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

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Diagnostic evaluation in physical education teaching process: A transpositive issue for learning

ATOUN Carlos Eméry Hyacinthe [1, *], OGUEBOULE Bachar Moba-Ola-Nlé [1], AGBODJOGBE Djéssounoukon Basile [1], Coovi Cyriaque AHODEKON SESSOU [2], KOUDEKOUTO Kénali Franck [1], ATTIKLEME Kossivi [1] and et GBAZAÏ Georges [3]

[1] *Laboratory of didactics of disciplines, National Institute of Youth, Physical Education and Sport, University of Abomey-Calavi.*
[2] *Research and Expertise Laboratory for Sport, Education and Social Interventions, National Institute of Youth, Physical Education and Sport, University of Abomey-Calavi.*
[3] *Laboratory of Research on Intervention in Physical Activity (LARIAP), School of Physical Activity Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury (ON), Canada.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 28(02), 163-185

Publication history: Received on 15 September 2025; revised on 24 October 2025; accepted on 28 October 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.28.2.3611

Abstract

This study analyzed the results from the diagnostic evaluation and the choices transpositive induced during the implementation of official prescriptions in a situation of class. The composite theoretical anchoring borrowed for this purpose is inspired by concepts federated by the model of evaluation of Godbout (1988) and the anthropological theory of Chevallard's didactics (2018). The Godbout model (1988) allowed to analyze the measuring instruments used by teachers in connection with their judgment on motor skills and performance carried out by the students Then approach the decisions taken at the didactic level. In addition, through the anthropological theory of Chevallard's didactics (2018) we appreciated the reasons that found the transpositive choices made by teachers.

According to the results, teachers who took into account information from the diagnostic assessment in their planning have shown their epistemological relationship and their professional experiences in their practice. It follows from the transpositive choices which favored the acquisition of knowledge and know-how by their students in the APS teaching objects. In contrast, those who have not taken into account the data collected in diagnostic evaluation are subject to official prescriptions and do not often manage to adapt to the needs of students and the requirements in terms of transpositive choices.

Keywords: Diagnostic Evaluation; Teaching; Transpositive

1. Introduction

To facilitate the construction and evolution of knowledge, students and the teacher interact by means of a teaching / learning / evaluation approach, pillar of educational action in all teaching objects. Official educational documents developed in Benin are in the logic of strengthening the coupling of teaching and learning with evaluation by showing very well that one cannot exist without the other. Physical and sports education (EPS) is no exception to this reality.

Barometer of any teaching program, evaluation constitutes the centerpiece of any teaching / learning / evaluation process (Agbodjogbé, 2007). Evaluation is an information on performance which is then examined in relation to objectives to be achieved or standards. It is therefore the relationship that we maintain with the value (Vial, 2013). The

* Corresponding author: ATOUN Carlos Eméry Hyacinthe

evaluation consists in collecting a sufficiently relevant, validated and reliable set of information, in examining the degree of adequacy between this information and a set of adequate criteria with the objectives to be assess, set out or readjusted along the way to make a decision (de Ketèle, 2010). It establishes a prognosis and a diagnosis which have the function of determining the cognitive resources available for new learning. It analyzes the needs, profits, representations or prerequisites of students. It is a question for the teacher from this information, to define a strategy which is set for replacing or correcting the prior representations of the students. It also makes it possible to guide and plan learning objects from the analysis of the results obtained.

It is from this perspective that this study has shown the importance of diagnostic evaluation in the EPS teaching process. It was a question of verifying the exploitation made by the teachers of the information taken in terms of the motor skills and performance of the students during the diagnostic assessment. This scientific concern imposed the observation of class sessions, the collection and analysis of evaluation grids and then post cycle interviews with teachers who participated in the study.

The objective and the theoretical framework

This study aims to analyze the results from the diagnostic assessment and the transpositive choices induced when implementing official prescriptions in class situations. Specifically, it is a question not only of showing the treatment that teachers make information collected during the diagnostic assessment, but of highlighting the transpositive choices made in connection with the information collected to support students in the construction of new knowledge.

The originality of this didactic obedience study then lies in the fact that it relates to the diagnostic evaluation and the teaching effects it generates during the following class sequences. It is carried out through the Godbout (1988) assessment model and the model of the didactic transposition of Chevallard (2018).

Assessment is an inseparable teaching practice of teaching and learning and consists in measuring the production of students and judging it by comparing it to a reference in order to make a decision. Subsequently, the teacher should take into account the data collected (putting this judgment at the service of a decision) to define clear objectives and develop systems highlighting this decision taken in order to allow students to improve and enrich their production. In class situations, diagnostic assessment at the start of the teaching / learning cycle has become a crucial step that facilitates the planning of learning content, taking into account the needs of students. In this logic, Godbout (1988) identifies several questions, fundamental bases of the evaluation, because the student must participate in the entire evaluative process and therefore in the various stages mentioned by the Godbout evaluation model, defined from three concepts: measure, judgment and decision.

The measure is the first step in any evaluation and aims, according to Hadji (2001), the collection of information or data related to students' learning. It takes place using instruments whose choice is not only of the type of evaluation, but especially of the type of skill to assess, the type of interpretation of the data collected and the technical quality of the measurement or observation instruments used. It must also make it possible to identify the problems that the student may encounter in learning in order to offer him a help device and if necessary define the content to be taught by an internal didactic transposition responding to the realities of the class. This measurement instrument should be a summary instrument, covering the entire objectives to be achieved as best as possible (Godjo, 2008). As part of this study, we analyzed the information collected by teachers on the production of their students and its effect on the planning of the content taught. Judgment is an essential step in the entire evaluative approach. It is intimately linked to the decision to be made after the evaluation. In the case of a diagnostic assessment like ours, it is the judgment that allows the teacher to confront the requirements of official prescriptions in terms of objective to be achieved at the end of the cycle, at the level of students diagnosed in order to make a decision for cycle planning. In diagnostic evaluation, the decision is purely educational. It is following this evaluation that the teacher can make the decision to remain in accordance with official prescriptions or to adapt them, from a transpositive perspective to the realities of his intervention environment. It is above all the didactic transposition (Chevallard, 2018) made following the decision that interests us in this study.

Using this concept, we have analyzed the relevance of the transpositive choices made in the teaching of the different APS. He consisted in presenting the learning objectives (teaching content) defined by teachers and then checking whether they take into account the needs of students observed during the diagnostic assessment. A focus on internal didactic transposition operated by teachers interests us within the framework of this study which made it possible to analyze the decision of the teachers following the diagnostic evaluation.

2. Problem, research question and hypothesis

At the start of its implementation in EPS in Benin, formal diagnostic evaluation was not an obligation. From the first session, the teacher could come with a planning of his teaching when he does not know the prior achievements of his students. These Maldonnes were revealed by the results of the works of Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Gnanvè, Attiklemé and Kpazai (2019); Abidou (2017); Agbodjogbé, Oguéboulé, Atoun, Attiklème and Fadébi (2023) on the didactic analysis of the first session of an EPS learning situation. Many works on the research in APS didactics have shown the need to make the diagnostic evaluation formal for more objective planning of teaching / learning cycle in order to better assess the reasons that justify the transpositive choices made. This internal didactic transposition which takes place in a real class situation when the teacher interacts with his students to build an environment favorable to the advance of knowledge in time must be based on a prerequisite according to Chevallard (2018). This prerequisite is here, all the information arising from the diagnostic assessment. It arouses the research issue relating to its use by EPS teachers to offer content to teach students.

2.1. State of the problem

Do PSE teachers take into account the data collected by the measuring measuring instruments in diagnostic evaluation to make transpositive choices relating to the content of knowledge offered to students?

2.2. Hypothesis

Not all EPS teachers take into account the data collected by the measurement instruments in diagnostic evaluation to make transpositive choices relating to the contents of knowledge offered to students.

3. Methodology

In harmony with the problem, the field of study of this work aims to analyze the results from the diagnostic assessment and the transpositive choices induced when implementing official prescriptions in class. For this fact, we conducted a qualitative study which consisted in observing five (05) teachers of EPS whose professional experiences in teaching / learning / evaluation vary between 08 years and 17 years, during the progress of their diagnostic evaluation, each in one of its classes. Following the audio-visual recording of the diagnostic assessment session, each of them was subject to an interview after four sessions. To carry out this study, the methodology borrowed is revolved around four points including the subjects of the study, the techniques and investigative tools, the investigation procedure and then the analysis method.

3.1. The subjects of the study

The five teachers who participated in the study and secondary establishments (public and private) were selected in a reasoned manner with well -defined criteria. These are: General Education College of Hêvié, fullness, Jean Piaget 1, 2 and 3 colleges.

- The criteria for selecting colleges present themselves respectively as follows:
- Have started EPS lessons from the first week of the school year;
- Have classes with a reasonable number (45 students at most) so that diagnostic assessments take place in the three APS of the learning situation n ° 1 (SA1) or failing that in two APS in the first session.
- Regarding the choice of teachers, two criteria were used to know:
- Develop and make the evaluation grids available and agree to participate in an interview registered in the 4th session;
- Have professional experience of at least 05 years.

3.2. Investigation techniques and tools

Three techniques were used for data collection: documentary analysis, observation and maintenance.

3.2.1. Documentary analysis

It is based on an analysis of the content of documents such as: Memoirs, articles, educational documents of teacher - study teachers, official documents and journals dealing with diagnostic assessment in general.

3.2.2. Observation

It made it possible to closely see the realities experienced by teachers and their students during the diagnostic assessment. The evaluation grid developed by each of them was filled in connection with the observation grid during the production of each student evaluated.

3.2.3. Maintenance and registration of sessions

In reference to the works of Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Mèkpé, and Kpazai (2021) then Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Gnanvè, Attiklemé and Kpazai (2019), the interviews with the actors of the didactic system (teachers and students) and the recordings of the sessions are inseparable and complementary techniques. They made it possible to record and visualize several times the sessions that ended up being transcribed. Collected by interviews, teachers' words were crossed with the realities resulting from diagnostic assessments, the number of sessions already unrolled, the first APS planned in initiation, the objective of the cycle defined for this APS, the taking into account or not of information from the diagnostic evaluation to define teaching objects.

3.2.4. Data collection tools

This is the recorder which made it possible to collect the words of the teachers.

3.3. The investigation procedure

She consisted of: - Take an interest in EPS teachers available to be subjects of study; - Develop and validate maintenance guides; - Make the interviews with the teachers.

3.4. Data processing

Data from the analysis of the evaluation grids have been subject to a recapitulated counting in tables. The analysis of these tables has facilitated the highlighting of the prerequisites of the students and their different needs following the difficulties of realization noted or ignorance of certain expected motor skills. This information was crossed with that received from teachers during the interview to justify the transpositive choices made during the planning of the content of teaching after the diagnostic assessment in connection with the official prescriptions.

4. Results

This part is devoted to the presentation in the form of tables of the results from the field investigations followed by their analysis. It is revolved around the following points:

- The didactic analysis of the evaluation grids;
- The didactic analysis of transpositive choices made by each teacher after the diagnostic assessment.

4.1. The didactic analysis of teacher assessment grids

It consists in highlighting the motor skills taken into account by each teacher and the level of performance of the students. It is a question of analyzing the difficulties linked to motor skills and performance revealed by the diagnostic evaluation.

4.1.1. The didactic analysis of the evaluation grid of the teacher

E1 From the analysis of table n ° 1 below, it appears that teacher E1 did the diagnostic assessment in 5th (gymnastics and weight throwing) and 3rd MC (gymnastics, speed racing and weight throwing). The data from this evaluation show that in gymnastics, only 09 students out of 39 (5th grade) and 31 out of 31 (3rd class) know that a presentation must be made at the start and at the end of the execution of a chain. Two students out of 46 (5th grade), 10 out of 31 (3rd class) know that it takes the presence of the five families of gymnic elements in the sequence and 10 (5th grade) against 05 (3rd class) were able to make a correct realization of 3/5 of the gymnic elements made.

In shot put, 15 out of 33 students (5th grade) and 8 out of 31 students (9th grade) know how to hold the weight. Only 9 out of 39 students know how to throw from the front (5th grade) compared to 10 for the side throw (9th grade), and none of these students have the slightest idea about respecting the air of the throw. In 5th grade, the minimum performance for girls is 1m compared to 2m for boys. The maximum is 4m for girls compared to 5m for boys. Referring to the minimum prescribed in official documents, which is 4m for girls and 5m for boys, we can say that the average for this class for both sexes is well below the required minimum. This average is equal to 3m for girls and 3.20m for boys.

Table 1 Provides details in other APS. Table 1: Summary of data from the analysis of teacher E1's grid

E1												
CLASS	**APS**	**MOTOR SKILLS**						**PERFORMANCES**			
5MB	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end; execution sequence		Presence of 5 Families		Correct execution of 3/5 of gymnastic elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one gymnastic element per family
		09	36	02	43	10	35				
	Shot put	Weight Holding		Front throw		Front throw		1m, G 2m, B	5m, B 4m, G	3m G 3m 20 B	4m girls 5m boys
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				
		15	30	09	36	00	45				
3ème MC	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end, execution sequence		Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one element per family
		31	00	10	21	05	26				
	Speed race	Departure at the signal		Extended stroke, arm on the stroke axis		Arrived/crossed the finish line quickly		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	15s7, G 12s39, B	8s9, G 10s72, F	11s32 G 9s22 B	Throw with body extended
		25	06	18	13	14	17				
	Shot put	Outfit		Profile launch		Throw with body extended		Mini	Maxi	Moy	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	2m, G 4m, B	7m50, B 6m G	3m87 G 5m22 B	Throw with body extended
		08	23	14	17	05	26				

These results obtained by the teacher should form the basis for transposing choices to be made in relation to the content to be taught. We will see later in the teaching-learning assessment sessions whether this data has been truly used. What about teacher E2?

4.2. Didactic analysis of teacher E2's evaluation grid

As seen in Table 2 below, teacher E2 conducted the diagnostic assessment in each of the APS programs in the SA1 program with two classes, respectively: Tle AB (gymnastics, high jump, and shot put); 1ère AB (gymnastics, triple jump, and discus throw). The assessment in the Tle AB class shows that in gymnastics, 22 out of 30 students know that a presentation is required at the beginning and end of a routine.

Thirteen out of 17 students knew that the five families of gymnastic elements must be performed in the sequence, and 10 out of 30 students were able to correctly perform three-fifths of the gymnastic elements presented.

In the high jump, 29 out of 30 students knew that a calibrated run-up was required. Only 8 out of 22 knew how to perform the front roll jump, and 24 out of 6 knew that a dynamic push-off connection was required. The minimum performance was 0.85m for girls and 1.05m for boys. The maximum was 1.15m for girls and 1.30m for boys, with the prescribed minimum being 1.10m for girls and 1.30m for boys. Referring to the latter, we can say that the average for this class for both sexes was well below the required minimum. This average was 0.87m for girls and 1.15m for boys.

Finally, for the third APS in this class, the shot put, seven students were able to hold the shot put, compared to 23. Only six out of 30 were able to perform the back throw. Four, compared to 26, were able to perform a dynamic throw with full body extension. The minimum performance is 2m for girls and 3m for boys. The maximum is 4m50 for girls and 7m for boys, with the minimum being 5m for girls and 6m for boys. Based on the requirements, we note that the average for girls is well below, while that for boys is slightly below the required minimum. It is 3m19 for girls and 5m62 for boys.

The results for the 1èreAB class are in the table below, along with data on motor skills and performances for each of the APSs that were subject to diagnostic assessment in these classes.

Table 2 Summary of data from the analysis of the E2 teacher's grid

E2											
CLASSES	**APS**	**Motor skills**						**Performances**			
Tle AB	Gymnastics	**Presentation start and end, execution sequence**		**Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect**		**Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements**		**Mini**	**Maxi**	**Average**	**Minimum requirements**
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one element per family
		22	08	13	17	10	20				
	High jump	Calibrated run-up		Ventral jump		Call connection, dynamic pulse		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimum requirements
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	0,85m F 1m05, G	1m30, boys 1m15, girls	0m97 girls 1m15 boys	1.10 m girls 1.30 m boys
		29	01	08	22	24	06				
	Shot put	Outfit		Back throw		Throw with body extension		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	2m, F 3m, G	7m, boys 4m50, girls	3m19 girls 5m62 boys	5 m girls 6 m boys
		07	23	06	24	04	26				
1ère AB	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end, execution sequence		Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one element per family
		19	00	11	08	09	10				
	Triple jump	Race call connection		Coordination of the three leaps		Deep reception		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	5m70, B 7m70, G	9m B 6m80 G	4m06 girls 5m61 boys	9 m girls 12 m boys
		14	06	14	06	07	13				
	Discus throw	Outfit		Volte		Full body extension		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	6m, G 9m, B	15m, G 11m, F	10m93 12m96	10 m girls 15 m boys
		03	17	04	16	01	19				

Teacher E2, immediately after the diagnostic assessment, which for him represents the end of the implementation of the "motor expression" skill, then developed the "analysis and planning" skills. At the end of the session, Teacher E2 took care to provide feedback to his students on their productions on motor skills and performances (minimum and maximum) in comparison to the minimum prescribed in the official documents in each of his classes.

4.3. Didactic analysis of Teacher E3's assessment grid

Teacher E3 conducted the diagnostic assessment in his various classes with the various APS, namely: 9th grade (gymnastics and shot put); 8th grade (gymnastics and long jump). From the results of the 9th grade assessment, it appears that in gymnastics, all 31 students know that a presentation must be made at the beginning and end of a routine. Only one student knew that all five gymnastic elements were required in the sequence, and only three were able to correctly perform three-fifths of the gymnastic elements performed.

For the second APS, the shot put, an overwhelming majority of students (29 out of 31) knew that the shot must be held at the neck under the jaw. Only three knew how to twist/untwist and move the leg. Eight were able to perform a throw with full extension, high thrust, and forward thrust. The minimum performance is 2m for girls and 3.5m for boys. The maximum is 5m for girls and 6m for boys. The minimum performance is at least 4m for girls and 5m for boys. Referring to the latter, we can say that the average for this class for girls is well below, and that for boys is slightly below, the minimum required by the Directorate of Educational Inspections, Innovation, and Quality (DIPIQ). This average is 2.82m for girls and 4.34m for boys.

The results data for the 8th grade class (gymnastics and long jump) are presented in the table below.

Table 3 Summary of data from the analysis of the E3 teacher's grid

TEACHER E3											
CLASSES	**APS**	**MOTOR SKILLS**						**PERFORMANCES**			
3ème	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end, execution sequence		Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				
		31	00	01	30	03	28				At least one element per family
	Shot put	Holding the mass		Twisting/untwisting Displacement jambe		Full Extension High Push		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				
		29	02	03	28	08	23	2m, G 3m50 B	6m, B 5m G	2m82 G 4m34 B	4m girls 5m boys
4ème	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end, execution sequenc		Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				
		35	01	02	34	02	34				At least one element per family
	Long jump	Run-up		Call		Reception		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				
		17	04	17	04	17	04	2m, G 2m50 B	4m, B 3m50, G	2m40	3m girls 4m Boys

4.3.1. Didactic Analysis of Teacher E4's

Evaluation Grid Like Teacher E3, Teacher E4 conducted the diagnostic assessment in two classes: 8th grade (gymnastics, hurdles, and long jump) and 6th grade (gymnastics, sprint, and long jump). From the data from this assessment, it appears that for the 8th grade class, in gymnastics, 22 students versus 16, for a total of 38, knew that a dynamic entry and exit are required. Sixteen students knew that coordination is required, and 18 were able to correctly perform three-fifths of the sequenced gymnastic elements.

In the second APS activity, hurdles, 29 students versus 9 knew that a start is required, out of a total of 38 assessed. Only 5 cleared the hurdles. Those who finished are also 05. The minimum performance is 16 seconds 10 for girls and 14 seconds 11 for boys. The maximum is 10 seconds 52 for girls and 8 seconds 70 for boys. The minimum is 18 seconds at least for girls and 16 seconds for boys. Referring to this requirement, we note that the average of this class at the level of both sexes is well above the minimum required by the DIPIQ. This average is equal to 11 seconds 34 for girls and 9 seconds 30 for boys.

In the long jump, out of a total of 38 students assessed, 37 took a run-up. Ten took off from the board, and 28 landed. The minimum performance is 1.5 m for girls and 2 m for boys. The maximum is 3 m for girls and 4 m for boys. The minimum performance is at least 3 m for girls and 4 m for boys. As a result, the average for this class for both sexes is well below the minimum required by the DIPIQ (French Institute for the Arts and Sciences). It is 1.86 m for girls and 2.21 m for boys.

The results data for the 6th grade class (gymnastics, speed, and long jump) are presented in the table below.

Table 4 Summary of data from the analysis of the E4 teacher's grid

E4											
CLASSES	**APS**	**MOTOR SKILLS**						**PERFORMANCES**			
Third Form	Gymnastics	Dynamic input and output		Coordination		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	DIPIQ Minima
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one gymnastic element per family
		22	16	16	22	18	20				
	Hurdle race	Departure		Crossing		Finishing		Mini	Maxi	Average	DIPIQ Minima
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	16s10, F 14s11 G	08s70, G 10s52 F	11s34 F 9s30 G	18s Girls 16s Boys
		29	09	05	33	05	33				
	Long jump	Elan		Prise d'appel sur la planche		Réception		Mini	Maxi	Average	DIPIQ Minima
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	1m5, G 2m B	4m, B 3m G	1m86 G 2m21 B	3m Girls 4m Boys
		37	01	10	28	28	10				
First form	Gymnastics	Dynamic input and output		Realization		Coordination		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minima DIPIQ
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one gymnastic element per family
		10	18	16	16	03	26				
	Speed race	Departure		Sprint finish		Gradually accelerated race		Mini	Maxi	Average	DIPIQ Minima
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	12s25, F 10s02, G	05s20, G 07s 32, F	7s31 F 5s62 G	60m in 16s girls 13s boys
		10	22	11	16	07	21				
	Long jump	Momentum		Taking a call on the board		Reception		Mini	Maxi	Average	DIPIQ Minima
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	0m, F 0m, G	3m, G 2m, F	1m75 F 1m23 G	3 m girls 4 m boys
		26	03	12	17	13	15				

4.3.2. Didactic Analysis of Teacher E5's Assessment

Grid Teacher E5 conducted the assessment in two classes, each with two APS classes: Year 13 (shot put and high jump) and Year 14 (gymnastics and shot put).

Data from the Year 13 assessment show that in the high jump, 30 students versus 8 knew that a standardized straight run was required. Of the 38 students assessed, 24 versus 14 knew how to perform the ventral roll technique, and 18 knew how to land on three supports. The minimum performance is 0.95 m for girls and 1.05 m for boys. The maximum is 1.25 m for girls and 1.40 m for boys, with the minimum being at least 1.10 m for girls and 1.30 m for boys. We can deduce that the average for this class for girls is well below, and that for boys is slightly below, the minimum required by the DIPIQ. It is 0.86 m for girls and 1.26 m for boys.

Data from the second year of APS (shot put) and the 9th grade are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Summary of data from the analysis of the E5 teacher's grid

E5											
CLASSES	**APS**	**MOTOR SKILLS**						**PERFORMANCES**			
Tle D3	High jump	Calibrated race		Ventral roll technique		Reception on three supports		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	0m95, G 1m05, B	1m40, B 1m25, G	0m63 G 1m30B	1.10 m girls 1.30 m boys
		30	08	24	14	18	20				
	Shot put	Weight Holding and Placement		Back throw		Respect for throwing air		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	3m, G 5m, B	9m, B 6m, G	4m57 F 6m41G	5m girls 6m boys
		31	07	22	16	23	15				
3ème 7	Gymnastics	Presentation start and end, execution sequence		Presence of the 5 Families Practicable respect		Correct completion of 3/5 of the elements		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO				At least one element per family
		20	16	05	31	03	33				
	Shot put	Dress and placement		Profile launch		Respect for the throwing air		Mini	Maxi	Average	Minimums Prescribed
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	3m, G 4m, B	9m, B 5m, G	5m02 F 6m15G	4 m fGirls 5 m boys
		20	16	19	17	32	04				

4.4. Didactic analysis of the transpositive choices made by each teacher after the assessment

In this context, the aim is to examine the physical activity chosen for initiation after planning at the level of each teacher, the objective pursued, and to verify whether the transpositive choice made takes into account the students' needs and is in line with official requirements.

4.4.1. Didactic analysis of the transpositive choice made by teacher E1

Teacher E1's first introductory physical activity in each of his two classes is shot put. Based on the data collected during his diagnostic assessment, the following technical difficulties emerged: holding the shot, throwing from the front, and respecting the throwing area (5th MB) and holding, throwing with the body extended (3rd MC). This assessment, conducted at the start of the session, allows us to identify learners' knowledge and needs in order to better plan and offer attractive teaching content. The table below provides information on the pedagogical choices made.

Table 6 Summary of the APS sequence in initiation and the objective of the E1 cycle

Second form (Shot put)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Throw the 3kg weight at least 4m for girls and 4kg weight at least 5m for boys using the front throwing technique under the regulations. OA1: The student will learn to throw the weight frontally without moving. AA1: Perform a throw with feet together. AA2: Perform a throw with legs staggered. OA2: The student will learn to throw frontally after moving. AA1: Perform a throw after a step backward. AA2: Perform a throw after a jump forward. OA: OTI. AA1: Learning the overall form. AA2: Achieving the minimum (Learn to throw the 3kg weight at least 4m for girls and 4kg weight at least 5m for boys).	OG: Throw a 3kg weight at least 4m for girls and a 4kg weight at least 5m for boys using the front throwing technique under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Physical conditioning Sequence 2: Diagnostic assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will learn to throw frontally without moving after holding and positioning correctly. AA1: Perform a firm-footed throw after holding and positioning the weight. AA2: Perform a front throw with staggered legs. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will learn to perform a regulatory throw after moving. AA1: Perform a throw after taking a step forward in the circle. AA2: Learn to perform a regulatory throw. AA3: Learn to perform a throw after a forward jump.
Fourth class MC (Shot put)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
Throw the 3kg weight at least 4.50m for girls and at least 6m for boys using the twisting-untwisting technique with displacement under the regulatory conditions. OA1: The student will learn to throw the weight in profile without displacement. AA1: The student will learn to throw in profile with a quarter turn. AA2: The student will learn to throw in profile after a twisting-untwisting. OA2: The student will learn to throw in profile with displacement. AA1: Performs a throw after a step backward. AA2: Performs the throw after a backward jump. OA: (see OTI) AA1: The student performs the overall form of the profile throw. AA2: Learns to perform the minimums.	Throw a 3kg club at least 4.50m for girls and at least 6m for boys using the twisting-detorsion sideways throwing technique with displacement under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Physical conditioning Sequence 2: Diagnostic assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will be able to throw the club frontally with displacement after correct grip and positioning. AA1: Throw the club close to the neck after a run-up step. AA2: Throw forward with full body extension after a jump. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will learn to throw sideways in torsion-detorsion without displacement of the supports. AA1: Sideways throw after flexion-extension. AA2: Sideways throw after a twist-detorsion and full body extension. Sequence 5: OA3: The student will learn to throw sideways in torsion-detorsion with displacement.

	AA1: Throw after a run-up step. Back and forward jump. AA2: Throw after a forward jump - untwisting, full body extension.

From the analysis of the data from this table, it appears that Teacher 1, after the physical conditioning and diagnostic assessment sequences, defined his objective for the cycle while remaining faithful to the required minimum. He thus proposed an objective that takes into account the results from the analysis of the assessment grid, since, referring to Table 1, the average performance for girls is 3m and 3m20 for boys in his 5th grade class, then 3m87 (girls) versus 5m22 (boys) for his 9th grade class. We can therefore argue that Teacher 1 took into account the information from the diagnostic assessment when planning the knowledge content offered to the students.

4.4.2. Didactic analysis of the transpositive choice made by Teacher 2

Teacher 2 in the final year of secondary school (AB), after planning the learning objectives, began the introduction with shot put and in the first year of secondary school (AB) with discus throw. Based on the results of the diagnostic assessment, the following challenges emerged: stance, back throw, and throw with full body extension in the shot put in Year 1 AB, and stance, twirl, and throw with full body extension in the discus throw in Year 1 AB. The table below summarizes the transpositive choices he made to meet his students' needs.

Table 7 Summary of the APS sequence in initiation and the objective of the E2 cycle

Final Year AB Class (Shot Put)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Throw the 4kg weight at least 5.50m for girls and 5kg weight at least 7m for boys using the backstroke throwing technique with twisting, untwisting, and displacement under the prescribed conditions. Number of prescribed sequences: 3 Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to throw the weight from behind without displacement. AA1: The student learns to throw from behind with a quarter turn. AA2: The student learns to throw from behind after a twisting-untwisting. Sequence No. 3 OA: The student will learn to throw from behind with displacement. AA1: Performs a throw after a step backward. AA2: Performs the throw after a dynamic backward jump. Sequence No. 4 OA: (see OTI) AA1: The student performs the overall form of the backstroke throw. AA2: Learns to perform the minimum throws (Throw the 4kg weight at 5.50m). at least for girls and 5kg at 7m at least for boys)	OG2: Throw a 4kg weight at least 5.50m for girls and 5kg at least 7m for boys using the backhand throwing technique with twisting, untwisting, and displacement under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Diagnostic Assessment Sequence 2: OA1: The student will learn to throw sideways after a displacement following a twisting-untwisting movement. AA1: Perform a throw after a twisting-untwisting movement AA2: Perform a throw after a forward jump-untwisting movement Sequence 3: OA2: The student will learn to throw backhand with displacement. AA1: Perform a backhand throw with one step without twisting-untwisting movement AA2: Perform a backhand throw after a backward step while untwisting, followed by a full body extension. Sequence No. 4: OA3: The student will learn to perform the backstroke throw with a running motion in a synchronized and uniform movement. AA1: Learn to throw with a full body extension upon exiting the apparatus. AA2: Learn to perform an explosive backstroke throw with a running motion. Sequence No. 5: OA4: The student will learn to throw the mace at least 5.50 meters for girls and at least 7 meters for boys using the backstroke throwing technique under regulatory conditions. AA1: Learn to throw explosively from the backstroke under regulatory conditions.

	AA2: Learn to throw at least 5.50 meters for girls and 7 meters for boys under regulatory conditions.
1st AB class (Discus throw)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Throw at least one 1kg discus at 15m for girls and at least one 1.5kg discus at 18m for boys using the rotational throwing technique with full body extension under regulatory conditions. Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to throw the discus without moving. AA1: Learn to throw from the front without moving. AA2: Learn to throw from the side without moving. AA3: Learn to throw from the back without moving. Sequence No. 3 OA: The student will learn to throw the discus with moving. AA1: Learn to throw with a half-turn. AA2: Learn to throw with a full turn. Sequence No. 4 OA: OTI AA1: Perform the overall form of the discus throw. AA2: Perform the minimums.	OG: Throw at least one 1kg discus at 15m for girls and 1.5kg at 18m for boys using the rotational throwing technique with full body extension under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Diagnostic Assessment Sequence 2 OA1: The student will learn to throw the discus without moving after holding the discus firmly. AA1: Learn to release the discus with the index finger after holding it firmly. AA2: Learn to throw the discus with firm feet by fully extending the body as it releases the apparatus. AA3: Learn to throw sideways without moving with full body extension. Sequence 3 OA2: The student will learn to throw the discus in a twist. AA1: Learn to throw with a half-twist AA2: Learn to throw with a full-twist Sequence 4: OA3: The student will learn to throw the discus 13m (girls) and 16m (boys) in a twist in a uniform and synchronized movement AA1: Throw the discus in a twist in a uniform movement AA2: Throw the discus at least 13m (girls) or 16m (boys) in a twist in a synchronized movement Sequence 5: OA4: Be able to throw at least one discus 15m (girls) and 18m (boys) using the twist technique with full body extension under regulation conditions AA1: Learn to throw the discus using the twist technique with explosiveness AA2: Learn to throw the discus at least 15m for girls and at least 18m for boys under regulation conditions

When approached by interview, E2 stated that physical conditioning is a waste of time. His diagnostic assessment was therefore conducted during his first class. A reading of his teaching materials reveals that he made adjustments in each of his classes in view of his intended objective, in line with the prescribed minimum. Indeed, in the shot put in Year 11 (AB), he proposed a minimum of at least 5.50 m for girls and at least 7 m for boys, while the minimum requires at least 5 m for girls and at least 6 m for boys.

In Year sixth form (AB), he proposed a content that required throwing the discus 15 m for girls and 18 m for boys, while the prescribed distance requires 10 m for girls and 15 m for boys.

In the interview, E2 stated, "The recommendations are not fixed." Everything depends on the reality of each environment (infrastructure and equipment), what the learners already have and, above all, the teacher's relationship to knowledge through his ability to propose tasks that involve knowledge challenges." We can see that E2 had to process the information from the diagnostic assessment and propose teaching content whose threshold is above that officially prescribed. In his teaching practice, he focused on the playful dimension of learning and drew lines by setting the threshold to expect according to gender. His transpositive choices could be justified by the level of his students. In his different classes, the average performance, for example, in Seventh form AB is 3m19 for girls compared to 5m62 for

boys. In 1ère AB, the average performance for girls is equivalent to 11m93 compared to 12m96 for boys. In short, teacher E2 truly took into account the data from the diagnostic assessment to make the decision to make a plan adapted to the needs of the students by referring to the official prescriptions.

4.4.3. Didactic Analysis of the Transpositive Choice Made by Teacher E3

With Teacher E3, shot put was taught in fourth form and gymnastics in third form. Referring to the diagnostic assessment data, the following difficulties were observed: twisting-untwisting and full body extension in shot put (Year 9); absence of the five families, failure to respect the floor plan, and failure to perform 3/5 gymnastics elements (Year 9). A summary of the knowledge and skills taught by Teacher E3 is recorded in the table below.

Table 8 Summary of the APS sequence in initiation and the objective of the E3 cycle

Fourth form (Shot put)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Throw the 3kg weight at least 4.50m for girls and at least 6m for boys using the twist-untwist sideways throwing technique with displacement under the prescribed conditions. Three sequences are prescribed. Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to throw the weight sideways without displacement. AA1: The student will learn to throw sideways with a quarter turn. AA2: The student will learn to throw sideways after a twist-untwist. Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to throw sideways with displacement. AA1: Performs a throw after a backward step. AA2: Performs the throw after a backward jump. Sequence No. 3 OA: (see OTI) AA1: The student performs the overall form of the sideways throw. AA2: Learns to perform the minimums.	OG: Throw a 3kg weight at least 3m for girls and at least 4m for boys with twisting and untwisting under the prescribed conditions. Sequence 1: Physical conditioning Sequence 2: Diagnostic assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will learn to throw the weight in profile without moving. AA1: The student will learn to throw in profile with firm feet. AA2: The student will learn to throw in profile with staggered legs. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will learn to throw in profile with moving legs. AA1: Perform a throw after a step backward. AA2: Perform the throw after a forward jump.
4th form (Gymnastics)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Present a routine consisting of at least one gymnastic element per family in at least 60 seconds and at most 70 seconds for girls and in at least 50 seconds and at most 60 seconds for boys on a 12m/12m floor under the prescribed conditions. 4 Sequences are prescribed. Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-routine No. 1 AA1: Learning the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families AA2: Presentation of mini-routine No. 1 Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-routine No. 2	OG: Present a routine consisting of at least one gymnastic element per family in at least 60 seconds and at most 70 seconds for girls and at least 50 seconds and at most 60 seconds for boys on a 12m/12m floor under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Physical Condition Sequence 2: Diagnostic Assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will learn to present mini-routine 1. AA1: Learning the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families. AA2: Learning to present mini-routine 1 developed from the elements learned. Sequence 4:

AA1: Learning the second gymnastic elements of the five families AA2: Presentation of mini-routine No. 2 Sequence No. 3 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their routine AA1: Development of a routine Based on the combination of two mini-sequences (mini-sequences 1 and 2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under regulatory conditions Sequence 4 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their sequence AA1: Development of a sequence based on the combination of two mini-sequences (mini-sequences 1 and 2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under regulatory conditions	OA2: The student will learn to perform mini-routine 2. AA1: Learning the second gymnastic elements of the five families. AA2: Learning to present mini-routine 2 developed from the elements learned.

From the interview with E3, we note that his first sequence was dedicated to physical fitness, which is what justifies the four sequences he performed. Referring to the table above, E3, in his ninth grade class, proposed a cycle objective that was below the prescribed one. Thus, we can say that he made a transpositive choice that prevented his learners from progressing in their learning. The average performance of the girls was 2.82m, compared to 4.34m for the boys. These performances were higher only at the boys' level than what he proposed in his cycle objective, which is 3m for the girls and 4m for the boys. In his eighth form gymnastics class, he met the prescribed requirements. We can conclude that E3 did not take into account the data collected by the diagnostic assessment measuring instruments when making his transpositive choices.

4.4.4. Didactic Analysis of the Transpositive Choice

Made by Teacher E4 Teacher E4's planning of learning objectives is hurdling in 8th grade and gymnastics in her 6th grade class. These learning objectives in the introductory classes relate to the major difficulties encountered. These inappropriate motor skills are as follows: problems clearing hurdles and a poor finish in the hurdling class (8th grade class); incoordination, non-dynamic entry and exit, and incorrect execution of elements in floor gymnastics (6th grade class). These certainly led to the definition of the following learning objectives and learning activities (see Table 9).

Table 9 Summary of the APS sequence in the introductory classes and the objective of the E4 cycle

4th form class (hurdling)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: The student will be able to clear 70m hurdles in 16 seconds (boys) and 18 seconds (girls) under the prescribed conditions. 3 Sequences are prescribed. Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to run while clearing hurdles. AA1: Clearing on the spot AA2: Clearing while walking AA3: Clearing while running Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to run fast while clearing hurdles after a quadrupedal start. AA1: Learn to run fast while clearing hurdles after a standing start. AA2: Learn to run fast while clearing hurdles after a sitting start. AA3: Learn to run fast while clearing hurdles after a quadrupedal start.	OG: Be able to clear 5 40cm high hurdles spaced 7.50m apart (with the first hurdle located 11.50m from the start and the last hurdle 8.50m) in 12s at the most for girls; 5 50cm high hurdles in 10s at the most for boys, while respecting the rules of the activity. Sequence 1: Physical conditioning Sequence 2: Diagnostic assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will be able to correctly clear hurdles in a fast race. AA1: The student will learn to clear hurdles in various movements (on the spot, walking, and striding). AA2: The student will learn to clear hurdles in a fast race. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will be able to run a fast and steady race between hurdles until crossing the finish line. full speed.

Sequence No. 3 OA: (see OTI) AA1: Learning the overall form of the race. AA2: Achieving the minimum	AA1: The student will learn to clear hurdles with the same lead leg and the same pace while walking. AA2: The student will learn to clear hurdles with the same lead leg and the same pace while striding. AA3: The student will learn to clear hurdles with the same lead leg and the same pace as quickly as possible.
First form (Gymnastics)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: The student will be able to perform a routine consisting of ten (10) gymnastic elements in no more than 70 seconds for girls and no more than 60 seconds for boys, under the prescribed conditions. 4 sequences are prescribed Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-sequence No. 1 AA1: Learning the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families AA2: Presentation of mini-sequence No. 1 Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-sequence No. 2 AA1: Learning the second gymnastic elements of the five families AA2: Presentation of mini-sequence No. 2 Sequence No. 3 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their sequence AA1: Development of a sequence from the combination of the two mini-sequences (mini-sequence No. 1 and mini-sequence No. 2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under the regulatory conditions Sequence No. 4 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their sequence AA1: Development of a sequence based on the combination of two mini sequences (mini #1 and mini #2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under regulatory conditions	OG: Present a routine consisting of at least one gymnastic element per family in at least 60s and at most 70s for girls and in at least 50s and at most 60s for boys on a 12m/12m floor under regulatory conditions. Sequence No. 1: Diagnostic assessment Sequence No. 2: OA1: The student will learn to present mini routine No. 1 AA1: Learning the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families AA2: Learning to present mini routine No. 1 developed from the elements learned Sequence No. 3: OA2: The student will learn to perform mini routine No. 2 AA1: Learning the second gymnastic elements of the five families AA2 Learning to present mini routine No. 2 developed from the elements learned. Sequence No. 4: OA3: The student will learn to develop and present their routine. AA1: Learn to develop a routine based on the combination of two mini routines (mini routines No. 1 and mini routines No. 2). Sequence No. 5: OA4: Present a routine consisting of at least one gymnastic element per family in at least 60 seconds and at most 70 seconds for girls and in at least 50 seconds and at most 60 seconds for boys on a 12m/12m floor under the prescribed conditions. AA1: Learn to present their routine with coordination, rhythm, and maximum amplitude. AA2: Learn to present their routine on the floor under the prescribed conditions.

Teacher E4 is in his third sequence in 8th grade, but in 6th grade, he is in his fifth sequence. Approached for an interview, he said that his first sequence in 8th grade was dedicated to physical fitness. Subsequently, he felt it was a waste of time and that it should be done without. This explains the delay of one sequence compared to the number of sequences performed in his 6th grade class. From analyzing the table above, we can deduce that Teacher E4 has remained faithful to the official requirements in 6th grade. Moreover, in 8th grade, the average performance of both girls and boys is higher than the prescribed one. The girls' performance is equal to 11.34 seconds compared to 9.30 seconds for boys. We can therefore conclude that Teacher E4 has taken into account the information from the 8th grade assessment. In his 6th grade class, he has no choice. He has maintained the prescribed one.

4.4.5. Didactic analysis of the transpositive

Choice made by teacher E5 teacher E5, in his choice of teaching content, began the introduction to gymnastics in Year 11 D3 and in Year 9 with shot put. In relation to the results of the diagnostic assessment, the identified motor skill

difficulties can be summarized as follows: lack of presentation at the beginning and end of the sequence, absence of the five families, and incorrect execution of gymnastic elements (Year 11 D3 class); holding and positioning the mace, sideways throw (Year 9 class). The teaching content defined by Teacher E5 is presented as follows in the table below.

Table 10 Summary of the APS sequence in introduction and the objective of the E5 cycle

Final Year D3 Class (Gymnastics)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: The student will be able to present a sequence composed of ten (10) gymnastic elements in 70 seconds at most for girls and in 60 seconds at most for boys under the regulatory conditions. 4 sequences are prescribed Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-sequence No. 1 AA1: Learning the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families AA2: Presentation of mini-sequence No. 1 Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to perform mini-sequence No. 2 AA1: Learning the second gymnastic elements of the five families AA2: Presentation of mini-sequence No. 2 Sequence No. 3 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their sequence AA1: Development of a sequence from the combination of the two mini-sequences (mini-sequence No. 1 and mini-sequence No. 2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under the regulatory conditions Sequence No. 4 OA: The student will learn to develop and present their sequence AA1: Development of a sequence based on the combination of two mini sequences (mini #1 and mini #2) AA2: Presentation of the sequence developed under regulatory conditions	OG: Present a routine consisting of at least one gymnastic element per family and one or two freestyle elements in 90 seconds for girls and 70 seconds for boys on a 12m/12m floor under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Physical conditioning Sequence 2: Diagnostic assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will learn to present mini-routine 1 AA1: Learn the first gymnastic elements of the five (5) families AA2: Learn to present mini-routine 1 developed from the elements learned. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will learn to perform mini-routine 2 AA1: Learn the second gymnastic elements of the five families AA2 Learn to present mini-routine 2 developed from the elements learned.
Fourth form 7 (Shot put)	
Prescribed teaching content	**Teaching content defined by the teacher**
OTI: Throw a 3kg weight at least 4m for girls and a 4kg weight at least 5m for boys using the profile throwing technique under the prescribed conditions. Sequence No. 1 OA: The student will learn to throw the weight in profile without moving. AA1: Profile throw with a quarter turn. AA2: Profile throw after a twist-untwist. Sequence No. 2 OA: The student will learn to throw in profile with moving. AA1: Perform a throw after a step backward.	OG: The student will be able to throw a 3kg weight at least 4m for girls and a 4kg weight at least 5m for boys using the profile throwing technique under regulatory conditions. Sequence 1: Physical Condition Sequence 2: Diagnostic Assessment Sequence 3: OA1: The student will learn to throw the weight in profile without moving AA1: Learn to hold and position the weight correctly AA2: The student will learn to throw in profile after flexion-extension

AA2: Perform the throw after a backward jump. Sequence No. 3 OA: (see OTI) AA1: Perform the overall form of the profile throw. AA2: Learn to perform the minimums.	AA3: The student will learn to throw in profile after a twist-untwist. Sequence 4: OA2: The student will learn to throw in profile with moving AA1: Perform a throw after a step backward AA2: Perform the throw after a forward jump

Teacher E5 in Tle D3, in his planning of learning objects, began the initiation with gymnastics. He is in his 4th class sequence. Approached by interview, he says that his first sequence was dedicated to physical fitness and this is what justifies his 4 sequences performed. From the analysis of table no. 10, we note that E5 remained faithful to the official requirements in all his classes. He did not take into account the data from the assessment in his 3rd M7 class. In his 3rd M7 class, the girls' performances are equivalent to 5m02 compared to 6m15 for the boys. These performances are higher than the minimum that he planned and which is prescribed. In doing so, he is proposing to his students to reach a level of competence lower than the one they have and that the diagnosis made by him paradoxically revealed. In the Tle D3 class, the APS chosen for initiation was not the subject of a diagnostic assessment. In summary, the diagnostic assessment for E2 is a mere formality that puts chronogenesis to the test.

5. Discussion

Assessment is at the center of the teacher's action in a classroom (Florin et al, 2023). It is an integral part of the teaching/learning process and constitutes a benchmark (Agbodjogbé, Attiklémé and Atoun, 2014). Diagnostic assessment is the first step in the teacher's action and must, from the beginning, accumulate the positive (in our case remarkable motor skills) and negative (faults or lack of motor skills, needs) points of the students' behavior before teaching (Florin, Tricot, Chesné, Piedfer-Quêney and Simonin-Kunerth, 2023). This is the case of teachers E1, E2, E3, E4 and E5 who implemented this assessment at the start of SA1 even if others first did a physical conditioning session (E1, E3, E4 and E5). Through diagnostic assessment, the teacher collects a myriad of information about his students, their expectations, their level of motivation, their prior knowledge and their preconceptions. With this information in hand, he will be able to: choose content (based on the learning objectives and skills associated with the course); decide on the best strategy to adopt to teach this content and to promote the transfer of knowledge in various contexts; verify that the teaching material is adapted to his audience and that the teaching, learning and assessment strategies are adequate in this specific and momentary context (Mondor, 2017; Lapierre, 2014). Thus, the collection of information from the diagnostic assessment of the five teachers (the measurement according to Godbout, 1988) according to the motor skills and performances defined in each APS of the observation grid (measuring instrument), made it possible to identify not only the gaps to be filled in motor skills but also and above all the performance levels of the students in the APS. This diagnosis allowed them to "discover the strengths, weaknesses and levels of preparation of the students" before they began a learning sequence (Al Zubia, 2020). These lacks in motor skills or technical difficulties such as: holding the shot, throwing from the front and respecting the throwing area (5th MB) and holding, throwing with body extension (3rd MC) in E1 or holding, throwing from the back and throwing with full body extension in the shot put in Tle AB and holding, twirl, throwing by full extension in the discus throw in 1st AB in E2 or even problems clearing hurdles and a poor finish in the hurdle race (4th grade); incoordination, non-dynamic entry and exit; failure to correctly perform elements in floor gymnastics (6th grade) in E4, should form the basis of the choice of teaching objects in line with official requirements.

Indeed, faced with these technical difficulties identified during the diagnostic assessment, teachers E1, E2, E3, E4 and E5 made didactic choices to plan the learning objects before starting lessons (Lapierre, 2014). They therefore made “decisions” (Godbout; 1988). According to the analysis and interpretation of the transpositive choices they made (tables n06 to n010), only teachers E1, E2 and E4 made adaptations that favored chronogenesis. These adaptations or adjustments take into account not only the motor skills of the students not appropriate for APS but also their average performances in relation to the official prescriptions in the logic of Dassé (1989). All this makes it possible to appreciate the relationship to knowledge of the teachers investigated, but also their practical epistemology; all factors promoting dexterity in teaching practices (Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Sèdodé, and Kpazai, 2018). They therefore made decisions that helped students adapt to educational contexts and meet their real learning needs (Al Zubia, 2020). In contrast, E3 and E5 made pedagogical choices that are either typically linked to official injunctions or fall short of these injunctions (E3 table no. 8) or even inappropriate choices of objects not diagnosed by the assessment (E5 with the Tle D3 class in floor gymnastics). This did not allow students to truly learn according to their needs. These misdeals related to the decisions taken by E3 and E5 following the diagnostic assessments confirm the results of the work of Atoun, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Oguéboulé and Kpazaï (2015); Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Gnanvè, Attiklemé and Kpazaï (2019);

Abidou (2017); Agbodjogbé, Oguéboulé, Atoun, Attiklémé, and Fadébi (2023) in terms of didactic analysis of assessments in PE classroom situations.

6. Conclusion

The objective of this research was to analyze the results of the diagnostic assessment and the transpositive choices made during the implementation of official instructions in classroom situations. With this in mind, we used Godbout's (1988) model to analyze the assessment grids designed by teachers and their judgments of students' motor skills and performance. The resulting decisions were approached from a didactic perspective. In addition, Chevallard's (2018) anthropological theory of didactics helped us understand the reasons behind the transpositive choices made by teachers. In synergy with this composite theoretical framework, the methodological approach used focused on document analysis, interviews, and observation of diagnostic assessment sessions implemented by five PE teachers. The analysis of the results shows that three out of five teachers put the information collected through diagnostic assessment into tension with the prescribed knowledge content when deciding to retain and plan the content offered to students in the classroom. The other two are subject to the prescribed content to be taught as if the diagnostic assessment, which has become formal again, is just a formality. However, a good number of studies in PE have emphasized the usefulness of diagnostic assessment for teaching that meets the needs of students in line with official prescriptions.

In the case of this study, the teachers who took into account the information from the diagnostic assessment made transpositive choices that allowed their students to progress from a pedagogical point of view. This was not the case for the others who, no doubt, will have time to strengthen their epistemological relationship and their professional experience.

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] Abidou, L. (2017). From Teaching to Assessment in Handball in the 8th Grade. What System for Summative Assessment? Professional Master's Dissertation in Sports and Physical Education, Porto-Novo, INJEPS-UAC.

[2] Agbodjogbé D. B., Ogueboulé B., Atoun C. E., Attiklémè K., and Fadébi E. (2023). Didactic Analysis of the First Session of a Learning Situation for Three Physical Education and Sports Teachers in Benin. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies. Vol. 39 No. 2 pp. 833-848. Innovative Space of Scientific Research Journals.

[3] Agbodjogbé D. B., Attiklémé O. A., Gnanvè S., Attiklémé K. and Kpazaï G. (2019). From Formative Assessment to Immediate Interactive Remediation in Gymnastics in the General Education Middle Schools of Sègbèya and Suru Léré. IOSR Journal of Sports and Physical Education, Volume 6, Issue 4, (Jul. –Aug. 2019), PP 17-30

[4] Agbodjogbé, B., Attiklémè, K. and Atoun, C. (2014). The Implementation of New Competency-Based Programs in Physical Education in Benin: An Analysis of the Content Taught. Questions Vives, No. 22, pp. 2-13.

[5] Agbodjogbé, D. B. (2007). Problems of Implementing the Teaching/Learning/Assessment Approach in Physical Education in Benin. Master's Thesis in Physical Education and Human Development Sports. Porto-Novo, INJEPS-UAC, 81p.

[6] Al Zubia, S. (2020). Didactic Approach to Assessment in Teaching/Learning: Journal of Academic Research, University of Misrata, Faculty of Arts, Department of French; Vol. 15, pp. 69-87.

[7] Atoun, C. E. H., Agbodjogbé, B., Attiklémè, K., Mèkpé, A., and Kpazaï, G. (2021). Volleyball Teaching in Schools: A Transpositive Problem. IOSR Journal of Sports and Physical Education, Volume 8, Issue 6, pp. 29-44

[8] Atoun, C. E. H., Agbodjogbé, B. Attiklémè, K. Sèdodé, G., Kpazai, G. (2018). The Influence of Epistemology on Volleyball Teaching Practice in Benin. Journal of Sport and Physical Education, Vol. 5 Issue 5, pp. 27-40.

[9] Atoun, C. E., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Attiklémè, K., Oguéboulé, B. M., and Kpazaï, G. (2015). Team Sports Assessment According to the APC in Ouémé Middle Schools: The Case of Volleyball Teaching. Journal of the International Francophone Association for Scientific Research in Education, 13 pp. 48-65.

[10] Dassé, B. (1989). Planning and Assessment of Learning. INJS

[11] De Kétèle, J-M. (2010). Don't Make a Mistake in Assessment. French Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15 (1), pp. 25-37.

[12] Florin, A., Tricot, A., Chesné J.-F., Piedfer-Quêney, L., Simonin-Kunerth, M. (2023). Summary Report: Classroom Assessment, in the Service of Student Learning.

[13] Godbout, P. (1988). Supervision of Assessment in Physical Activity, In Brunelle, Drowin, Godbout, Tousignan, Supervision of Physical Activity Intervention, Gaëtanmorin. Montreal, Quebec, pp. 215-231.

[14] Godjo, S.F. (2008). The Implementation of Assessment Subjects in the 6th Grade of High Schools and Colleges in the Ouémé and Zou Departments. Master's Research Dissertation in STAPS. Porto-Novo: INJEPS-UAC, 70p.

[15] Hadji, C. (2001). Paths to Assessment. In Educating and Shaping Knowledge and Debates in Education and Training. Humanities, Auxerre.

[16] Lapierre, L. (2014). A Framework for Didactic Questioning in College," in BIZIER, N. (ed.). The Didactic Imperative: At the Heart of College Teaching, PERFORMA Collection, Montreal, Quebec Association of College Pedagogy, pp. 25-51

[17] Mondor, P. (2017). Diagnostic Assessment to Assess the Measure at the Beginning of the Course: College Pedagogy; pp. 17-21. Vol. 30 No. 4.

[18] Vial, M. (2013). Referring to Educational Models. Brussels, De Broek, 340p