

Gender Differences in Technical-Tactical Behaviour of LaLiga Spanish Football Teams

Claudio A. Casal ^{1,*}, Rubén Maneiro ², Antonio Ardá ³ and José L. Losada ⁴

¹ Department of Science of Physical Activity and Sport, Catholic University of Valencia “San Vte Mártir”, Valencia, 46900, Spain.

² Department of Science of Physical Activity and Sport, Pontifical University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain.

³ Department of Physical and Sport Education, University of A Coruña, A Coruña, 15179, Spain.

⁴ Department of Methodology of Behavioral Sciences, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, 08035, Spain.

* Corresponding author. ca.casal@ucv.es

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to identify gender differences in technical-tactical behaviour in football. To this end 68 matches of the first division of the Spanish men’s and women’s league, corresponding to 2016/17 season were analyzed. A comparison of medians was carried out using the Mann-Whitney U-test were conducted as post hoc test and a grouping of the variables through the clustering bootstrapping technique in both groups. We have detected statistically significant differences regarding all accurate passes, in favour of men, as well as a greater number of yellow cards. In female football, a greater number of picking up free balls, interceptions, lost balls, recoveries, challenges and attacks, both positional and counterattacks, are produced. The clustering analysis also allowed that in male football, the circumstance of receiving a red card is closely related to the number of goals conceded and most of the shots on goal are achieved by positional attacks. In women's football, ball possession on own half is closely related to the number of losses. These results could be useful for gender-specific training information for optimal preparation. However, more research is warranted to establish the main gender differences and characterize women's football.

Keywords: performance analysis; football; gender differences; LaLiga; technical-tactical behaviour; observational methodology

1. Introduction

Women's soccer in recent years has experienced a very important boom, especially from different areas of knowledge [1,2]. According to recent data from FIFA (2014) the number of participating teams has doubled, and the number of participants in the qualifying stages has almost tripled. The media in

general and television in particular, are increasingly permeable to host matches and broadcast competitions in which women's football is present [3]. As the general interest in a sport increases, the professionalization of it is inevitable and essential [4]. This professionalization will have to lead to a potential increase in player and team performance, due to a greater and exclusive dedication of the same and will require a greater game knowledge and factors that influence performance. In this regard, it should be noted that scientific knowledge about women's football is quite deficient because, in some cases, this knowledge does not evolve at the same pace as social trends or changes, especially when the latter occur at high speed. To put this in perspective, the availability of the few scientific studies that focus the efforts on this soccer hardly refers to the last twenty years [5,6]

If we want to increase performance in women's football we will have to focus on the study of its conditional, technical, tactical-strategic, volitional and socio-affective structure. If we look at the first three, we can see that the number of studies on them is scarce. The works found that have analyzed female football from the conditional and physiological side, such as speeds, accelerations, striking force, fatigue levels, displacements, distances recovered at high intensity and heart rate are those of Bangsbo et al. [7], Barfield et al. [8], Mohr et al. [9,10], Anderson et al. [11], Bradley et al. [12] and Unveren [13]. As we can see, their number is not very wide. But, if the works focused on the conditional analysis are scarce, those related to the technical structure, and tactical-strategic, are still more, since we are facing a situational sport in which these two structures are fundamental, because the main actions of the game must be performed by manipulating a ball with the feet. In addition, these actions are acyclical, stochastic and unexpected. In this sense, some works have been developed that made a comparison of technical-tactical behavior between male and female football, as the one published by Hjelm [14]. Specifically, in this study a comparative analysis of the technical errors (passes, receptions, dribbling, shots, actions with a negative outcome) between male and female players of the Swedish national team is performed. Results show that technical differences were found between genders, specifically, men football players performed more short passes and receptions, on the other hand, women football players perform more actions with a negative outcome, more dribbling and more shots. Another comparative study is that of Bradley et al. [12] in which a comparative analysis was performed between genders of some technical-tactical parameters (duels won, possession time, lost balls, successful passes and touches for possession) in the UEFA Champions League matches, concluding that women lose the ball more times than men, but did not find differences regarding the number of touches by possession, nor in the possession time. In the work of Althoff et al. [15] a comparison between genders was also carried out, analyzing matches of the Men's World Cup in Korea 2002,

and of women in the USA 2003. Their results conclude that, women use more long passes than short ones, the foot's instep, they execute less dribbling and a less aggressive game (less tackling) and they try to get closer to the goal before shooting.

In other studies, more emphasis is placed on the differences in tactical behaviour between both genders. An example being the works of Gómez et al. [16] and Pollard and Gómez [17]. In the first one, finalization differences were analyzed between male and female teams in the World Cup 2006 and 2007 respectively. Results show a greater goal shot average in women's football than in men's. Women made more collective play shots, while men made more individual shots play. In the second work, a comparison between male and female football was carried out on the influence of obtaining victory when playing at home. Thirty-nine European domestic leagues were analyzed, from 2004 to 2010. Results confirm that, in men's football, playing home games is more decisive than in women's football.

On the other hand, some works do not carry out comparative analysis, but focus on studying only female football. An example is the one elaborated by Wlodzimierz et al. [18] in which the field area from which shots were executed and execution leg laterality was studied in the women's under-19 and absolute selections of the world championship, 2004 and 2005 respectively. The results indicate that senior players are ambidextrous, while juniors are not. [19] carry out a very similar study in which foot laterality of the Intercollegiate Women's Football Championship of Turkey players is analyzed. They conclude that these players are characterized by dextrality.

Other works analyze the static phases of the game, specifically in the study done by Jiménez et al. [20] the execution of set pieces was analyzed by the F.C Barcelona women's team during the 2014-2015 season. Concluding that set pieces had a low impact in the final score, they were executed sending the ball mostly to the first post, they were produced mainly in the last thirds of the first and second part, and the majority of the goals obtained through these actions, were achieved in the final minutes of both parts of the match.

Studies found, for each of the performance structures, indicate the need to deepen the study of women's football, to perform a categorization and quantification of competition behaviors and model training, which will increase competitive performance. The absence of this type of studies will obviously lead to the use of male football training methods and systems, thus obviating one of the principles of sports training, which is none other than training specificity. To avoid this circumstance it will be necessary to increase the number of studies that allow identifying the characteristics of women's football, focusing in the exclusive analysis of their game or, making comparative

analysis between the game of both genders, in order to identify differences between them.

It will also be necessary to conduct studies in which domestic competitions are analyzed during a regular season, since the type of competition can influence player and team behavior [21]. Most of the work carried out so far analyzed special competitions (UEFA Champions League, UEFA Euro and FIFA World Cup). This type of design is limited and results may not be conclusive, since in these competitions the number of matches is small and an elimination competition system is established, showing characteristics different from those of a regular league.

In addition, to be able to generalize results, it will also be necessary to carry out studies that analyze more than one team, because case studies, focused on a single team, do not generate results that can be extrapolated to other teams. In this sense, we have not found any previous study that analyzes the technical-tactical structure of female elite football with this type of design (during a regular league, more than one team and with a high number of performance indicators). Only Pollard and Gómez [17] use a domestic league sample, but they focus their analysis on the influence of obtaining victory when playing at home.

Consequently, to fill in the gaps detected in the previous scientific literature, in this study a comparative analysis of the technical-tactical structure between male and female football is carried out, analyzing a several teams of a domestic competition, during one season. The objectives to be achieved with this study are, on the one hand, to characterize the game of women's football and, on the other hand, trying to identify the technical-tactical differences between the game of both genders.

2. Method

Data were obtained from the analysis platform InstatScout and analyzed post event. Instatscout (www.instatscout.com) is a private platform dedicated to assessing the performance of teams in different world leagues. The information cannot be considered either personal or intimate, as the research consisted solely of naturalistic observations in public places, and it was not anticipated that the recordings would be used in a manner that could cause personal harm [22]. No experimental analysis involving human studies is performed in the study. Also, according to Belmont Report [23] the use of public images for research purpose does not required informed consent or the approval of an ethical committee. An ethics approval was therefore not required as per applicable institutional and national guidelines.

2.1. Participants

A total of 68 matches of the men's first division of the Spanish league and of the women's league during the 2016/17 season were analyzed. Unfortunately, the InstatScout platform only has statistics on 68 matches of the Spanish women's league, corresponding to 14 teams. Therefore, to work with similar samples the same number of matches from the men's league have been selected randomly. This selection has been developed applying the "srswor" method, which consists of applying a random sample without replacement with the "n" sample size (equal probabilities, setting a sample size without replacement or substitution). InstatScout granted the necessary permits to provide the images and data and use them for research purposes.

2.2. Performance indicators

The technical-tactical actions compared in this study and whose operative definitions can be consulted in www.instatscout.com, have been divided into three groups, according to the available literature [24–32], (see Table 1).

Table 1. Selected performance indicators.

Groups	Performance indicators
Outcome of attack	Goals scored, shots, shots on target
Offence	Attacks, positional attacks, attacks with shots-positional, counterattacks, counterattacks with shots, set pieces attack, attacks with shot set pieces attacks, ball possession, ball possession on own half, ball possession on opponent half, ball possession time in the final third of the field, attacking challenges, attacking challenges won, corners, crosses, crosses accurate, dribbles, dribbles successful, fouls opponent, lost balls, lost balls in own half, offsides, passes, passes accurate, extra attacking and key passes, extra attacking and key passes accurate, passes forward, passes forward accurate, passes back, passes back accurate, passes to the left, passes to the left accurate, passes to the right, passes to the right accurate.
Defence	Challenges, challenges won, air challenges, air challenges won, defensive challenges, defensive challenges won, fouls, goal conceded, interceptions, interceptions in opposition half, picking up free balls, picking up free balls in opposition half, recovered balls, recovered balls in opposition half, tackles, tackles successful, red cards, yellow cards.

3. Data reliability

To ensure the reliability of the data, five randomly selected matches were coded by the authors of this study and then compared with those provided by InstatScout. The Kappa (K) values obtained ranged from 0.92 to 0.98.

4. Procedure and statistical analysis

To carry out the statistical analysis the program R (v.3.4.1) was used, using the pvclust library [33]. The significance level for each performance indicator was set at 1% to be more conservative in the detection of differences between groups. Further, the data of the groups were checked for normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk). Due to the fact that the samples were no normally distributed, non-parametric tests were applied, specifically the Mann Whitney U test.

In order to acknowledge the magnitude of the differences between groups, the Mann Whitney U effect size was calculated:

$$r = \frac{z}{\sqrt{N}}$$

We explain that z is the standardized score of the Mann Whitney U, and N the number of observations. For its interpretation, the Cohen (1988) criteria is followed, where r = 0.10 equals low difference, r = 0.30 equals medium, r = 0.50 equals large and r = 0.70 equals very large, although some authors [34] indicate that Cohen's correlation guidelines are too demanding, being consistent with the significance value of 1%. We maintain this author's criteria.

Finally, due to the large number of variables analyzed, a clustering analysis was carried out in both groups, in order to carry out groupings and check if there are differences in them. Specifically, the bootstrapping technique [35,36] was applied following the following procedure: The R's pvclust package is used for the uncertainty evaluation in the hierarchical grouping analysis. For each group, p-values are calculated, which are determined using non-parametric multiscalar bootstrap resampling, which is a descriptive exploratory technique. This provides two types of p-values: p-value Approximate Unbiased (AU) and p-value Bootstrap Probability (BP). p-value AU is calculated by bootstrap resampling of multiple scales, it is a better approximation and more unbiased than the p-value of BP, calculated by normal bootstrap resampling, which is less accurate than the AU value. By an analogy with standard normal theory, the p-value AU is roughly estimated with values between 0 and 1. Clusters with AU greater than 0.95 are highlighted by rectangles, which are strongly supported by the data.

For a cluster with AU p-value > 0.95, the hypothesis that "the cluster does not exist" is rejected with a significance level of 0.05. These p-values include the sampling error, since they are also calculated by a limited number of bootstrap samples. The cluster analysis application collects a total of 10,000 samples to perform a multiscalar bootstrap resampling. Clusters whose result had an ≥ 0.90 alpha were selected, applying correlational distance.

5. Results

Table 2 shows the results obtained from the comparison of medians between all the variables. No significant differences were found for any variables of the outcome of attack group.

For the second group of variables (offensive performance indicators) it can be seen that significant differences were obtained in the variables: attacks, positional attacks, counterattacks, attacking challenges, fouls opponent, lost balls, passes, passes accurate, passes back, passes back accurate, passes to the left and the right, passes to the left and the right accurate and passes forward accurate.

In the third group of variables (defensive performance indicator) significant differences have been found in: challenges, challenges won, defensive challenges, defensive challenges won, interceptions, interceptions in opposition half, picking up free balls, picking up free balls in opposition half, recovered balls, recovered balls in opposition half, tackles successful and yellow card.

Table 2. Summary descriptives table by group of categories.

Performance indicators	Female	Male	p.overall
Categories related to Outcome of attack			
Goals scored. Result	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	1.00 [1.00;2.00]	0.681
Shots	11.0 [7.00;16.8]	10.0 [7.00;13.0]	0.210
Shots on target	4.00 [2.00;7.00]	4.00 [3.00;6.00]	0.699
Categories related to offence			
Attacks	102 [92.0;114]	91.0 [83.2;103]	<0.001
Positional attacks	71.0 [62.0;83.0]	66.0 [58.0;73.5]	0.010
Attacks with shots positional	6.00 [3.00;9.00]	5.00 [3.00;6.00]	0.209
Counter attacks	19.5 [16.0;22.0]	18.0 [14.0;20.0]	0.005
Counter attacks with shot	2.00 [1.00;3.75]	2.00 [1.00;3.75]	0.950
Set pieces attacks	9.50 [7.00;12.8]	9.00 [6.00;11.8]	0.159
Attacks with shots set pieces attacks	3.00 [2.00;4.00]	3.00 [1.25;3.75]	0.462
Ball possession min.	25.0 [21.0;30.0]	27.5 [22.0;32.0]	0.137
Ball possession in own half	782 [646;979]	920 [721;1.067]	0.015
Ball possession in opp half	661 [499;957]	632 [523;833]	0.707
Ball p. time in the final third of the field	392 [240;544]	342 [232;442]	0.273
Attacking challenges	99.5 [84.0;106]	86.0 [76.8;98.5]	0.009
Attacking challenges won	43.0 [34.0;47.0]	39.0 [35.0;46.0]	0.503
Corners	4.00 [2.00;5.75]	4.00 [2.00;6.00]	0.869
Crosses	11.0 [6.00;14.0]	10.0 [6.00;14.0]	0.995
Crosses accurate	3.00 [1.00;5.00]	2.00 [1.00;3.00]	0.156
Dribbles	33.0 [22.5;40.8]	33.0 [26.0;38.0]	0.944
Dribbles successful	16.5 [11.0;23.8]	19.0 [14.0;24.0]	0.136
Fouls opponent	11.0 [9.00;15.0]	14.0 [10.2;16.0]	0.007
Lost balls	94.0 [79.5;108]	79.5 [62.8;92.8]	<0.001
Lost balls in opp. Half	23.0 [16.0;29.8]	16.0 [12.2;21.8]	<0.001
Offsides	2.00 [1.00;3.75]	2.00 [1.00;3.00]	0.611
Passes	393 [357;490]	481 [390;572]	0.001
Passes accurate	276 [240;378]	397 [311;488]	<0.001
Extra attacking and key passes	13.0 [6.00;19.5]	16.0 [10.2;23.8]	0.043

Extra attack. And key passes accurate	5.00 [3.00;10.0]	7.50 [5.00;11.0]	0.047
Passes forward	296 [266;328]	321 [276;368]	0.122
Passes back	106 [74.8;147]	164 [129;201]	<0.001
Passes to the left	195 [175;240]	238 [201;286]	<0.001
Passes to the right	198 [170;240]	245 [195;276]	0.003
Passes forward accurate	190 [171;236]	239 [196;294]	<0.001
Passes back accurate	92.5 [64.5;136]	151 [118;192]	<0.001
Passes to the left accurate	140 [121;181]	196 [156;242]	<0.001
Passes to the right accurate	146 [118;183]	199 [154;237]	<0.001
Categories related to defence			
Challenges	201 [178;207]	174 [154;193]	<0.001
Challenges won	98.0 [87.0;108]	89.0 [79.2;99.5]	0.003
Air challenges	43.0 [33.8;54.2]	47.0 [36.0;63.2]	0.167
Air challenges won	21.5 [17.2;27.8]	25.0 [17.2;32.0]	0.244
Defensive challenges	99.5 [84.0;107]	85.0 [77.0;96.0]	0.002
Defensive challenges won	54.0 [49.2;61.0]	47.0 [41.0;53.8]	<0.001
Fouls	12.0 [9.25;16.0]	13.50[10.2;17.0]	0.112
Goals conceded. Result	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	0.467
Interceptions	63.5 [55.0;71.0]	51.0 [45.2;55.8]	<0.001
Interceptions in opp. Half	15.5 [11.0;19.0]	9.00 [7.00;13.0]	<0.001
Picking up free balls	80.0 [74.0;92.0]	63.0 [56.0;74.0]	<0.001
Picking up free balls in opp. Half	26.0 [22.0;36.5]	20.0 [15.0;25.8]	<0.001
Recovered balls	67.5 [60.0;72.8]	54.0 [51.0;58.0]	<0.001
Recovered balls in opp. Half	14.0 [11.0;19.0]	8.00 [6.25;11.8]	<0.001
Tackles	44.0 [36.0;52.0]	39.0 [32.0;46.8]	0.022
Tackles successful	26.0 [21.0;29.0]	20.0 [17.0;24.8]	<0.001
Red card	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	0.013
Yellow card	0.00 [0.00;0.00]	0.00 [0.00;0.00]	<0.001
ID_unit	794 [777;810]	484 [224;660]	<0.001
Prob.	2.00 [2.00;2.00]	1.00 [1.00;1.00]	<0.001
Stratum	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	1.00 [0.00;2.00]	<0.001

In table 3 we can observe the effect size of the significantly different variables for both genders. The biggest differences are found in the variables recovered balls, recovered balls in opp. half and picking up free balls. The following variables that show intermediate significant differences are interceptions in opp. half, interceptions, passes back accurate, yellow card, passes back, passes to the left accurate, passes accurate, tackles successful, passes to the right accurate, lost balls, picking up free balls in opp. half, defensive challenges won, passes forward accurate, attacks, challenges and passes to the left. Finally, the other variables show very small differences between both genders.

Table 3. Mann Whitney’s U effect size test results.

Performance indicators	r	Interpretation
Recovered balls	0.549	Big difference
Recovered balls in opp. Half	0.538	Big difference
Picking up free balls	0.509	Big difference
Interceptions in opp. Half	0.474	Medium difference

Interceptions	0.467	Medium difference
Passes back accurate	0.450	Medium difference
Yellow card	0.443	Medium difference
Passes back	0.418	Medium difference
Passes to the left accurate	0.416	Medium difference
Passes accurate	0.404	Medium difference
Tackles successful	0.397	Medium difference
Passes to the right accurate	0.380	Medium difference
Lost balls	0.372	Medium difference
Picking up free balls in opp half	0.366	Medium difference
Defensive challenges won	0.350	Medium difference
Passes forward accurate	0.341	Medium difference
Attacks	0.336	Medium difference
Challenges	0.318	Medium difference
Passes to the left	0.309	Medium difference
Passes	0.286	Low difference
Defensive challenges	0.275	Low difference
Passes to the right	0.262	Low difference
Challenges won	0.258	Low difference
Counter attacks	0.244	Low difference
Attacking challenges	0.228	Low difference
Fouls opponent	0.233	Low difference
Positional attacks	0.224	Low difference

263

264 Regarding the results of the clustering analysis, the dendograms of both
 265 genders are presented with two p-values. AU that is used for grouping
 266 interpretation, and the BP that is the value of "probability bootstrap", less
 267 precise than the AU value.

268 In men's football, 15 clusters have been obtained (Fig. 1). Eleven of them are
 269 formed by two variables: Goals conceded result - Red card with AU = 0.99 and
 270 Ball possession in own half - Ball possession in own half seconds; Dribbles -
 271 Dribbles successful; Extra attacking and key passes - Extra attacking and key
 272 passes accurate; Shots - Attacking with shots positional; Interceptions in opp.
 273 half - Recovered ball in opp. half; Crosses - Crosses accurate; Yellow card -
 274 Fouls; Tackles - Tackles successful; Lost ball - Lost ball in own half all of them
 275 with AU = 1.


276 A cluster with three variables: Attacks with shots set pieces attacks - Corners
 277 - Set pieces attacks (AU = 1).

278 A cluster with four variables: Ball possession in opp. Half min. - Ball
 279 possession in opp. half second - Ball possession in the final third of the field min
 280 - Ball possession in the final third of the field (AU = 1).

281 Another cluster with six variables: Attacking challenges - Challenges in
 282 attack won - Air challenges - Air challenges won - Challenges - Challenges won
 283 - Defensive challenges - Challenges in defence won (AU = 0.96).

284 Finally, the largest cluster formed by eleven variables: Ball possession min -
 285 Passes back - Passes back accurate - Passes forward - Passes forward accurate -


286 Passes to the right – Passes - Passes accurate - Passes to the left - Passes to the
287 left accurate (AU = 1).



288
289 **Figure 1.** Cluster dendrogram with AU/BP values (%) men.
290

291 In the case of women's football (Fig.2), 7 clusters are detected. Four clusters
292 are formed by two variables: Air challenger - Air challenger won (AU = 0.1);

293 Picking up free balls - Picking up free balls in opp. half (AU = 0.92); Dribbles -
294 Dribbles successful (AU = 1); Tackles - Tackles successful (AU = 0.98).



295
296 **Figure 2.** Cluster dendrogram with AU/BP values (%) women.
297

298 A cluster formed by three variables: Attacks with shots set pieces attacks -
299 Corners - Set pieces attacks (AU = 1).

A cluster of four variables: Ball possession in own half min. - Ball possession in own half s. - Lost ball - Lost ball in own half (AU = 0.96)

Finally, a cluster formed by twenty-six variables (AU = 0.9): Goal scored - Attack - Positional attack - Passes forward - Ball possession - Passes back - Passes back accurate - Passes to the left - Passes to the left accurate - Passes forward accurate - Passes accurate - Passes to the right accurate - Passes - Passes to the right - Crosses - Crosses accurate - Recovery ball in opp. half - Extra attacking and keys passes - Extra attacking and key passes accurate - Ball possession in opp. half min. - Ball possession in opp. half s. - Ball possession time in the final third of the field min. - Ball possession time in the final third of the field s. - Shots on target - Shots - Attacks with shot positional.

6. Discussion

The objectives of the study were, on the one hand, to describe the characteristics of women's football and, on the other hand, to identify the differences in technical-tactical behavior between the male and female first division football teams of the Spanish league. For this, 68 matches of both competitions were analyzed, corresponding to the 2016/17 season. In this work we intend to establish a comparative analysis to identify differences, not to point them as weaknesses, but as a practice particularity of each gender. In this context, it is the first study that analyzes technical-tactical performance factors of elite women's football in a domestic league during the game's dynamic phase. Therefore, discrepancies can be found between the evidence found in this study and those of previous works with samples corresponding to special competitions (UEFA Euro, FIFA World Cup and UEFA Champions League), among other reasons, by the type of competition analyzed.

Results obtained allow us to indicate the existence of technical-tactical differences between elite football for women and men. Specifically, we can say that women's football is characterized by carrying out a greater number of attacks, both positional and counterattacks. This circumstance, together with a greater number of recoveries and recoveries in the opposite field, will necessarily be linked to the existence of a greater number of transitions, producing more possession changes per game cycle prior to an interruption, which makes it more dynamic. Keeping possession of the ball, first of the objectives of the attacking game of high-level teams, seems that it has not yet been achieved by women teams, perhaps it has something to do with a need to improve the ability to keep the ball in situations of tactical commitment and space-time pressure.

Another important difference found refers to the number of passes and successful passes. Our work shows evidence that women make fewer passes of any kind and fewer successful passes than men. These results corroborate those of previous studies such as those of Hjelm [14], who analyzed the Swedish

men's and women's national teams during the 2002, 2006 and 2003, 2007 world championships respectively. In his work he concludes that men make more passes and short passes and women make more long passes and more unsuccessful passes. Another work that corroborates these results is that of [37], who also obtained a greater number of passes in men, as well as the work of Bradley et al. [12] who analyzed gender differences in the UEFA Champions League matches and concluded that women lose more balls and make fewer successful passes than men. The fact of making fewer passes and a greater number of lost balls clearly identifies a less evolved style of play, a style currently abandoned by men's football, which is currently based on long possessions [38–43] and high number of players interventions. We insist that this feature of the game can be closely linked to a deficit in the ball's domain, in situations of time-space compromise. This data also helps to strengthen the individual character of this game, as just mentioned when describing the type of possessions of women's football.

The results of this study also indicate that in women's football a greater number of attacking challenges, defensive challenges and defensive challenges won, picking up free balls and picking up free balls in opposition half is observed. These data coincide with those obtained in the work of Hjelm [14], indicating that in women's football there is less control of the ball and it remains for a longer time without a clear possessor, which leads to a greater number of challenges to gain the ball's control. We will, therefore, in front of a game in which the percentage of split possession time should be higher than that of male football, which reveals, again, a low technical level game, typical of players in formation stages.

We have also found that in women's football there is a greater number of interceptions, interceptions in opposition half, losses, recoveries and recoveries in opposition half. These data are in line with the previous ones and do nothing but strengthen the echo that in women's football there is less control of the ball in real game situations. In the study by Hjelm [14], it is also indicated that women make more mistakes than men, as in the work of Bradley et al. [12] who indicates that women's football produces a greater number of lost balls than in men's.

On the other hand, we have not detected differences regarding dribbling, number of shots on target and goals, as Hjelm's work detects, [14], although these differences may be because in their study only the matches of the national Swedish teams were analyzed during the development of two world championships. As in some previous works, we have not detected differences in elements related to the number of corners, offsides, fouls, ball possessions, shots and set pieces.

Results found through clustering analysis have also allowed us to identify some relevant differences between the game of both genders. The number of groupings in both genders has been different, as well as the relationships

between the different variables. The first thing we can see is that, in the case of male football, a greater number of groupings have been found (15) and with greater discrimination between the relationships of the different variables. In women's football, the number of groupings has been lower (7) and there is less differentiation between variables. Groupings of men's football allow establishing a better relationship between similar technical-tactical actions, while in female football this discrimination does not occur and a large number of actions with a greater or lesser technical-tactical similarity are included in the same grouping.

Of the groupings found in men's football it is possible to emphasize the narrow relation found between the circumstance of receiving a red card with the number of conceded goals. Which indicates that receiving a red card will entail conceding a greater number of goals. We also checked how the number of shots on goal is related to positional attacks, which corroborates data shown in previous analysis and indicates that male football is characterized by attacks, mostly positional and that these types of attacks are the most successful, results that coincide with some previous works [38–43].

In the case of women's football we have seen how challenges are mostly aerial. It is not possible to discriminate different types of attack, passes, possessions and recoveries and a very significant circumstance is that possession time in one's own field is very related to the number of ball losses. As indicated above, women's football is characterized by many ball losses, if we maintain possession a long time in our midfield, this will cause a greater probability of losses in that sector.

We can also affirm that women's football is characterized by a less controlled team game, favouring the existence of a greater number of divided balls, proposing a very different playstyle from male football, a game based on dispute and individual duels, very contrary to what one might think by their physical abilities, and that we believe may be related to deficits in their coordinative structure. In this sense it would be necessary to reflect on the suitability of certain changes in the structural elements of the sport itself, such as the ball model and the playing field dimensions, a circumstance similar to that which occurs in lower category competitions in which these elements are modified, to facilitate the game action of players.

The data obtained in this study, in which the game of the Spanish league's first division is analyzed, allows to affirm the existence of functional differences between male and female football and coincide with most of the previous works that studied World Cups, UEFA Euro and UEFA Champions League matches. Therefore, we can indicate that Spanish female elite football has characteristics very similar to those played by national teams and local leagues in other countries. We should ask ourselves if those differences represent a problem to solve or we have to accept them as an identity factor of the women's game.

Results found in this work allow to have greater knowledge of how the game action is developed in women's football and what are the main differences with male football, which will make possible to design a specific preparation, which should pursue as its main objective the improvement of the players coordinating structure. However, we believe that there is a long way to go in the development of training processes that lead to an improvement in technical-tactical skills, so it will be necessary to continue analyzing women's football in depth, in order to have a more exact knowledge of their singularities, thus being able to increase its performance.

Acknowledgmets

We gratefully acknowledge the support of Generalitat Valenciana project: *análisis observacional de la acción de juego en el fútbol de élite* (Conselleria d'Educació, Investigació, Cultura i Esport) during the period: 2017-2019 (GV2017/044). We also acknowledge the support of Universidad Católica de Valencia "San Vicente Mártir" project: *Estudios en el deporte de élite desde los Mixed Methods: técnicas de análisis de estudios comparativos*, during the period 2018 [Grant UCV2017/230-002]

References

1. LeFeuvre AD, Stephenson EF, Walcott SM. Football frenzy: The effect of the 2011 world cup on women's professional soccer league attendance. *J Sports Econ.* 2013;14(4):440-8.
2. Meier HE, Leinwather M. Women as 'armchair audience'? Evidence from German national team football. *Sociol Sport J.* 2012;29(3):365-84.
3. Meier HE, Konjer M, Leinwather M. The demand for women's league soccer in Germany. *Eur Sport Manag Q.* 2016;16(1):1-19.
4. Kjaer JB, Agergaard S. Understanding women's professional soccer: the case of Denmark and Sweden. *Soccer Soc.* 2013;14(6):816-33.
5. Hoare D, Warr CR. Talent identification and women's soccer: an Australian experience. *J Sports Sci.* 2000;18(9):751-8.
6. Little T, Williams A. Specificity of acceleration, maximum speed, and agility in professional soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2005;19(1):76-8.
7. Bangsbo J, Norregaard L, Thorso, F. Activity profile of competition soccer. *Can J Sport Sci.* 1991;16:110-6.
8. Barfield W, Kirkendal D, Yu B. Kinematic instep kicking differences between elite female and male soccer players. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2002;3(1):72-9.
9. Mohr M, Krstrup P, Bangsbo J. Match performance of high standard soccer players with special reference to development of fatigue. *J Sports Sci.* 2003;21:519-28.
10. Mohr M, Krstrup P, Anderson H, Kirkendal D, Bangsbo J. Match activities of elite women soccer players at different performance levels. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2008;22(2):341-9.
11. Anderson H, Randers M, Heiner-Moller A, Krstrup P, Mohr M. Elite female soccer players perform more high-intensity running when playing in international games compared with domestic league games. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2010;24(4):912-9.

- 473 12. Bradley PS, Dellal A, Mohr M, Castellano J, Wilkie A. Gender differences in match
474 performance characteristics of soccer players competing in the UEFA Champions League.
475 *Hum Mov Sci.* febrero de 2014;33:159-71.
- 476 13. Unveren A. Investigating Women Futsal and Soccer Players' Acceleration, Speed and
477 Agility Features. *Anthropologist.* julio de 2015;21:361-5.
- 478 14. Hjelm J. The bad female football player: women's football in Sweden. *Soccer Soc.*
479 2011;12(2):143-58.
- 480 15. Althoff K, Kroiher J, Hennig EM. A soccer game analysis of two World Cups: playing
481 behavior between elite female and male soccer players. *Footwear Sci.* 2010;2(1):51-6.
- 482 16. Gómez M, Álvaro J, Barriopedro M. Patrón de actuación en las acciones de finalización en
483 el fútbol masculino y femenino. *Kronos.* 2009;VIII(14):5-14.
- 484 17. Pollard R, Gómez MA. Comparison of home advantage in men's and women's football
485 leagues in Europe. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2014;14(1):77-83.
- 486 18. Włodzimierz S, Józef B, Andrzej S. Movement symmetry and asymmetry of goal shots in
487 female football at European championships and at World Cup. *Afr J Phys Health Educ*
488 *Recreat Dance.* 2011;17(4):865-78.
- 489 19. Akalin T, Gümüş M, Göktepe M, Acar H, Tutkun E. Cerebral Laterality of Women
490 Soccer's. *Int J Acad Res.* 2016;8:48-52.
- 491 20. Jiménez C, Díaz R, Rodríguez D. Análisis observacional de los saques de esquina y tiros
492 libres indirectos en el fútbol femenino de alto nivel. *Kronos.* 2016;15(2):1-13.
- 493 21. Taylor JB, Mellalieu SD, James N, Shearer DA. The influence of match location, quality of
494 opposition, and match status on technical performance in professional association
495 football. *J Sports Sci.* 2008;26(9):885-95.
- 496 22. A.P.A. Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. 2010.
- 497 23. Belmont Report T. *Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of*
498 *Research.* The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical
499 and Behavioral Research. Washintton; 1978.
- 500 24. Castellano J, Casamichana D, Lago C. The Use of Match Statistics that Discriminate
501 Between Successful and Unsuccessful Soccer Teams. *J Hum Kinet.* 2012;31(1):118-123.
- 502 25. Lago-Ballesteros J, Lago-Peñas C, Rey E. The effect of playing tactics and situational
503 variables on achieving scorebox possessions in a professional soccer team. *J Sports Sci.*
504 2012;30:1455-61.
- 505 26. Lago-Peñas C, Lago-Ballesteros J. Game location and team quality effects on performance
506 profiles in professional soccer. *J Syst Sci Med.* 2011;10(3):465-71.
- 507 27. Lago-Peñas C, Lago-Ballesteros J, Dellal A, Gómez M. Game-related statistics that
508 discriminated winning, drawing and losing teams from the Spanish soccer league. *J Syst*
509 *Sci Med.* 2010;9(2):288-93.
- 510 28. Liu H, Gomez M-Á, Lago-Peñas C, Sampaio J. Match statistics related to winning in the
511 group stage of 2014 Brazil FIFA World Cup. *J Sports Sci.* 21 de julio de 2015;33(12):1205-13.
- 512 29. Liu H, Hopkins W, Gómez MA, Molinuevo JS. Inter-operator reliability of live football
513 match statistics from OPTA Sportsdata. *Int J Perform Anal Sport.* 2013;13(3):803-21.
- 514 30. Tenga A, Holme I, Ronglan LT, Bahr R. Effect of playing tactics on goal scoring in
515 Norwegian professional soccer. *J Sports Sci.* 2010;28(3):237-44.
- 516 31. Tenga A, Ronglan LT, Bahr R. Measuring the effectiveness of offensive match-play in
517 professional soccer. *Eur J Sport Sci.* julio de 2010;10(4):269-77.
- 518 32. Tenga A, Holme I, Ronglan LT, Bahr R. Effect of playing tactics on achieving score-box
519 possessions in a random series of team possessions from Norwegian professional soccer
520 matches. *J Sports Sci.* febrero de 2010;28(3):245-55.
- 521 33. Suzuki R, Shimodaira H. Pvcust: an R package for assessing the uncertainty in
522 hierarchical clustering. *Bioinformatics.* 2006;22(12):1540-2.

- 523 34. Gignac GE, Szodorai ET. Effect size guidelines for individual differences researchers.
524 *Personal Individ Differ.* noviembre de 2016;102:74-8.
- 525 35. Casella G, Berger RL. *Statistical Inference*. 2nd Edition. Pacific Grove: Duxbury Press; 2002.
- 526 36. Efron B, Tibshirani R. An Introduction To The Bootstrap. En: *Journal of the American*
527 *Statistical Association*. 1993. p. 436.
- 528 37. Miyamura S, Susuma S, Hisauki K. A time analysis of men's and women's soccer. *Sci*
529 *Footb III*. 1997;251-7.
- 530 38. Bloomfield JR, Polman RCJ, O'Donoghue PG. Effects of score-line on intensity of play in
531 midfield and forward players in the FA Premier League. *J Sports Sci*. 2005;23:191-2.
- 532 39. Carling C, Williams AM, Reilly T. *Handbook of soccer match analysis: A systematic approach to*
533 *improving performance*. Abingdon UK: Routledge; 2005.
- 534 40. Casal CA, Losada JL, Ardá T. Análisis de los factores de rendimiento de las transiciones
535 ofensivas en el fútbol de alto nivel. *Rev Psicol Deporte*. 2015;24(1):103-10.
- 536 41. Casal CA, Losada JL, Maneiro R, Ardá T. Influencia táctica del resultado parcial en los
537 saques de esquina en fútbol / Influence of Match Status on Corner Kick in Elite Soccer. *Rev*
538 *Int Med Cienc Act Física Deporte*. 2017;68:715-728
- 539 42. Hook C, Hughes M. *Patterns of play leading to shots in 'euro 2000'*. Passcom UWIC. 2001;
- 540 43. James N, Jones PD, Mellalieu SD. Possession as a performance indicator in soccer. *Int J*
541 *Perform Anal Sport*. 2004;4:98-102.
- 542