World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

From prescribed knowledge content to assessment objects: An anthropological analysis of basketball in the third year of secondary school in PORTO-NOVO, BENIN

OGUEBOULE Bachar Moba-Ola-N'lé [1,*], ATOUN Carlos Eméry Hyacinthe [1], GNANVE Sébastien [1], AGBODJOGBE Djéssounoukon Basile [1], ATTIKLEME Kossivi [1], KPAZAÏ Georges [2] and et ACKOUNDOUN-N'GUESSAN Kouamé Sharl [3]

[1] Laboratory of Didactics of Disciplines (LDD) of the National Institute of Youth, Physical Education and Sport (INJEPS). University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin.
[2] Research Group on the Evaluation and Development of Skills in Physical Activity and Health (GRDCAPS), School of Kinesiology and Health Sciences (EKSS), Faculty of Education and Health, Laurentian University, Sudbury (ON), Canada.
[3] Laboratory of Didactics Research (LaReDi). Higher Teacher Training College of the Alassane Ouattara University of Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 29(03), 1906-1915

Publication history: Received on 20 February 2026; revised on 26 March 2026; accepted on 28 March 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.29.3.0468

Abstract

This study focuses on the problem of discrepancies in knowledge transfer between the intended curriculum content, the content actually taught, and the content assessed through summative evaluation. It examines the case of basketball in a ninth-grade class in Porto-Novo. Concepts drawn from the anthropological theory of didactics (Chevallard, 2018) and the model of assessment practices (Grenier and Beaudoin, 2012) were used to analyze and discuss the results. Following the triangulation framework of Van Der Maren (1996), Amade-Escot (2003), and Paquay (2006), a mixed-methods approach was employed. Document analysis allowed for an assessment of the prescribed curriculum content, a review of existing research on the topic, and the framing of the study's central question. The questionnaire survey involved 25 teachers, while the audiovisual recordings of basketball sessions, combined with pre- and post-session interviews, included one teacher. These methods were selected based on a combination of deliberate and impromptu choices. The results reveal that prescribed knowledge content is not being taught (e.g., fast ball movement), and summative assessment considers both the process and the product, including untaught elements (e.g., long-range shooting, fundamental basketball rules). This teaching practice compromises the objectivity of the assessment and penalizes students. The number of students to observe simultaneously in a dynamic environment, the limited time available, and the high number of criteria are among the difficulties teachers cited regarding summative assessment in basketball. These same difficulties were highlighted by the findings of Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Oguéboulé, and Kpazaï (2015) on summative assessment in volleyball.

Keywords: Summative Assessment; Didactic Transposition; Basketball; Process; Product

1. Introduction

Adopted in Benin around the 1990s, Competency-Based Approach (CBA) teaching positions the student as a key player in constructing their own knowledge (Attiklémè, 2009) and prescribes, for each grade level, specific knowledge content, teaching methods, and assessment tools to be designed by the evaluators. Physical Education and Sport (PES) has remained aligned with this reality, which emphasizes the interdependence between teaching, learning, and assessment (Sarthou, 1998). However, the implementation of assessment practices in Physical Education (PE) generates difficulties in understanding, designing, and using assessment criteria and tools (Agbodjogbé, Oguéboulé, Attiklémè, Djovitou,

* Corresponding author: **OGUEBOULE Bachar Moba-Ola-N'lé**

Atoun, Odjoussou, 2014), even though these criteria are prescribed in relation to the officially programmed knowledge and skills. In light of these difficulties, the question arises as to whether all the prescribed knowledge content is actually taught and then assessed at the end of the cycle. Difficulties in summative assessment in PE are more noticeable in team sports (Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attikliémè, Oguéboulé, and Kpazaï, 2015), and the alignment between what is taught and assessed, the use of grading, and the definition of relevant criteria are the major difficulties encountered by teachers (Mougenot and Dugas, 2014). From this perspective, this didactic study aims to use the curriculum content for a team sport like basketball in the third year of secondary school in Benin as a starting point, inferring the content that is taught in order to compare it with the content used for summative assessment. Attempts to explain the observed similarities and discrepancies have been made. The investigations conducted within this study are intended to draw the attention of stakeholders to potential untaught knowledge that could be assessed and undermine the validity of summative evaluation.

The results will therefore allow us to minimize these discrepancies in the future.

To this end, a composite theoretical framework informed a research question and a hypothesis. The qualitative data collected at the Anavié General Education College (CEG) in Porto-Novo's second district were compared with data from a questionnaire administered to other teachers in the city, and the results were discussed in light of previous research.

2. Towards a Problem Statement for the Study

2.1. Study Context

The formal education system in Benin is structured into three levels of education, each organized under a ministry. These are the Ministry of Nursery and Primary Education (MEMP), the Ministry of Secondary, Technical, and Vocational Education (MESTFP), and the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MESRS). Each level of education has its own characteristics. The Ministry of Secondary Education and Vocational Training (MESTFP) faces several problems, including overcrowded classrooms, teacher staff and their professional qualifications, insufficient furniture and equipment, and, above all, inadequate sports infrastructure for the curriculum (Oguéboulé, 2008). These difficulties hinder effective teaching, learning, and assessment of the physical activities included in the curriculum for the various grade levels. General secondary education is a sub-division of the MESTFP. Theoretically reserved for students aged 11 to 19, it lasts seven years, structured into two cycles. The first cycle, lasting four years, begins in sixth grade and ends in ninth grade, passing through seventh and eighth grades. The second cycle, lasting three years, consists of tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades, culminating in the baccalaureate exam. In the first cycle, ninth grade is marked by the awarding of the Brevet d'Étude du Premier Cycle (BEPC). In this grade, physical education is taught, learned, and assessed. The curriculum is structured around two Learning Situations (LS), each designed to last thirteen three-hour sessions per week. LS1, entitled "Activities for Mastering the Body and the Physical Environment," covers the first term of the school year and includes three activities from individual sports: floor gymnastics, shot put, and sprinting. The targeted disciplinary skill relates to psychomotor challenges. LS2 extends over the second term of the school year. Entitled "Cooperative and/or Oppositional Activities," it includes two activities from team sports: relay racing and basketball. The challenge is sociomotor. Having become an object of study in the sense of Paun (2006), the content of the basketball program in the third year of secondary school—both what is taught and what is assessed—formed the focal point of this article. A team sport played with hands, typically five against five, basketball is taught outdoors in Benin's high schools and middle schools, sometimes on uneven terrain. The objective is to score points by throwing a ball into the opponent's basket while defending your own.

2.2. From Theoretical foundation to research hypothesis

Any practice aimed at teaching a **sub**ject presupposes the prior transformation of that subject into a teaching tool. From this perspective of the anthropological theory of didactics (Perrenoud, 1998; Chevallard, 2018), academic knowledge, or, in physical education, reference social practices (Martinand, 1989), such as basketball, can undergo transformations that generate distortions between the curriculum content and the content actually taught, learned, and assessed. In reference to this theory, the results of the work of Oguéboulé, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè and Kèkè (2019) on African wrestling revealed and explained discrepancies between the knowledge in the program and that taught in fifth grade without looking at the content being assessed at the end of the cycle.

Regarding assessment, Grenier and Beaudoin's (2012) model of assessment practices, following the logic of Godbout's (1988) theory of assessment, indicates that summative assessment follows a process, focuses on specific objects, and is not without purpose. The work of Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attikliémè, Oguéboulé, and Kpazaï (2015), which inferred difficulties in assessment in volleyball, and that of Agbodjogbé, Oguéboulé, Attiklémè, Djovitou, Atoun, and Odjoussou

(2014), which showed that teachers have difficulty understanding and designing assessment criteria, did not highlight the tension between the content of the knowledge taught and that which is the object of assessment. It is possible, however, that adherence to the prescribed process for evaluating students in Physical Education (PE) could lead teachers to assess concepts not actually taught, particularly in the case of a team sport like basketball.

This study addresses this issue, focusing on the similarities and discrepancies between the knowledge officially included in the basketball curriculum for ninth grade, the knowledge actually taught, and the knowledge used for summative assessment. It is based on a research question and a hypothesis.

Research Question: Are there discrepancies between the knowledge content in the curriculum, the knowledge taught, and the knowledge used for summative assessment in ninth-grade basketball?

Hypothesis: There are indeed discrepancies between the knowledge content in the curriculum, the knowledge taught, and the knowledge used for summative assessment in ninth-grade basketball. Knowledge not initially taught may ultimately become the subject of summative assessment.

To verify this assertion, a methodological approach was adopted.

3. Methodological approach

3.1. Nature and selection of study subjects

The objective is to analyze the actions of certain actors interacting in the teaching/learning/assessment of Physical Education (PE) during team sports classes. This is therefore an essentially qualitative and descriptive study, for which the subjects of study can only be PE teachers implementing the SAN°2 program with their students, scheduled for the second term of the school year. Students in their final year of thesis defense, enrolled in the Didactics of Disciplines Laboratory (LDD) at INJEPS/UAC, were enlisted to identify and contact PE teachers in order to collect data relating to the conduct of teaching/learning sessions and subsequent summative assessments in team sports. This task proved challenging because, in most high schools and middle schools, teachers are reluctant to allow observation of their routine classroom practices with their students. It was during a professional development workshop on the topic at CEG Anavié that the School Facilitator (AE) reassured and convinced his colleagues, who eventually agreed to participate in the study. Of the six physical education teachers at the school, only two, each in charge of a Year 9 class (Year 9 M1 and Year 9 M2), were able to participate. In fact, with each of these classes, they had just completed the diagnostic assessment session for SAN°2 and were planning to dedicate subsequent sessions to teaching and assessing basketball. The four other teachers, despite initially agreeing, had already conducted several teaching/learning sessions in the aforementioned SAN°2. Therefore, they could no longer participate in the study. However, due to health reasons, only one instructor (E), responsible for the Year 9 M1 class, participated in the study. At the CEG Anavié sports facilities during the qualitative data collection period, PE classes for the 3rd M1 class, with a staff of fifty students, take place on Thursdays from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. in the presence of three other classes.

To ensure greater reliability and in line with Paquay's (2006) approach of transcending the boundaries between research types, a questionnaire was sent to teachers to qualitatively test the collected data. During a professional development workshop organized in a school district of Porto-Novo, we met with teachers and explained the objectives of this study. Of the 47 teachers present, 32 who had already taught and assessed basketball in the third year of secondary school accepted the questionnaire and each took it to provide their answers. After four weeks of follow-up, 25 responded and returned their questionnaires.

It is within this framework of combining deliberate and serendipitous selection that this mixed-methods study involved a physical education teacher interacting with his students in basketball in the third year of secondary school at CEG Anavié and 25 other physical education teachers from the same city of Porto-Novo. They were investigated using specific techniques, each requiring appropriate tools.

3.2. Investigation techniques and tools

Several techniques were used, based on Van Der Maren's triangulation (1996), which was used in Physical Education by Amade-Escot (2003) and subsequently by Oguéboulé, Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Sarè, Attiklémè, and Kpazaï (2025). Each technique required the use of specific tools. These essentially consisted of content analysis of documents, instrumented observation of classroom sessions, and questionnaire-based surveys.

*3.2.1. Content *analysis of documents*

Before and during the writing of this article, this involved a thorough reading of official documents (guide and curriculum, physical activity continuums, decrees, and other materials) and scientific works related to the topic of this study. Following the approach of Leedy and Ormrod (2015), research on teaching/learning/assessment in general, in physical education, and in the context of implementing competency-based learning (CBL) served as a reference for inferring the prescribed knowledge for basketball in the third year of secondary school, for formulating the research problem, and for discussing the results.

3.2.2. Instrumented observations of classroom sessions

With reference to the methodological prototypes of Van Der Maren (1996), Amade-Escot, and Leutenegger (2013), increasingly adopted by research on classroom intervention in Benin, this involved the cumulative recording of both audiovisual basketball classes and interviews.

Audiovisual recordings of classroom sessions

Inspired by the pioneers of instrumented observation, this technique allowed for the filming of the teacher (E) and his students interacting during three sessions dedicated to teaching basketball to a ninth-grade class, followed by a summative assessment session in the same physical activity. In total, four sessions were audiovisually recorded for E with his ninth-grade M1 class at CEG Anavié in the second district of Porto-Novo. For each of the four filmed sessions, two cassette camcorders, each equipped with a camera and a microphone, were used. One camcorder filmed the entire class, while the second, more mobile one, filmed points of interest emerging throughout the session. Before and after each session, E was interviewed.

Interviews with the Teacher (E)

For each filmed session, two types of interviews were conducted with the instructor. Following the approach of Amade-Escot (2003), these consisted of a pre-session interview before the session began and a post-session interview after the session ended, in order to compare the instructor's statements with the reality of the session as it unfolded. In line with Erard (2015), these interviews allowed for an analysis of the meaning the instructor attributes to their practices and highlighted the value systems and normative frameworks that guide their work.

Pre-session interview

Based on the findings of Amade-Escot and Leutenegger (2013), teacher E was interviewed before each session. This interview allowed the teacher to situate the session within the class's didactic history and to understand E's teaching intentions (Amade-Escot, 2003). It provided an opportunity for E to outline the knowledge and skills he intended to teach or assess, the activities to be offered, the materials and setup to be implemented, the students' anticipated difficulties, and the solutions he envisioned. A total of four pre-session interviews were conducted, each lasting no more than four minutes.

Post-session interview

After each session, E was interviewed. This post-session interview, following the approach of Erard (2015), allowed for an immediate and thorough review of the session. It was here that he acknowledged and justified the knowledge content taught and/or assessed in basketball, and the difficulties encountered in conducting certain sessions. A total of four post-session interviews were conducted, each lasting no more than six minutes.

3.2.3. Questionnaire survey

Following Combessie's (2007) approach, the questionnaire survey broadened the scope of observations from ordinary classroom situations, making them more generalizable. The questions posed allowed for further testing of the hypothesis that untaught knowledge content ultimately becomes the subject of summative assessment, extending beyond the individual teacher being observed. The questionnaire was sent to 25 physical education teachers selected according to a previously described methodology.

3.3. Data collection and processing procedure

The data collection procedure involved contacting physical education teachers working in schools in Porto-Novo to explain the purpose of the study and to select those who met our criteria and agreed to participate. The interview guides, observation grid, and questionnaire were designed and validated at the Laboratory of Didactics of Disciplines (LDD) of

INJEPS/UAC. Taking into account the schedules of the selected teachers, the three-basketball teaching/learning sessions and the summative assessment session for this physical activity were filmed, with a pre-session interview and a post-session interview conducted for each.

The results, expressed as percentages, were calculated using Excel 2016, which allowed for the statistical processing of the data from the questionnaire survey. The data collected through interviews and audiovisual recordings were transcribed. Initially transcribed verbatim, the interviews were subsequently grouped thematically to address the research question by comparing them with information from the audiovisual recordings of the sessions. After several viewings, the video of each session was transcribed into a synopsis, referencing the work of Schneuwly, Dolz, and Ronveaux (2006). Using the video recordings, the students' actions as they carried out the teacher's instructions were analyzed to infer the content taught and assessed. To ensure greater reliability, these analyses were compared with E's statements, the responses given by the teachers interviewed, information from official documents, and other research, following the approach of Amade-Escot and Leutenegger (2013). The processed data yielded results.

4. Results and discussion

This section is dedicated to the presentation and analysis of the program's learning outcomes in terms of knowledge and skills related to basketball in the third year of secondary school (grade 9), and to the presentation and analysis of the knowledge content taught and then assessed by the observed instructor. The results of the questionnaire survey of the 25 other teachers helped to clarify the discrepancies and similarities observed between the prescribed, taught, and assessed knowledge content. These analyses were based on summary tables. The results were then discussed.

4.1. Didactic analysis of the curriculum expectations for Basketball in the third year of secondary school

An analysis of the content of documents published by the Directorate of Pedagogical Inspection, Innovation, and Quality (DIPIQ) for the 2024-2025 school year, as well as the Physical Education (PE) curriculum and guidance documents, resulted in a summary table (Table 1) of the knowledge and skills prescribed for basketball in the third year of secondary school.

Table 1 Summary of prescribed content for Basketball in the third year of secondary school

Expected skill level at the end of the cycle	Planning the cycle in five sessions	Knowledge and techniques
The student will be able to play basketball by rationally occupying the court and using attack and defense techniques to win a match under the rules.	-Pass and receive -Marking and unmarking -Quick ball advance -5-on-5 play -5-on-5 play	-Dribbling -Pass and move, pass and follow -Man-to-man defense -Rational use of the field, collective organization of the game, pass and move, pass and follow, receiving, pivoting, man-marking, tactical movement, ball recovery

From the analysis of this table, it is important to note that the official guidelines have planned basketball instruction in five sessions, each with a specific content of knowledge and skills. The first session focuses on "passing and receiving," the second on "marking and creating space," the third on "quick ball advancement," and the fourth and fifth on "five-on-five play." The planning of knowledge and techniques is no longer left to the teacher's discretion. It relates to "dribbling" for the first session, "pass and move, pass and follow" for the second session, "man-to-man defense" for the third session, and "rational use of the court, collective organization of the game, passing and move, pass and follow, receiving, pivoting, man-marking, tactical movement, and ball advancement" for the fourth and fifth sessions. At the end of the cycle, students are expected to be "able to play basketball by rationally occupying the court and using offensive and defensive techniques to win a game under the rules."

As a benchmark social practice (Martinand, 1989), basketball as played in society has thus entered the school system (schooling) to become a subject of instruction through official guidelines that have adapted it to the realities of teaching, which differ from the selective constraints of sports training. Teachers therefore draw on the content of normative knowledge to plan what they teach to students in real-life situations. This is the case with E's basketball lessons with his students in the 3rd M1 class at CEG Anavié in Porto-Novo, Benin.

4.2. Analysis of the knowledge content taught in Basketball in a classroom setting

The cross-referencing of session synopses with pre- and post-session interviews resulted in Table 2, which summarizes the knowledge used by E with his students in basketball in 3rd grade M1 at CEG Anavié in Porto-Novo.

Table 2 Knowledge taught in Basketball by instructor E in 3rd grade

	Session objective	**Learning activities**
First session	The student will be able to pass and receive the ball.	-The student learns to pass and receive the ball in basketball. -The student learns to advance by passing and receiving towards the opponent's end, using the court effectively.
2nd session	The student will be able to stand out in attack and mark an opponent in defense.	- The student learns to create space on offense to shoot close to the basket. - The student learns to guard their opponent man-to-man on defense.
3rd session	The student will be able to play collectively in attack and defense.	- The student learns to play as a team in attack within a real game. - The student learns to play as a team in defense within a real game.

Analysis of the table reveals that E taught basketball in three three-hour sessions per week instead of the five officially mandated. He explained this at the end of the third session by citing the constraints of the school's schedule, which required assessments to be completed by a specific date and grades finalized. Conducting all five sessions would have made it impossible to meet this requirement.

Consistent with his statements in the pre-session interview, and adhering to the official plan, he dedicated his first session to the objective that "the student will be able to pass and receive the ball." He therefore taught passing and receiving, requiring students to progress without dribbling, which is the officially prescribed skill and technique for the first session. At the end of the session, he argued that "allowing dribbling will lead students to avoid passing." During this first session, he briefly taught the rational use of the court, a skill and technique officially prescribed for the fourth and fifth sessions. "Marking and unmarking" was the focus of E's second session, in accordance with his pre-session interview, which stated that "the student will be able to create space in attack and mark an opponent in defense," with close-range shooting and man-to-man marking as the respective learning activities. The "pass and go" and "pass and follow" skills prescribed as knowledge and techniques to be taught in the second session were not presented by E to his students.

During E's first two sessions, the objectives were the same as those in the official guidelines. It is at the level of knowledge and techniques that discrepancies were observed, reflecting didactic transpositions.

In E's third session, the transpositional differences became apparent in the session's objective. While "quick ball advancement" was prescribed, he rightly acknowledged that his objective was "the student will be able to play collectively in attack and defense." The "man-to-man defense" he taught in the second session was officially scheduled for the third, during which he proposed "students learn to create space on offense to shoot close to the basket" and "students learn to play collectively on defense in a real game" as learning activities. It was in this third session that he taught the five-on-five game officially planned for the fourth and fifth sessions.

Ultimately, the "quick ball up the court" planned for the third session was not taught, nor were skills and techniques such as "pivoting and tactical movement." When questioned at the end of the third session, E stated that "the actual time spent, the unavailability of equipment and space, the overcrowded classes, and the difficulties students identified in the diagnostic assessment made it impossible to teach everything planned in the curriculum." It is these discrepancies and similarities between the prescribed and actual curriculum that can impact the assessment practices at the end of the cycle. We also know that the constraint of subsequent evaluation influenced the transposition choices made by the teacher observed in a classroom basketball situation in 3rd M1 at CEG Anavié in Porto-Novo, Benin during the 2024-2025 school year.

4.3. Didactic analysis of the content used for end-of-cycle Basketball assessment

During the pre-session interview, E stated, "I'm going to assess what I taught the students, that's all. I had already informed them beforehand about what I was going to assess." Logically, the assessment materials should primarily come

from those that were taught. The prescribed assessment process compelled him to use the three minimum criteria (C1, C2, and C3) and the improvement criterion (C4) to assess his students in basketball. His assessment took place through an actual game, as shown in the excerpt below.

Tdp3-P: Today, as planned, we're going to do a summative assessment in basketball. So, I'm asking everyone to give their best in the game. Okay?

Tdp4-E: Yes, sir.

The purpose of his summative assessment being to assign grades to students using a marking key, he used the four officially defined levels of mastery (AM = lack of mastery, MP = partial mastery, Mm = minimal mastery, and MM = maximum mastery) for each of the three minimum criteria in order to assess physical education skills in Benin. In line with his remarks at the beginning of the session, he used an assessment grid, a test, and a marking scheme. Following the C1 guidelines, he observed and assessed the students' behavior when their team had the ball (attack) and when their team lost possession (defense). In accordance with C2, he evaluated the students' efficient use of the court and their application of the basketball rules. At the end of the session, he admitted that he hadn't focused on the rules as a learning objective but maintained that official assessment guidelines required him to consider them during evaluation. "Besides," he insisted, "they themselves should familiarize themselves with the rules during five-on-five games, even if I forgot to draw their attention to it. In reality, it's not easy to emphasize techniques, tactics, and the rules all at once." In the C3 class, the playing techniques learned in class (passing, shooting, receiving, marking, and creating space) were assessed for each student individually, and the collective organization in attack and defense was evaluated as a group. However, here, the "mid-range shot" and the "long-range shot" were also assessed, even though only the "close-range shot" had been taught. The instructor felt this was his way of striving towards the improvement criterion. “We need to give teams the opportunity to score from all angles to allow them to win and earn the C4,” he insisted. He weighted the improvement criterion based on the scores of the matches between the teams. “For C4, I took into account both wins and losses, and in addition, those who score baskets will receive a bonus point, so a basket scored earns a bonus point,” he emphasized. Therefore, individually, the players who scored the baskets benefited from the improvement criterion, and collectively, the team with the most wins and the fewest losses was declared the most successful. Here too, the students had never before been put in a five-on-five situation to determine the best team before the evaluation.

It can be concluded that the on-site observation of the E sessions revealed discrepancies and similarities between the prescribed knowledge content, the knowledge actually taught, and the knowledge assessed. The 25 teachers mentioned in the methodological approach were given a questionnaire to compare their statements with the in situ practice of E, who evaluated the process and the product through four evaluation criteria imposed by the control body in PE.

4.4. Cross-analysis of E's practices with data from the questionnaire survey

There are questions to which all 25 teachers responded either affirmatively or negatively. The responses were almost unanimous. Therefore, we did not need summary tables.

In synergy with E's classroom practices, all 25 teachers surveyed stated that there are discrepancies between the prescribed basketball curriculum and the knowledge they teach their ninth-grade students. This discrepancy is attributed to often overcrowded classrooms, insufficient equipment and infrastructure, and limited time allocated to address student needs identified during diagnostic assessments. According to their responses, they all assess their students in five-on-five games, taking into account individual techniques and tactics, despite the challenges related to the design of the assessment tools used. Therefore, like E, they take into account the results of the matches to award collective points to be added to those obtained individually in the game. They all acknowledge using, in accordance with official guidelines, the three minimum criteria (C1, C2, C3), each broken down into four levels of mastery, to assess the learning process, and the improvement criterion (C4) to assess the learning outcome. This is the case for E, who, as we know, took into account the results of the matches to weight C4 after having dedicated C1, C2, and C3 to the process of constructing new knowledge in basketball. As recommended by official guidelines, E and 022 out of the 025 (88%) of the teachers surveyed use an assessment grid, a test, and a marking key/grading scale during the end-of-cycle assessment.

It is precisely this adherence to official end-of-cycle assessment guidelines that creates discrepancies detrimental to students between the knowledge taught and that assessed. Of the 25 teachers surveyed, 23 (92%) answered "yes" to the question, "Do you assess content that is not taught?" They cited the limited time devoted to learning, which prevents them from emphasizing C2 (rational use of the court, rules of the game, and other aspects) and C4, which requires students to push their limits to justify this situation. Within this framework, E considered "long-range shooting," "mid-

range shooting," and "close-range shooting" in C3, while only briefly mentioning "close-range shooting" in his interactions with students during basketball teaching and learning.

The results of the questionnaire survey, which largely align with E's classroom practices, were compared with those of other authors.

5. Discussion of results

From a didactic transposition perspective (Chevallard, 2018; Lagacé, 2013), the observed teacher implemented the basketball unit in three three-hour weekly sessions instead of the five officially planned. He prohibited his students from dribbling and did not teach "pass and go," "pass and follow," "pivoting," or "tactical movement," which are all intended to be taught. Instead of the officially planned "quick ball advance," he pursued the objective that "the student will be able to play collectively on offense and defense." This classroom practice in basketball, recognized by all the teachers surveyed, confirms the findings of Oguéboulé, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Kouété, and Kpazaï (2016), which revealed, in the javelin throw, that physical education teachers adapt official guidelines to the realities of their teaching environment and ultimately introduce knowledge content not included in the curriculum. The investigations within this study also focused on team sports assessments conducted by the instructor in a game context that integrates technical, tactical, and physical factors, emphasizing cooperation and competition, as revealed by the findings of Grädel (2019).

In the basketball assessment process, the technical and tactical skills considered (Roegiers, 2005) are consistent with the findings of Gréhaigne, Billard, and Laroche (2007) and Marle, Zerai, and Gréhaigne (2017), who believe that the technical and tactical aspects are prioritized in teaching and assessment in team sports. In accordance with official guidelines, the assessment criteria related to both the process and the product. This practice, approved by the teachers surveyed, confirms the findings of Camille (2021) and Durand and Chouinard (2006), who demonstrated that comprehensive assessment in team sports requires examining both the results obtained and the processes that led to those results. Discrepancies were observed between the teaching objectives and the assessment criteria.

Subject to the officially prescribed end-of-cycle assessment procedure and in accordance with the findings of Grenier and Beaudoin (2012), the student assessment by E and those questioned focuses on specific elements following a criteria-based process with weightings that adhere to established norms. It is within this framework that E assessed, for the improvement criterion (C4), "long-range shooting," "mid-range shooting," and match results; and the rules of basketball for (C2). These are topics that had not been explicitly taught. This adherence to prescribed assessment practices thus motivates teachers to design measurement tools for team sports, despite the challenges highlighted by the findings of Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Oguéboulé, and Kpazaï (2015) on the teaching and assessment of volleyball.

6. Conclusion

The investigations within the framework of this study are didactic in nature and were initiated in Porto-Novo with the objective of exploring the transposition chain (Perrenoud, 1998) from prescribed content to that which is the subject of assessment in ninth-grade basketball.

To this end, a composite scientific framework focused on the concept of didactic transposition (Perrenoud, 1998; Chevallard, 2018) and concepts mobilized by the model of assessment practices of Grenier and Beaudoin (2012) was used.

Methodologically, the analysis of document content, the instrumented observation of teaching/learning/assessment sessions, and a questionnaire survey were the techniques used, along with appropriate investigative tools. A teacher (E) was observed in a regular classroom setting during four sessions, three of which were devoted to teaching/learning and one to assessing basketball, a subject taught in the third year of secondary school at CEG Anavié in the second district of Porto-Novo. Following Paquay's (2006) approach, which combines qualitative and quantitative methods for greater reliability, 25 other physical education teachers were surveyed using a questionnaire. The 26 teachers who participated in the study were selected using a combination of rational and random sampling. The data collected by the different techniques were cross-referenced according to triangulation (Van Der Maren, 1996).

The analysis of the results reveals discrepancies between the officially mandated curriculum content, the content actually taught, and the content assessed. The first adjustment to the realities of the teaching environments is the number of sessions allocated to physical education instruction. In the case of this study, the school's scheduling

constraints led the instructor to conduct three three-hour sessions per week instead of the officially prescribed five. Consequently, a skill such as "the student will be able to play collectively on offense and defense" was offered instead of the officially prescribed "quick ball advance." Subject to the prescribed evaluation process, the teachers under investigation ultimately assessed the cycle based on the three minimum criteria and the improvement criterion, despite the difficulties in designing measurement tools. As a result, knowledge and skills not explicitly taught became the subject of evaluation, undoubtedly to the students' detriment. In the case of the teacher observed on-site, the "long-range shot," the "mid-range shot," the "rules of the game in basketball," and the "number of wins," which were assessed, were not actually taught to the students. It is therefore important to take steps to minimize these discrepancies, which can undermine the credibility of end-of-cycle assessments in Physical Education.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

All the authors acknowledge that there is no conflict of interest. They all agree with what is written in this article. In accordance with the requirements of transparency and scientific integrity, we, the authors of this study, declare that we have no conflict of interest, whether financial, commercial or otherwise, that could influence the results or interpretations of our research on initiation rites in Benin, thus guaranteeing the independence and objectivity of our work and ensuring the credibility of our conclusions

References

[1] Attiklemé, K. (2009). The content of the new Physical Education curriculum defined in terms of skills in Benin: a problem of intervention in secondary education. *STAPS*, 4 (86), 93-108.

[2] Agbodjogbé, B., Oguéboulé, B.M., Attiklémè, K., Djovitou, P.G., Atoun, C. & Odjoussou, M. (2014). Problems of using a skills assessment tool in Physical Education and Sport in secondary schools in Benin: a multiple case study. *Revue Universitaire des Sciences de l'Education, ASSEMPE*: Editions Universitaires de la Côte d'Ivoire, No. 3, pp. 39-60.

[3] Atoun, C.E., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Attiklémè, K., Oguéboulé, B.M., & Kpazaï, G. (2015). Assessment in team sports according to the Competency-Based Approach (CBA) in Ouémé secondary schools: the case of volleyball instruction. *Journal of the International Francophone Association for Scientific Research in Education*, 13, pp. 48-65.

[4] Amade-Escot, C. (2003). Interactive management of the didactic contract in volleyball: arrangement of learning environments and teacher regulation. In *C. Amade-Escot (Ed.), Didactics of Physical Education - State of Research, Editions de la revue EPS*, pp. 240-264.

[5] Amade-Escot, C. & Leutenegger, F. (2013). *Current relevance of the theory of joint action: questions and methodology*. Paper presented at the 3rd ARCD Colloquium, Aix-Marseille University.

[6] Camille, M-S. (2021). T*owards a new assessment in Physical Education, or how to substitute progress for performance: Experimentation with a teaching sequence in Cycle 2*. Bachelor's thesis, Delémont.

[7] Chevallard, Y. (2018). The Anthropological Theory of Didactics in relation to the Mathematics Teacher. *In Almouloud et al., The Anthropological Theory of Didactics: principles and foundations* (pp. 31-49). Curitiba, Editora: CRV, Edição. Curitiba, PR: CRV.

[8] Combessie, J.C. (2007). *Methodology in Sociology*. Repères Collection. 5th ed. 127p.

[9] Durand, M-J., & Chouinard, R. (2006). *The assessment of learning: From planning the approach to communicating results*. Montreal, QC: Hurtubise HML Publishers.

[10] Erard, C. (2015). *Assessment, between objectivity and subjectivity: a teacher's perspective*. Bachelor's thesis. BEJUNE University of Teacher Education, La Chaux-de-Fonds.

[11] Grädel, R. (2019). *Assessment during team games in physical education: Evaluating student behavior in match situations*. Master's thesis in sports science, University of Fribourg. 82 p.

[12] Grenier, J. & Beaudoin, C. (2012). Perceptions and expectations of elementary school students regarding assessment in physical education and health. *Canadian Journal of Education,* 35(3).

[13] Gréhaigne, J-F., Billard, M., & Laroche, J-Y. (2007). *Data and indicators for observing, evaluating, and making sense of*. De Boeck University Press.

[14] Leedy, P.D., & Ormrod, J.E. (2015). Practical Research: Planning and Design. Pearson.

[15] Lagacé, C. (2013). *Didactic transposition.* Christianelagace.com/pedagogy/didactic-transposition

[16] Martinand, J.L. (1989). Reference practices, didactic transposition, and professional knowledge in science and technology. *Educational Sciences*, 2, pp. 23-29.

[17] Marle, P., Zerai, Z., & Gréhaigne, J-F. (2017). *Teaching and learning knowledge and motor skills useful in team sports*. Open Edition.

[18] Mougenot, L. & Dugas, E. (2014). Teacher training and practice: A look at assessment in physical education. In: *Spiral-Revue de recherches en éducation*, supplement, E58.

[19] Oguéboulé, B.M. (2008). *The emblematic effects of the new physical education program in Benin: The case of SA N01 in 6th grade classes in secondary schools in Ouémé (Toffa 1st High School and CEG1 Adjarra)*. Master's thesis in STAPS (Science and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities). Porto-Novo. INJEPS/UAC. 45 p.

[20] Oguéboulé, B.M., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Attiklémè, K., Kouété, C. & Kpazaï, G. (2016). Adapting the content of the Competency-Based Physical Education Program to the learning context: a review of three case studies of javelin instruction in Benin. *La revue universitaire des sciences de l'éducation, ASSEMPE:* Editions Universitaires Côte-d'Ivoire, NO6, pp. 58-81.

[21] Oguéboulé, B.M., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Attiklémè, K. & Kèkè, A.M.A. (2019). Teaching African wrestling in high schools and middle schools: an anthropological study of two cases in 8th grade at CEG Malanhoui in Benin. *Annales de l'Université de Lomé*, Series Letters and Human Sciences, Volume XXXIX-1. Presses de l'UL, pp. 79-100.

[22] Oguéboulé, B.M., Atoun, C.E.H., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Sarè, Z.O., Attiklémè, K. & Kpazaï, G. (2025). Comparative Didactic Analysis of the Debriefing and Remediation Session of Two Primary School Teachers in Porto-Novo (Benin). *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*, Volume 13, Number 5, pp. 1-13.

[23] Paquay, L. (2006). *Beyond the divisions between different types of research, what quality criteria?* De Boëck, Brussels, pp. 13-29.

[24] Paun, E. (2006). Didactic transposition: a process of constructing school knowledge. *Carrefour de l'éducation*, No. 22, pp. 3-13.

[25] Perrenoud, P. (1998). Didactic transposition based on practice: from knowledge to skills. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation* (Montreal), Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 487–514.

[26] Roegiers, X. (2005). Assessing students' skills using the basic competency approach. In *X. Roegiers, L'école et l'évaluation*. Brussels: De Boëck Université.

[27] Sarthou, J.J. (1998). Assessment and the concept. *Revue EPS*, No. 273, pp. 41–81.

[28] Schneuwly, B., Dolz, J., & Ronveaux, C. (2006). The synopsis: a tool for analyzing taught content. In M. J. Perrin-Glorian and Y. Ruuter (Eds.), *Les méthodes de recherche en didactique*. Villeneuve d'Asq: Editions du Septentrion, pp. 175–189.

[29] Van Der Maren, J-M. (1996). *Research method for education. Brussels*: De Boëck, Pedagogy and development.