

Toward a Transformation of Practices in Teacher Education **Pour une transformation des pratiques de formation à l'enseignement**

Yves Lenoir

Volume 46, numéro 1, winter 2011

When Adult Education Invites Itself to the Debate About Teacher Development

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1005672ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1005672ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Faculty of Education, McGill University

ISSN

0024-9033 (imprimé)

1916-0666 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Lenoir, Y. (2011). Toward a Transformation of Practices in Teacher Education. *McGill Journal of Education / Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, 46(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1005672ar>

Résumé de l'article

L'article met en évidence la nécessité de modifier en profondeur les processus de formation des futurs enseignants et, par là, leurs pratiques d'enseignement. Dans un premier temps, il avance différents motifs justifiant cette exigence en faisant appel à des facteurs sociaux, économique-politiques, téléologiques et axiologiques, épistémologiques et psychologiques. Dans un deuxième temps, l'article se penche sur les pratiques de formation qui doivent changer en soulignant les modifications apportées aux finalités éducatives, en relavent l'impératif d'une nouvelle approche du rapport au savoir et du rapport tant aux étudiants qu'aux autres formateurs. Enfin, dans un troisième temps, des modalités de changement sont proposées. Sont ainsi abordées la mise en place de conditions appropriées, le pilotage du changement et les transformations elles-mêmes dans les pratiques de formation et dans les processus d'évaluation.

TOWARD A TRANSFORMATION OF PRACTICES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

YVES LENOIR *Université de Sherbrooke*

ABSTRACT. This article underscores the need for a profound transformation in the training processes of future teachers, and thereby in teaching practices. The text first presents various grounds for this transformation, citing social, economic-political, teleological, axiological, epistemological, and psychological factors. It then focuses on teacher development practices that need to change, highlighting the modifications to be brought to educational objectives, and in particular underscoring the essential need for a new approach in terms of relationships to knowledge and to students and other teacher educators. Finally, the article offers approaches for change in teacher education. In so doing, it argues for the establishment of appropriate conditions, the piloting of change, and for changes in the context of training and evaluation processes.

POUR UNE TRANSFORMATION DES PRATIQUES DE FORMATION À L'ENSEIGNEMENT

RÉSUMÉ. L'article met en évidence la nécessité de modifier en profondeur les processus de formation des futurs enseignants et, par là, leurs pratiques d'enseignement. Dans un premier temps, il avance différents motifs justifiant cette exigence en faisant appel à des facteurs sociaux, économique-politiques, téléologiques et axiologiques, épistémologiques et psychologiques. Dans un deuxième temps, l'article se penche sur les pratiques de formation qui doivent changer en soulignant les modifications apportées aux finalités éducatives, en relavent l'impératif d'une nouvelle approche du rapport au savoir et du rapport tant aux étudiants qu'aux autres formateurs. Enfin, dans un troisième temps, des modalités de changement sont proposées. Sont ainsi abordées la mise en place de conditions appropriées, le pilotage du changement et les transformations elles-mêmes dans les pratiques de formation et dans les processus d'évaluation.

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this text is to highlight the need for university professors – and for that matter for primary and secondary school teachers, with certain adaptations in light of the level of instruction and students – to profoundly change their practices relative to the training of future teachers. This matter is hardly the fancy of unhinged or disgruntled individuals seeking to create problems for faculty members. Instead, it is a requirement that has grown

from profound economic, political, social, cultural, and other transformations. Along these lines, Théberge, Bourassa, Lauzon and Huard-Watt (1997) submit that the training model currently in effect must undergo substantial change to adapt to social transformations and new training orientations.

We will approach this subject based on three questions. First, why should practices in teacher education change? In other words, why should trainers change their habits, their familiar ways of thinking and doing things, which they've mastered and with which they are comfortable? This first question necessarily leads us to questioning the reasons for expecting, promoting, or sometimes even imposing change. Second, what needs to change? What aspects should this change address? Third, but certainly not least, how can change be accomplished? How can trainers modify their teaching-training practices?

It is equally important, as a preliminary step, to situate this critical reflection on the practices of teacher education in a framework of adult education. In Quebec, student teachers begin their teacher development at 18 or 19, and complete it four years later at about 22 or 23, normally. We can thus hypothesize that university teacher educators are addressing adults, that is to say, human beings who have achieved their physical growth and have developed, in a way that suggests they are balanced and mature, the intellectual abilities needed for engaging with life in a reflective, responsible, and autonomous way. The orientations that ground the perspective we develop here are built on the need to treat these students as adults and, more specifically, as teachers growing in strength. We thus reject any tendency to "mother" these students or any concept or practice that could infantilize them or consider them to be immature beings.

WHY CHANGE? A PARTIAL LIST OF REASONS

Many reasons or factors lead to the need to change practices in teacher education. Without attempting to provide an exhaustive survey, we will present a few of these reasons, in no particular order.

First, social factors related to the evolution of human relationships have created the need for a transformation in educational systems in view of changing teaching/learning relationships, and this implies a prerequisite or at least concomitant change in training. The democratization of social relationships – and hence the rejection of elitist advantages underpinning the training of a privileged class – has led to the conception of a school open to all students regardless of their socio-economic, cultural, and religious background. Access to education is a social norm that requires the consideration of teaching practices of social and physical differences of all kinds. In addition, a growing concern has developed for questions of social justice and equity, as well as equal opportunity. Debates in the West increasingly extend from strictly economic questions of class struggle to include social matters, particularly those related

to the recognition of the human dimension – human dignity and self-respect – for all human beings. These orientations influence policies and educational sensibilities, ruling out processes of discrimination and segregation.

Although in our capitalist societies most social conflicts have primarily concerned economic inequalities over the past two centuries (Caillé, 2004), the question of recognition has in the last few decades become increasingly central to debates (Lazzeri and Caillé, 2004), to the extent that Fraser (2004) describes it as “the paradigmatic form of political conflict” (p. 151, our translation). Expressed through the various women’s, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, and other movements, these debates seek the acceptance, respect, and acknowledgment of identity-related specificities, both individual and collective. Economic exploitation and redistribution have been supplanted by – or in some cases supplemented with – socio-cultural domination and the denial of socio-cultural recognition. These are the primary reasons for feelings of social injustice. This change in the reading of social relationships requires the establishment of new relationships between educational players in school settings, based on equity, respect for others, and social justice.

Second, numerous economical-political factors related to transformations in the capitalist world call for profound changes in educational systems. The neo-capitalism strongly established since the 1980s and supported by neoliberal ideology has imposed new expectations for educational systems. We will only mention four that nonetheless clearly show the expected transformations. To begin with, the social and economic cost of failure and dropout within the secondary school context – which translates into a loss of social status, an inability to find qualified work, and a resulting social burden (unemployment, social assistance, etc.) – has led governments to adopt various measures to promote academic perseverance and success. It also, however, demands the institutionalization of a system based on competitiveness, performance, and accountability. The concern for efficiency and the cost-quality-results relation is another predominant theme in the educational world. Finally, these economical-political changes have imposed a new governance of educational systems through changes in hierarchical power relations, with the introduction of accountability at all levels and the need for active participation and inter-relations in activities.

Third, teleological and axiological factors relative to the aims of educational systems have led to their transformation. The traditional school formed an elite group, a minuscule percentage of the population, essentially made up of individuals from favoured and dominant classes. The phenomenon of massification has led to the conception of different aims in education, especially since the number of years of schooling has been raised. Thus, for instance, the need for a qualified labour force and for high-level technicians and professionals is increasingly felt, and the foremost aim of transmitting culture and traditional values tends to be replaced by occupational training.

Fourth, epistemic factors related to the results of research conducted over the past 50 years have led to the consideration that the relation to knowledge is a determining factor in more ways than one. Much work, including that of Bourdieu and the New Sociology of Education in Great Britain, has clearly shown the role played by knowledge in social selection. Works in line with this British current in the 1960s on the structuring of teaching content and its modes of transmission have highlighted, among other things, the effect of the stratification of school subjects on socio-educational processes. Bernstein (1971, 1997a, 1997b) and Young (1971), who distinguish between “collection” and “integrated” curricula, especially underline the intrinsic hierarchical nature of the former and the powerful process of social selection and control it implies, as well as the higher social status of teachers who teach subjects judged to be more important. According to Bernstein (1971), “How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control” (p. 47). In addition to noting the existence of a significant ideological undertone in certain academic subjects, Bernstein advances that the curricular structuring itself is a carrier for sociological-ideological options subservient to a certain conception of power relations in a given society. Far from transmitting disinterested scientific knowledge, the educational disciplines reflect and maintain the distribution of power in society and, as a result, are socially determined. Bernstein (1975) also states that

formal educational knowledge can be considered to be realized through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught. The term, educational knowledge code . . . refers to the underlying principles which shape curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation (p. 264).

In sum, specific forms of knowledge are canonized at the curricular level and power reifies and calcifies these forms to its advantage.

It should be noted that teachers are currently expected to train individuals not only to possess knowledge, but also — and especially — to be able to implement it. Knowledge consequently becomes an indispensable and unavoidable means, but the fundamental aim is the ability to implement this knowledge in new, innovative, and complex situations.

Besides the disciplinary compartmentalization and social hierarchization of school disciplines, Beillerot (1989), Charlot (1997), and Lenoir (2005) have highlighted the epistemic centrality of the relation human beings have to knowledge as well as their need to (re)construct it. In the traditional conception of education, knowledge has three possible distinct and complementary conceptions. It is either the product of a revelation that can be transcendent or handed down from “scholars;” the result of a contemplation, with knowledge

having been produced in the past; or the result of a disclosure, with knowledge being the product of a planned process, conceived and managed by specialists. In all cases, however, it has been grasped as a pre-existing “given,” as a reified object to transmit. Today, however, it is important to conceive the relation to knowledge in a different way.

Fifth, numerous psychological factors, related among other things to transformations in students, call for a profound change in the dynamic of teaching/learning relationships. We will note here only two factors, though many others could be mentioned. Firstly, world events find their way into our homes immediately through television and especially the internet. Technological transformations in communication means have radically changed conceptions of the world, particularly among young people, who are increasingly familiar with these new technologies. Secondly, the ways of thinking and sensibilities, if not values, of these young people substantially differ from those of previous generations, and school no longer has a monopoly on knowledge or training. We must therefore acknowledge our obligation to differently conceive teaching/training approaches.

WHAT SHOULD BE CHANGED? A LOOK AT TRAINING PRACTICES

It is of course practices in teacher education that must be modified to favour changes in teaching practices, along with structural revisions – for example concerning the curriculum and organizational management – which we will not address here. But what does this mean? Without presenting an exhaustive review, we will examine four dimensions of the change that we believe must occur, and which cannot be neglected by trainers of future teachers.

First, the system of teacher education and its various stakeholders (leaders and teachers) must seek a transformation of their relation to educational aims. In a 1967 article, Bourdieu – who preferred to speak of functions rather than aims, to highlight the collective rather than individual nature of these matters – distinguishes between internal functions relative to preservation (cultural legitimization, passing on the cultural heritage, self-perpetuation) and external functions relative to adaptation (both social, i.e. integration into society, and economic, i.e. adaptation to economic needs through preparation for an occupation). He thus underlines the overlapping of these functions, their heterogeneity and irreducibility, and the possibility for governments to promote some of these to the detriment of others. Whatever the aims chosen and the choices relative to society, it is important in our view to appropriate three complementary perspectives: adopting a logic of complexity (Morin, 1990) rather than of simplification; adopting a logic of action rather than an encyclopedic logic, in view of the professionalization of the teaching occupation; and uniting the mind, the hand, and the heart. This last perspective respectively involves closely associating the epistemological perspective of meaning (the

questions of the why and the what, the knowledge), the perspective of acting (doing), and the perspective of attitudes (*savoir-être* or knowing how to be) in teaching and training processes.

Second, it is important to change the relation to knowledge, that is, to go from an additive and cumulative vision of knowledge to an integrative, if not interdisciplinary, one. The question of knowledge also requires that we pose three epistemic questions: Firstly, what is the status of knowledge, or to put it otherwise, what is our understanding of the nature of knowledge? Secondly, how is knowledge accessed – in other words, given the answer to the first question, how can one conceive of the way human beings acquire knowledge? Thirdly, what modes should be established to enable this access or, to put it otherwise, given the answers to the two preceding questions, what means, resources, devices, and the like should be used to enable human beings to learn? These epistemological questions also bring up the question of meaning, which, as Fabre (1999) has noted, has three inter-related and inseparable dimensions: the propositional nature of knowledge, or its comprehensibility as a relation to concepts (the epistemological perspective); the reference of the object of meaning, or the relation to the world that it permits, rather than the sole reference to some school knowledge (the sociological perspective); the manifestation of the object of knowledge, or the relation to the subject who is questioning him- or herself (the psychological perspective) and that is related to the functionality of knowledge. It is this perspective that Fabre (1999) supports – and here, we are already imagining what kinds of changes need to be implemented – a problem-situation must be founded on constant questioning, must implicate reliance on a process of conceptualization, anchored in the social life and meaning-making of students.

Third, it is necessary to change one's relationship with students. We will treat only four aspects that we nevertheless consider fundamental. First, it is imperative to consider each student in his or her singularity, and this implies the establishment of differentiated pedagogy. Second, it is just as important to take into account the learning and experience already acquired by the student rather than seeing a *tabula rasa*, a blank page. Third, and consequently, it is essential to conceive of the teaching/learning process as work that deals with error as a fundamental part of learning. Rather than being penalized, error would be addressed by pedagogical intervention; it is precisely this error that justifies and legitimizes the teacher's work. Fourth, it is equally important to consider students as human beings in their own right, regardless of their social status, ethnic background, culture, etc. These are human beings who have rights (not only responsibilities) and are to be respected, hence the importance of recognizing them in their dual dimension, singular (unique beings) and universal (members of the human community). This, thus, implies that we need to implement relational and socio-affective dimensions that are sufficient to

create favourable conditions for putting into play students' learning processes. Moreover, the conception of teaching must go from a vision of transmitting knowledge to one of being a mediator. This means that a teacher-trainer's responsibility is to establish the conditions judged to be most favourable – in view of the context and certain constraints – to favour, stimulate, support, and regulate learning processes, the relation students establish with teaching content. To put it otherwise, teachers are in charge of the conditions for learning, but the students remain responsible for their learning. Furthermore, in the frame of initial teacher education, the students are adults at least 19-20 years old in their first year of university and at least 23-24 years old upon completing their training. They should, as a result, be treated foremost as adults rather than students, especially since they are future teachers. We will come back to this aspect later.

Fourth, relationships with colleagues also need to change. The individualist and compartmentalized vision of teaching is no longer appropriate. Secrecy and opacity in professional activities carried out in isolation must be supplanted by collaboration and partnership aiming to better facilitate training in a coherent and integrative horizontal and vertical perspective. The perspective of complexity necessitates partnerships based on organizational modes that break through isolated teaching and draw on interdisciplinary approaches.

HOW CAN CHANGE BE EFFECTED? MODES TO IMPLEMENT

Changes in teaching-training practices cannot be based on a teacher's individual will. They must primarily be founded on an institutional policy decision and a structure of governance sustaining this decision throughout the change process. An innovative process must take place. A number of conditions for successful innovative change in education have been summarized by Collerette (2005), by Nutley, Percy-Smith and Solesbury (2003), and by Rohrbach, Ringwalt, Ennett and Vincus (2005), and include the following:

- Consistency between the project of change and the values and beliefs of the potential users: teachers, directors, administrators, parents, etc.
- Consistency between the expectations and needs of users and the characteristics of the project.
- Users' perception of self-efficacy (leaders, teachers, and students).
- User involvement in the change process.
- The need for a piloting committee to guide and regulate the change process on an ongoing basis.
- Strong leadership and active coordination of leaders in the piloting of activities.

- The existence, when it comes to actions and expected results, of clear and permanent directives that can nevertheless be adapted according to the dynamic of change.
- A truly collaborative climate and the implementation of a culture of participation as concerns educational institutions.
- A solid level of training and support in all phases of the change process.
- The availability of time and material resources.
- The availability of human and financial resources.
- The quality and importance of regularly disseminating results.
- The establishment of regular and sustained contact between those disseminating knowledge and users, and a set time for sharing this knowledge.

It should be kept in mind that the question of piloting a change in training begins with a policy decision that can be taken within an institution. For example medical training at Sherbrooke University was rethought, and has, as a result, adopted (for almost 20 years) a problem-based approach excluding any formal education, so that classrooms have even been eliminated. Similarly, certain engineering training programs at the same university are today conceived based on a project-based approach and, right from the first weeks of training, grant central importance to the multi-referential and multi-dimensional facets of a complex professional practice. We likewise believe that teacher training must be re-conceptualized, especially so as to eliminate the sterile and dangerous opposition between theory and practice, as well as other traditional modes and conceptions of action still implemented that hinder the improvement of educational processes in a democratic context.

We would like to add six other conditions for change in line with the practice of teaching-training. It is important first to conceive of one's practice differently by clearly answering the six following questions, thus explicitly circumscribing the dimensions addressed by a curriculum:

1. What are the socio-educational aims pursued by the education (training) involved and what learning is targeted as a result (the "why" of teaching)?
2. What are the objects of learning and training, that is, what content stated in the curriculum must be taught (the "what" of teaching)?
3. Which students are targeted by the teacher-training in terms of psychological, social, economic, and cultural background (the "to whom" of teaching)? On this point, we consider that future teachers should be seen not as students, but as potential and up-and-coming teachers, thus bringing to the fore the questions of responsibility, ethics, and professional conduct in the professional training process. Rather than see themselves as mere doers of tasks (Tardif and

Lessard, 1999), they would consider themselves active players involved in an individual and collective process of analysing and developing competencies, going “from consumption predetermined by experts to active involvement” (Conseil supérieur de l’éducation, 2004, p. 56). The question of “recognition,” in the Hegelian sense, each day appears to us more fundamental.

4. What are the teacher-training modes adopted (the “how” of teaching)? On this subject it would be important to design alternation processes [practical] involving closer collaboration between the university and practice settings to strengthen the link between theory and practice. It would also be relevant to conceive of training in an interdisciplinary frame so as to inscribe it within the paradigm of complexity and enable the elaboration of multi-referentialized and multi-dimensional training situations from an integrative standpoint. This could require the formation of training teams rather than only thinking of training in the additive and cumulative terms of successive courses.

5. What resources are drawn on to carry out this teaching-training (the “with what” of teaching)?

6. How are these five dimensions articulated and how do they allow for meeting the pursued objectives and objects of teaching-training (Lenoir, Maubant, Hasni, Lebrun, Zaid, Habboub et McConnell, 2007).

A change in practices of this magnitude also rests on the consideration of teaching practices still in use, regardless of education level (from preschool to university). The participants’ acceptance and follow-through will result from, among other things, the consideration of their everyday common-sense practices, their ways of doing things in the frame of an occupational habitus. Drawing on these practices as a point of departure will enable a critical and reflective approach, thus avoiding top-down and “applicationist” approaches. The training models currently in place, top-down and prescriptive, have proven ineffective. Meirieu (1988) objects to “the ‘applicationist’ model in education, a dangerous old illusion according to which one needs only analyse a situation as completely as possible to deduce the principles and modes of educational action” (p. 143, our translation). Based on European research and various North American research work, Charlier (1989), shows the impasse created by such normative and “impositional” approaches. Bru (1994), for his part, highlights the impasse resulting from recourse to any method at all, as “it is vain to try to define a teaching method universally superior to all others” (p. 104). He also highlights that “theoretical models are generally models for the practice of teaching, but one should rather endeavour to construct models of teaching practice in its complexity, its tensions, its contradictions, its contextualization” (p. 104, our translation).

As previously mentioned, one prerequisite for change concerns the need to ascribe meaning to learning. This requires the anchoring of teaching in situa-

tions. At the heart of the teaching/learning process one finds not the student (psychologizing excess), the knowledge (epistemological excess), or the teacher (demiurgical excess), as Meirieu (1985) has well shown. It is the teaching/learning situation that lies at the heart of the teaching/learning process. This notion should not be understood in its common sense dimension, but rather drawn on as a theoretical construct in accordance with the works in which it was developed. We are here referring to the didactic conception of the situation (Brousseau, 1972, 1986), to its psychological conception (Vergnaud, 1992, 2000), to its functional conception as found in professional didactics (Pastré, 2002, 2008; Mayen, 2001, 2004) and its anthropological conception (Freire, 1972, 1974, 2005). These various conceptions are examined in a special journal issue that will be published in October 2011 (Lenoir et Tupin, in press).

Regardless of the theoretical perspective adopted, in our view teacher-training must be anchored in situations according to three perspectives involving a number of dimensions:

- A socio-educational perspective tied to the evolution of the educational system and to social realities (contextual and historical dimensions).
- A socio-educational perspective tied to the teacher's frame of reference, both external (curricular dimensions) and internal (epistemological, socio-affective, moral, and ethical dimensions).
- An operational perspective representing the actualization of this frame of reference in teaching practices (didactic, psychoeducational, organizational, and mediating dimensions).

Consequently, it can be seen that trainers – and hence teachers – must define themselves as mediators, that is, individuals who take on the responsibility of offering conditions judged most favourable to promote the student application of learning processes.

Finally, the question of evaluation is an intrinsic part of teaching/learning situations and does not appear only from the standpoint of evaluating cognitive learning, since, in a curricular perspective, objects of teaching cannot be reduced to cognitive knowledge. Instead, they encompass other types of *savoir* (knowledge), *savoir-faire* (knowing how to do,) and *savoir-être* (knowing how to be) that must be actualized in a *savoir-agir* (knowing how to act) required by the competency-based approach. But the question of evaluation is also directly related to the teaching-training practices implemented. Indeed, from a curricular perspective evaluation must be considered from two angles: first, that of evaluating the competency acquired by pupils as a product of learning and as a process used to acquire this learning, and, second, that of implementing the official curriculum, which is delivered (rather than merely learned) while taking into account the dimensions we have discussed above – in this case the evaluation of teaching becomes inseparable from the evaluation of learning.

To conclude, we would like to illustrate what we have proposed using a concrete example related to the evaluation of learning, conceptualized according to the logic of the competency-based approach. We have been teaching the course *FFE 413-Fondements de l'éducation et système scolaire au Québec* (educational foundations and the Quebec educational system) offered in the fourth and final year of the preschool and primary school education baccalaureate at the Faculty of Education at the Sherbrooke University. Offered to future teachers primarily concerned with the intensive (four month, full teaching workload) practicum and with searching for a teaching job for the following year, this course was not central to their concerns and was treated as a *pensum* to suffer through.

With two, then three colleagues – and with the assistance of a colleague from another faculty and support from assistants in a spirit of collaboration and partnership – we brought together the groups (some 160 students between 23-24 years old) and shared the 45-hour workload. We chose 13 themes on current and thought-provoking questions that constitute essential issues in education as well as problems encountered today by future teachers in school settings. These include immigration and the school; professionalization and the professional identity; social stakes in education: equity, religion, and secularism; recognition; culture, the school, and teachers; school-family-community relations; aims of the school in a globalization context; pedagogical movements; major currents in sociology and psychology; etc. Cognitive content, which is generally little-known or unknown to teachers, was addressed based on situations from Quebec and Canadian social life, current debates in society (or extending beyond it owing to their stakes), problems encountered in the realities of schools, Quebec educational orientations or policies, etc.

The 13 sessions (if we exclude the first and last) were organized as follows:

- Mandatory readings before each course on the current theme, along with guiding questions.
- A formal PowerPoint presentation of roughly 90 minutes highlighting the essential aspects of the theme and presented to all four groups in an auditorium.
- A roughly 90-minute period, in separate classrooms, for discussion with the future teachers in each of the four groups. This period was hosted by one of the professors and addresses the content of the presentation as well as questions of the future teachers concerning the prior readings and guiding questions, some of which required the establishment of links between course content and various aspects of the teaching function.

As for evaluation, consistent with what we have presented, we propose among other things (since three evaluations are required according to faculty regulations for undergraduate studies) a written assignment – completed in groups of two or maximally three students – comprising a letter of one to five pages

addressed to the Quebec ministry of education on one of the current issues in the Quebec educational system. The issue chosen must be in line with one of the themes seen in class. The letter must take stock of the situation considered a socio-educational issue, show what makes this an issue, highlight its components by referring to publications, survey debates on the subject, and finally advance propositions in view of correcting or adjusting the situation. Since this is a group assignment, the submitted document must of course include the final version of the letter along with a page of bibliographical references consulted, as well as all supporting material produced by the students, organized chronologically: rough drafts, notes, emails, various previous versions, etc. This method affords a look at the processes of production, of consulting proposed resources, and of documentary research. These steps are currently carried out using an integrated online system, namely Moodle, which also permits various types of follow-up. The best letters are then sent to the ministry, signed by their authors. A somewhat similar evaluative process is used for individual work related to the required readings.

In this way, we intend to implement the contextual and integrative dimensions in a meaningful situation underpinned by an explicit intention, and requiring the mobilization of knowledge, and the use of a heuristic inter-subjective and progressive path.

CONCLUSION

Changing one's training practice can certainly result from an individual choice. Many teachers engage in a significant process of change throughout their careers. Institutional change, however, requires more than individual wills. It demands a political will – mobilized not from a position of power held by institutional leaders, but primarily from one of accepting leadership (Zaleznik, 1970). As we have noted elsewhere (Lenoir, 2004),

leadership, which Tannenbaum, Weschler and Massarik (1961) define as “interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals” (p. 24), sets itself apart, by its unstable and situational character, from formal power that is permanent and instantaneous, and from competence that is permanent and evolving. It also distinguishes itself from expertise, owing to the principal factors of recognition, personality, the position and the situation – rather than sets of skills – and owing to the pursued aim: that of leading and convincing – as opposed to acting as a consultant and ultimately serving as a model of reference (Lenoir, 2004, p. 15).

While the importance of leadership is fundamental, and if the active presence of leaders is essential to the success of a change process, so is the maintenance of objectives and orientations. There is nothing worse than changing, let alone replacing them. The modes implemented must, however, be adapted, adjusted, and regulated; they cannot be set in stone. Hence the need for an initial and

ongoing consultation phase. Collerette (2005) attributes lack of success in organizational change to six main factors: insufficient promoters and support; insufficient priority; the absence of a common reading; brief and inadequate efforts; inadequate management; and insufficient monitoring. Change can only be effected if, in the initial awareness of the need for such a change, there is a shared reading of problems within the institution, a mobilization of influential players who might play a leadership role, a critical mass of partisans, and a well-documented and well-argued presentation of the problem written in clear and simple terms and highlighting that the problem is an important issue for concerned players and from a social and contextual standpoint.

In short, a change in training practices will not happen overnight. It will require an in-depth preparation phase to put pressure on concerned players and involve them in a methodical, rigorous, and stimulating process of change. If significant progress has been made in the last decade, a Copernican revolution is still to come in teacher education, and appears necessary if we are to support and achieve consistency with the logic of professionalization.

REFERENCES

- Beillerot, J. (1989). Le rapport au savoir: une notion en formation. Dans J. Beillerot, A. Bouillet, C. Blanchard-Laville et N. Mosconi, *Savoir et rapport au savoir. Élaborations théoriques et cliniques* (pp. 165-202). Paris: Éditions Universitaires.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (dir.), *Knowledge and control. New directions for the sociology of education* (pp. 47-69). London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Langage et classes sociales. Codes socio-linguistiques et contrôle social*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Bernstein, B. (1997a). Écoles ouvertes, sociétés ouvertes? Dans J.-C. Forquin (dir.), *Les sociologues de l'éducation américains et britanniques. Présentation et choix de textes* (pp. 155-164). Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.
- Bernstein, B. (1997b). À propos du curriculum. Dans J.-C. Forquin (dir.), *Les sociologues de l'éducation américains et britanniques. Présentation et choix de textes* (pp. 165-171). Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.
- Bourdieu, P. (1967). Fins et fonctions du système d'enseignement. *Les cahiers de l'INAS*, 1, 25-31.
- Brousseau, G. (1972). Processus de mathématisation. *Bulletin de l'Association des professeurs de mathématiques de l'enseignement public*, 51(282), 57-84.
- Brousseau, G. (1986). Fondements et méthodes de la didactique des mathématiques. *Recherches en didactique des mathématiques*, 7(2), 33-115.
- Bru, M. (1994). L'enseignant, organisateur des conditions d'apprentissage. Dans J. Houssaye (dir.), *La pédagogie: une encyclopédie pour aujourd'hui* (pp. 103-117). Paris: ESF.
- Caillé, A. (2004). Présentation. *Revue du MAUSS*, 23, 5-28.
- Charlier, E. (1989). *Planifier un cours, c'est prendre des décisions*. Bruxelles: De Boeck-Westmael.
- Charlot, B. (1997). *Du rapport au savoir. Éléments pour une théorie*. Paris: Economica-Anthropos.
- Collerette, P. (2005). *Conditions pour réussir un changement sur une grande échelle*. Conférence lors du colloque "La problématique de la réussite éducative des jeunes estriens" organisé par la Table estrienne de concertation interordres en éducation, Centre d'arts d'Orford, Magog, 28 novembre.

- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (2004). *Un nouveau souffle pour la profession enseignante. Avis au ministre de l'Éducation*. Québec: Conseil supérieur de l'éducation.
- Fabre, M. (1999). *Situations-problèmes et savoir scolaire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Fraser, N. (2004). Justice sociale, redistribution et reconnaissance. *La revue du MAUSS*, 23, 151-164.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Conciencia crítica y liberación. Pedagogía del oprimido*. Bogotá: Editores América Latina.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Concientización. Teoría y práctica de la liberación*. Bogotá: Asociación de Publicaciones Educativas.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogía de la esperanza*. México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Lazzeri, C. et Caillé, A. (2004). La reconnaissance aujourd'hui. Enjeux théoriques, éthiques et politiques du concept. *Revue du MAUSS*, 23, 88-115.
- Lenoir, Y. (2004). L'enseignant expert: regard critique sur une notion non dépourvue d'intérêt pour la recherche sur les pratiques enseignantes. *Recherche et formation*, 47, 9-23.
- Lenoir, Y. (2005). Comment caractériser la fonction enseignante? *Puzzle*, 19, 5-18.
- Lenoir, Y., Maubant, P., Hasni, A., Lebrun, J., Zaid, A., Habboub, E. et McConnell, A.-C. (2007). *À la recherche d'un cadre conceptuel pour analyser les pratiques d'enseignement*. Sherbrooke: Faculté d'éducation, CRCIE et CRIE (Documents du CRIE et de la CRCIE n° 2).
- Lenoir, Y. et Tupin, F. (in press). Revisiter la notion de situation: approches plurielles. *Recherches en éducation*.
- Mayen, P. (2001). Dynamique de la pensée et processus d'élaboration pragmatique. Dans G. Vergnaud (dir.), *Qu'est-ce que la pensée? Les compétences complexes dans l'éducation et le travail* (pp. 30-41). Paris: Hachette.
- Mayen, P. (2004). Le couple situation-activité. Sa mise en œuvre dans l'analyse du travail en didactique professionnelle. Dans J.-F. Marcel et P. Rayou (dir.), *Recherches contextualisées en éducation* (pp. 29-39). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Meirieu, P. (1985). *L'école mode d'emploi. Des "méthodes actives" à la pédagogie différenciée*. Paris: ESF.
- Meirieu, Ph. (1988). Les acquis des recherches-action: rigueur et pertinence. Dans M.-A. Hugon et C. Seibel (dir.), *Recherches impliquées – Recherches action: le cas de l'éducation* (pp. 142-145). Bruxelles: De Boeck/Éditions universitaires.
- Morin, E. (1990). *Science avec conscience*. Paris: Seuil (1re éd. 1982).
- Nutley, S., Percy-Smith, J. & Solesbury, W. (2003). *Models of research impact: A cross-sector review of literature and practice building effective research: 4*. London: Learning and Skills Research Center. Retrieved from <[http://www.cf.ac.uk/socsi/capacity/Activities/Themes/ Impact/LSDA_models_of_research_impact.pdf](http://www.cf.ac.uk/socsi/capacity/Activities/Themes/Impact/LSDA_models_of_research_impact.pdf)>.
- Pastré, P. (2002). L'analyse du travail en didactique professionnelle. *Revue française de pédagogie*, 138, 9-17.
- Pastré, P. (2008). Apprentissage et activité. Dans Y. Lenoir et P. Pastré (dir.), *Didactique professionnelle et didactiques disciplinaires en débat. Un enjeu pour la professionnalisation des enseignants* (pp. 53-79). Toulouse. Éditions Octarès.
- Rohrbach, L. A., Ringwalt, C. L., Ennett, S. T. & Vincus, A. A. (2005). Factors associated with adoption of evidence-based substance use prevention curricula in US school district. *Health Education Research*, 20(5), 514-526.
- Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R. & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tardif, M. et Lessard, C. (1999). *Le travail enseignant au quotidien. Contribution à l'étude du travail dans les métiers et les professions d'interactions humaines*. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Théberge, M., Bourassa, M., Lauzon, Y. et Huard-Watt, G. (1997). Vers un modèle de cohérence entre formation pratique et formation théorique. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, XXIII(2), 245-370.

Vergnaud, G. (1992). Qu'est-ce que la didactique? En quoi peut-elle intéresser la formation des adultes peu qualifiés? *Éducation permanente*, 111, 19-31.

Vergnaud, G. (2000). Apprentissage et didactique en formation professionnelle. Dans J.-C. Ruano-Borbalan (dir.), *Savoirs et compétences en éducation, formation et organisation* (pp. 127-145). Paris: Éditions Démos.

Young, M. F. D. (1971). An approach to the study of curricula as socially organized knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education* (pp. 19-46). London: Collier Macmillan.

Zaleznik, A. (1970). Power and politics in organizational life. *Harvard Business Review*, 48(3), 47-60.

YVES LENOIR holds a doctorate in the sociology of knowledge and is full professor at the Faculty of Education of the University of Sherbrooke, where he is holder of the Canada Research Chair in Educative Intervention. His research deals with analysis of teaching practices and teacher education practices.

YVES LENOIR docteur en sociologie de la connaissance, ets professeur titulaire à la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université de Sherbrooke et titulaire de la Chaire de recherché senior du Canada sur l'intervention éducative. Ses travaux portent sur l'analyse des pratiques d'enseignement et de formation à l'enseignement.