1- Project title – Instruction and Socialization among Primary School Teachers: An International Comparison (ISEP-CI)[1]

2- Reasons leading to the event

2.1 Origins– The ISEP-CI project stems from a confluence of three factors. **First**, the findings of research performed by the Canada Research Chair in Educative Intervention (CRCIE)[2] have shown the existence of strong tension, among Quebec teachers of primary school, between the missions of instruction and socialization (Lebrun, Araújo-Oliveira et Lenoir, 2010; Lenoir, 2006, 2009, 2012*a*, under press) adopted by the Ministry of Education (MEQ) in 1997 as overarching aims during the school system reform. The same situation has been noted among future teachers, as suggested by ongoing analysis of recently collected data (Lebrun, Lenoir et Thomas, 2011). This tension has been chosen as the third area of research[3] for the CRCIE to pursue in his second mandate (2008-2015). **Second**, numerous international meetings, in the context of conferences—such as those on applied psychology in Romania and those of the OPEN network in France and the Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE) in Turkey— as well as meetings related to my duties as president of the World Association for Educational Research (AMSE-AMCE-WAER) have, from 2000 to 2012, led me to engage in dialogue with colleagues from various countries on issues in line with education, reform, and the attributes of reform as implemented in various countries. **Third**, collaborative efforts with foreign colleagues regarding research and publications, including an international symposium funded by the SSHRC in 2010 and bringing together 13 researchers from different countries (*Les pratiques des enseignants face à l'exigence de la réussite: instruire et/ou socialiser? Un croisement international de regards sociologiques et anthropologiques* [teaching practices in light of the requirement of success: to instruct and/or to socialize? An international crossroads of sociological and anthropological perspectives] [Lenoir et Tupin, 2012*a*]), have highlighted that although all these societies implement an education system reform that mainly draws on a competency-based approach, the motives, issues and even overall aims can differ. To give an example, in Brazil, when it comes to the aims of national education, the *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional* (Gouvernement du Brésil, 1996) emphasizes civic education, as well as qualification to prepare students for employment. This law more generally deals with education and teaching. **In sum**, the aims adopted in this case are not necessarily the same as those adopted elsewhere, and the meaning they are given can also vary substantially.

2.2 Problem – Schnapper (1994) recalls that "all those who have had the ambition of inventing a nation have veritably worshipped the school" (p. 132). The ancient and inexhaustible debate surrounding the aims of the school has given rise to the most contentious of controversies. As Lee Boggs wrote in 1970, "Education today is a great obsession. It is also a great necessity" (p. 18). Just as the epistemological dimension can be used to understand teaching practices, educational aims can be powerful indicators to grasp the explicit and implicit orientations of school systems. They also reveal theoretical, meaning-related and value-related functions of these orientations, as well as expected empirical and operational

---

[1] French title: *Instruction et socialisation chez les enseignants du primaire: une comparaison internationale.* All translations in this text are ours.

[2] *Tension instruction-socialisation dans l'enseignement primaire* [tension between instruction and socialization in primary education], CRSH 2011-2014, nº 410-2011-1383 (Y. Lenoir; Hasni, Lebrun, Moldoveanu *et al.*); *Que sont les savoirs devenus? Analyse de pratiques d'enseignement au primaire* [what has become of knowledge? Analysis of teaching practices in primary school], CRSH 2007-2010, nº 410-2007-1909 (Y. Lenoir; Hasni, Lebrun *et al.*); *Contribution au développement d'un référentiel professionnel basé sur la pratique enseignante: à quelles compétences professionnelles les enseignants du primaire recourent et disent recourir dans leur pratique?* [a contribution to developing a professional framework based on teaching practice: what professional competencies do teachers use and say that they use in their practice?], CRSH 2004-2007, nº 410-2004-1887 (Y. Lenoir; Hasni, Lebrun *et al.*); *Rapports entre curriculum et intervention éducative dans l'enseignement primaire québécois* [relations between curriculum and educational intervention in Quebec primary education], CRSH 2011-2014, nº 410-2001-0628 (Y. Lenoir *et al.*).

[3] The two other areas are 1) interpretations of the curriculum by key players and 2) analysis of practices in their interactions with students.

procedures in teaching-learning practices. Certain authors (Crampe-Casnabet, 1985; Dottrens, 1964; Gutek, 1988; Reboul, 1971; Steutel and Spiecke, 1999) have shown that multiple issues are at play and that control over educational orientations in schools first and foremost has to do with political, economic, ideological, cultural and other factors rather than didactic or pedagogical ones. An analysis of educational aims provides a way to understand their anchoring in social reality; the meaning that they give to the educational process; the issues and objectives that they convey; and their concrete recommendations for actualization in the classroom. The question of educational aims is therefore a crucial and "burning" topic. When examining both official discourse and scientific or non-scientific documentation, three educational objectives emerge (also referred to as missions, aims or functions, depending on the author) that characterize the very purpose of the school: to instruct, to socialize and to provide qualifications. Although these three aims are mentioned explicitly in Quebec (Gouvernement du Québec, 1997, 2001), they are scarcely explained in official texts and are consequently liable to be interpreted in multiple ways by different players in educational settings, starting with teachers (Lenoir, 2009). In addition, a tendency has been observed among Quebec teachers of primary school to over-value the function of socialization and to minimize that of instruction, and hence disciplinary knowledge, as attested by group discussions, planning meetings, and analyses of videotaped teaching-learning activities (Lenoir, 2006, 2009, 2012*a*, under press). This trend can be observed in a number of countries (Lenoir et Tupin, 2012*a*). Such findings, brought to light by other publications (for example Ecclestone et Hayes, 2009; Kramer, 1991; Moskowitz, 2001; Nolan, 1998; Oser et Baeriswyl, 2001), underscore the trend toward "therapyization" in North American schools. An in-depth review of some 80 English- and French-language publications has led us to hypothesize a trend toward therapeutic education (Lenoir, 2012*b*). A Brazilian researcher, in an article on the submission of the Brazilian curriculum to the market economy, (Lopes, 2002) has also noted this trend in Brazil, in spite of other social and cultural aspects considered. Similar observations have been made by other researchers in their respective countries (Lenoir et Tupin, 2012*a*). As indicated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1995), the function of socialization may be prevailing over that of instruction. Research findings, confirmed by our most recent SSHRC research (2007-2011) or the thesis of Araújo-Oliveira (2010), along with the diminished place given to knowledge, points to the strong presence, in teaching practices, of facilitators (*see "reference framework" section*) that are pursued as educational aims in themselves rather than as indispensable mechanisms to support cognitive learning processes. Oser and Baeriswyl (2001) suggest that this current, described as humanist, North American, individualist, psychologizing, and therapeutic, becomes a factor that inhibits learning processes. In addition, as a number of researchers have underscored, primary school teachers constantly invoke three notions to describe the educational aims that they claim to pursue in class with their students: self-esteem (ex.: Dineen, 1999; Furedi, 2004; Jendouri, 2002; Kramer, 1991), autonomy (ex.: Bélanger et Farmer, 2012; Hameline, 1999; Hoffmans-Gosset, 1987; Lahire, 2001; Lebrun, Lenoir et Thomas, 2011; Marples, 2002) and responsibility (ex.: Haji et Cuypers, 2008; Paturet, 2007; Peters, 1973). In brief, approaching the question of educational aims in schools is no simple task. A review of the literature on these aims shows a complete absence of consensus, as noted for example by White (2002) and most of the contributors to a book edited by Marples (2002). To quote Gohier (2002), "determining the aims of education appears as a step that is not only necessary, but also a priority, since they establish the foundations on which curricula will be developed."

3- Statement of the general objective and specific objectives of the project
It is important to distinguish between the objectives of the research and of the event. The former will be necessary to understand the latter.
3.1 Research objectives – What is the situation of primary school systems elsewhere in the world? A comparative study should enable a better definition and understanding of the social representations held by primary teachers who work in distinct social worlds, so as to reveal their specificities, but also their similarities. The **research question** that emerges from this questioning is the following: How do primary teachers in various countries understand the notions that characterize the aims of the primary school?

The **operational objectives** are as follows: 1) to identify the meanings that primary teachers ascribe to 1.1) the aims of the primary school, 1.2) the notions used by various ministries of education in the countries concerned, namely instruction, socialization, qualification, teaching, education, etc., and 1.3) the notions of autonomy, responsibility and self-esteem associated with these aims; 2) to bring out the specific means that they claim to implement in their teaching practices to pursue their chosen educational objectives; 3) to compare the results obtained so as to identify shared elements and diverging perspectives; and 4) to formulate hypotheses about these comparative results from an interpretative standpoint.

3.2 Event objectives – To carry out this international research based on a comparative approach,[4] a three-day workshop is scheduled take place in early June of 2013 at the Free University of Brussels (ULB) in Belgium in order to reduce air travel costs for most participants from Europe. This meeting will gather representatives from the 13 teams involved in the project, which are based out of eight different countries (Belgium; Brazil; Chili; Spain; 2 from France; 2 from Mexico; Romania; and Turkey) and two Canadian provinces (2 from Quebec; and Ontario). The **general objective** is to support the development of an already emerging international network of researchers (*see "origins" section*) in the field of analyzing teaching practices, so as to enable successful completion of the international comparative study on representations of educational aims among primary school teachers. Operationally speaking, the specific objectives have to do with adopting a common framework to use as a reference, as well as common methodological procedures, functioning modes and terms of supervision for graduate students, and operational follow-up:

1) Ensuring a common and unambiguous understanding of the reference framework.
2) Presenting the contexts specific to each country so as to take them into account during the interpretation phase.
3) Agreeing on the samples required and on sample-related procedures and criteria.
4) Approving and adapting common tools for collecting data depending on the context.
5) Approving common procedures for data treatment and ethical rules to observe.
6) Clarifying the involvement and guidance of students.
7) Planning the sequence of activities as well as governance arrangements for the research and the network.
8) Planning means to disseminate knowledge.
9) Determining the follow-up needed to successfully complete the research and to ensure a long-term future for the network.

4- Event description

4.1 Preparation phase – The meeting will require a preparation phase, which has already begun with the recruitment and commitment of various teams in the project (April to August 2012). The members of each team have received a 55-page text presenting a suggested reference framework and methodological procedures (data collection and treatment), including components of analytical grids. Before the workshop, ongoing dialogue will be established between various teams to prepare the way for the event, and will address the research objectives in accordance with the 9 objectives planned for the workshop. These discussions are essential to ensure a productive meeting capable of covering all of the objectives.

4.2 ULB meeting – The workshop at the ULB will be organized as follows: The ***first day*** will feature a morning discussion/clarification of the **reference framework** (obj. 1) and an afternoon presentation/discussion of different **socioeducational contexts** (obj. 2). To facilitate discussion on social representations of educational aims among primary teachers, an open-ended reference framework will be distributed to address the concepts of instruction (including disciplinary knowledge), socialization, qualifi-

---

[4] To apply the comparative approach, we will use an integrative model (Bouchard, 2000). This model implies that all units are treated on an equal level, each being compared to all the others, so as to identify one or more general principles that can be used to guide various operations (classifying and identifying models, ideal types, etc.), all while taking into account differences resulting from a diversity of cultural and historical heritage.

cation, teaching, education, and the three related notions of self-esteem, autonomy and responsibility. Each notion will be defined and circumscribed by attributes that will be operationalized from a methodological standpoint. To provide an illustration, a critical review of some 50 French- and English-language publications (Lenoir et Tupin, 2012*b*) enables a distinction to be made between, on the one hand, academic socialization processes that concern 1. facilitators,[5] 2. the student's role (with respect to rules and norms, as well as "rules of the game"), 3. citizenship education (which, as Audigier [2006] points out, touches upon cognitive, identity-related, legal and political dimensions); and, on the other, means of implementation that can range from inculcation to integration or "therapyization." The same work will be undertaken for each notion so as to be able to design data collection tools that enable a subtle analysis and interpretation of gathered discourse. Because educational aims in schools are situated in specific **contexts** that are historically, spatially and socially marked,[6] analyzing these aims requires that they be placed in various contexts—inside and outside the school—that characterize and connote the education system in each country, as well as the work settings of the primary teachers involved in the study. The second part of the first day will be devoted to this contextualization. A set of dimensions and indicators will be proposed to identify these contexts one month before the workshop. The ***second day*** will be reserved for methodological procedures and for operationalizing dimensions and indicators stemming from components of the reference framework (obj. 3, 4, 5). As for **samples**, regardless of the country, even if the concerned population is composed of public school teachers working with students 6 to 12 years old and if the required samples are non-probability samples (Beaud, 2006) consisting of convenience samples—since teachers are volunteers who agree to participate in data collection (Rossman et Rallis, 1998)—it will be important to establish operational procedures regarding sampling and the number of teachers required. **Data collection** will be performed based on three mechanisms: a widely distributed survey questionnaire, a semi-directed questionnaire seeking to closely examine certain aspects, and five focus groups made up of 9 to 12 schoolteachers (Stewart, Shamdasani et Rook, 2007) who will be met using a common protocol (Fern, 2001; Krueger et Casey, 2000; Stewart, Shamdasani et Rook, 2007). Data collection will address the notions of self-esteem, autonomy and responsibility, as well as the importance to give to the notions of instruction and socialization. Various tools will be produced using components of the reference framework. The **data treatment** procedures will be based on analytical grids developed using attributes of notions from the reference framework. These procedures will combine qualitative analyses (for example the content analysis advanced by Bardin, 2001) and quantitative ones (various statistical analyses) consistent with the principles of mixed methods (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori et Teddlie, 1998, 2003). Also during this stage, the grids will be sent out several months before the workshop. Finally, the matter of ethical rules will be addressed to ensure respect of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement* (also communicated beforehand, with an approval request for each university, to be adapted according to the situation). The ***third day*** will be devoted to the last 4 objectives of the workshop (obj. 6, 7, 8, 9), which will centre on ways of functioning. Rules and standards for guiding students involved in the research, as well as the terms of their involvement (*see "training and mentorship" section*), will be suggested to meet the standards of high-level academic training (obj. 6). This will include their participation throughout all steps of the research, including interaction between groups and the dissemination of information. A future calendar of activities will also be established and the governance arrangements for the network and the research will be clarified based on a proposal submitted to each participating team (obj. 7). One of the aspects of this governance is the preservation, accessibility and mobilization of knowledge stemming from the research (obj. 8, *see "mobilization plan" section*).

---

[5] We use the term "facilitator" to denote any relational, psycho-emotional or organization-related procedural mechanism—a teaching strategy, a technique, a pedagogical method, a spatial arrangement, an emotional relationship, etc.—independent of disciplinary content itself and its didactic usage, and which is considered to foster learning conditions. See Gersten, Baker, Pugach, Scanlon et Chard (2001).

[6] Harris (2002) states that "the aims of education . . . are social, historical, fleeting and changing . . . like all matters of policy, [they] are contextualized, political, normative, dynamic and contested" (p. 3).

Finally, a plan for ensuring the future of the network will be proposed, along with a plan for disseminating and preserving digital data relating to the research (obj. 9).

5- Description of the research findings that will be disseminated, transferred, exchanged or mobilized

During the **preparation phase** (before the workshop), mechanisms for dissemination and dialogue will be established. The CRCIE website (http://www.usherbrooke.ca/crcie/) will host a section on the ISEP-CI research providing various information documents (on the participants, the problem, the reference framework, etc.—and, subsequently, findings, reports, etc.), which will be made available in a spirit of open access. The CRCIE bulletin *Recherches sur les pratiques d'enseignement* and the *Bulletin de liaison du CREAS* will announce the launch and present an overview of the research project. **During the workshop**, the contributions of various teams will lead to establishing a common course of action as well as adaptations needed depending on local contexts. This step will be fundamental to establishing the network and to successfully completing the research. Because the study is based on a comparative approach, the disseminated findings will be on four levels (*see "mobilization plan" section*): 1) the various specific contexts established based on a common grid of components that are external (economic, political, cultural, religious, etc.) and internal (school system, teacher education approaches, requirements and types of degrees, etc.) to school realities; 2) the findings, in each country, of analysis on various collected data (interviews, questionnaires, focus groups); 3) a summary report for each country, produced based on a common structure, presenting all of the findings from an integrative perspective and presenting the required interpretations; and 4) finally, following a future gathering to present the various summary reports, the production of a final and comprehensive report established based on the parameters underpinning the global comparative approach that has been chosen (see footnote 3). Based on the common plan for structuring each report, the global report will unveil aspects of convergence and divergence in representations of educational aims among primary school teachers.

6- Description of the main players targeted (researchers, practitioners, etc.)

Owing to the nature of this project, the national and international scientific community in education is the chief group concerned by the study. However, the question of educational aims is also of great interest to politicians who are responsible for producing educational curricula; for the designers of textbooks and other pedagogical tools who, in publishing houses, are responsible for operationalizing these tools on a didactic and pedagogical level; for academics who provide initial and continuing teacher education; and for school administrators in charge of implementing and applying curricula. Finally, teachers themselves are directly concerned, since it is of utmost importance that they be made aware of the issues and effects of various kinds—beginning with socioeducational ones—that these aims have on their teaching practices. The mobilization plan is designed to reach these different groups.

7- Description of the reason why it is important to target certain groups more extensively

Numerous American authors have shown the distinction that is needed, among other things, between prescribed and implemented curricula. In this regard, educational aims are one of the essential issues to consider, from distinct angles, by the above-mentioned players.

8- Description of the way the activities can be completed over one year

In the context of putting together an emerging international network, we have described an initial phase involving research on representations of educational aims. The June 2013 workshop is the operational springboard for both the research and the launch of the network. However, before this workshop, preparatory actions will be needed to ensure success. In addition to the circulation of proposed reference frameworks, methodological procedures, analytical grids, etc., and subsequent dialogue (*see "event description" section*), Professor Yves Lenoir will assume conceptual and organizational leadership, as accepted by all team members. He has appointed a coordinator in each team, chosen by team members, to ensure the smooth running of the project. Professor Sabine Kahn of the ULB, together with her team, has agreed to organize the workshop on the premises of her institution.