defensive throw from the corner, it can be concluded that 2/3 of all respondents defend such a break with a combined defence. This way of defending the break is even more used by the respondents of the first and second groups of coaches (71.4% and 75%). In standard situations, it can be noticed that slightly more than 50% of the respondents from all three groups (57.7%) send five players on an offensive throw in from the corner who will try to endanger the opponent's goal with their jump game. If the opponent is dangerous from a corner kick, the respondents of all three groups (74.1%) agreed to leave 2-3 players in the middle of the field as a tactical variant in order to try to force the majority of opposing players to stay in defence. It is obvious that the respondents of the second group of coaches would leave 3-4 defensive players in the middle of the field in the variant of offensive throw in from the corner, and at the same time 2-3 opposing players would remain in the attack. In the same situation, the respondents of the first and third groups half-opted for the variant of 2-3 or 3-4 players. A total of 88.9% of coaches during the offensive throw in from the corner prefer and use the input throw, and that the right-handed perform the throw-in from the left side while the left-handed ones perform the throw-in from the right side. Differences can be noticed between coaches with B license and C license. Respondents with a B license (71.4%) prefer right-handed players on the left wing and left-handed players on the right wing, who can disrupt the opponent's defensive and midfielders with their entrances and at the same time break through on the side. However, coaches who have a C license (62.5%) prefer to position right-handed players on the right wing and left-handed players on the left wing. When using the patch option as a tactical tool over the opponent's best player, large differences can be noticed between the first and the second group of coaches compared with the third group. Respondents from the first group (58.3%) and the respondents of the second group (100%) agree that they do not use the patch option, while the respondents from the third group (87.5%) still take this option into consideration in some matches. The difference has also been noticed between the third and first group of respondents in relation to the second group of coaches (57.1%) who do not use the variant of short play during the offensive throw in from the corner, while the respondents of the first and third groups often use such this solution.

## Conclusion

In order to achieve a positive result, the coaches, in addition to technical and fitness tasks, also use various tactical variants, and try to take advantage of the opponent's weaknesses. In this paper, a survey of UEFA licensed coaches collected a number of data on what they prefer, to set up a team in certain situations. The research was conducted through a survey questionnaire consisting of nineteen questions (13 questions related to game systems, preference for player types, while 6 questions refer to standard situations). Twenty-seven respondents participated in the research, which differ in the level of license obtained. Respondents were sorted into three groups (the first group - respondents holding a UEFA PRO and UEFA A license, the second group - respondents holding a UEFA B license and the third group - respondents holding a UEFA C license). Taking into account the results obtained from the above answers from the questionnaire, we can conclude that there are differences in the application of tactical knowledge and elements between coaches with different degrees of acquired UEFA license. We can also conclude that the identified differences may be the result of the level of acquired education (license level) and football education, but certainly also the acquired experience in practical playing and coaching.

## References

- Bangsbo J, 2014, Physiological demands of football. *Sport Sci Exch*; 27(125), pg.1-6.
- Barišić V, 2007, Kineziološka analiza taktičkih sredstava u nogometnoj igri. (Doktorska disertacija). Zagreb: Kineziološki fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Bunčić, V, Stanković, N, 2015, Tehnika i taktika u sportu. Brčko: Evropski univerzitet.
- Caligiuri P, Herbst D, 1998, Nogomet, Tehnike i taktike za vrhunsku igru. Zagreb: GOPAL d.o.o.
- Čolakhodžić E, Rađo I, Alić H, 2016, Tehnologija treninga mladih nogometaša - nauka i praksa. Mostar: Nastavnički fakultet Univerziteta „Džemal Bijedić“ u Mostaru.
- Čolakhodžić E, Đedović D, Skender N, Novaković R, and Popo A, 2017. Differences in Distance And Intensity Of The Movement Of World Soccer Championship Participants 2010 and 2014. 15 the International Sport Sciences Congress. Antalija; Turkiye.
- Dujmović P, 2000, Škola suvremenog nogometa. Zagrebački nogometni savez.
- Novitović B, 2006, Nogomet, Primenjena tehnika-taktika. Beograd: Bane Novitović.
- Nožinović F, Halilović E, Midžić F, 2002. Nogomet. Tuzla: Filozofski fakultet.
- Toplak I, 1985, Savremeni nogomet i njegove tajne-taktika i metodika. Beograd: Nogometni savez Jugoslavije