



P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38
IJPESH 2019; 6(5): 200-210
© 2019 IJPESH
www.kheljournal.com
Received: 08-07-2019
Accepted: 12-08-2019

Agbodjogbe D Basile
Laboratory of Didactic
Discipline LD) University of
Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Ogueboule Bachar M
Laboratory of Didactic
Discipline LDD University of
Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Attikleme Kossivi
Laboratory of Didactic
Discipline LDD University of
Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Godeme Anne-Marie
Laboratory of Didactic
Discipline LDD University of
Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Corresponding Author:
Agbodjogbe D Basile
Laboratory of Didactic
Discipline LDD University of
Abomey-Calavi, Benin

The problem of learning volleyball in second form: A study of two cases of teaching in Za-Tanta in Benin

Agbodjogbe D Basile, Ogueboule Bachar M, Attikleme Kossivi and Godeme Anne-Marie

Abstract

This study analyzes the functioning of the didactic system in volleyball in the fifth to identify and explain the difficulties encountered by CEG Za-Tanta students in the municipality of Za-Tanta in Benin. In this perspective, we used a model of analysis that mobilized concepts from Chevallard's anthropological theory of didactics (1992) and Sensevy's theory of joint didactical action (2007, 2006) to analyze and interpret the results. In synergy with this model, the approach taken is focused on documentary analysis, ante-sessional and post-sessional interviews. The data collected by these interviews were crossed with those from the instrumented observations of the class sessions with reference to Van Der Maren (1996). The pupils' difficulties are related to the teaching process implemented by the teachers and the knowledge and know-how involved. This is the high key, the low service and the rotation followed by the occupation of rational ground. Volleyball students' reports, the small number of sessions, the density of the program's content and the teachers' subjection to the overall game explain these difficulties.

Keywords: Volleyball-knowledge-difficulties-didactic transposition-didactic interaction

1. Introduction

The implementation of the decisions of the State's General of Education held from 2nd to 9th October 1990 in Cotonou has led to a reform of the Beninese education system (Attikleme and Kpazai, 2011) [11]. It has led to the effectiveness of teaching according to the Competence-Based Approach (CBA), whose first drafts appeared around 2002 (Agbodjobé, 2013) [1]. It is an approach that focuses on general education, job training, life training and character training. With this in mind, a new educational policy has been adopted with the introduction of new curricula devoting the overhaul of the teaching approach of all the subjects included in the school timetable (Ministries in charge of Education, 2007). Teachers are now in a context that outlaws dogmatism and makes the student the main craftsman of the construction of his knowledge.

In Physical Education and Sports (EPS), this vision aims to encourage the updating of educational actions and a more harmonious planning of the teaching of a still poorly perceived discipline (Ministry of Secondary Education of Technical and Vocational Training, Reconversion and Youth Inclusion, 2014). Teaching PSE must respond to the needs of the individual and society (UNESCO, 1978) [51]. Through physical and sporting activities (APS), it must participate, like the other disciplines, in the training of a technically and harmoniously balanced, efficient and entrepreneurial citizen, with a taste for research, capable of self-employment, creating jobs and contributing to development (National Institute of Training and Research in Education, 1994, p 7). APS is therefore in EPS, elements that determine the culture that the student must master after a pedagogical progression proposed by the teacher (Jeannin, 2011) [30].

In Benin, the official documents provided for the teaching of APS according to the classes of the sixth year in the final year. Among them, team sports and especially volleyball appear to be the most difficult to teach according to teachers (Oguéboulé, 1999) [15]. According to the study programs, volleyball is taught in fifth, fourth, first and final. According to the work of Atoun *et al.* (2015) [9], it is an APS whose teaching / learning is even more problematic in the context of teaching according to the Competency Based Approach (CBA).

Indeed, the students, even in the final year, have for most beginners' behaviors in this Physical and Sports Activities (PSA) of which they do not know the regulation, even if they recognize having lived it in the previous classes. This finding assumes that there are facts that hinder the learning of volleyball in ordinary classroom situations. It is to highlight and explain the difficulties of students learning volleyball that our work focused on the teaching/learning of this PSA second form in the high school of Zan-Tanta in the department of Zou in Benin.

2. The objective and the theoretical framework

The purpose of this article is to analyze the practices of teachers offering content of knowledge to their students in the Volleyball class to highlight the difficulties encountered by students in learning in the context of the implementation of the CBA (Agbodjogbé, 2013) ^[1]. This is a study whose focal points are the interactions between teachers and their students in class in volleyball. These are interactions that generate difficulties that may explain possible gaps between the contents taught and those actually learned by students.

To this end, we have used a transpositive theoretical framework (Perrenoud 1998, Chevallard 1992, Martinand 1989) ^[47, 17, 36] extended to concepts mobilized by the theory of joint didactic action (Sensevy 2007, Amade-Escot 2007, 2003). ^[48, 3, 4] Concepts on the teaching of collective sports games (Gréhaigne and Poggi, 2007, Brau-Antony, 2003, 2001, Amans-Passaga, 2005, Gréhaigne, 1999, 1995) ^[26, 13, 6, 24, 25] were also used to analyze and interpret the results.

Before the class situation, scholarly knowledge, current practices in society such as PSA undergo transformations and become objects to be taught through the curriculum (Odjoussou 2010, Perrenoud 1998, Chevallard 1992; Martinand 1989, Verret 1975) ^[41, 47, 17, 36, 13]. Subsequently, the ordinary classroom situation is a relational practice between the teacher and his or her students that is finalized through the learning of socially and culturally identified knowledge. In class then, students and teacher interact to train with knowledge, which Chevallard (1997, 1992) ^[17] continued by Sensevy (2007; 2006) ^[48, 49] and Amade-Escot (2007) ^[3] called didactical system. The transformations evoked thus continue *in situ* and can justify the difficulties encountered by the students in volleyball.

In this logic, the anthropological theory of didactics of Chevallard (1992) ^[17] firstly accounts for the transformations that an object can undergo, from one institution to another, identified to be taught and learned (Perrenoud, 1998) ^[47]. Secondly, Sensevy's theory of joint didactic action (2007, 2006) stipulates that, conversely, the actions of the teacher in a classroom situation are a function of those of the pupils for the construction of an environment conducive to advancement. Knowledge. The use of the concepts mobilized by these two theories to operationalize our theoretical framework made it possible to look at the whole transpositive chain of knowledge and know-how, from official documents in the fifth to the class situation and those whose learning puts students in difficulty. Finally, the approaches (technical, structural, dialectical) used to teach volleyball were taken into account when this study focuses on the analysis of the intervention and then the pedagogical choices. Approaches are at the crossroads of multiple parameters such as initial training, work experience, sports experience (Brau-Antony, 2003) ^[13]. These approaches result in taking positions on the ends and the means, positions sometimes at odds with the implementation observed in the pedagogical action. These are

approaches that reflect the views of stakeholders on PSA teaching. Regarding the teaching of collective sports games such as volleyball, this author proposes a three-category model designed to analyze the conceptions that teachers reflect through their practices, taking into account their definition of the game, the role of the player, the knowledge of the game teaching, proposed learning situations, the learning model chosen (Brau-Antony, 2001) ^[13]. With all the precautions concerning the fact that a teacher always develops a singular conception, not strictly recognizable in a typology, he releases three conceptions: technician, structural and dialectic. The first conceives the game as a combination of gestures that everyone must first learn to master. The second values the organization of the team and the internal communication to it. The dialectical design focuses more on the balance of power between teams and the development of strategic and tactical skills. The works of Gréhaigne (1999, 1995) ^[24, 25] and the current Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU) suggest an approach of collective sports through play with presentation of the effective rules of action and cognitive solicitation of the players to promote a tactical tactical conscious activity. Together, they advocated for strategic and tactical priority training for players (Gréhaigne, Gotbout and Bouthier, 1999) ^[28].

These studies reveal that teachers' conceptions of collective sports intervention combine different registers of beliefs and knowledge that take into account, to varying degrees, aspects related to the values and purposes of educational action and elements related to the analysis of knowledge issues and ways of transmitting them (Amans-Passaga, 2005) ^[6]. As pointed out by Gréhaigne and Poggi (2007, p.15) ^[26], the teaching of collective sports games "still very often comes from a narrowly technicalistic conception" which does not allow students to progress significantly during their schooling. This justifies the relevance of a reflection on the problem of learning volleyball in schools in Benin.

2.1 The problem, the research questions and the hypotheses

This study aims to explore the approaches used by teachers involved in volleyball, the content offered to students and especially the difficulties encountered by them, by performing the Learning Activities (LA) that are proposed to them according to the prescriptions of the CBA in Benin. The implementation of this approach has given rise to questions, concerns and even revolts (Agbodjogbé 2013, Lasnier 2000) ^[1, 31]. She makes APS, objects of knowledge and means to develop skills.

Many studies have revealed difficulties in implementing the teaching / learning / evaluation approach prescribed by the PBA in the Beninese context in general and in the case of certain PSAs. To this end, investigations into volleyball have, from a transpositive and comparative perspective, shown that in a generic way, the simple touch, the cuff and the simple service are taught to girls and boys. Specifically, the tennis service, the smash and the counter are taught in homogeneous boy. Moreover, with just girls, the teacher's practice is much more reflective of the technician approach to teaching team sports. With boys, he is more in the dialectical and structural approaches. The work of Agbodjogbé, Oguéboulé, Attikléme, Kpazai, Djovitou, Atoun and Odjoussou (2014) ^[2] on the analysis of the difficulties related to the use of the evaluation tool (Evaluation Grid) of teaching / learning in PSE according to the CBA, have highlighted the differences between the approaches and strategies used by PSE teachers in their evaluation practices at the end of the two Learning Situations

(LS). About the evaluation of collective sports, the results of the investigations of Atoun *et al.* (2015) ^[9] revealed in volleyball, the difficulties encountered by the teachers evaluating the students according to the prescriptions of the CBA. These are: the elaboration and filling of the observation grid, the high number of evaluation criteria, the management of overcrowding, and the objectivity in the appreciation of numerous and fast actions in volleyball. In the context of this approach, very little work has focused their attention on the learning difficulties of students.

In the case of individual sports, Oguéboulé, Agbodjogbé, Attiklémè, Kouété and Kpazaï (2016) ^[45] at the javelin throw showed that the unavailability of equipment, the high number of classes running at the same time on the sports facilities, the The plethora of classes, the experience of the pupils and the teachers' report to this PSA force them to adapt the prescriptions of the CBA to their respective environment of intervention. It is the works of Gandjèto (2015) ^[23] which, in the logic of the teracity of the didactic system, have identified and justified by the reports to the knowledge of the pupils and teachers, the quality of the material, the amalgam at the level of the contents of knowledge at the program, the reduced number of sessions devoted to APS, the difficulties of students in learning the hurdles race.

The problematic of this article aims at similar concerns in the case of volleyball in fifth at High School Za-Tanta in the department of Zou in Benin. Assuming that the position of the teacher differs from that of the students in the class institution, we have chosen to infer the didactic intentions of the teachers and the tasks they propose to explore the difficulties of their students in teaching appropriate knowledge and skills in volleyball. In synergy with this problem, we asked two research questions and proposed a hypothesis for each of them.

2.2 Research questions

- What are the difficulties encountered by students struggling with knowledge offered by volleyball teachers?
- How can one explain the difficulties that students encounter when learning volleyball?

2.3 The hypotheses

- Students have difficulty engaging the game and performing game techniques taught outside the game and in the game.
- The personal and institutional relations of the protagonists of the didactic system in volleyball, the insufficiency of the material, the density of the contents proposed by the official documents, the subjection of the teachers to the totality and the reduced number of sessions make it possible to explain the difficulties students.

To test the hypotheses, a methodological approach was adopted.

3. The methodological approach

In synergy with the literature review, the theoretical framework and the research questions, we used an approach that made it possible to invest study subjects, in a suitable context with appropriate techniques and tools. This is the teaching / learning context of volleyball in fifth grade classes.

3.1 The choice of context and subjects of the study

This article deals with the analysis of teaching / learning

phenomena in volleyball in ordinary class situations. In this logic, the subjects of study can only be PSE teachers and their students. We know from the literature review that work has been done in Benin on the teaching of volleyball in fourth and first. In our field of investigation, fifth graders are supposed not to have volleyball in their cognitive universe in the sense of Chevillard (1997) ^[16]. Learning difficulties should therefore be more noticeable among students in this class. This justifies the choice of this class to highlight the difficulties of the students performing the tasks proposed to them to teach them volleyball.

To facilitate the collection of data, the investigations took place in Za-Kpota, a community in which a member of our research team did their internship in the workplace during the 2015-2016 school year, the period of data collection. In this locality, it was in the High school of the area of Za-Tanta that we met two teachers who agreed to participate in the study. It is about T1 (03 years of experience) in charge of the courses of PE in 5th 1 and T2 (04 years of experience), teacher of PE of the 5th 4. It is therefore in a logical reasoned choice that the fifth class, the High school Za-Tanta in Benin and the two teachers were selected for our investigations.

In Benin, the practices of the teachers in PE are articulated around two SA in harmony with the two disciplines. LS N°1 is entitled "Practicing Physical Activities of Body Control and the Environment" and proposes individual sports as objects and means of teaching. With the title "Practicing physical activities of cooperation and / or opposition", LS N ° 2 provides for the teaching of collective sports and struggles.

Each LS takes place in twelve sessions of three hours each week (at least three sessions by PSA). Nine sessions are reserved for teaching / learning from three to four APS, one assessment session and two summative assessment sessions marking the end of the cycle. This order prescribed for the execution of the LS is not always respected by the teachers. In the logic of the school PS project, they sometimes adapt the program to the contexts of their intervention community. For the fifth class, endurance, shot put, floor gymnastics and rope climbing are the PSA on the LS N°1 program while volleyball, basketball and African wrestling are the PSA provided in the LS No.2 (Ministry of Secondary Education of Technical and Vocational Training, Reconversion and Youth Integration, 2014). In this LS, the teaching / learning of volleyball is the focal point of our investigations.

Originally called "mintonnette", volleyball was invented in February 1895 by Pastor William Morgan in Massachusetts in the United States. It owes its current name to Dr. Halstead in 1896; the idea being to "fly" the ball over the net (Metzler, 1996) ^[37]. Performance volleyball began in 1947 with the creation of the International Volleyball Federation (IVBF) to which Benin affiliated in 1964. It is played six against six on a rectangular ground of 18 meters on 09 meters. The two teams are separated by a net whose height is 02.44 meters for men and 02.24 meters for women. The single touch, the cuff, the service with its variants, the smash, the cons, and the dive are techniques to acquire in class to play volleyball. To make a point is to drop the ball within the limits of the opposing side or to get a foul from the opposing team (Amans-Passaga, 1997) ^[7].

In strict compliance with official regulations, this PSA is taught in secondary schools and High school of Za-Tanta is no exception. In Benin, the student discovers volleyball often in fifth. It is not programmed at the elementary level and is not yet popular like football, basketball and handball. The High school of Za-Tanta is named after the district which

shelters it in the municipality of Za-Kpota, department of Zou in Benin. Distributed in 29 educational groups (from the sixth to the first), the 4497 pupils of this group are supervised in 2015-2016 by 318 teachers, 10 of them in PE. Some classes therefore remained without an PE teacher. The four fifth grade classes are PSE courses and two of them (5th and 5th grade) have been fertile ground for investigations. The 56 students of the 5th grade take the PE class on Tuesdays from 7am to 10am with their teacher in the presence of three other classes. On the same infrastructures, the 49 students of the 5th grade 4 live with their teacher the classes of EPS, the Thursdays from 7am to 10am in the presence of four other classes. In this secondary school, volleyball lessons are held on the ground with insufficient equipment forcing teachers to use a string instead of a regulatory net to separate the two teams. Class size, the number of balloons available (just two for one session) and the number of sessions (03 as prescribed) can influence the delivery of teachers. In reference to the tenacity of the didactic system (Sensevy, 2007, Amade-Escot, 2007)^[48, 3], students in T1 and T2 are automatically subjects of study.

In the impossibility of following them all at once, we chose 04 by class with reference to the works of Leutenegger (2009, 2003)^[32, 33]. It is for each class, of the two said stronger and the two said weaker, retained in collaboration with the teacher who is supposed to know his pupils. In the end, 08 pupils and T2 teachers of PE were invested with suitable techniques and tools.

3.2 Investigative techniques and tools

The documentary analysis, the interviews and the in-situ observations are the techniques mainly used. For each of them, we used investigative tools.

3.2.1 The documentary analysis

The literature review was devoted to reading documents that relate to the subject. It allowed a literature review to prove the originality of the investigations. The analysis of the contents of the guide and study program documents helped to promote the knowledge and skills expected to be taught in the fifth grade through the selected PSA, including volleyball. This investigative technique facilitated the tensioning of didactic transpositions (Chevallard 1992, Martinand 1989)^[17, 36] operated by teachers in ordinary classroom situations.

3.2.2 Interviews and in-situ observations of class sessions

With reference to the work of Leutenegger (2009, 2003)^[32, 33], Amade-Escot (2003)^[4], Van Der Maren (1996)^[52], the interviews with the actors of the didactic system and the recordings of sessions are inseparable and complementary techniques. The sessions observed are recorded; they are preceded and followed by interviews. In our case, these are ante-session, post-session and post-cycle interviews.

3.2.2.1 Ante-session and post-session interviews

The ante-session interviews were held before each session with the teachers. The three sessions held by each teacher led to six pre-session interviews in total. They allowed to know for each session, didactic intentions of the teacher in reference to the works of Oguéboulé (2017)^[42], Atoun (2016)^[8] and Agbodjogbé (2013)^[11] inspired by Amade-Escot (2007, 2003)^[3, 4]. They led the speakers to discuss the difficulties that

students might face with the planned AA. For each difficulty mentioned, they planned solutions approaches. At the end of each session, teachers are subjected to a post-session interview.

These are interviews that aim to make hot, the results of each session by giving the opportunity to the teacher to return to the actions he has just taken with his students in the construction of knowledge in volleyball reference the work of Vermersch (1994). This is the time for him to justify the achievement or not of his objectives and the possible gap between what he has announced and what he has done. The difficulties actually encountered by the students were mentioned during each of the six post-session interviews.

3.2.2.2 Post Cycle Interviews

At the end of the third and final session of the volleyball cycle, the four students selected in each class were interviewed. These are post-cycle interviews. They had to say the knowledge they really think they have learned and the difficulties they have encountered. Numbering 08 according to the number of students selected, they allowed to collect remarks that were compared to those of their teachers in the logic of triangulation in reference to the work of Van Der Maren (1996)^[52]. In summary, the contents of knowledge proposed by the teacher, the difficulties encountered by the students performing the proposed tasks and their experience in volleyball outside of school hours were discussed. The six class sessions (3 per teacher) each made the subject of audio-visual recording.

3.2.2.3 Audio-visual recordings of the sessions

They were made using two camcorder with a camera and a microphone. One camcorder filmed the whole class and the second, much more mobile, filmed the focal points for example for the target students. These are instrumented observations that led to the recording of the words and gestures of the teacher interacting with his pupils for the construction and advancement of knowledge over time (Amade-Escot, 2003)^[4]. After these audio-visual recordings, the session films, meticulously visualized, led to condensed synopses of the volleyball class sequences in the logic of Devos-Prieur (2006) cited by Agbodjogbé (2013)^[11]. The knowledge and know-how actually involved have been inferred to compare with the work of Leutenegger (2009, 2003)^[32, 33], the statements of actors of the didactic system to reality.

The interviews and the observations of meeting were carried out according to a chronogram adopted in agreement with the teachers.

3.3 The chronogram of the collection, the transcription and the data processing

Before collecting the data, we organized a session to explain the objectives of our study to the subject teachers. We talked about the main points of our interview guides (ante and post session, post-cycle) and about the conditions of organization of the collection of information (teachers' timetable, observation planning, practical arrangements, presentation of the audio-visual recording technicians team). After this session, we chose a timetable with each teacher according to the table below.

Table 1: Planning for Data Collection

Trancher	Classes	Observations of the class sessions			Entretiens			
		Hours	1st session	2 nd session	3 rd session	Ante-session (with teachers)	Post-session (with teachers)	Post-cycle (with students)
T ₁	2 nd form M ₁	07h à 10h	09-02-16	16-02-16	23-02-16	06h45min-06h55 min	10h05min- 10h15min	10h15min- 10h35min
T ₂	2 nd form M ₄	07h à 10h	07-01-16	14-01-16	21-02-16	06h45min-06h55 min	10h05min- 10h15min	10h15min- 10h35min

This table presents the chronogram of the collection of field data with the teachers and students studied at High school of Za-Tanta. It shows that, in the logic of a teaching project, the LS N ° 2 in which the volleyball is programmed took place during the first semester, contrary to the prescriptions of the program.

In accordance with our approach, all interviews (12 with teachers and 08 with students) and all session films (6 including 3 per class) were transcribed. The interviews, transcribed verbatim are then grouped according to the themes to answer our research questions while the transcription of the films has resulted in reduced corpora of class sequences.

This methodological approach resulted in results that were analyzed and interpreted with the concepts mobilized by our theoretical framework.

4. Presentation of the results and discussion

The results of our investigations are structured around the didactical analysis of the contents to be taught in volleyball in the fifth, the knowledge and know-how offered to the students by the teachers, the difficulties encountered by the students during the learning.

4.1 Didactic interest of contents to teach volleyball in fifth.

Referring to the guide and curriculum documents published by the Ministry in charge of secondary education, we have listed the objects of knowledge to teach volleyball in the fifth. From the analysis of prescribed knowledge content, it appears that the teaching of volleyball in the fifth should be structured around four AA chronologically related to: the rational occupation of the field with evolution in passes after reception (low and / or high), the tactical circulation of the ball in attack, the effectiveness of the collective game by the mastery of the techniques of control of passes in various forms and strikes, the control of the techniques of ball control. These are prescriptions that focus on the overall game to teach volleyball with less importance to learning outside the game. The structural and dialectical approaches to teaching collective sports games are therefore valued at the expense of the game technician approach evoked by Brau-Antony (2003, 2001)^[12, 13].

The official documents take into account the two praxeological blocks (Chevallard, 2002, 1999)^[14, 15]. The notions of cooperation, opposition, partner, opponent, defense, attack, play area, fair play are intended to be taught as well as the rules of the game; it is the technologico-theoretical block. With regard to the practical-technical block, the pass, the reception, the high key, the low key, the permutation, the tactical combinations, the simple service, the rotation, the cons, the collective organization of the game are the knowledge - to teach in fifth grade.

In the context of the effectiveness of the competency-based approach in which the teacher performs capacity-based abilities with a more discursive than practical teaching practice (Agbodjogbé, 2013, Oguéboulé, 2008)^[1, 43], we can ask ourselves if the student can really acquire this knowledge and know-how without difficulty in, only, three sessions. This situation may justify any discrepancies between the contents of the fifth volleyball program, those taught by the teachers and those actually learned by the students. In addition, the knowledge and techniques in the program are listed pell-mell without any proposal for pedagogical progression. They are too numerous and some of them (pass, counter, permutation, tactical circulation of the balloon) seem inappropriate to the level of fifth grade students who are discovering volleyball. It is possible that this abundance of knowledge and know-how to teach poses a problem for teachers in the choice of content to offer students.

4.2 The knowledge taught

The visualization and transcription of the sequences in condensed class synopses were cross-checked with the analysis of the different interviews to infer the knowledge and skills taught by each speaker, T1 and T2 at High school of Za-Tanta in Za-Kpota, Benin. Condensed synopses allowed to summarize chronologically the knowledge involved.

4.2.1 The knowledge put into play by the teacher T1

Each of the three sessions of this speaker was analyzed to bring out the content actually offered to students. Tables 3, 4 and 5 are respectively the condensed synopsis of the first, second and third sessions of T1.

Table 2: Condensed synopsis of the first session conducted by T1

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
The high key	1- Students do and say what they know about volleyball, identify steps and propose a learning timeline	Expression	Know the students' pre-requisites for volleyball
		Analysis	Identify with students the different phases (attack and defense) and some steps (service, reception, pass, send) of the game
		Planning	Establish with students, an order in the teaching / learning of these two phases: attack and defense
	2- Students make the key up	Exploration	Encourage students to correctly do the high key by trial and error
		Position statement	Encourage students to identify and choose the best way to touch up
		Implementation	Teach the high key outside the game, in reduced and global games

Table 3: Condensed synopsis of the second session conducted by E1

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
1- The low service	1- Achieve low service	Exploration and Position Statement	Encourage students to choose the right way to do low service in the game.
		Implementation	Encourage students to perform low service in the game
2- The rotation	2- Perform the rotation	Exploration and Position Statement	Encourage students after trial and error to choose the right way to rotate
		Implementation	Encourage students to rotate well in the game

Table 4: Condensed synopsis of the third session held by T1

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
Improvement of the contents of the two previous sessions	1-Improved service after a good rotation	Exécution	Encourage students to have low service and spin in the game
	2 Improved high key		Encourage students to have low service and spin in the game.

From the analysis in Table 3, it appears that T1 introduced the volleyball to students before teaching them the high key as, he announced at the interview ante-session. In doing so, he invalidates the results of Oguéboulé's (2008) ^[43] work, according to which teachers intervening following the CBA approach the first session without learning object on the practice of PSA. By performing abilities-based abilities, he remained essentially in the dialectical approach to teaching collective sports games of Brau-Antony (2003, 2001) ^[12, 13] using the global game in expression, analysis and planning. With the execution capacity, T1 proposes tasks outside the game and in the game, thus alternating (Lasnier, 2000) ^[31] the dialectical, structural and technician approaches with more time devoted to the global game. In the post-session interview, he says that "it is difficult to do everything in the global game when students cannot perform the game techniques". It is in the logic of Gréhaigne, Richard and Griffin (2005) ^[27] then Gréhaigne, Godbout and Mahut (1999) ^[29] who argue that it is necessary for the student a range of technical skills specific to the activity to exploit them in the. At the end of the session, he recognizes that his goal is not reached by stating that: "The high key is really very complex for students especially that the ball should not be caught." It is possible that the propensity to globality to the detriment of technique is one of the causes of difficulties students in learning volleyball. The second session of T1 was the subject of an analysis.

Table 4 reveals a gap between the knowledge contents announced by T1 and those actually taught. The low service and the rotation were taught in the game while the teacher announced, again the simple touch as an object of knowing to teach: "The pupils will be able to make the touch in a game by occupying the ground rationally". Even though T1 recognized that his students could not perform the high key at the first session, he remained in the cumulative logic of learning (Marsenasch, 1991) by moving on to other objects of knowledge. His words at the end of the second confirm this logic: "Given the level of students in relation to the high key, I had to introduce the rotation followed by the occupation of the ground and low service. Not because the students have mastered the high key but to give them other notions of the activity. If not, we will stay on the sidelines alone during the three sessions. The behavior of this teacher confirms

Leutenegger's (2009, 2003) ^[32, 33] assertions that teachers' statements may not be in line with actual actions in contact with students. At the post-session interview, T1 projects his goal for the third and final session. He says, "No, it's Impossible to address all the PSA concepts in the guide and the program. I will be satisfied with what we did for both sessions. The next session I will correct, improve by regulations the level of students compared to what is done. T1's personal report to program content and volleyball can explain his pedagogical progression.

From the analysis in Table 5, we can deduce that T1 during the last session essentially taught the high key, low service and rotation in a real game as he had announced at the post-session interview of the previous meeting.

The technician approach has been absent in favor of the dialectic and the structural one of Brau-Antony (2003, 2001) ^[12, 13]. After the last session of the volleyball cycle, we can remember that E1 chose from the multitude of knowledge and techniques in the program, the high key, the low service and the rotation as knowledge and skills to teach his students. He adapted the content prescribed at the level of his students by performing a didactic transposition that justifies a gap between the prescribed content and those taught. The students' report to volleyball and the small number of sessions have been an inertia to chronogenesis. Teacher T1 claims that he was unable to deal with all that is provided by the official documents. Despite the restrictions, E1 recognizes that its objectives have not been achieved. Here is an excerpt of his comments after the last session: "I cannot say that my goals are achieved. All students are not yet able to achieve the high key, to position themselves in the field, to respect their position and to achieve low service. But compared to previous sessions, they have evolved in the activity. These remarks make it possible to suspect that students are confronted with difficulties that affect the acquisition of knowledge and skills at their level during learning. In the same school, teacher T2 was followed in interaction with his students.

4.2.2 The knowledge put into play by the teacher T2

The three sessions of T2 were analyzed to bring out the knowledge actually offered to students. Tables 5, 6 and 7 are respectively the condensed synopses of the first, second and third sessions of T2.

Table 5: Condensed synopsis of the first session by T2

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
The high key in a game	1- Students do and say what they know about volleyball	Expression	Know the students' prerequisites for volleyball
		Analysis	Identify with students the different phases of the game and some points of its rules
		Planning	Establish with the students, an order in the teaching / learning of these two phases: attack and defense (the high key in attack and defense)
	2- Students make the key up	Exploration	Encourage students to correctly do the high key by trial and error
		Position statement	Encourage students to identify and choose the best way to touch up
		Execution	Teach the high key in reduced and global games

Table 6: Condensed synopsis of the second session conducted by T2

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
1. Rational occupation of the land 2. Improved high key	1- Occupy your play area and prevent the ball from falling into it 2- Realize the high key in the game	Exploration and Position Statement	Encourage students after trial and error to choose the correct positioning on the field according to the positions
		Execution	Inciter les élèves à bien se positionner sur le terrain sans le jeu et dans le jeu et en jouant toutes les balles venant à leur poste Encourage students to improve their skills at the touch of high

Table 7: Condensed synopsis of the third session by T2

Contents	Tasks	Capacities	Didactic intentions of the teacher
1. The service 2. The game directed with application of all that is learned	1. Achieve low service	Exploration and Position Statement	Encourage students to choose the right way to serve low
	2. Improvement of low service, high key by occupying ground	Execution	Encourage students to perform low service Encourage students to hit the ball Encourage students to move to play the ball in their play space and then to the success of low service Co-arbitration

From the analysis in Table 7, we can remember that the E2 teaching actually taught the high key as he announced in the ante-session interview: This means that the teacher, for this class in the beginning of introduction to volleyball, provides a priori resolution of the first fundamental problem that may encounter students. He says at the interview-ante-session: "No, not at all. They present enormous difficulties as it is their very first volleyball session. Therefore, he proposes at this first session, an object of learning and contradicts, like E1, the results of the work of Oguéboulé (2008) [43]. The teacher T2 approached his course following the dialectical approach of Brau-Antony (2003, 2001) [12, 13] since he remained only in the game to teach the high key to the students. We can say at this first session, that the teacher T2 has also made an internal didactic transposition by not beginning his teaching by the "rational occupation of the field and evolution in passes after reception (low or high) to mark the point, evolution towards variants "in accordance with official documents.

The objective of the second session was clearly announced by T2 during the interview. It is about improving the high key in a game and to insist on the rational occupation of the field. The analysis in Table 6 asserts that the statements of T2 are true to reality. Despite the tasks proposed in his teaching, T2 still finds in his students, difficulties in achieving the knowledge and skills taught. At the post-session interview, teacher T2 shows his desolation at the level of his pupils in the game compared to the contents taught during the two sessions. He says, "Students drop the ball into their playing space, in front of, next to or behind them. Even the high key is another big problem". He believes that volleyball is a complex activity for students, and that only awake students can practice it. It is easy to see that the propensity of structural and dialectical approaches has not facilitated learning among T2 students.

For the third and final session, the analysis in Table 7 shows that T2 taught the high key, the rational occupation of the land and the service contrary to the official documents according to the following chronology: occupation rational ground - low key - high key - collective play - ball control techniques. The service taught by the teacher T2 is extracted from the myriad of techniques prescribed by the program. This reveals a gap between the prescribed and the realized by T2 in a transpositive perspective. At the end of the last session of the cycle, this facilitator is not able to say that his / her goal is reached: "the students did what they can, even if they did not

master what I told them teaches".

In summary, the teachers who participated in the study adapted the prescriptions of the guide and the curriculum to the realities of their intervention environment in synergy with the results of the work of Oguéboulé *et al.* (2016) [45] in javelin throwing. In a generic way, T1 and T2 taught the high key during the learning cycle even though each of them proposed specific AAs depending on the level of their students, their relationship to volleyball and the approach prescribed by the official documents. Beyond the high key, T2 had his students do a simulacrum of low service.

This observed variation in teaching practice can be interpreted as being related to the teacher's personal relationship to the subject of knowledge, as well as the prescribed teaching / learning / evaluation approach (Chevallard, 1992) [17].

In the course of our investigations, we have elucidated and explained the students' difficulties with the tasks proposed by the teachers.

4.3 Difficulties faced by students

Through ante-session interviews, the teachers involved recognized and discussed difficulties their students may face in learning volleyball. Despite the proposed remedies, the majority of students did not overcome the difficulties. Students interviewed at the post-cycle interview also had the opportunity to discuss the various difficulties encountered when learning volleyball in a classroom situation. In the logic of triangulation (Van Der Maren, 1996) [52], the difficulties evoked by students and teachers have been crossed with information from visualization and condensed class sessions (Leutenegger, 2009, 2003) [32, 33]. It emerges from this crossover that it is by executing the tasks proposed by the teachers that the difficulties encountered by the pupils emerge. They are related to the high key in the game and out of the game, low service, rotation and rational occupation of the field. The motor actions carried out by the pupils that lead to a failure in the realization of the game techniques taught are inferred in Table 7.

These are difficulties mainly related to Chevallard's practical-technical block (2002, 1999) [14, 15]. It was easy to see during the visualizations, students realize without success, the skills taught. In reference to the literature on volleyball instruction, the content of knowing which causes difficulties in the pupils analyzed and interpreted after the summary table.

Table 8: Summary of the difficulties encountered by students in learning objects taught by T1 and T2

Teachers	Learning cycles		Difficulties identified
	Contents	Content tough Tasks	
T ₁	The high key	Organize with your classmates to touch the ball over your forehead and with your ten fingers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non hardening of the fingers to the touch of the ball ▪ Send the ball down ▪ To catch the ball ▪ Poor placement of members ▪ No movement to the ball
	The low service	Engage the game by throwing the ball from the line drawn to the opposing side	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disorientation of the ball ▪ Rotation of the hip ▪ Balancing of the arms ▪ Lack of strength
	The rotation	Perform the rotation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of rotation ▪ Confusion of posts but not with the ground trace arrows amounting direction of rotation
T ₂	The high key	Realize the high key in the game	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indecision ▪ No movement to the ball ▪ Imprecision ▪ Poor placement of members
	The rational occupation of the land The low service	Occupy your play area and prevent the ball from falling into it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indecision ▪ Agglutination around the ball
		Achieve low service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disorientation of the ball ▪ Rotation of the hip ▪ Balancing of the arms ▪ Lack of strength

4.3.1 The high key or the single key

If, specifically, the pupils of E1 do not harden the fingers in contact with the ball and catch it, elements of genericity appear at the level of the difficulties to succeed the high key. In a generic way, students have a bad placement of limbs, do not move to the ball. They cannot send the ball to a specific destination. In the game, the ball just falls and the regulations of teachers to motivate students do not significantly change their expertise. The protagonists of the didactic system devote time to the theory on the high key while the practical-technical block poses a great problem for the pupils. These lack of success at the high key observed in the high school of Za-Tanta students in Benin, had already been mentioned by Piéron (1993), Toyoda (1989)^[50] and Dürrwächter (1982)^[22]. These authors group together the difficulties in "a bad position of the uncured fingers, a bad position with respect to the ball, an imprecise trajectory, an insufficiency or a lack of displacement and mistakes in the elementary form (lack of extension of the legs, arms)".

Faced with this situation, the teachers propose tasks outside the game in the logic of the technician approach to the teaching of collective sports games, in reference to the work of Brau-Antony (2003, 2001)^[12, 13]. The subjection to the global, the reduced number of sessions and the density of the contents of the program to the volleyball obliges, according to the remarks of the pupils and teachers to return in the game or to pass to another object of knowledge as the low service for example.

4.3.2 Low service or simple service

The actions of T1 and T2 to teach low service are noticeable, but student success has not accompanied. The lack of strength, the swinging of the arms and the rotation of the hip generically result in a disorientation of the balloon. The ball goes out of the play area or cannot even get to the other side. In this case, it is difficult, or impossible to engage the game and to make it last for the teacher to regulate the actions of the students.

Unable to get the students to play, teachers introduce didactic variables into the environment by allowing students to catch

the ball and launch it to engage the game. This is an internal didactic transposition that problematic. In fact, the students questioned retained that it is possible by regulation to throw the ball to start the game. Faced with the massive failure, the teachers to facilitate the task to the students, reduce the distance on which it is necessary to serve. In this case, some students manage to do the service even if, the concern of the global game does not allow to devote enough time to this situation however beneficial.

4.3.3 Rotation and rational occupation of the land

Teachers T1 and T2, in reference to Chevillard's technologico-theoretical unit (2002, 1999)^[14, 15] explain at length the mechanism of rotation in volleyball. But as soon as you have to go to practice, the students get lost. They do not keep the numbers of the posts and do not know how to make the rotation, in spite of the efforts of the teachers who, sometimes lose patience and get upset. But their topogenic posture in the institution that is the class, forces them to calm down to co-build with their students, an environment facilitating chronogenesis. The rotation is not well done, the ground cannot be rationally occupied. Students who want to play stick around the ball and allow those who are fleeing the ball not to be noticed.

Some people make the choice not to do the service, thus confirming the results of the work of Oguéboulé *et al.* (2015)^[46] on the teaching of volleyball in first class. Moreover, on the whole, students do not know who is to serve. The succession of tasks that characterizes volleyball confuses them in the game. In this logic, DAVISSE and LOUVEAU (1991) quoting and continuing EYQUEM (1944), drew attention to the difficulty related to the rotation in volleyball among students. According to these authors, rotation requires each player to play successively different and varied roles.

In summary, teachers propose tasks aimed at teaching knowledge and know-how while students do things differently from those expected by them. The difficulties lead to gaps between what the teacher asks and what the students actually do. The latter may end up acquiring motor skills that are not in line with those targeted by official documents and

teachers. In the case of our subjects of study, the possible sources of these difficulties should be explored.

4.4 Probable sources of difficulties for students

In reference to the results of the work of Oguéboulé *et al.* (2016)^[45], the contents of the program are too numerous and put teachers in an embarrassment of choice. This situation may have repercussions on student behavior. In the municipality of Za-Kpota, it is in fifth that students discover volleyball. They do not have it in their cognitive universe in the sense of Chevallard (1997)^[16]. In this context, it is difficult, if not impossible, to learn everything at the same time. This justifies the didactic transpositions made by the teachers, which are manifested by discrepancies between the prescribed contents and those offered to the students. Despite the restrictions, students' personal and institutional relationships are an obstacle to learning. In their day-to-day lives, they are not accustomed to the motor gestures imposed by the learning of the techniques of play. The number of sessions is often limited to three whereas to install a technique, it takes many repetitions (Delignières and Garsault, 1999, Durand, 1997)^[20, 21].

Because of their subjugation to the global, teachers put beginner students in the game and realize the technical difficulties. In fact, Gréhaigine and Poggi (2007)^[26] already pointed out that team sports are primarily technical. They agree with Cloes and Lapiere (1995)^[19] who supported the same point of view for the specific case of volleyball. If, to overcome this situation, teachers alternate the technician, dialectical and structural approaches in the sense of Lasnier (2000)^[31] (Brau-Antony, 2003, 2001)^[12, 13], the time devoted to the technician is very small and does not allow students to. The strong propensity for dialectical and structural approaches to the detriment of technician is therefore one of the sources of students' difficulties in learning collective sports, especially volleyball. The more technical the approach, the more the participants need balloons, while secondary schools in Benin have few balloons for teaching team sports, including volleyball.

5. Conclusion

The present study of didactic obedience has been initiated with the aim of highlighting the difficulties encountered by fifth graders learning volleyball. The results of the investigations were analyzed and interpreted using a theoretical framework inspired by concepts mobilized by Chevallard's theory of anthropology of didactics (1992)^[17] and Sensevy's theory of joint didactic action (2007, 2006)^[48, 49].

In addition, concepts related to the teaching of collective sports games of Brau-Antony (2003, 2001)^[12, 13] were used. In synergy with the theoretical framework, we borrowed a methodological approach focused on documentary analysis, audio-visual recording of volleyball class sessions, pre- and post-session interviews with both teachers and post-cycle interviews with students. With reference to Agbodjogbé (2013)^[1] and Amade-Escot (2003)^[4], the data collected were transcribed and processed in the logic of triangulation (Leutenegger 2009, Van Der Maren 1996)^[32, 52].

From the analysis of the results, it appears that the prescribed knowledge and skills are too numerous and unsuitable for the fifth grade students who do not have volleyball in their cognitive universe (Chevallard, 1997)^[16]. Faced with this situation, the teachers make didactic transpositions by filtering from the program, the contents taught to the students.

In the co-construction of the environment favorable to the chronogenesis, the difficulties of the pupils' spring up through the approach used by the teachers and the contents brought into play. The contents taught and which pose problem to the pupils are: the high key, the low service and the rational occupation of the land by rotation.

Faced with the difficulties of the students, the teachers make use at times of the technician approach to the teaching of volleyball. But their subjection to the global game prescribed by official documents forces them to prioritize the dialectical and structural approaches to volleyball instruction that do not facilitate student learning. Despite the failure of students, teachers are in the cumulative logic of learning moving from one content to another and teach the high key, low service and rotation for the rational ground occupation.

The difficulties of success justify the gap between the knowledge and the know-how that the teacher thinks to transmit and the one that the students actually learn. In the same logic, despite the technologico-theoretical discourse, the students do not succeed in realizing the techniques taught. The actors of the didactic system recognize that the game confuses the students who have difficulties to assume the successions of tasks that the game imposes in volleyball. They are often grouped in the same area and leave open spaces in their camp. The consequence is that the ball falls and the teachers do not hide their bitterness during the post-session interviews by saying that "the pupils have difficulties in all the techniques taught to them; more sessions are needed and the equipment is sorely lacking".

In accordance with our hypotheses, the personal and institutional relations of the actors of the didactic system in volleyball, the insufficiency of the material, the density of the contents proposed by the official documents, the subjection of the teachers to the totality and the reduced number of sessions make it possible to explain the difficulties of the students.

6. References

1. Agbodjogbé DB. The implementation of new programs by skills in Benin: from official texts to teaching practices. Didactic analyzes in Physical Education and Sport and in Science of Life and Earth in 5th class. Doctoral thesis. Toulouse: University Toulouse 2, the Mirail (UT2 Le Mirail), 2013, 540p.
2. Agbodjogbé B, Oguéboulé B, Attikleme K, Kpazai G, Djovitou P, Aoun C *et al.* Problem of the use of a tool of evaluation of competences in physical education and sports (EPS) in the secondary schools in Benin: A multiple case study. The university journal of the sciences of education, assempe: Editions Universitaires of the Ivory Coast. 2014; 3:39-60.
3. Amade-Escot C. Knowledge at the heart of didactics. In C. Amade-Escot, (coord), didactics. Paris: Edition Revue EPS, collection Pour l'action, 2007, 11-30.
4. Amade-Escot C. The interactive management of didactic contract in volleyball: layout of environments and regulations of the teacher. In C. Amade-Escot (Ed.), Didactics of Physical Education - State of Research. Paris: Editions of the journal PE, 2003, 240-264.
5. Amade-Escot C, Garnier A, Monnier N. The contractual dynamics of the didactic process. In Didactics coordinated by Chantal Amade-Escot, Paris: Edition Revue EPS, 2007, 31-48.
6. Amans-Passaga C. The teaching of team sports by the teachers of EPS in the framework of the School Sports Association: comparative study of the conceptions of

- some teachers. *Electronic Journal, eJRIEPS*. 2005; 8:4-23.
7. Amans-Passaga C. Taking into account the adversity in volleyball: test-evaluation of a training object. PhD thesis, unpublished. University Paul Sabatier, Toulouse III, 1997.
 8. Atoun CE. Volleyball instruction and training in the Republic of Benin: a comparative didactic analysis. PhD thesis in STAPS. Multidisciplinary Doctoral School: Physical Education, Sport and Human Development. Didactic specialty of APS. INJEPS-UAC Porto-Novo, 2016, 291p.
 9. Atoun C, Agbodjogbé B, Attikléme K, Oguéboulé BM, Kpazai G. The evaluation in collective sports according to the APC in the colleges of Ouémé: the case of the teaching of volleyball. *Educational research: Review of the International Francophone Association for Scientific Research in Education*. WWW. la-recherche-en-education.org. 2015; 13:48-65.
 10. Attikléme K. The comparative analysis of the knowledge taught in swimming in the 6th grade of middle schools and high schools in Benin and France. *Laboratory of Human Sciences and Society of INJEPS / UAC (Benin) and the DiDiST-CREF-T of the University of Toulouse (France)*, 2009, 41-67.
 11. Attikléme K, Kpazai G. Analysis of the evolution of the curricula of the teaching of physical education and sport (EPS) in Republic of Benin from the colonial period to the present day. *Research in Education*, N ° 164, 2011, 83-99.
 12. Brau-Antony S. Characteristics of didactic situations proposed by teachers of EPS as part of the teaching of volleyball. In C. Amade-Escot *Didactic of Physical Education State of Research*, Paris: EPS Review, 2003, 169-192.
 13. Brau-Antony S. The conceptions of physical education and sports teachers on the teaching and evaluation of collective sports games: results of a survey. *STAPS Review No. 56*, 2001, 93-108.
 14. Chevillard Y. Organize the study. Structures and functions. Communication as part of the Summer University of Didactics of Mathematics. Body (Isère), 2002.
 15. Chevillard Y. The analysis of teaching practices in the anthropological theory of didactics. *Research in Didactics of Mathematics*. 1999; 19(2):221-266.
 16. Chevillard Y. The knowledge taught and their school forms of transmission: a didactic point of view. *Skholè*. 1997; 7:101.
 17. Chevillard Y. Fundamental concepts of didactics: perspectives brought by an anthropological approach. *Research in mathematics didactics*, Marseille, University Aix-Marseille II. Flight. 1992; 12(1):73-112.
 18. Chick B. Didactic observation of a master in training during an innovative teaching sequence in collective sports games. *Training Institute for Secondary School Teachers and Masters*, Geneva, 2009.
 19. Cloes M, Lapière M. Analysis of the learning situation proposed in a high school volleyball teaching cycle. *International Volley Tech*. 1995; 4:9-20.
 20. Delignières D, Garsault C. Knowledge and skills in EPS. *EPS Review*. 1999; 280:43-47.
 21. Durand M. Semiological approach to sports training and the teaching of physical and sports education. Communication at the symposium. Analysis of the skills of the sports worker. Act of the VIIIth International Congress of Researchers in Physical and Sports Activities. Conferences and Symposia, Marseille, ACAPS, 1997.
 22. Dürrwächter G. Volleyball: learning and exercising while playing. Editions Vigot 23, Rue de l'Ecole de Médecine 75006 Paris, 1982, 166p.
 23. Gandjèto DUA. The teaching / learning of the 4th class hurdle race in the high schools and colleges of the city of Parakou: case of CEG Okédama. Master's thesis, STAPS, INJEPS-UAC, Porto-Novo, 2015, 59p.
 24. Gréhaigne JF. Student decision-making in team sports. Oral communication. AIESEP Symposium, What do students learn by doing physical and sports activities? Besançon: France, 1999.
 25. Gréhaigne JF. Examples of evaluation practices for collective sports games. *Journal of Physical Education*. 1995; 35(3):125-134.
 26. Gréhaigne JF, Poggi M-P. Introduction. In J.-F. Gréhaigne (coord). *Configurations of the game. Debate of ideas and learning of football and collective sports*, Besançon: University Press of Franche-Comté, 2007, 15-20.
 27. Gréhaigne JF, Richard J-F, Griffin LL. *Teaching and learning team sports and games*. New York: Routledge Falmer, 2005.
 28. Gréhaigne JF, Gotbout P, Bouthier D. The foundations of tactics and strategy in sports teams. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. 1999; 18:159-174.
 29. Gréhaigne JF, Godbout P, Mahut N. Teaching games by understanding - a question review. *Staps*. 1999; 48:81-93.
 30. Jeannin M. EPS program, expected skills in APSA and common foundation of knowledge and skills. France: Créteil, 2011.
 31. Lasnier F. *Succeed in skills training*. (Montreal toronto) Guérin, 2000.
 32. Leutenegger F. The time to teach. Clinical and experimental approach of ordinary didactics in mathematics. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009.
 33. Leutenegger F. Study of didactic interactions in mathematics class: a methodological prototype. *Psychology Bulletin*. 2003; 56(4):559-571.
 34. Marsenach J. The practices of EPS teachers in colleges. *French Review of Pedagogy*. 1989; 89:4-10.
 35. Marsenach J, Mérand R. The formative evaluation in EPS in colleges. Paris: INRF, research collection, 1987.
 36. Martinand JL. Reference practice, didactic transposition and professional knowledge in science and technology. *Education Sciences*. 1989; 2:23-29.
 37. Metzler J. 100 Years of Volleyball Practice: Reflections for PSE Teachers. In P. Goirand & J. Metzler (Dir.), *Sports Techniques and School Culture: A Cultural History of Sport*. Paris: EPS Review, 1996, 145-193.
 38. Ministry of Secondary Education of Technical and Vocational Training, Reconversion and Youth Integration. *Philateral guide, Physical Education and Sports Class 5ème*. Cell generation new programs, Porto-Novo, 2014.
 39. Ministry of Secondary Education of Technical and Vocational Training, Reconversion and Youth Integration. *Program of Study, Physical Education and Sports Class 5th*. Cell generation new programs, Porto-Novo, 2014.
 40. Ministries in charge of Education. *Education Sector Forum: Curricula, Methodological Approaches, Issues*

- and Perspectives. Cotonou, 2007.
41. Odjoussou M. The structuring of the teaching of physical education and sport in Benin from a new program: challenge of a mutation or mutation of an issue. PhD thesis in STAPS. Mention Didactic, Expertise, and Technology in APS Human and Social Science. Reindeer: under the seal of the European University of Brittany, 2010, 312p.
 42. Oguéboulé BM. The issue of sex difference in the teaching / learning process in EPS: a didactic approach to teaching high school volleyball. PhD thesis in STAPS. Multidisciplinary Doctoral School: Physical Education, Sport and Human Development. Didactic specialty of APS. INJEPS-UAC, Porto-Novo, 2017, 285P.
 43. Oguéboulé BM. The emblematic effects of the new EPS program in Benin: the case of SA No.1 in the 6th secondary schools of Ouémé (the Toffa 1st high school and the CEG1 Adjarra). Master thesis Research STAPS, INJEPS-UAC, Porto-Novo, 2008, 45p.
 44. Oguéboulé BM. The teaching of physical education and sports in high schools and colleges in Benin: the place of collective sports. Master's thesis STAPS, INJEPS-UNB, Porto-Novo, 1999, 9-10.
 45. Oguéboulé B, Agbodjogbé B, Attikleme K, Kouété K, Kpazaï G. Adaptation of the curriculum content by EPS skills to the learning context: a reading of three case studies of Javelin teaching in Benin. The university journal of the sciences of education, assempe: Editions Universitaires of the Ivory Coast. N ° 6, 2016, 58-81.
 46. Oguéboulé B, Attikleme K, Agbodjogbe B, Kpazai G, Agbohoui R. The problem of teaching volleyball in homogeneous classes: the case of a teacher intervening at Lycée Toffa I and CEG Djègan-Kpèvi in Porto-Novo, Benin. Annals of the University of Lome, Letters and Human Sciences Series, Presses of the University of Lome. 2015; XXXV(1):235-252.
 47. Perrenoud P. Didactic transposition from practices: from knowledge to skills. Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences. University of Geneva, 1998.
 48. Sensevy G. Categories to describe and understand the joint action. In G. Sensevy & A. Mercier (Eds.). To act together, the joint didactic action of the teacher and the pupils. University Press of Rennes, 2007, 13-49.
 49. Sensevy G. Didactic action: Elements of theorization. Swiss Journal of Educational Sciences. 2006; 28(2). ISSN 1424-3946, Academic Press Friborg, 2006, 205-225.
 50. Toyoda H. Themes of basic individual techniques. In Coach Manual 1. Lausanne: FIVB, 1989, 149-196.
 51. UNESCO. The International Charter of Physical Education and Sport, 1978.
 52. Van Der Maren JM. Research method for education. Brussels: De Boeck, Pedagogy and Development, 1996.
 53. Verret M. The time of studies. State Thesis. Paris: University of Paris V, 1975.