Appendix 1

Scheme used to transcribe video-recorded dialogue in Study 2

Adapted from an original scheme by Silverman (2001)

Symbol	Definition	Example
[	Left bracket indicates the point at which a current speaker's talk is overlapped by another's talk	KR: as of Wednesday, we've, we've SS: [well there's more work (to come)
=	An equals sign at the end of a line indicates no gap between that line and the next; or at the beginning of the line that there is no gap between it and the previous one	PB: yeh MW: = you know just for one row of seats.
(0.5)	A number in parenthesis indicates the elapsed time in silence in seconds	MW: cos otherwise. (2) I mean, (1) structurally
(.)	A dot in parenthesis indicates a very short gap of less than 0.5 seconds	GR: So what we solved (.) well what we realised is that anyway
----	Underscoring indicates some form of stress via pitch and/or amplitude	SS: because it was <u>eight</u>een hundred
::	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The length of the row of colons indicates the length of the prolongation	GR: And um: (1), because what they asked is ehm:: four
( )	Empty parentheses indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said. If accompanied by a figure, this indicates the number of seconds that were inaudible	SS: ( ) <u>updated S D N F</u> files
(word)	Parenthesized words are possible hearings	MW: (what's this?)
(( ))	Double parentheses contain author's descriptions rather than the transcriptions.	SS: ((looks round, sees him behind)) Michael?
.,?	Indicate speaker's intonation (. Is a falling intonation; , is flator slightly rising intonation	MW: Which model is that?

Table A1.1 Outline of coding scheme used to categorize the data from Study 2 (Dialogue content).

Appendix 2

Raw data and initial analysis for Study 1 - The structure of interaction networks between team members during Liveweek

On the following pages are the eighteen sets of interactions observed during Liveweek 2002 for Study 1. The original data (which were hand sketched), were converted in to computer diagrams, but in all other respects the maps are identical to the raw data. Alongside each of these maps I have also presented the social network diagrams that were generated for each of the raw data sets. These show which of the actors within the network were deemed to be *interacting* with one another (indicated by lines between them). To generate these diagrams, interactions between actors were identified on each of the eighteen raw data maps, and these interactions were used to create a eighteen corresponding separate interaction matrices on UCINET (a social network analysis software package created by Borgatti *et al*, 2002). These UCINET matrices were then converted to network diagrams using a social network drawing program, called VNA. The letters by each actor represents the actor's initials; nodes of the same colour belong to the same team.