UNIFORM ASSESSMENT OF SKILLS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BENIN: TOWARDS A UNIFORM AND OBJECTIVE SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT MODEL

ABSTRACT

The study focuses on the standardization of summative assessment practices in physical education and sports (EPS) in secondary schools in Benin. It focuses on the gaps observed in summative assessment practices in basketball and handball in the first year of secondary school. In this perspective, the objective is to develop a uniform and objective summative assessment model for basketball and handball in the first year of secondary school in Benin. To achieve this objective, the analysis model combines four theories (Godbout's evaluation model (1988), Chevallard's anthropological theory of didactics (1992), the model of referentialization in action (Brau-Antony &Grosstephan, 2020) and Artigue's didactic engineering approach (1988)), articulated around the five qualities expected of a uniform and objective evaluation (objectivity, fairness, validity, fidelity and relevance) served as a benchmark for the analysis of practices and the identification of levers of standardization. The research is based on several data collection techniques: documentary analysis, interviews and in situ observation. The results indicate gaps in heterogeneous evaluation practices from one establishment to another and from one teacher to another. Also, significant disparities in the use of infrastructure and equipment, leading to disparate local adaptations. Faced with these disparities, experiments have shown that thoughtful support, backed by a solid theoretical framework and the active involvement of teachers, can encourage the emergence of more uniform assessment practices, better aligned with the frameworks, and perceived as more equitable by those in the field.

Keywords: Summative assessment, standardization, team sports

INTRODUCTION

In Benin, the assessment of Physical Education and Sports (PE) skills, particularly in team sports, constitutes a major challenge for the fairness and quality of the assessment system (Agbodjogbé et al., 2014). Research and field observations highlight significant disparities between the grades awarded by different teachers for the same student performance, revealing a high degree of subjectivity in the assessment process (Agbodjogbé et al., 2014). This situation undermines learners' confidence and raises questions about the fairness and reliability of PE assessment practices, where assessment often relies more on the teacher's personal perceptions than on objective and standardized criteria (Cogérino and Mnaffakh, 2008). In team sports, issues related to justice are particularly acute (Gréhaigne, 2018).

Within Physical Education and Sports (PES) programs in Benin, team sports, particularly basketball and handball, occupy a privileged place in secondary education rules (Thépaut and Léziart, 2013; Agassounon, 2013). They constitute vectors of physical, social, and cognitive development, and privileged spaces for the acquisition of complex skills ranging from motor coordination to tactical management and collaborative work (Muguet, 2009). Assessment, in this context, should play a fundamental role in guiding learning, certifying achievement, and strengthening student motivation. However, despite the adoption

of the Competency-Based Approach (CBA) since the 1990 General Assembly on Education, the benchmarks and assessment methods in PE remain problematic and insufficiently contextualized, making consistent and equitable implementation difficult (Adda and Godjo, 2021).

Faced with these limitations, the literature and studies carried out in the Beninese context (Agbodjogbé and Gnanvè, 2025, Adda and Godjo, 2021; Abidou, 2017) highlight the urgent need to clarify the evaluation criteria and to design tools adapted to the specificities of team sports. The challenges identified are as much at the level of clarifying the framework, which is still too vague and multivocal, as at the level of practices, influenced by the personal epistemologies of teachers and material and organizational constraints (Agbodjogbé and Gnanvè, 2025). In this context, didactic engineering (Artigue, 1988) appears to be a relevant approach to develop a standardized and objective model, capable of ensuring a uniform, reliable and representative assessment of students' real skills.

Objective

This article aims to develop a standardized and objective summative assessment model for basketball and handball in the first year of secondary school in Benin. Specifically, it aims to analyze the main challenges inherent in current summative assessment practices in basketball and handball in the first year of secondary school in Benin, as well as their impact on the quality and consistency of assessments. It also aims to develop avenues for improvement with a view to designing a standardized and objective summative assessment model for basketball and handball, adapted to the first year of secondary school in Benin.

2. State of the problem, Research questions and Hypotheses

2.1. State of the problem

The problem of this research arises from the recurring disparities related to the summative assessment of team sports skills within the framework of the competency-based approach (CBA). As Gérard (2005), Scallon (2004), and Mottier and Crahay (2009) emphasize, this assessment requires a rigorous, consistent approach capable of fairly assessing the mobilization of acquired skills in complex situations. However, in secondary schools in Benin, the assessment of basketball and handball faces numerous obstacles: the complexity of sports practices, disparities in provision, insufficient teaching resources, and a lack of infrastructure (Tokpo, 1995; Ogueboulé, 1999; Agassounon, 2013; Abidou, 2017). These constraints limit the effective acquisition of the targeted skills and hinder the implementation of reliable assessments. In addition, several studies highlight shortcomings in assessment practices, ranging from non-compliance with the assessment approach (Abidou, 2017; Agbodjogbé et al., 2014) to difficulties in designing suitable tools, such as assessment grids (Adda and Godjo, 2021; Houenoumadji, 2017). However, few studies have paid sufficient attention to the clarity of the frameworks (Figari, 1994; Hadji, 1997) and the need for harmonization of assessment practices (Bélair, 2007; Rey et al., 2003; Godbout, 1988). In light of these findings, this research examines the challenges and limitations of current summative assessment practices in basketball and handball in Benin, in order to propose a

standardized and objective model promoting the standardization and reliability of assessments. In order to shed light on this issue, we formulate the following research question:

2.2. Research questions

What summative assessment model can consistently and objectively assess basketball and handball skills in the first year of secondary school in Benin?

2.2.1. Specific research questions

- What are the challenges and gaps in current summative assessment frameworks and practices for basketball and handball in secondary schools in Benin?
- What features should the summative assessment model incorporate to ensure consistent and objective assessment of basketball and handball skills in the first year of secondary school in Benin?

2.3. Central hypothesis

The uniform model for assessing basketball and handball skills in the first year of secondary school in Benin is based on a clear framework, assessment tools, and assessment practices related to objectivity, validity, reliability, fairness, and relevance.

2.3.1. Specific assumptions

- Current summative assessment frameworks and practices for basketball and handball in secondary schools in Benin present major challenges related to the objectivity, validity, reliability, fairness, and relevance of assessment in basketball and handball.
- The uniform summative assessment model for basketball and handball in secondary schools in Benin must incorporate characteristics related to the objectivity, validity, reliability, fairness, and relevance of assessment.

3. Methodological approach

3.1. Choice of study

Setting and Subjects This research took place in two complementary settings, each providing a specific contribution to our approach. On the one hand, the Discipline Didactics Laboratory (LDD) at INJEPS provided a favorable environment for research in the didactics of Physical and Sports Activities (PSA) as well as for pedagogical experimentation. It enabled the conceptualization and methodical planning of the study, and the rigorous analysis of the collected data.

On the other hand, secondary schools spread across Benin provided a rich and diverse field of observation for examining summative assessment practices in their real-world context. Among Benin's twelve departments, the study focused on three strategic departments: Atlantique, Littoral, and Ouémé. These departments account for 42.71% of PE teachers in Benin (Kouapek, 2014) and offer a diverse urban context. This geographical choice allows for efficient data collection while ensuring the representativeness of the results. The Première

class was chosen for this research due to the physical and cognitive maturity of the students, the expected deepening of basketball and handball skills, and the fact that it constitutes the final year of teaching these APS, making summative assessment particularly relevant. The articulation of these two frameworks favored an integrative approach reconciling theory and practice, for a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of summative assessment practices in PE in secondary schools in Benin.

3.1.1. Selection of departments

3.1.2. Study subjects

Since learning assessment is primarily a teaching practice (Tramoy, 2016), this study primarily targeted PE teachers, while also incorporating key stakeholders in the educational noosphere, including educational advisors (PAs) and inspectors. Based on the (non-probability) sample, six PE teachers working in three secondary schools, six educational advisors, and three inspectors working in the targeted departments participated in the study. To ensure rigorous selection, three types of criteria were defined: inclusion, non-inclusion, and exclusion. The inclusion criteria specify the minimum conditions for inclusion in the sample (Sacré, Lafontaine, & Toczek, 2021). Thus, only PE teachers employed in a secondary school located in one of the targeted departments (Atlantique, Littoral, Ouémé), teaching PE classes in the first year of secondary school during the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 school years, and who had given their informed consent, were selected. All of these teachers' schools were also included in the sample. The sample size is presented in the table below.

Table 1: Sample Size

Departments	Establishments	PE teachers	CP and Inspectors
Atlantic	01	02	03
Littoral	01	02	02
Ouémé	01	02	04
Total	03	06	09

3.2. Investigation techniques and tools

To collect data, three complementary techniques were used: document analysis, interviews, and instrumental observation. Document analysis, based on Bardin's (1977) method, examined official PE curricula and standards for basketball and handball in the first year of secondary school, identifying skills, assessment criteria, and potential gaps. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with inspectors and educational advisors, based on Rondeau, Paillé, and Bédard's (2023) method, to complement the qualitative analysis. Finally, instrumental observation of six teachers during the second year of secondary school included in-situ observations and interviews (pre- and post-session) to identify intentions, adjustments, the effective implementation of learning and assessments in basketball and handball, and the implementation of the improved model. The pre-session interview aims to clarify the subjects'

teaching intentions, the resources taught, and the resources to be evaluated. The post-session interview aims to determine whether the desired objectives were achieved, the difficulties encountered, the adaptations made, and the feedback.

A total of 240 interviews were conducted, divided between 120 pre-session interviews and 120 post-session interviews over the two phases of the study. This number of interviews stems from the structure of SA2 (Learning Sequence 2) in the first-year class, which is organized into 14 distinct sequences. These sequences include a diagnostic assessment sequence, five basketball learning sequences, three handball learning sequences, two summative assessment sequences, two remedial sequences, and one assessment sequence. Consequently, each teacher observed underwent a total of 20 interviews, corresponding to the ten SA2 sequences considered for each phase. These are the sequences for implementing the initial situation and the diagnostic assessment, the three handball learning sequences, the five (05) basketball learning sequences, and the summative assessment sequence.

Table 2: Pre- and post-session interview results for phases 1 and 2

	Phase 1		**Phase 2**		
Teachers	Pre-session interviews	Post-session interviews	Pre-session interviews	Post-session interviews	Totals
E1	10	10	10	10	40
E2	10	10	10	10	40
E3	10	10	10	10	40
E4	10	10	10	10	40
E5	10	10	10	10	40
E6	10	10	10	10	40

Sources: Field data from May 2025.

3.3. Data collection procedure

The data collection procedure took place in four stages, in accordance with the instructional engineering approach proposed by Artigue (1988). Initially, preliminary analyses were used to examine the skills and assessment frameworks, develop questionnaires and interview guides, and plan their administration to schools during the 2023-2024 SA2. The a priori design and analysis phase then identified obstacles to standardizing practices and refined the tools according to criteria of objectivity, validity, reliability, fairness, and relevance. The experiment consisted of presenting the improved model to teachers, collecting new data during the 2024-2025 SA2, and conducting pre- and post-session interviews for the observed sequences. Finally, a posteriori analyses combined observations, interviews, and

questionnaires to assess the model's consistency and effectiveness and to validate the results through triangulation.

3.4. Data processing

After collection, the data were processed according to their nature: questionnaire responses were analyzed thematically and summarized in tabular form using Excel. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed by thematic grouping to identify key ideas. Instrumented observations were processed in the same manner. All assessment tools were examined according to the criteria of objectivity, reliability, validity, and effectiveness defined in the theoretical framework. Official documents from the first-year class (guides, curricula, continuums, lesson plans) were also subjected to content analysis. Finally, data from interviews and observation videos were cross-referenced to highlight differences in practices between teachers and between secondary schools.

4. Results

4.1. Differences between assessment practices in the three institutions

Table 3 : Differences between assessment practices in the three institutions

Qualities	**Indicators with concrete observable actions**		**Éts 1**		**Éts 2**		**Éts 3**	
			H	**B**	**H**	**B**	**H**	**Down**
OBJECTIVITY	I1. Use of the same tools in the establishment		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I2. Use of the administration guide		No		No		No	
	I3. Agreement between evaluators		No		Yes		Yes	
	I4. Uniform content of tools	Test	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Observation grid	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Scale	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Evaluation sheet	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I5. Administration of the tests together as in the examination		Yes		Yes		No	
	I6. Co-assessment		No		No		No	
	I7. Double correction		No		Yes		No	
VALIDITY	I8. Assessment situation in the form of problem solving		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I9. Realistic assessment task		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I10. Alignment of observation grid with training content		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I11. Tools conforming to the prescribed formats	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I12. Alignment between the scale and the APC recommendation	3-occasion rule	No		No		No	
		3/4 and 1/4 rule	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Rule of non-doubling of weighting by criterion	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I13. Alignment between test and training content	OTI	Partial		Yes		Yes	
		Teaching content	No		Partial		Partial	
		Skills	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I14. Alignment between tools		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I15. Regulatory infrastructure		No		Only E4		No	
	I16. Regulatory materials		Yes		No		No	
	I17. Measurable indicators	C1-1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C1-2	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C1-3	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

		C2-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C2-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C2-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-1	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
		C3-2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
		C4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-2	No	No	-	-	Yes	Yes
		C4-3	No	No	-	-	Yes	Yes
	I18. Unambiguous indicators	C1-1	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
		C1-2	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
		C1-3	No	No	No	No	Non	Non
		C2-1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Non	Oui
		C2-2	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
		C2-3	No	No	No	No	Non	Non
		C3-1	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
		C3-2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-3	No	No	Yes	Yes	Oui	Non
		C4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-2	No	No	-	-	Yes	Yes
		C4-3	No	No	-	-	Yes	Yes
EQUITY	I19. Uniform infrastructure		Yes		No		Yes	
	I20. Appropriation of assessment expectations by learners	Reading the test	No		Yes		Only E6	
		Reading the evaluation grid	No		Only E3		No	
		Reading the scale	No		No		No	
	I21. Balanced team composition		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I22. Uniform observation modalities	Playing time	No		No		No	
		Identifying learners in the game	No		Yes		Yes	
		Number of learners assessed at a time	No		Yes		Yes	
	I23. Taking into account the level of performance of teachers		No		Yes		Yes	
RELEVANCE	I24. Indicators related to the objectives of basketball and handball	Group attack	No		No		No	
		Collective defense	No		Yes		Yes	
		Counterattack	No		No		No	
	I25. Assessment situation took into account the context of collective play		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I26. Taking dimensions into account	Tactics	No		Yes		Yes	
		Techniques	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Social	Partial		No		Partial	

Sources: Field data from May 2025

Table 3 presents the observed gaps in summative assessment practices across the three schools. Analysis of these gaps indicates marked heterogeneity between the three schools (Schools 1, 2, 3) in terms of the quality of summative assessment practices in PE. Schools 2 stand out slightly due to their efforts in terms of validity (better consideration of the task and instructions), reliability (partial alignment between tools and contexts), and fairness (more structured approach to observation and team formation in basketball). However, Schools 1 demonstrates a weaker approach across all qualities, particularly relevance, fairness, and reliability, with tools poorly aligned with expected skills and assessment contexts that are poorly standardized. Schools 3 demonstrates some strengths, such as better consideration of technical and social dimensions, but remains generally limited in the standardization of

practices and student involvement in the assessment process. An interpretation of the results reveals that, in all three schools, the fundamental principles of PE assessment are only partially applied, with a predominance of practices focused on technical measurement, to the detriment of the complexity of the skills expected in team sports. The limited availability of clear and measurable indicators, the lack of communication of assessment expectations to students, and the lack of standardization of assessment conditions constitute major obstacles to the quality of these assessments. These findings demonstrate an insufficient understanding of official standards and an urgent need for ongoing teacher training on the didactic and ethical dimensions of assessment. To move towards more accurate, consistent, and meaningful assessment, harmonization of practices and improvement of tools are essential.

4.2. Highlighting the expected characteristics of a uniform and objective assessment model

4.2.1. Improvements made based on desired characteristics

The improvements made to the competency and assessment framework directly affect several indicators of fairness, reliability, validity, relevance, and objectivity, which reflect the challenges encountered in designing the tools and aligning them with program requirements. First, the explicit integration of standardized formats for the assessment tools (administration guide, observation grid, evaluation sheet) addresses indicators I11 (tools comply with prescribed formats) and I10 (observation grid alignment with training content). These adjustments address one of the major difficulties reported by teachers, namely the lack of a formal framework for certain tools. By specifying these formats through standard tables, the framework strengthens the validity and objectivity of the assessment by ensuring consistency between the tool, the content taught, and the expected skills (I13).

Furthermore, the clarification of the terminal integration objectives (TIOs) and the teaching content specific to each APSA strengthens several indicators related to relevance. Indeed, the improvements made address I24 (indicators related to the objectives of handball and basketball), I25 (consideration of the team game context), and I26 (consideration of tactical, technical, and social dimensions). The precision of teaching content, such as three-lane spacing or the 6-0 zone defense, ensures that assessments are better anchored in real-life, discipline-specific team practices. This allows for better contextualization of the tasks proposed to learners and guarantees a more authentic and meaningful assessment.

Also, the adjustments made to the description and format of the tools better address certain objectivity indicators, notably I2 (use of the administration guide) and I4 (uniform content of the tools: grid, scale, sheet). The use of a detailed format facilitates their use and limits the gaps between the practices of one teacher and another. This also meets the need for standardization of assessment (I1). This reduces biases linked to personal interpretation or improvisation of tools.

Regarding fairness, improvements to the framework contribute to strengthening this quality. Thus, tools with standardized formats facilitate teachers' efficiency in designing various tools. The introduction of a clear format for the observation grid and administration

guide allows for greater transparency of expectations, which meets indicator I20 (learners' ownership of assessment expectations), particularly through the possibility of organizing the provision of test sets, an administration guide, and a scale before the assessment. Furthermore, the clarification of observation conditions (playing time, number of players observed at a time, identification of players in the game) supports indicator I22. This promotes uniform observation of all learners regardless of the assessor. These adjustments help reduce disparities in interpretation and ensure that each learner is assessed under equivalent conditions, regardless of material or infrastructural constraints. This strengthens procedural justice in the assessment.

4.2.2. Comparative analysis of the gaps observed during the experiment

Table 4 : Gaps in assessment practices within the three institutions

Qualities	**Indicators with concrete observable actions**		**Ets 1**		**Ets 2**		**Ets 3**	
			H	**B**	**H**	**B**	**H**	**Bas**
OBJECTIVITY	I1. Use of the same tools in the establishment		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I2. Use of the administration guide		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I3. Agreement between evaluators		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I4. Uniform content of tools	Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
	I5. Administration of the tests together as in the examination		Yes		Yes		Non	
	I6. Co-évaluation		No		No		No	
	I7. Double correction		Yes		Yes		Non	
VALIDITY	I8. Assessment situation in the form of problem solving		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I9. Realistic assessment task		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I10. Alignment of observation grid with training content		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I11. Tools conforming to the prescribed formats	Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Oui	
	I12. Alignment between the scale and the APC recommendation	Rule of 3 occasions	No		No		No	
		3/4 and 1/4 rule	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Rule of non-doubling of weighting by criterion	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I13. Alignment between test and training content	OTI	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Teaching content	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Skills	Yes		Yes		Yes	
LOYALTY	I14. Alignment between tools		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I15. Regulatory infrastructure		No		No		No	
	I16. Regulatory materials		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I17. Measurable indicators	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	I18. Unambiguous indicators	C1-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C1-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C1-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C2-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C2-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C2-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C3-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		C4-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
EQUITY	I19. Uniform infrastructure		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I20. Appropriation of assessment expectations by learners	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Reading the scale	No		No		No	
	I21. Balanced team composition		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I22. Uniform observation modalities	Playing time	Yes		Yes		No	
		Identifying learners in the game	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Number of learners assessed at a time	Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I23. Takingintoaccount the level of performance of teachers		Yes		Yes		Yes	
RELEVANCE	I24. Indicators related to the objectives of basketball and handball	Mass attack	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Collective defense	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Counterattack	No		No		No	
	I25. Assessment situation took into account the context of collective play		Yes		Yes		Yes	
	I26. Taking dimensions into account	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	
		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	

Sources: Field data from May 2025

Overall, the results in Table IV reveal a notable improvement in assessment practices, marked by greater uniformity in the use of tools, grids, and scales common to the three institutions. All institutions now use the same assessment instruments (I1), apply the prescribed content (I4, I11), and demonstrate greater alignment between tools (I14). The integration of contextualized situations (I25) and the consideration of technical, tactical, and social dimensions (I26) illustrate greater pedagogical relevance. Efforts are also visible in

terms of transparency and fairness, with the widespread use of reading tests and grids (I20), as well as the balanced composition of teams (I21). However, certain specific features persist, including the absence of the three-opportunity rule (I12), the lack of compliant infrastructure (I15), and the failure to consider counterattacks (I24), which underscore the need to continue efforts to ensure a fully valid, accurate, and fair assessment.

However, certain specific features persist, including:

- In I5, simultaneous administration of the tests, as in the exam, was not possible in school 3 due to resistance from the administration, which requires teachers to supervise in class during the homework week. Since classes are no longer grouped together, each teacher therefore evaluates their class during their class time.
- In I6, co-assessment was not respected in any of the schools due to overcrowding: each teacher takes a single team to speed up the assessment process.
- In I7, school 3 did not implement double marking; the teacher in charge of the class is also the one marking, unlike schools 1 and 2, which respected this criterion.
- Regarding I15, no school has regulatory infrastructure; all had to adapt existing spaces based on the recommendations in the administration guide.
- For I22, playing time was not consistent across the three schools. Some teachers complete their assessments more quickly than others, causing downtime and desynchronization. Since teams are already established, teachers must align themselves with the pace of the assessor in charge of the opposing team. This dysfunction was particularly observed in schools 2 and 3, where teachers justified the speed of the assessment by their prior knowledge of the students.

These discrepancies show that, despite the progress made, adjustments are still needed to strengthen the rigor and fairness of the assessment system.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this article highlights the significant gaps between the teaching/learning/assessment practices of PE teachers and the requirements of the official framework for basketball and handball in secondary schools in Benin. The results reveal that assessment practices, although heterogeneous between schools and teachers, are generally marked by structural and methodological shortcomings that undermine the validity, objectivity, reliability, fairness, and relevance of summative assessment. Similarly, the results of this experiment have shown that thoughtful support, supported by a solid theoretical framework and active teacher involvement, can foster the emergence of more uniform assessment practices that are better aligned with the frameworks and perceived as more equitable by stakeholders in the field.

REFERENCES

- Abidou, L. (2017). *From Teaching to Assessment in Handball in the 8th Grade. What System for Summative Assessment? The Case of CEG Djègan-Kpêvi and Toffa 1er*

High School in Porto-Novo [Master's Thesis in Sports and Physical Education, INJEPS-Benin].

- Adda, G. I. and Godjo, S. F. (2021). *Contribution to the Pragmatic Modeling of Summative Assessment Tools in Physical Education in Secondary Schools in Benin. End-of-Training Dissertation for the Certificate of Aptitude for the Inspectorate of Secondary Education.* Course: Unpublished Physical Education, National Education Supervisory Staff Training School (EFPEEN), Porto-Novo-Benin.

- Agassounon, R. (2013). *Problems of teaching basketball using the competency-based approach in 5th grade classes in middle and high schools in Cotonou and Porto-Novo (Benin)* [Master's thesis in STAPS, INJEPS, Porto-Novo].

- Agbodjogbé, B. and Gnanvè, S. (2025). Uniform Assessment of Physical Education and Sports Skills in Secondary Schools in Benin: Analysis of the Challenges Encountered by Teachers in the First Year of High School in Benin. *Pedagogy and Humanities.*

- Agbodjogbé, B., Oguéboulé, B., Attiklémé, K., Kpazaï, G., Djovitou, P., Atoun, C., &Odjoussou, M. (2014). Problems of Using a Tool for Assessing Physical Education and Sports (PES) Skills in Secondary Schools in Benin: A Multiple Case Study. *Journal of Educational Sciences.* 3, 39-60.

- Artigue, M. (1988). Didactic Engineering. *Research in Mathematics Didactics*, 9(3), 281–308. https://revue-rdm.com/1988/ingenierie-didactique-2/

- Artigue, M. (1990). Didactic Engineering. *Research in Mathematics Didactics*, 9(3), 281–308. (English translation:

- Artigue, M. 1992). Didactical engineering. In R. Douady& A. Mercier (Eds.), *Research in Mathematics Didactics*, Selected papers (pp. 41–70). La Pensée Sauvage.

- Bélair, L. M. (2005). Observation tools. In N. Rousseau (ed.). *Training to supervise*. (pp. 125–144). Guérin Universitaire.

- Brau-Antony, S., &Grosstephan, V. (2020). Certificative assessment in physical and sports education and the epistemology of the assessor.*Contexts and Didactics*. 16, published online December 15, 2020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/ced.2178

- Chevallard, Y. (1992). Fundamental Concepts of Didactics: Perspectives Provided by an Anthropological Approach.*Research in Mathematics Didactics*, 12(1), 73-112.

- Cogérino, G., &Mnaffakh, H. (2008). Evaluation, Fairness of the Grade in Physical Education and Effort Standard. *French Journal of Pedagogy* 164 (111-122)

- Figari, G. (1994). *Evaluation: What Framework?* De Boeck.

- Gérard, F.-M. (2005). *Assessment of Skills Through Complex Situations*. Proceedings of the Admee-Europe Conference, IUFM Champagne-Ardenne, Reims, October 24-26, 2005.

- Godbout, P. (1988). Observation Strategies for Assessing Motor Skills. Theoretical and Practical Implications. *Sciences et sports*. No. 3, pp. 237-244

- Gréhaigne, J.-F. (2018). Observing and Evaluating in Team Sports: Quantitative and Qualitative Elements. *eJRIEPS*, Special Issue No. 2. https://doi.org/10.4000/ejrieps.516. http://journals.openedition.org/ejrieps/516

- Hadji, C. (1997). *Evaluation Demystified*. ESF.

- Mottier L-L et Crahay M. (2009). *Evaluation in tension. Between the regulation of learning and the management of systems*.De Boeck.

- Oguéboulé, B. (1999). *The teaching of physical education and sports in secondary schools in Benin: the role of team sports*. [Master's thesis in STAPS, INJEPS/UAC].