Int.J.Curr.Res.Aca.Rev.2025; 13(5): 1-13

EXCELLENT PUBLISHERS

International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review

ISSN: 2347-3215 (Online) Volume 13 Number 5 (May-2025)

Journal homepage: http://www.ijcrar.com

doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcrar.2025.1303.001

Comparative Didactic Analysis of the Debriefing and Remediation Session of Two PE Teachers in Porto-Novo (Benin)

Ogueboule Bachar Moba-Ola-N'lé[1], Atoun Carlos Eméry Hyacinthe[1], Agbodjogbe Djéssounoukon Basile[1], Sare Zoumarou Ozias[1], Attikleme Kossivi[1] and Kpazai Georges[2]

[1]Laboratory of Discipline Didactics (LDD), National Institute of Youth, Physical Education and Sport, University of Abomey-Calavi (Benin)
[2]Laboratory of Research on Intervention in Physical Activity (LARIAP), School of Physical Activity Sciences, Laurentian University, Sudbury (ON), Canada

**Corresponding author*

Abstract

After nearly two decades of implementing PE teaching using the Competency-Based Approach (CBA) in Benin, the Directorate of Educational Inspections, Innovation, and Quality (DIPIQ), inspired by the results of the work on PE intervention, continued to propose corrective measures to minimize the gaps between what is prescribed and what is actually achieved in the classroom. Thus, following the guidelines for implementing the baseline situation and diagnostic assessment starting in the 2018-2019 school year, which were the subject of a study conducted by Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2023), the DIPIQ made the implementation of the debriefing and remediation session mandatory in PE after each summative assessment. This study was initiated to analyze the practices of two teachers subject to this new prescription, using as a theoretical basis the immediate remediation model proposed by Lenoir *et al.,* (2007) and then the anthropological theory of didactics (Chevallard, 2018). To this end, in addition to documentary analysis, the methodological approach is based on instrumental observation (Vermesch, 1994; Amade-Escot, 2003) with a view to triangulation (Van Der Maren, 1996). The analyzed and interpreted results allow us to affirm that in the absence of prescriptions relating to the implementation approach of this session, the practices of the two teachers are influenced by their relationship to the implementation of the skills and strategies provided in the assessment sequence. They encountered difficulties in remediation. These include, among other things, overcrowded class sizes, inadequate materials and infrastructure, the choice of physical activity activities for remediation, and the diversity of student difficulty levels. Teachers acknowledge the usefulness of this session and maintain that more than one is needed to achieve remediation objectives after the summative assessment.

Article Info

Received: 25 February 2025
Accepted: 30 April 2025
Available Online: 20 May 2025

Keywords

Summative Assessment, Report, Remediation, Abilities, Strategies.

Introduction

Following diagnostic assessment, teachers in the teaching and learning process have the dual responsibility of conducting formative/instructive and summative assessments (Scallon, 2000). These assessments are inseparable from learning, but summative assessments allow for an assessment, measurement, or verification of student achievement at the end of a teaching/learning process (Archer, 2015). Student results or output are compared against a framework for decision-making. It certifies whether or

not the set objectives have been achieved (Talbot, 2012). Following this assessment, which may take the form of a report on the knowledge and skills acquired by students, difficulties or gaps may still be evident in their output. The teacher, aware of the continuum of content, from one level of study or from one class to another, is called upon to put in place a pedagogical system to correct the gaps in order to ensure chronogenesis.

He will provide remediation. It is with this in mind that the Directorate of Pedagogical Inspections, Innovation and Quality (DIPIQ) has dedicated, starting in the 2022-2023 school year, a session to the implementation of reporting and remediation in Physical Education and Sports (PE) in Benin. According to Djoudi (2008), reporting draws students' attention to the reasons for errors and encourages them to implement strategies to manage and overcome them. It follows the summative assessment and allows for remediation, which is a support for students still having difficulty acquiring or mastering knowledge but also skills, as in PE.

This new prescription, which has remained silent on the approach to its implementation in classroom situations, will undoubtedly induce changes in the practices of some PE teachers. Those who, despite the absence of an official prescribed approach, make the effort to implement it deserve special attention and have inspired the present study which focuses on the analysis of their practices in classroom situations relating to debriefing and remediation following the summative assessment of their students. The general objective of this study is to analyze the approaches used by PE teachers in the implementation of the debriefing and remediation session. This specifically involves inferring their practices and the difficulties related to their session on the one hand and then comparing them to bring out the elements of generalities and specificities on the other hand. The results of this investigation are of interest to subsequently generate a proposal for an approach to implementing said session.

Towards the state of the problem

The results of the work of Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2023) recall that the official prescriptions in PE according to the APC organize the teaching of this discipline around two Learning Situations (LS) and three skills (disciplinary skills, transdisciplinary skills, transversal skills). The two Disciplinary Skills (DS) determine the teaching/learning/assessment content and are specifically related to knowledge and skills in the field of Physical and Sports Activities (PSA). The first DS is entitled "Practicing PSA to Meet Psychomotor Challenges" and targets the practice of athletic disciplines and individual sports in the SANo1 category from the sixth grade to the final year.

The second CD is entitled "practicing APS to meet social challenges" and aims to teach, from sixth grade to final year, the practice of team sports, team sports, and wrestling in SANo2. Not including the debriefing and remediation session, a SA currently lasts for each class, thirteen three-hour sessions per week.

The implementation of integration sessions and debriefing and remediation sessions, which is a new dynamic, has begun to become a reality in the practice of PE teachers in Benin. Our investigations in this study focus on the implementation of the debriefing and remediation session in a second-year class at the Koutongbé General Education College (CEG) and in a third-year class at the Toffa 1st High School in the Porto-Novo educational catchment area of Benin.

Theoretical Framework

The composite theoretical framework of this study is inspired by the immediate remediation model of Lenoir *et al.,* (2007), followed by Chevallard's theory of the anthropology of didactics (2018). The immediate remediation model is structured in four stages, the first of which relates to the activity proposed by the teacher. The second stage is the diagnosis of the persistent difficulty and the third is devoted to immediate remediation by relearning. The fourth stage is the implementation of new activities or a return to the initial activity.

This model describes a system that can, after a summative assessment, diagnose the knowledge and skills that still pose a problem for students, and propose new learning to address them (Meirieu, 1996). If the difficulty is overcome, the student can continue the activity initially planned by the teacher. Otherwise, the cycle is repeated and a second remediation system is considered.

In the case of this study in PE in Benin, we focused our attention on the approaches used by two stakeholders who reported on a summative assessment and implemented remediation systems for the knowledge and skills that still pose problems for their students. Chevallard's (2018) theory of the anthropology of didactics allowed us to understand the relationships of

the two stakeholders to the various corrective measures of the DIPIQ, which could explain the differences and similarities arising from their classroom practices. From this theoretical framework, the formulation of the problem, accompanied by a research question and a hypothesis, stems.

State of the problem, Research Question, and Hypothesis

According to Agboton (2020), assessments of PE learning in Benin's high schools and middle schools were left to the initiative of each teacher. The key was to transmit each student's grades and average to the school administration, which took note of them. However, with the DIPIQ corrective measures, there have been significant improvements. Weekly schedules now include, as in other disciplines, two sets of students' academic output (supervised homework) per semester. The PE team of each establishment, under the supervision of the School Animators (AE) is therefore required to submit to the administration the tests to be administered to the students. In addition to these two assessments per semester, therefore four for the entire year, the end of each SA is sanctioned by a summative assessment, the test of which must be available to the administration and in the weekly educational animation notebook of the establishment. During these assessments, teachers carry out a class swap and students are often assessed by a teacher, other than the one with whom they did the learning. After each of these team assessments, students are entitled to a debriefing and remediation session materialized by the submission of assessment sheets including, among other things, the grade(s) obtained.

Much research has focused on the issue of implementing the corrective measures proposed by the DIPIQ to facilitate teaching/learning/assessment in PE in Benin, but those relating to the debriefing and remediation session are rare. The investigations of Ahouangbénon (2013) and then Kélani *et al.,* (2017) focused only on debriefing but in another discipline, notably Life and Earth Sciences (SVT). In PE, some research that did not focus on the debriefing and remediation session revealed that, even before the DIPIQ instructions that made the debriefing and remediation session mandatory, teachers were already carrying out didactic actions related to remediation in their classroom practices. These include, for example, the work of Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2018), then Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2019), which showed that, respectively in the assessment sequence and in other class sequences, teachers offer remedial activities following formative/formative assessments. Remediation is therefore not a new practice for PE teachers, even though it is only since the 2022-2023 school year that the DIPIQ has dedicated a dedicated session to it, in which it is preceded by the report of the previously implemented summative assessment. The remediation in question here in PE is therefore not that of a traditional class session, nor of the assessment sequence. The key question of this study relates to the description and comparison of the practices of two teachers interacting with their students to implement the debriefing and remediation session in the absence of a framework proposing the approach to follow. It is underpinned by a research question and a hypothesis.

Research Question

What teaching/learning approaches do PE teachers use when implementing debriefing and remediation sessions?

Hypothesis

The teaching/learning approaches used by teachers during debriefing and remediation sessions are influenced by their relationship to the assessment sequence. To test this hypothesis, a methodological approach was adopted.

Materials and Methods

Description of the Study Context

The investigations for this research took place in general education institutions such as CEG Koutongbé and Lycée Toffa 1er located in the second arrondissement of Porto-Novo, capital of Benin, during the 2022-2023 school year. CEG Koutongbé had an enrollment of 2,563 students divided into 48 teaching groups taught by only 6 PE teachers. During the same school year at Lycée Toffa 1er, the 1,760 girls were divided into 40 teaching groups with only 5 PE teachers.

Nature and Selection of Study Subjects

The objective here is to qualitatively analyze the actions of certain subjects interacting for teaching/learning/assessment in PE during a specific session. This is therefore an essentially qualitative and descriptive study, for which the study subjects can only be teachers implementing the debriefing and remediation session. Professional students enrolled in the Discipline

Teaching Laboratory (LDD) at INJEPS/UAC were asked to research and contact PE teachers to collect data on the classroom conduct of the debriefing and remediation session. This task was perilous because in the majority of high schools and middle schools, teachers simply give students individual assessment sheets containing the grade(s) they received during the summative assessment. It was through a discussion with an educational advisor about this session that we learned that it was at Lycée Toffa 1er that teachers themselves took the initiative to do remediation after a summative evaluation report. According to the educational advisor, it was this teaching practice at the said Lycée that inspired the DIPIQ to make this session mandatory.

With this in mind, we contacted the teachers at Lycée Toffa 1er to find that only one teacher (E2) had agreed to participate in the study. We were nearing the end of SANO1, and she still had to conduct the debriefing and remediation session with her 3ème M2 class. In this girls' high school, the 3ème M2 class (3ème M2), with a class size of 47, was the focus of our investigations. She holds her PE classes every Friday from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. under the guidance of a teacher who has been certified for 23 years and is a civil servant (FE). This teacher informed us about the possibility of collecting data on the debriefing and remediation session at CEG Koutongbé. She claimed that a teacher had worked at this school who, as an assistant teacher, had imposed the custom of holding the said session before being seconded to another ministry. Indeed, of the six teachers working at this school, the one in charge of the 2nd D2 (E1) agreed to participate in the study. However, the SANO2 had already begun, and we were forced to wait for the right time to collect data. In this school, the 2nd D2 (2ndD2) class, with a class size of 56 students, was the focus of our investigations. With a certified teacher-intervener with four years of seniority and an Aspirant au Métier d'Enseignement (AME) status, PE classes for this class take place every Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

Therefore, the topics and locations were chosen with a view to making a reasoned choice. With reference to official requirements, the APS objects and means of teaching in SANO1 in the third year are floor gymnastics, sprinting and shot put. In the case of SANO2 in the second year, these are football and volleyball.

It is around these APS that these two speakers should interact with their students during their respective debriefing and remediation sessions. The students of these speakers should retain our attention in reference to the ternarity of the didactic system of Sensevy (2007) and Amade-Escot (2003). But our investigations focused on the actions of teachers in classroom situations. We therefore made the choice not to specifically target students to be retained as subjects of study. These investigations were conducted through certain techniques and tools.

Investigation Techniques and Tools

In line with Van Der Maren's (1996) triangulation approach, used in PE by Amade-Escot (2003) and then Oguéboulé *et al.,* (2019), the techniques used were primarily document review, audiovisual recording of sessions, and interviews. Each required the use of a number of tools.

Document Review

The document review consisted of an in-depth reading of official documents (curriculum guide and curriculum, APS continuums, decrees, and others) and scientific work relating to the implementation of debriefing and/or remediation sessions. Research on teaching/learning/assessment in general, in PE, and in the context of APC implementation served as references for discussing the results.

Audiovisual Recording of Sessions and Interviews

These two techniques were used cumulatively, referring to the methodological prototypes of Van Der Maren (1996); Amade-Escot and Leutenegger (2013), and adopted by Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2018) in Benin to conduct instrumented observations.

Audiovisual Recording of Class Sessions

Referring to the results of the work of Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2023), this technique made it possible to film each of the two teachers and their students interacting during the debriefing and remediation session. These were E1 at CEG Koutongbé with the 2nd D2 class on behalf of SANO2, and E2 with the 3rd M2 class at Lycée Toffa 1er on behalf of SANO1. For each of the two filmed sessions, the tools used were two cassette camcorders, each equipped with a camera and a microphone.

One camcorder filmed the entire class, and the second, much more mobile, filmed areas of interest emerging throughout the session. Before and after the session, E1 and E2 each underwent an interview.

Interviews with Teachers

For each filmed session, two types of interviews were conducted with each of the two teachers. Following Amade-Escot's (2003) logic, these were the pre-session interview before the session began and the post-session interview after the session ended. Pre-session Interview Referring to the results of Amade-Escot and Leutenegger's (2013) work, teachers E1 and E2 were interviewed before the debriefing and remediation session began.

This interview allowed us to situate the session within the classroom's teaching history and to understand the teachers' teaching intentions (Amade-Escot, 2003). This provided an opportunity for each teacher to announce the session's objective and the activities to be proposed to achieve it, the materials and infrastructure to be used, the practical exercises to be debriefed and remediated, the students' perceived difficulties, and the solutions envisaged. In total, two pre-session interviews were conducted, one per teacher lasting a maximum of 6 minutes. Post-session Interview After the debriefing and remediation session, teachers E1 and E2 were interviewed. This was the post-session interview, which, following Vermersch's (1994) logic, provided an opportunity to immediately assess the debriefing and remediation session. It was here that teachers acknowledged and justified whether or not the set objective had been achieved, as well as the difficulties encountered in conducting the debriefing and remediation session based on the nature and number of the physical activity sessions. The strategies and skills actually implemented were discussed. For a total of two post-session interviews, each lasted a maximum of 7 minutes with each of the E1 and E2 teachers.

Data Collection and Processing

Procedure The data collection procedure consisted of contacting the PE teachers at the schools to explain the purpose of the study in order to select those who met our criteria and agreed to participate. The interview guides and observation grids were designed and validated at the Discipline Teaching Laboratory (LDD) of INJEPS/UAC. Taking into account the timetables of the two selected teachers, the debriefing and remediation session of each of them was filmed, with in each case, a pre-session interview and a post-session interview with the teacher. The data collected through interviews and audiovisual recordings were transcribed. Initially transcribed verbatim, the interviews were then grouped by theme to address the research question by comparing them with information from the audiovisual recording of the sessions. After several viewings, the film of each session was transcribed into a synopsis, referencing the work of Schneuwly and Ronveaux (2006). Using the videotapes, the students' actions as they carried out the teacher's instructions were analyzed with a view to addressing persistent difficulties. For greater reliability, these analyses were compared with the teachers' comments and information from official documents and other research studies, referring to the findings of Amade-Escot and Leutenegger (2013). The data thus processed led to the following results.

Results and Discussion

The results are presented in the form of tables and excerpts followed by comments to provide a comparative analysis of the practices (approaches) of the two teachers conducting the debriefing and remediation session at Lycée Toffa 1er and CEG Koutongbé in Porto-Novo, Benin. As usual, each of them structured their presentation around three stages: introduction (Table II, excerpts 1 and 2), performance (Table III), and feedback and projection (Table IV, excerpts 3 and 4).

Comparative Didactic Analysis of the Practices of the Two Teachers in the Introductory Phase of Their Debriefing and Remediation Session

With reference to Table II, which presents the condensed synopsis of the introductory phases of the two teachers, and to extracts 1 and 2, which are portions of verbal interactions, it can be argued that the two teachers observed generically handed out the copies (individual sheets containing the grade obtained) to the students after announcing the objective of the session, used individual work as a strategy, and reported the grades obtained by the students in the administration notebook. The two speakers formed working groups based on the difficulties that persisted after the end-of-cycle assessment. There are, however, some specific elements. Before submitting the papers, E1 reviewed the assessment criteria and the scale to provide students with a benchmark against which they could compare their work, reminding them of the success indicators for the high touch and the overhand in the game. To form the groups, E2 conducted a diagnostic assessment by asking students who scored below 12 out of 20 to express the difficulties encountered and errors made during their floor gymnastics and sprint performances. To this end, they used metacognitive skills (objectification and self-assessment), which may not

reflect reality; learning in PE is related to motor skills. E1 and E2 therefore implemented the introductory phase of the debriefing and remediation session with specific elements related to their relationship with the official guidelines on the subject, which, as we know, are not sufficiently explicit. They both informed the students that the implementation phase would be devoted to finding solutions to the knowledge content taught that still posed problems. Since the two instructors were working with students of different grade levels and in two different learning situations, it is logical to note specificities related to the physical activities that were the subject of remediation in the implementation phase.

Comparative didactic analysis of the practices of the two instructors in the implementation phase of their debriefing and remediation session

In accordance with their comments in the post-session interview, E1 and E2, after reporting on the assessment in the introductory phase, proposed activities in the implementation phase to enable their students to overcome the difficulties that persist. This is reflected in the analysis of Table III. In the absence of an official prescription on the approach to follow, E1 provides remediation in only one APS (volleyball) out of the two that were assessed, while E2 takes into account the two APS (floor gymnastics and sprinting) in which the students were assessed. Approached by post-session interview, E1 states that "I conducted volleyball alone because, unlike football, it is in volleyball that students do not get good grades due to the difficulties they encountered. Moreover, the number of students, the lack of time and the insufficient equipment do not allow me to conduct both APS." In the same perspective, E2 justifies himself by arguing that "even if it is difficult, it is in both APS that have been assessed that it is important to carry out remediation to continue to advance the students' know-how." The number of APS therefore depends on the specificity depending on the relationship of each participant to the new prescription. In the second-year volleyball class, E1, alternating between the technical and dialectical approaches (Atoun, 2016), proposed a game situation giving students the opportunity to relearn the high touch and the overhand, recognized as persistent difficulties. Similarly, the E2 students had the opportunity to relearn the gymnastic elements that posed problems in the summative assessment, then the speed of reaction to the signal and maintaining maximum speed in the sprint. In synergy with their objectives announced before starting the session, they strove to improve their students' know-how after the summative assessment. With this in mind, in the implementation phase, they organized the class into groups of two levels per APS according to the difficulties as prescribed to carry out the assessment sequence. This is what justifies the two groups at E1 for only volleyball and the four groups at E2 for floor gymnastics and sprinting. Here is an excerpt from E1's comments to this effect: "First of all, these are my learners and I have already had several class sessions with them. So, I know their difficulties. In addition to that, the summative assessment grades allowed me to form two groups per APS to propose exercises and improve skills."

With the peer teaching, tutoring and pair work strategies, the E1 and E2 students, still in difficulty, are helped by their classmates to consolidate their knowledge and those with less difficulty are enriched. The strategies and skills implemented by the two speakers in the implementation phase are those prescribed for the assessment sequence. The visualizations of this phase reveal that both participants are facing enormous difficulties.

On this subject, E1 states, "You will see that we only had one sandy court available since the other colleague was on the second court. In addition, we only had one volleyball for this entire group. I was therefore forced to use basketballs, handballs, and soccer balls to be able to get all the students to work." E2 reinforces this by saying, "When you don't regularly visit the different workshops to check that the instructions given are being followed, the students do other things. We are therefore forced to visit all four groups each time to ensure that the instructions are being followed." The multitude of cases to be managed depending on the difficulties, the number of physical activity sessions, the lack of equipment and infrastructure, the time available, and then the overcrowded class sizes are therefore difficulties encountered by PE teachers during remediation during the implementation phase followed by the feedback and screening phase.

Comparative didactic analysis of the practices of the two participants in the feedback and screening phase of their debriefing and remediation session

From the analysis of Table 3 and excerpts 3 and 4, it emerges that, in a generic way, E1 and E2 carried out the feedback and projection by carrying out actions for the implementation of certain skills. By encouraging the students to verbally express the knowledge and skills learned with emphasis on the process, they both carried out objectification.

Table.1 Summary of the Introductory Phase of the Two Teachers (E1 and E2)

	Objective	Tasks completed by students	Strategy and capabilities
E_1	Attendance check, statement of the session objective, reminder of the assessment criteria, submission of copies and transfer of marks	Gather, listen to the teacher, collect the copies, form the two groups of levels	Individual self-assessment work
E_2	Attendance check, statement of the day's objective, return of copies and reporting of grades	Gather, listen to the teacher, collect the copies, form the four level groups	Individual work, self-assessment, objectification

Table.2 Condensed synopsis of the didactic actions of teachers E1 and E2 with their students during the implementation phase

	Objective	Strategies	Breaking down the protocol according to tasks	Abilities	Breakdown of the protocol according to the teacher's instructions	Typical student behaviors
E1	The student will be able to play volleyball to improve the difficulties encountered during the assignment	Pair work Peer teaching	**Task 1: Practice playing the high key** **Task 2: Learning the machete** **Task 3: Game: 6 vs. 6**	Execution Improvement	-Throw the ball high and take a high touch to your partner in front. Your partner catches the ball and does the same. Go behind the line when you throw the ball. Those who know how to do it observe the group and correct their teammates. -This time you throw the ball high and pass the high touch to your partner in front, who automatically returns the ball. You must not catch the ball again. After five rallies, you go behind. Those who know how to do it observe the group and correct their teammates. -Form two lines, one here and the other in front. I throw the ball to my partner in front in the other line, who receives it with a cross. Both pass behind, and so on. When everyone has passed once, you switch roles. -You must take three touches before throwing the ball into the opponent's half.	The students do what the teacher asked them to do. The students line up on either side of the string and exchange the ball with a high throw. The students do what the teacher asked. The students fail to take three touches before kicking the ball into the opposing team's half.
E2	**Floor Gymnastics** The student will be able to perform 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	Enseigne-ment par tutorat	**Task 1: A-Consolidation** Learning gymnastic elements not mastered by students **B- Enrichment** Learning the gymnastic elements of the classroom **Task 2:**	Execution	-Learn to perform the elements you haven't mastered yet. The tutors will help them master the gymnastic elements that are still challenging at their level. Toward the end of the class, each student will present their routine. -Continue by learning the gymnastic elements of the class. You will each do a routine. Your routine must consist of 10 elements, including 8 required elements for the class. You will work in pairs; I will review your routines so we can improve them	The students follow the teacher's instructions and are assisted by the tutors. The students work in pairs on their routines. The students present their routines. The students follow the instructions with the help of the tutors. The students take turns

	least 50 seconds and at most 60 seconds for boys, under the prescribed conditions. **Sprint Race** Run a distance of 60m in 13s or less for girls and 11s or less for boys under the prescribed conditions.	Travail par paire	A-Consolidation The student learns to run 60m in 13s or less under regulatory conditions. **B-Enrichment** The student learns to run 60m in 11s or less under regulatory conditions.	Improve-ment	together. Afterward, each student will present their routine to me. -From a seated position, quickly get up to run. The tutors are there to give you the starting signal. - Aim to maintain your speed until the end. You must not slow down at any time until the end of the race. Each of you must aim to complete the race in no more than 11 seconds.	completing the three-by-three race.

Table.3 Summary of the Feedback and Screening phase for the two participants (E1 and E2)

	Objective	**Breakdown of the protocol according to tasks**	**Capabilities and strategy**
E_1	New knowledge check	- Organize yourself to list what you learned during this session and how you learned it, - State your difficulties.	Objectification Self-assessment Individual work
E_2	New knowledge check	Organize yourself to list what you learned during this session and how you learned it.	New Objectification Individual work

Excerpt.1 Verbal interactions between teacher E1 and his students during the introductory phase

Tdp1P1: Gather, captains, give me an attendance report.
Tdp1E: Sir, it's done, only Christian is absent from the blues.
dp2p1: Okay, today you will receive your homework copies, then we will work on volleyball. The teacher binds, explains the observation grid, and gives the grading scale to the students.
Tdp3P1: Do you understand?
Tdp2E: Yes, sir.
Tdp4P1: The grades are here, the grades range from 10 to 17. The grade will be yours. The leader, come and take the copies to distribute to your classmates. (Report grades in the administration's grade book.)
Tdp6P1: Okay, I'll call someone, he'll come with his copy.
Tdp7P1: Follow, we will form two groups. There is one group for enrichment and another group for consolidation. The groups were formed based on the grades you obtained.
Tdp8P1: Okay, leader, go to the warm-up; you're leading the warm-up, you have 15 minutes to do it.
-d'accord monsieur !

Excerpt.2 Verbal interactions between teacher E2 and his students during the introductory phase

Tdp1P2: Everyone gather. Who are those who are absent?

Tdp1E: Madam, everyone is here.

Tdp2p2: Okay, you will receive your homework copies right away, then we will go over your various difficulties.

Tdp2E: Okay, madam.

Tdp3P2: Carole and Justine, come and take these sheets to give to your classmates.

Tdp4P2: Okay, I'll call someone, they'll give me their grade. Transfer of grades to the administration's grade book.

Tdp7P2: Those who have a grade below 12 in gymnastics separately as well as in sprinting.

Tdp8P2: So all those who remain have a grade above 12 in each of the two sports?

Tdp3pE: Yes.

Tdp9P2: Let's do the same thing again. Group yourselves according to the physical activity in which you don't have a high score.

Tdp10P2: Those of you who have a score below 12, what were your difficulties during this assessment? Tdp4E: Here, madam, here, we can't do certain gymnastic elements and run well.

Tdp11P2: Yes, Chantal,

Tdp12P2: So, right after the warm-up, we're going to work on improving these difficulties and weaknesses that you continue to experience. Do you understand?

Tdp5E: Yes, madam! Tdp13P2: Who are those with high scores? I want the best by physical activity. Tdp14P2: That's good, right after the warm-up, you'll be tutors for those with a grade below 12 in the APS level where you have the highest grade.

Tdp15P2: Go to the warm-up. Look at those you're in the same group with so you don't end up in the wrong group afterward.

Excerpt.3 Verbal interactions between teacher E1 and his students during the feedback and projection phase

Tdp49P1: We're at the end of our remedial session. You were in the enrichment session, what new things did you learn?
Tdp43E: We learned the overhand reception.
Tdp50P1: Here, what new things did you learn in terms of consolidation?
Tdp44E: We learned that the ball must not fall.
Tdp51P1: What else? Tdp45E: We learned how to perform the high touch in the game.
Tdp52P1: And what did you find difficult?
Tdp46E: The overhand reception.
Tdp53P1: So for the following sessions, we're going to focus on the overhand reception.

Excerpt.4 Verbal interactions between teacher E2 and his students during the feedback and projection phase

Tdp80P2: We're at the end of our session. What did you learn and how?
Tdp75E: I learned to do the elements that were difficult for me with the help of my partner.
Tdp81P2: Okay! Who else?
Tdp76P2: I learned to run fast.
Tdp82P2: Okay, that's good. Now we're going to cool down. Everyone stands up and keep your distance.

But specifically, E1 carried out self-assessment by giving her students the opportunity to recognize that the overhand continues to pose a problem in volleyball despite the remediation. In the post-session interview, E2 acknowledged not having carried out the self-assessment and maintained, along the same lines as E2, that difficulties persist despite the remediation. This excerpt from her remarks speaks volumes: "...even before the feedback and projection, we know that difficulties still exist. For example, learning must continue for certain gymnastic elements. In a single remediation session, we cannot solve all the problems in all the APS." In this context, it is logical to note that none of the participants proposed reinvestment activities to verify the scope of the remedial activities.

Referring to the results of Doudji's (2008) work, the report of a summative assessment is the set of pedagogical operations undertaken by the participant during preparation and implementation, leading to decision-making. However, in the case of this study, it was only during the introductory phase that E1 and E2 provided the report. This result, consistent with those of Ahouangbénon (2013) and Kélani *et al.,* (2017), suggests that, generally speaking, the reporting of homework or assessment by teachers consists of marking and returning copies to students as quickly as possible so that they can see the results of their work. Specifically, by reminding his students of the evaluation criteria, E1 allows them to have a reference to which they can compare their productions in the sense of Roegiers (2010). The diagnosis specifically made by E2 in the introduction to constitute the level groups, the generic return in the implementation phase on the knowledge contents already taught, but still poorly assimilated by the students fall respectively under the second stage diagnosis and the third stage learning mentioned by Lenoir *et al.,* (2007) on behalf of the theory of immediate remediation. The different level groups constituted according to the students' difficulties by the two speakers imposed a differentiated remediation in synergy with the results of the work of Roegiers (2010). During the three phases of the debriefing and remediation session, E1 and E2 prioritized skills and strategies prescribed for the assessment sequence and used by PE teachers investigated by Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2018). Despite the absence of a prescribed approach, the two speakers have practices that confirm the results of the work of Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2019) according to which PE teachers had generic relationships with remediation activities even before the imposition of its implementation by the DIPIQ. This confirms our initial hypothesis which stipulates that the teaching/learning approaches used by teachers during the debriefing and remediation sessions are influenced by their relationship with that of the assessment sequence.

Conclusion

The research for this article was conducted with the aim of describing, analyzing, and comparing the approaches

used by two facilitators during the debriefing and remediation session following the summative assessment. Based on the immediate remediation model of Lenoir *et al.,* (2007) and Chevallard's theory of the anthropology of didactics (2018), data collection took place at the Koutongbé CEG with E1 and her second-year D2 students, and then at the Toffa 1er high school with E2 and her third-year M2 students in Porto-Novo, Benin. Referring to the results of the work of Amade-Escot and Leutenegger (2013); Agbodjogbé *et al.,* (2023) inspired by Schneuwly and Ronveaux (2006); Van Der Maren (1996) and Vermesch (1994), we used the study of documents and the audiovisual recording of the debriefing and remediation session of each speaker (E1 and E2) subjected to an interview before and after the said session. The analyzed and interpreted results allow us to argue that the two speakers, in the absence of a proposal for an approach to adopt, each conduct their debriefing and remediation session using skills (objectification, self-assessment, improvement) and strategies (peer teaching, tutoring, pair work) prescribed and implemented during the assessment sequences in PE. These practices reveal that they had generic connections with remedial activities even before the DIPIQ requirements that made it mandatory. In the report given during the introductory phase, they simply gave students individual sheets containing their grades. The difficulties encountered by E1 and E2 in improving students' unstabilized knowledge and skills related to the number of physical activities requiring remediation, the unavailability of materials and infrastructure, and the time and size of classes, which generated several groups of students with varying levels of difficulty. Faced with these difficulties, the two speakers proposed approaches that brought out specific elements. For example, the two physical activities being assessed (sprinting and gymnastics) were remedied for E2 in the ninth grade at Lycée Toffa 1er. But for E1 in the tenth grade at CEG Koutongbé, only volleyball was remedied, while the students were also assessed in soccer. For more generalizable conclusions that could lead to a proposal for an approach to implementing the debriefing and remediation session in PE, it is appropriate to conduct several studies on cases of implementation of said session.

References

Agbodjogbé, D. B., Attiklémè, O. A., Gnanvè, S., Attiklémè, K. & Kpazaï, G. (2019). From Formative Assessment to Immediate Interactive Remediation in Gymnastics in the General Education Colleges of Sègbèya and Suru-Léré. *IOSR Journal of Sports and Physical Education*, 6 (4), pp. 17-30.

Agbodjogbé, D.B., Oguéboulé, B. M., Atoun, C. E. H., Attiklémè, K. & Fadébi, E. (2023). Didactic Analysis of the First Session of a Learning Situation of Three Physical Education and Sports Teachers in Benin. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies. Vol. 39 No. 2 ISSN 2028-9324, pp. 833-848.

Agbodjogbé, D.B., Oguéboulé, B.M., Attiklémè, K. & Dawékpé, G. (2018). Problematic of the Implementation of the Balance Class Sequence of the Third Form in the Middle School and High School of Porto-Novo. *International Journal of Research Culture Society*,. Vol. 2, Issue 8, ISSN: 2456-6683, pp. 67-77.

Agboton, F. U. D. (2020). *Organization of Summative Assessments in Physical Education in Middle Schools: What Contribution to the Objectivity of Grades?* Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis in STAPS. UAC-INJEPS, Porto-Novo.

Ahouangbénon, C. D. (2013). *Report on summative assessments in SVT in secondary school classes: Difficulties and approaches to solutions*. Unpublished end-of-training dissertation for the CAPES (Certificate of Vocational Training), ENS Natitingou, Benin.

Amade-Escot, C. & Leutenegger, F. (2013). *Current state of the theory of joint action: questions and methodology.* Presentation at the 3rd ARCD conference, AIX-Marseille University.

Amade-Escot, C. (2003). *Interactive management of the didactic contract in volleyball: layout of environments and teacher regulation*. In C. Amade-Escot (Dir), Didactics of physical education – State of research, Edition of the EPS journal. Paris, pp. 240-264.

Archer, M. (2015). Summative Assessment in History and Geography. *African Journal of Educational Research*, 7, pp. 90-108.

Atoun, C.E.H. (2016). *Volleyball Teaching and Training in the Republic of Benin: A Comparative Didactic Analysis*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, INJEPS/UAC, Porto-Novo, Benin, 314p.

Chevallard, Y. (2018). The Anthropological Theory of Didactic in Relation to the Mathematics Teacher. In ALMOULOUD *et al., The Anthropological Theory of Didactic: Principles and Foundations* (pp. 31-49). Curitiba, Editora: CRV, Edição. Curitiba, PR: CRV.

Doudji, M. (2008). *Written Expression Report*. http://www.oasisfle./com.doc-pdf/le_compte_rendu_rendu_d_expression_ecrite.pdf. General Directorate of School Education.

Kélani, R., Gado, I., Oké, E. (2017). Report on Summative Assessments of Learning in Secondary Schools in Benin: What Are Teachers' Practices? *International Francophone Review*. No. 24. pp. 83-93.

Meirieu, Ph. (1996). *Differentiated Instruction: Confinement or Openness*. In A. Bentolila. School: Diversity and Coherence, pp. 109-149. Paris: Nathan.

Oguéboulé, B.M., Agbodjogbé, D.B., Attiklémè, K. & Kèkè, A.M.A. (2019). Teaching African Wrestling in High Schools and Colleges: An Anthropological Study of Two Cases in Fifth-Grade Classes at the Malanhoui CEG in Benin. *Annals of the University of Lomé*, Volume XXXIX-1 pp. 79-100.

Roegiers, X. (2010). The Pedagogy of Integration: Education and Training Systems at the Heart of Our Societies. Brussels: De Boeck.

Scallon, G. (2000). *Summative Assessment and Its Multiple Roles*. http://www.fse.ulaval.ca/gerard.scallon/fascicules/sommative.pdf

Schneuwly, B., Dolz, J. & Ronveaux, C. (2006). The Synopsis: A Tool for Analyzing Taught Subjects. In M. J. Perrin-Glorian and Y. Ruuter (Eds). *Research Methods in Didactics*, Villeneuve d'Asq: Editions du Septentrion, pp. 175-189.

Sensevy, G. (2007). Categories for Describing and Understanding Joint Action. In G. Sensevy& A. Mercier (Eds). *Acting Together: the Joint Didactic Action of Teachers and Students*. pp. 13-49.

Talbot, L. (2012). *Formative Assessment. How to Assess and Address Learning Difficulties?* Armand Colin, Humanities and Social Sciences Collection.

Van Der Maren, J-M. (1996). *Research Methods for Education.* De Boeck, Pedagogy and Development.

Vermesch, P. (1994). *Explanatory Interview in Initial and Continuing Education*. ESF.

How to cite this article:

Ogueboule Bachar Moba-Ola-N'lé, Atoun Carlos Eméry Hyacinthe, Agbodjogbe Djéssounoukon Basile, Sare Zoumarou Ozias, Attikleme Kossivi and Kpazai Georges. 2025. Comparative Didactic Analysis of the Debriefing and Remediation Session of Two PE Teachers in Porto-Novo (Benin). *Int.J.Curr.Res.Aca.Rev.* 13(05), 1-13.
doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcrar.2025.1305.001