

Verbalization in football games and evolution of logical connectives: the case of a ninth basic year class in Tunisia



Physical Education

KEYWORDS :

Chamseddine Guinoubi	Research Laboratory, "Sports Performance Optimization" National Center of Medicine and Science in Sports (CNMSS), Tunis, Tunisia
Nabila Bennour	UMR EFTS, Le Mirail University, Toulouse II, France
Hajer Sahli	Higher Institute of Sports and Physical Education, Kef, Tunisia
Mohamed Jabri	Higher Institute of Sports and Physical Education, Kef, Tunisia
Makram Zghibi	LASELDI, University of Franche-Comté, Besançon, France

ABSTRACT

In this paper we opt for the Geneva's model that aims to detect the evolution of student's verbal productions. To understand the phenomena of verbalization, conversational parameters must be taken into account. A pragmatic study is always based on the enunciation parameters. Every conversation is contextualized; it is part of a pragmatic framework and complies with enunciation parameters such as the spatio-temporal framework of discourse and the actors. Therefore, verbal interactions can be studied on the basis of logical connectors that can lead the interlocutor to the aimed conclusion. Thus, linguistic markers (personal pronouns, adverbs) can be used to understand the organization and structuring of interactive discourse.

Introduction

The speech helps to achieve social interactions via the lived experiences in team sports. Discussions between pupils focus on the preliminary experience of the game (before the verbalization). During these discussions, pupils think about the action in order to develop a collective project. In addition, the return to game is the opportunity to confirm or not their planned actions. It is in this logic that language interactions arise as a moment when pupils exchange their opinions in order to enrich their personal experiences. These speech acts concern the collective actions, which allow achieving collective goals. We can say then, that what is shared via the verbalization is the source of what is understood and learned. Individual interpretation of a part of the game reflects the ability of a player and the strategies developed between teammates.

Methodology

We aim to follow the progress of language interactions in a didactic situation (Bruner, 1983; Brousseau, 1998) about a confrontation in a team sport (Chang et al, 1998. Gréhaigine, 2010). Speakers, (in this case the pupils), use connectors to describe and analyze the game. Thus, they co-construct knowledge of

action around the interpretations they make (Wallian, 2010). Given the plethora of logical connectives used in language activity, it is more appropriate to list them by the interdiscursive process. These logical connectives are divided into four major classes: *argumentative* operators, *conterargumentative* operators, *reevaluative* operators and *conclusive* operators (Roulet, 1985). They serve as indicators in the analysis of discourse produced by pupils.

We will focus specifically on the body of a thesis conducted in didactics of football over Tunisian pupils (Zghibi, 2009). Eight sessions of football (effective 4 hours) are taught to pupils of 14 years old ($n = 20$). The proposed situations are based on games of 5 VS 5 in a small pitch (40 m x 20 m). Each session consists of two situations ($T = 10$ minutes), under the supervision of the teacher, separated by a sequence of verbalization ($t = 6$ minutes). An analysis of different logical connectives will help to detect the progress of pupils' speech through the cycle. Given the small number of sessions (8), we found it more useful to proceed to an interpretive qualitative analysis of the evolution of logical connectives more than a statistical one.

Results

	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4	Session 5	Session 6	Session 7	Session 8
Argumentative operators	3	5	3	4	6	8	7	9
Conterargumentative operators	6	5	5	4	6	9	12	12
Reevaluative operators	2	6	3	5	4	5	5	4
Conclusive operators	2	2	3	4	5	5	6	6

Pupils' verbal exchanges progress through the cycle. Argumentative operators, conterargumentative operators and conclusive operators, showed apparent evolution. The increase of those operators is in favor of the verbalization's process. "Reevaluative" operators didn't show an important increase. The increase of argumentative operators shows that language productions about the game progress gradually towards a logic of interpersonal cooperation. The evolution of conterargumentative operators shows that pupils faced through the cycle many situations of "ideas' debate" that result in forms of impasses in decision making. These connectors are designed to question some of the decisions already taken by suggesting other views and other solutions that will reunify the opinions or expand the discussion. The increase in conclusive operators shows the culmination of pupils' thinking: through the cycle these connectors are

more used because they represent the top of an interpretive demarche of each pupil. These connectors are important because they reflect the ability to make judgments and lead to a summary conclusion. Finally, the reevaluative operators did not an improvement, this can be explained by the fact that in a situation of discussion, teammates constantly arise, not an explicit judgment of what is said, but an assessment of its discursive relevance: the speaker compare his speech with those of his teammates and constantly reposition his discursive productions (Peytard 1994).

Discussion

The speech offers a free field of interpretation of the game. This can be either open or confrontational. In fact, the speech acts play a nodal role in the didactic situation (Wallain,). Interac-

tional strategies are strongly impregnated with the discursive markers that influence the type of speech act mobilized by the speaker. More importantly, the circulation of knowledge in and through action passes via the exchanges between teammates during the game. The analysis took into account the presence of these discursive markers that guide the interpretation of the

hearer. A discourse marker used to explain and reformulate can be for example "that is to say," or can be used in judgment (eg, "therefore") or for reformulation. A marker is used to establish mutual understanding between teammates through language exchanges. It may also be via non-verbal means (eg smile, grimaces ... etc.).