RESEARCH PAPER | Sports | Volume : 3 | Issue : 6 | June 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X



# Students' Responses in Football Game and Development of the Players' Cognitive Structures

KEYWORDS: verbalization, methods, responses, game, football.

**Makram Zghibi**
LASELDI, University of Franche-Comté, Besançon, France

**Nabila Bennour**
UMR EFTS, Le Mirail University, Toulouse II, France

**ABSTRACT** *This work is done under a semi-constructivist concept of learning in PSE focusing on the essential role of the language action in knowledge co-construction in / by the action (Chang & al., 1998 Gréhaigne, 2001; Zghibi, 2013 b). From this perspective, this work aims at studying methods of taking decisions of three groups students benefited from a football cycle with verbalization. The referential didactic situation consists in managing time of verbalization in the form of "ideas' debate" (Gréhaigne & al, 1999; Gréhaigne, 2009) between students ("mixed teams, 14 years old) with / without teacher (T = 2 X 4') before / after a match in a reduced field (2 X 10').*

*Student' language activity is dependent on the stadium of development of students' cognitive structures.*

**Introduction**

Teaching in PSE and particularly in collective sports, is not only giving students instructions to apply or orders to follow. It is also a reflexive practice in and by the action (Wallian & al, 2007a). In a semi-constructivist approach where the student is considered so important in the teaching / learning system, the subject is asked to understand in order to play and to play in order to understand (Wallian & al, 2007b). Therefore, the researcher position passes from an interpersonal activity to an intrapersonal process through discursive interlocutions teacher / student (s) and between students / pairs (Zghibi, 2009). The challenge of studying students' verbal interactions is presented as an essential task to understand and analyze teaching-learning process (Ricoeur, 1986). In this context, this work aims at studying students' speech in football game through four periods( primary school, college, secondary school) that draw the development of the remained player cognitive structures (Gréhaigne & al , 1999).

**Methodology**

The research protocol of this study is inspired from the reflection of (Schön, 1983, 1987.1991) and particularly from the semi-constructivism approach developed by Wallian (2007, 2010) and Gréhaigne (1992, 1999, and 2009) .The study deals with three homogeneous groups. Each group includes 8 boys and 6 girls.

- Experimental Group 1 (period of elementary school): it is composed of two teams A (5 players) and B (5 players) aged of 9 years old and enrolled in 3rd primary grade. Each team will benefit from eight learning sessions with verbalization under control of their teacher, they play during a preliminary time of 12 minutes then they verbalize during 4 minutes in the presence of the teacher who asks open questions like: what do you notice, to what do this due to, what are your action plans, ... etc.). Then they return to play so as to validate the decisions that are already taken during the sequence of the idea debate. The aim is to enable students to co-construct a shared knowledge (Lave & Wenger, 1991. Sensevy & al 2007).
- Experimental Group 2 (college period): will benefit from the same training, but with students aged of 14 years old and enrolled in 9th grade.
- Experimental Group 3 (period of secondary school): same thing but with students enrolled in the 3rd year of secondary education.

This research is based on the semiotic approach of students' language productions. (Wallian, 2010). To identify the different types of responses emitted by each group, we opt for the model developed by Kerbrat Orecchioni-model (2001) that distinguishes five types of responses: "no response, out of topic, a beginning of decision, a decision with justification, and at least one alternative with justification." This typology presents the interest of focusing on the communication contract that links exchange partners to structural plan more than dynamic one: "This is the condition that the partners of a language act understand a minimum and can interact in co-constructing meaning, which is the main goal of all communication acts "(Charaudeau & Maingueneau, 2002, p. 138). The sake of completeness from this work pushes also to elaborate another method of response (the reproach) which is the result of the student verbal activity development in context.

**Results**

**Group 1**

**Table II: Encoded data during the eight sessions**

| | session1 | session2 | Session3 | Session4 | session5 | Session6 | Session7 | session8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No response | 10 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 07 | 08 |
| Out of topic | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Beginning of decision | 11 | 09 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 12 | 11 | 13 |
| Decision with justification | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| At least one alternative with justification | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Reproach | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

**Groupe 2**

**Table II. Encoded data during the eight sessions**

| | Session1 | session2 | session3 | session4 | session5 | session6 | session7 | session8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No responses | 6 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Out of topic | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Beginning of decision | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 09 | 10 |
| Decision with justification | 9 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 14 |
| At least one alternative with justification | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Reproach | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |

Volume : 3 | Issue : 6 | June 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X

**Groupe 3**
**Table II. Encoded data during the eight sessions**

| | Session1 | Session2 | Session3 | Session4 | Session5 | Session6 | Session7 | Session8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No responses | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Out of topic | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Beginning of decision | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Decision with justification | 6 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| At least one alternative with justification | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Reproach | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 |

- **No response:** the age variable acts directly on the category "no-response". The difference is very significant for p .001. Students enrolled in primary school resort more to this method of no response. Indeed, the discussion in this age aroused a hesitant attitude among students. Though, students enrolled in college and in secondary school gave free courses to their expression and took more and more the initiative to speak. While the other two classes found less difficulties to response.
- **Out of topic:** the difference is not significant. It could be said also that students of the three classes are aware of the discussion importance and prove interested in sharing opinions in narrow relation with the problems encountered during the game.
- **Beginning of decision:** the difference is very significant for p < .001 in favor of group 1 . Students of the first group used more this response category (beginning of decision). They often tend to respond in a simple and concise way. They preferred to give a response, which does not engage in the process of explaining or arguing, and to avoid driving the deployment of thought to its bitter end.
- **A decision with justification:** the difference is very significant for p < .001 in favor of Group 2. This category of response "a decision with justification" is much more used by college students compared to those enrolled in primary or in secondary school. This allows us to say that the players at this age prefer to give simple responses with a single justification to avoid engaging in an explanation of several arguments risking by attracting criticism from those pairs. Furthermore, students of the first and the second group can also suffer from a deficiency at the level of expression: there is no enough explanations to argue their responses.
- **At least one alternative with justification:** in this response category the difference is very significant for p < .001 in favor of u group 3. The number of exchanges that belongs to this category for Group 3 is more important than that of the exchanges issued for the other two groups. We pass respectively during the cycle of, 3, 5, 4, 6, 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the course of the last session. It seems at this stage (primary school) that students are armed enough with communicative techniques and endowed for a freedom of expression. Students do not hesitate to get caught up in detailed explanations that reflect in fact "a kind of language and social maturation."
- **Reproach:** the difference is not significant. The emergence of the response category "reproach" is almost the same for the three experimental groups. This report corresponds to an emotional attitude that shines out of any control and that can sometimes verge verbal aggression. Those reproaches could be the result of the inadequacy between the views going up to settle the cause of a team mate point of view.

**Interpretation**

The ideas debate between students change in content and in nature according to the teaching period to which they belong. The found results go for granted with the work of Gréhaigne (2009) that classifies the students' cognitive status into four major periods. During the first period (maternal time) the child can establish a result, code what s/he does after having carried out the action. So that, this is the time to carry out a distancing beginning compared to an action under the form of a description after the action. The second period is that of the elementary school and so forth that of the start of the college where the learner is able to describe modalities of his/her action after having acted to enter in a system of regulation facing similar obstacles. It is by the teacher questioning that the player can explain the obtained results: relating what is expected with what is obtained ("I was able to pass the opponent because I ...."). So, it is stage of re-making and of the explanatory description beginning with extraction of action rules. This is a reason for which students resort to methods of response as "beginning of decision."

The third period corresponds to time when college student can describe, understand, or generalize the obtained results to formulate the rules of effective action. In other words, the student is able to explain the factors of success and causes of failure. Through the teacher questioning, the player can dig into these knowledge to give responses. From that, it is required to develop plans and strategies for the success of the action (reflection on action). This is the stage of success and understanding with a beginning of generalization. For that, students prefer to use responses as "decision with justification". The fourth stage covers the period of secondary school where the student is able to problematize him/her self, referring to the proposed situations, hypotheses about faced problems and tools permitting to elaborate their projects. This is the stage of understanding to succeed and to succeed in order to understand permitting problematization by the student before / after the action. Thus, students opt for argued and detailed responses in order to be able to convince the speaker.

**Conclusion**

Following the analysis of these different response categories, it is worth mentioned that the terms of the responses made by students change from one group to another. For the first group, students have opted for the less developed responses mainly as (beginning of decision). This group manifests a moment of perplexity during which students struggle to express themselves. For the second group, we note that students begin to overcome difficulties of expression and began issuing answers with justifications. For the third group, we note that students are able to make responses more and more complex. The category of response "a decision with justification" has been frequently used corresponding to suggestions and to formulate propositions to overcome the encountered difficulties.

Volume : 3 | Issue : 6 | June 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X

**REFERENCE** Chang, CW., Wallian, N., & Gréhaigne, JF. (2008). The tactical knowledge construction: Case study on 5th Grade class in Basketball games. TGfU Symposium, AIESEP World Congress, Sapporo (JP), January 21-24th. | Charaudeau, P., & Maingueneau, D. (2002). Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours. Paris : Seuil. | Gréhaigne, JF, Billard, M et la roche. (1999). .L'enseignement des jeux sportifs collectifs à l'école. Conception, construction, évaluation, Bruxelles. De Boeck. | Gréhaigne, J.F. (1992). L'organisation du jeu en football. Paris : Actio. | Gréhaigne, JF. (2009). Autour du temps. Apprentissages, Espaces, projets dans les sports collectifs. Besançon : PUFC. | Gréhaigne, J. F., & al. (2001). The teaching and learning of decision making in team sports. Quest, 53, 59-76. | Gréhaigne, JF, Billard, M et la roche. (1999). L'enseignement des jeux sportifs collectifs à l'école. Conception, construction, évaluation, Bruxelles. De Boeck. | Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2001). Les actes de langage dans le discours. Paris : Nathan. | Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning : legitimate peripheral participation. New York : Cambridge University Press. | Ricoeur, P. (1986). Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II. Paris : Seuil. | Searle, J.R. (1991). The collective intentionality. In Parreth H. (éd) : Community in words. Liège : Mardaga, 277-243. | Schön, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. How professionals think in action. New York: Basic books. | Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design forTeaching and Learning in the Professions. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass. | Wallian, N. & Chang, C.W. (2006). Development and learning of motor skill competencies, Chap. 13. In D. Kirk (Ed.), Handbook of research in PE. London: Sage Editions. | Wallian, N. & Chang, C.W. (2007a). Language, thinking and action: Towards a semio-constructivist approach in physical education. Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 12(3), 289-311. | Wallian, N., & Chang, C.W. (2007b). Sémiotique de l'action motrice et des activités langagières : vers une épistémologie des savoirs co-construits en sports collectifs. In Gréhaigne, J.F. (dir.). Configurations du jeu, débat d'idées et apprentissage des sports collectifs. Besançon : Presses de l'Université de Franche-Comté, 146-164. | Zghibi, M. (2009). Interactions langagières des élèves et apprentissage en football : le cas de quatre Classes de 9ème Année de Base en Tunisie. Thèse de Doctorat ès Sciences du Sport, Université de Franche Comté. | Zghibi M, Sahli H , Bennour N, Guinoubi Ch, Guerchi M , Hamdi M. (2013b). The Pupil's discourse and action projects: the case of third year high school pupils in Tunisia. Creative Education. | Zghibi M, Gunoubi Ch, Bennour N, Jbeli M, Sahli F, Jabri M (2013a). Evolution of language productions and action rules extraction: case study of an 8th grade class girls during a Handball cycle. Creative Education.