

'Training the trainers' of teachers in France: assessment and outlook

Guy Lapostolle

Senior lecturer in education at the Burgundy university institute of teacher training (IUFM), which is attached to the IREDU, UMR CNRS 5225, Université de Bourgogne

SUMMARY

With the creation of IUFMs (university institutes of teacher training) in the 1990s, the training of teacher trainers in France has become a fundamental part of the renewal of teacher training. It is seen as a fundamental lever for the IUFMs to achieve the tasks and goals entrusted to them: training teachers who need to accommodate the new demands of their profession. To do this, the IUFMs have established 'trainer training programmes'. A closer look at these programmes reveals that a professionalisation of trainers has begun which is giving the IUFMs a stronger role in working towards achieving the goals set. However, some current reforms seem to be questioning the future of this professionalisation and, beyond that, the place and role that the IUFMs will play both in training teachers as well as in the universities in which they have just been integrated.

Keywords

Training trainers, policies, state, profession, university, teachers

At the beginning of the 1990s, the creation of IUFMs (university institutes of teacher training) in France showed a determination to take account of the developments in the teaching profession and to centre the training of all teachers in a single institution. Primary-school teachers used to be trained in an *École normale* after successfully completing a DEUG (general university studies diploma) at a university. Teachers at vocational secondary schools received training in an *École normale nationale d'apprentissage* (ENNA) after attending a vocational training institution and in many cases after also acquiring some professional experience. Secondary-school teachers were first trained at university until they received their *licence* (three-year Bachelor's degree) and then in a *Centre pédagogique régional* (CPR) if they were successful in the competitive recruitment process run by the Ministry of Education. The creation of IUFMs reinforced the academic aspect of primary teacher training, as much meeting their demands for an enhanced recognition of their status – they would now need to complete a Bachelor's degree – as reacting to the implications of the democratisation of secondary-school teaching. As nowadays almost all pupils continue their education beyond primary school, it seemed inappropriate for these teachers to be trained in more than century old *écoles normales*, which fell outside the scope of university education. Soon ENNA schools were also abolished and vocational secondary-school teachers would also receive their training at IUFMs. Secondary-school teachers were faced with pupils from increasingly heterogeneous backgrounds and with a continuing problem of school failure rates. Subject-specific education received in a university and a one-year work placement alongside classes in a CPR no longer seemed to meet the demands of the job; a 'professionalisation' of their training was necessary. The creation of IUFMs responded to the issues raised by the developments in the teaching profession.

It was therefore essential to also tackle the issues concerning teacher trainers. In this new environment, these trainers would also need to address the requirements defined by the State for the teaching profession. To enable the trainers to adapt to these developments, consideration was given to renewing the framework, methods and content of their training programmes. Gradually an institution, or a long-term structure, called 'trainer training' was established within each IUFM. The content of this institution can be found in a 'trainer training programme' which is drawn up each year by a manager who aims to identify the trainers' training needs.

In general, the proposals of the manager, often a policy officer or deputy director, are submitted to the decision-making bodies of the IUFM and are subject to approval by the State under the four-year contracts which link the IUFM to the State. The training programme is made up of subject-specific elements (epistemological, pedagogical, etc), and activities which respond to the issues raised by training: developing tools and designing elements of the training course (tracking sheets for student teachers, methods and ways of supporting in-class training, professional writings, reflexive analysis of practices, etc). Future-orientated educational activities (reflection and/or proposals on how to handle pupils in difficulty, managing of classes, etc), general know-how regarding the biggest issues raised in education and ICTE training activities, etc. are also included in the programme. This list is non-exhaustive and changes over time and with each IUFM, since they are relatively free to choose the content of their training programmes.

However, in general terms the place and the legitimacy of this 'trainer training' institution within the IUFMs is still being questioned. How far can it be said to have established itself as an essential institution within these IUFMs? While the position of the institution is recognised by the State – it is in the four-year contracts signed by the State and the IUFMs – we need to ask how they benefit the trainers. Does the training programme content meet their expectations? What is taken into account in drawing up the content? Is the content consistent enough to encourage the development of a professional identity for the trainer? A number of academic works and experts' reports on the subject of teacher training make it very clear that one of the major problems in 'training the trainers' concerns their professionalisation. However, some recent or planned institutional reforms may have a major impact on this institution, particularly the new requirements of the State as employer regarding the teachers it recruits ⁽¹⁾ and the 'universitisation' of the IUFMs. This neologism refers to the developments in the institutional relations between IUFMs and universities, and more particularly to the fact that teachers will soon need to have a professional Master's degree. It is the effect of these institutional changes on the trainer training programmes that we would like to examine in order to assess the impact they may have on the professional identity of trainers and on what researchers are calling, albeit somewhat cautiously, an 'ongoing process of professionalisation'.

(1) Order of 19 December 2006 'Specifications of teacher training in IUFMs'.

We will begin by highlighting a few of the issues that led to the creation of this trainer training institution. We will show that it now claims a place as a legitimate institution because it supports the renewal of teacher training and also contributes to the professionalisation of trainers, which has been influenced in part by the sociology of professions. We will then show that behind the apparently eclectic proposed content of training courses lies a coherence which could help to develop a trainer identity. Thirdly, we will show that the development of this identity is emblematic of the role that IUFMs play in teacher training and that it will need to evolve with the current reforms. Lastly, we will show that the place and role of trainer training in the new environment created by the reforms will shed light on the position that IUFMs hold now that they are integrated in universities.

Trainer training: an institution questioned and legitimised by the concept of 'professionalisation'

Studies and recommendations on training teacher trainers have generally been based on the realisation that the teaching profession was changing. Teachers needed to be better equipped to deal with increasingly heterogeneous groups of pupils, to fight against a persistent level of academic failure and, from the mid-1980s, to participate in managing schools that were gaining more autonomy. Since the roles of these teachers were changing, their trainers needed to change as well. By the end of the 1980s, the desire to introduce changes in the occupations of teacher and teacher trainer had begun to take form and expanded with the preparatory work on the IUFMS and their eventual establishment. Soon 'training the trainers' was to become an institution that would have a vital role and place in the reform of teacher training.

However, teacher training and trainer training were to be called into question more broadly. The changes in the tasks assigned to teachers were no longer the only aspect to be considered in terms of the developments that this profession would undergo. The general acceptance of the concept of 'professionalisation', introduced by the sociology of professions, which was gaining ground in academic circles, may have changed and may still be changing the way we look

at the developments envisaged for these professions. This concept calls for the problems addressed by the studies relating to teacher training and trainer training to be redefined. The trainer training programme, which struggled to emerge before the early 1990s, now appears to have attained genuine legitimacy. The concept of 'professionalisation' seems to be both strengthening the legitimacy of the institution while also questioning it and shaping it.

The recognition of an institution

In tracing the history of teacher training, Antoine Prost (1999) shows how it became clear soon after the Second World War that the training needed to be completely reformed. He cites for example the Langevin-Wallon Plan (1947) which, while it was never implemented, went on to inspire future proposals for reform. Prost attaches great importance in particular to the ideas promoted during the Amiens conference in 1968, which based this need for reform on pedagogical objectives. 'Transforming teaching methods and styles to adapt them to a new type of client and new duties' became the underlying theme of future developments. However, before the 1990s, teacher training would only experience minor changes while trainer training would struggle to find a practical application. Marie-Laure Viaud (2007) states that 'objectively, teacher training had long been needed', but points out, with reference to various works (Lallez, 1982; Pelpel, 1996; Leselbaum, 1989) that this intention would remain a dead letter for quite some time. Although trainer training for primary school teachers underwent remarkable experiments, it was not officially mandatory nor was it really encouraged or standardised. Initiatives taken by the MAFPENs ⁽²⁾ (Academic missions for the training of National Education staff), which were created following the Peretti report (1982), aimed to develop continuing training for teachers and for trainers who are pedagogical advisers, but they appear to have been only 'sporadic, short-term and lacking in coherence' (Viaud, 2007). ENNAs, which were recognised as pioneers in pedagogical research (Borne, Laurent, 1990), and which were able to reconcile 'technical culture and humanism' in teacher training, could have inspired schools and various institutes for teacher training, but the poor public image of the 'technical' aspect presented a major obstacle to the dissemination of their experience (Terral, 2002). Thus, these studies appear to show that while trainer training had

⁽²⁾ MAFPENs were abolished in 1998 and the IUFMs took over their role.

had some success, before the 1990s the position it held and the role it played were not what academics, experts and educational policy-makers were hoping for.

The Bancel report (1989), which paved the way for the reform of teacher training and for the creation of IUFMs, was an important step in the process leading to the creation and standardisation of trainer training as it exists today. In this report, the trainer training programme provided by IUFMs represented the keystone of the planned changes because the authors were well aware that it was not enough to create or to transform an institution for a reform to have the anticipated effects. The players within this institution must also take on board the issues which led to its creation, since they are the ones who will ultimately provide the teacher training. The report did not envisage a particular status for these trainers, but it emphasised their importance in the renewal process. 'While it does not seem desirable to create a public service body devoted entirely to IUFM trainers, the professional nature of the activity of trainers within the IUFMs must be affirmed and clearly defined.' IUFMs soon adopted these recommendations and endeavoured to put in place the institution of 'training for trainers'. All IUFMs would offer a trainer training programme.

A survey of the 2007-2008 training programmes of seven IUFMs in the North-East region of France (Reims, Dijon, Amiens, Besançon, Nancy, Lille, Strasbourg) ⁽³⁾ produced a number of findings which demonstrate the foothold this institution has gained. The number of hours scheduled in the training programmes represents on average around a fiftieth of the hours managed by the IUFMs; the other hours are devoted to the training of school teachers, secondary teachers, vocational secondary school teachers, primary educational guidance counsellors and specialised teachers, and to continuing education. For example, the trainer training programme at the Dijon IUFM accounts for just over a thousand hours out of a total of approximately fifty thousand hours; at the Nancy IUFM it accounts for one thousand two hundred hours out of approximately seventy-six thousand hours, at the Amiens IUFM one thousand hours out of approximately twenty thousand hours and in Strasbourg one thousand five hundred hours out of sixty-two thousand hours in total. However, the work that the IUFMs are doing involves more than just the number of hours dedicated to training courses.

⁽³⁾ Survey carried out in 2007 by the author as the coordinator of trainer training programmes for the North-East region.

The IUFMs are organised within geographical areas so that they can pool their resources, sharing their human resources and 'good practices'. Training programmes are put in place at area level and summer schools are organised each year which focus on a topic that brings together the trainers within the same area. The IUFMs also allow their trainers to take part in training activities organised by other bodies such as the INRP (National Institute for Pedagogical Research). Pooling human resources and 'good practices' also reduces costs. Activities can be provided at regional level for trainers interested in the same course but who are too few for their IUFM to provide the programme. The pooling of resources is part of a rational management effort, since the activities organised – whether training programmes at the IUFM level or regional level or even summer schools – represent a relatively high number of hours. However, the cost of these hours only accounts for part of the dedicated budget.

In addition to these hours, the cost of the accompanying logistics for the activities must also be taken into consideration. IUFMs are responsible for covering the costs of travel, accommodation and, where applicable, meals for the trainers who are targeted by these activities. But the trainers are usually spread geographically across several *départements*, and sometimes far from where the training is taking place. For a course lasting only a few hours twenty or so trainers may need to travel tens or even hundreds of kilometres. While the logistical cost is difficult to quantify, IUFM directors insist that it is essential to monitor these incidental, but nonetheless real and significant costs when training programmes are being drawn up. In addition, it should be mentioned that some IUFMs reduce the workload (in number of hours worked) of trainers who participate in training sessions, even if they do not meet the exact conditions laid down by the decree relating to work schedule arrangements for teaching staff ⁽⁴⁾.

Gilles Baillat, the Vice-President of the CDIUFM (Conference of IUFM directors), confirms, that for him, the work done is what we would expect of trainers. He points out that trainer training programmes are 'at the heart of the CDIUFM's concerns' ⁽⁵⁾. The time devoted to examining and discussing trainer training shows how important each IUFM director deems it to be, and the conference of directors also reinforces this support.

⁽⁴⁾ Ministerial Decree No 2000-552 of 16 June 2000 provides for working schedule arrangements for teachers wishing to enrol in postgraduate training courses or to prepare for competitive recruitment examinations for teacher-researchers.

⁽⁵⁾ Interview on 7 May 2008 with Gilles Baillat, Vice-President of the CDIUFM.

In summary, these indicators of the work done by the IUFMs and the statement by the Vice-President of the CDIUFM demonstrate that the IUFMs attach great importance to this institution. They have clear ambitions in the area of trainer training and they are deploying the resources to put it into practice.

An institution questioned and legitimised by the concept of 'professionalisation'

The position given to trainer training is based on a realisation that provided the IUFMs with the justification needed for the work they were doing: the fact that trainers need to have specific skills which are different from those of teachers. The preamble to the trainer training programme at the Rouen IUFM expresses this realisation quite clearly: 'Being a teacher trainer is a complex occupation which goes well beyond the simple transposition of the occupation of teacher and requires new trainers to acquire specific skills and knowledge, while experienced trainers need to give continual thought to the development of the concept of training and to the various activities in which they are involved' ⁽⁶⁾. Thus awareness and recognition of the specific needs of the occupation of trainer appear to be necessary to justify the efforts made. But if the need to train trainers can be justified by developments in the teaching profession and the specific nature of the occupation of trainer, it also gains legitimacy from the concept of professionalisation.

This concept takes account of the needs set out above, but it places them in a broader context. It questions the factors which underlie the construction of a profession and the necessary conditions for this profession to develop. If we refer to the works of Dubar and Triper (1998), but without going into such exhaustive detail, we can establish that there are two easily identifiable factors which determine the desire to transform an occupation into a profession, and that two conditions are also necessary to bring about this evolution.

These two factors are, first, the tendency for people who practise the same occupation to have the same set of values, standards and rules for the purposes of 'subjective identification', and second, the desire for recognition, partly driven by the need to protect their interests on the employment market. IUFM trainers, especially primary and secondary school teachers, have good reason to be aware of these issues if only because their status is no different from the teachers

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.rouen.iufm.fr/ppf/pgene.htm> [29.05.2008]

they train. Teacher-researchers are more easily identified in terms of their status. This argument, however minor it may seem, is nonetheless one of the factors which explain why, at the time when IUFMs were integrated into the university system (⁷), primary and secondary school teachers were particularly concerned, especially about their representation in the CEVU (Council for university studies and student life). It was important for these teachers to be able to identify themselves in a set of values, standards and rules while defending their recognition in the new environment they were entering.

The two conditions referred to in the works of Dubar and Triper (1998) are reflected in the need for any profession to be based on a culture common to all its members and in the need to base this profession on formalised and transmissible knowledge. This second condition is illustrated in Triper and Dubar (1998) by the work of Merton (1957) who showed that American doctors became 'professionalised' when their university training transformed empirical knowledge acquired through experience into scientific knowledge acquired academically and evaluated formally and unequivocally. It appears that trainer training within the IUFMs is all about this desire to put in place a common culture and to promote formalised knowledge as the basis for a potential profession of trainer. The search for a common culture is partly to do with the tensions felt within all modern professional training programmes today. Put simply, this tension boils down to the difficulty in correlating values, standards and rules which for some relate to a world of theoretical and academic knowledge and for others relate to a practical world. It is in the interrelations between these two worlds that a common culture can be created. The attempt to establish formalised and transmissible knowledge is based on the need to link the knowledge and questions associated with these two worlds. It is this link which enables science to shape its research by taking account of what is real and which enables practice to be questioned and debated and to find answers using the concepts and knowledge developed by science. For trainers, the problem is exactly the same. For those close to the ground, it is a question of moving from the status of a 'handyman' to that of an 'engineer', as Lévi-Strauss (1962) suggests, and for those from the academic sphere it is a question of ensuring

(⁷) The integration of IUFMs into the university system is provided for by the Framework and Programme Law for the future of schools, No 2005-380 of 23 April 2005, which was published in the French Official Journal.

that their knowledge questions and informs actual practice. While the establishment of formalised and transmissible knowledge is a condition for raising an *occupation* to the status of a *profession*, it is also at the heart of the problems facing trainer training, both from the point of view of those questioning its effectiveness and from the point of view of those trying to affirm its legitimacy.

The fact that this concept of 'professionalisation', taken from the sociology of professions, has now entered the common language of the protagonists in trainer training is without doubt the most revealing sign that they have taken on board the requirements it involves. It no longer relates purely to the academic sphere. Most of the managers and political actors working within or outside the IUFMs now use the term, as we can see from the name of the trainer training programme at the Rouen IUFM, for example, which refers to 'a development plan for the professionalisation of trainers'.

Thus the sociology of professions, while questioning the factors and conditions involved in the emergence of a teacher trainer training programme, appears to support the activities of the IUFMs. While the concept of professionalisation still encompasses the issue of the specific skills that trainers must master, it also reinforces the legitimacy of the search for a common culture and for formalised and transmissible knowledge. However, it remains to be seen just how far we have come in the process of professionalising trainers. An analysis of the content of training programmes may give us some insight into the effects that trainer training may have had on this process.

Behind the eclectic content of training courses, there are signs of coherence capable of forming the basis for a profession

The diversity of subjects covered in training programmes is linked to the diverse nature of the trainers involved in teacher training. Although these programmes have an eclectic character, this should not, however, mask the fact that the programming of their content is fairly coherent. It seems that there are a certain number of umbrella subjects and training mechanisms in these programmes which give this institution a coherence capable of encouraging the formation of a training profession. A common culture seems to be being established and knowledge has been or is being formalised, suggesting that the process of professionalisation has really begun.

From the diversity of trainers to the eclectic content of training

Academic studies of teacher trainers generally come to the same conclusion: that it is currently impossible to talk about a professional identity for the teacher trainer. Vincent Lang (2002) talks about a 'composite world' for IUFM trainers. He shows that numerous divisions are preventing the establishment of a single identity for the trainer. The wide differences in status, by staff group and category (senior lecturers, secondary-school teachers, primary-school teachers, etc.), the differences in workload, the different institutions from which they come (*écoles normales*, regional teacher centres (*Centres pédagogiques régionaux*), universities, high schools, etc.), and the diverse professional cultures (researchers, educational advisers, teachers, etc.) are all obstacles to the construction of a trainer identity, without which the profession will not be recognised (Dubar, 1991). Marguerite Altet, Léopold Paquay and Philippe Perrenoud (2002) wonder whether a real profession exists and what conditions would be needed for it to be established. For these authors, training the trainers is one way to take this ongoing professionalisation further. It can also provide information on the progress of the professionalisation process, provided that training programmes are examined from a particular point of view.

An analysis of the 2007-08 training programmes of the seven IUFMs (Reims, Dijon, Amiens, Besançon, Nancy, Lille, Strasbourg) in North-East France initially leads us to the same conclusion reached by the authors cited earlier: that the training programmes display an eclectic character that undermines the very foundations of a trainer identity. While about 40 % of the programmed activities are open to a 'general audience', 60 % deal with trainers' specific requirements and are intended for 'selected audiences', such as subject trainers undergoing training in didactics, and in-school trainers training in methods of supporting student teachers, etc. These activities targeting 'selected audiences' seem to be necessary in that trainers' training needs are linked to the specific tasks for which they are responsible. Moreover, this specificity is particularly desirable since it is often directly reflected in the quality of knowledge and know-how passed on to the teachers. Indeed, a general inspectorate report (Borne, Laurent, 1990) published during the trial period preceding the establishment of IUFMs throughout the country mentioned that newly recruited 'educational science' graduates would not be expected to deal with all pedagogical problems, given that the field

of educational science covers specialist research in disciplines such as psychology, sociology and history. The report called for the teaching to be better divided among the trainers, in particular by adapting their specialised knowledge to the requirements of the occupation of teacher. This perhaps justifies the fact that certain training activities are targeted according to the specific duties of the trainers. Nevertheless, given their eclectic nature, these activities do not seem likely to produce training that would contribute to the creation of a culture common to all trainers, and hence to establishing a professional identity for the trainer. However, a different reading of these programmes might lead us to take a more optimistic view of the programmed activities.

Elements of coherence seen as signs of ongoing professionalisation

Many activities, just under half of those programmed, are open to the general audience of trainers. These activities give different trainers the opportunity to meet and are calculated to reinforce the establishment of a common culture. When in-school trainers take part alongside subject trainers or human and social sciences teachers in discussing a given subject, or where they work together on drawing up the basic principles of didactic engineering, the problems specific to their particular duties feed into each another. When primary trainers and secondary trainers work together, this is a first step towards better mutual understanding, and a stronger link between the two sectors is thereby established. In-school trainers working with teacher-researchers are able to adopt their conceptual frameworks to help them problematise the questions they face in the context of their work. These conceptual or methodological frameworks can help them to deal with issues that often make them feel uneasy and to which they therefore find it difficult to find appropriate responses. As for the teacher-researchers, they can focus their research on problems firmly rooted in the reality of practice. In this way, the activities directed at all the trainers help to strengthen the process that the Caspar report (1992) hoped for when it talked about 'a cross-fertilisation between trainers'. This fertilisation would also form the basis for a common culture essential to the process of professionalisation.

A survey carried out at the Burgundy IUFM ⁽⁸⁾ shows that trainers are aware of this need for 'cross-fertilisation'. The survey, conducted

⁽⁸⁾ Survey carried out by Guy Lapostolle and Sophie Genelot, Burgundy IUFM.

prior to the drawing-up of the training programme for 2008-2009 among 200 trainers at the Burgundy IUFM by means of questionnaires asking about their training needs and by decentralised interviews in the IUFM's four centres, identifies what their aspirations are. Although the trainers generally talked about specific needs connected with their role and work, more than a third of them wanted to work together on common themes. They wanted to pool their efforts in order to improve their performance of their occupation. There was a clear demand for training that would help to establish a common culture. It remains to be seen how the institution will respond to these aspirations.

Without claiming to be exhaustive, some of the findings suggest that the majority of the seven IUFMs studied are taking measures to encourage the development of a common culture. One of the first elements corroborating this idea is something we mentioned earlier: the fact that nearly 50 % of the scheduled activities in the training programme are open to a general audience. Of course, it could be pointed out that a certain number of trainers are often excluded from these training events, particularly associate trainers, who are employed by the State and only perform some of their duties in the IUFMs. However, according to what was said in the interviews, because of certain material constraints – specifically academic inspections in the case of primary teachers and headmasters in the case of secondary teachers – the State as employer is unable, given the strict management of human resources, to release teachers wishing to take part in the activities provided. Furthermore, it seems that teacher-researchers, although they are happy to supervise training activities, are reluctant to come and be trained themselves in these activities. Their participation is, admittedly, difficult to quantify, but their lack of interest can often be detected in what they say. Their main argument is that in the university tradition, scientific research is supposed to complement teaching.

Nevertheless, the fact is that many activities are open to all trainers and they allow different categories or bodies of trainers to come together. That being so, it is the training mechanisms that have been introduced, perhaps as much as the opening of activities to different audiences, that appear to be promoting discussion with a view to establishing a common culture. Evidence of this can be found in the replies to questions about how the trainers wanted to work: think-tanks or working parties, which generally involve several days devoted to a single subject, and which allow time

for occasional informal discussions without this always having to result immediately in the production of teaching tools, are what the trainers overwhelmingly wanted. This response suggests the desire to look at questions together, to focus on the specific role and duties assigned to different trainers and to compare them in order to harmonise teacher training as a whole. It appears that the construction of a common culture needs to go through this type of process, although it is difficult to prove whether it is directly effective. What is lost in terms of direct effectiveness, however, particularly when training activities do not result in the production of teaching tools, is probably gained in terms of the coherence of training as a whole. That is in any case what the IUFMs, who place importance in this type of process, are counting on.

Further evidence of the determination of IUFMs to establish a common culture for trainers is the large scope allowed in training programmes for the training of 'new trainers'. The majority of training programmes offered by the 31 IUFMs in France include a section on training for new trainers. The replacement of the first trainers from different backgrounds – *écoles normales*, inspectorate, university – by new trainers has led to the organisation of training for them which is designed to give them the skills they need for the job. The course content for new trainers has certain common features that suggest that the knowledge transmitted forms a body that could serve as the basis for a genuine training profession. This knowledge relates to the subjects taught, knowledge of the organisation and administration of the IUFMs, knowledge of teacher training programmes, and procedures for the recruitment and permanent appointment of trained teachers by the State. This knowledge or know-how also involves thinking about and developing the tools the trainer needs for the job: the requirements for training adults and supporting student teachers in class or in analysing their practice are areas that are broadly represented in the activities for new trainers. Although this content shows that the IUFMs attach genuine importance to establishing a common culture for trainers, it also suggests that a certain amount of formal knowledge, or in some cases knowledge that is still being formalised, has been developed since the IUFMs were set up. This formal knowledge, or knowledge that is still being formalised, represents a necessary, not to say fundamental, condition for the recognition of a profession (Dubar, Triper, 1998).

These few conclusions about the content of trainer training programmes suggest therefore that a process of professionalisation

has begun. Although different sociologists have very different views on a 'canonical' definition of a profession, the consensus seems to be that for a profession to be recognised as such, there should exist a form of identity based on a common culture and a body of formal and transmissible knowledge. However, it is worth noting that this culture and knowledge are extremely dependent on the historical and political circumstances in which they are shaped. A certain number of institutional reforms currently taking place are likely to encourage their development, which will have an effect on the professional identity of trainers and beyond that on the role to be played and the position to be taken by the IUFMs in teacher training within the university into which they have just been integrated.

Consequences of the new reforms on the professionalisation of teacher-trainers

The reforms on which the State has embarked – whether it be the integration of the IUFMs into universities ⁽⁹⁾, the recruitment of teachers at master's degree level, the publication of the requirements for teacher training or the new methods of teacher recruitment ⁽¹⁰⁾ – are bound to have an effect on the configurations that trainer training might take. These configurations will identify the role and the place that the IUFMs will assume in teacher training. The IUFMs, integrated into universities that are becoming increasingly independent of the State ⁽¹¹⁾, and needing to respond to the requirements that the State as employer sets for recruiting teachers, will have to change the way they operate, without losing sight of the tasks they have been given. One of their chief tasks, training teachers, relies above all on the attempt to link theory and practice or, more precisely, the results of academic findings and practical requirements. And it is on trainers who need to be trained to do this that the IUFMs rely. Providing training for these trainers and working on their professionalisation form part of their efforts to meet this objective. In this section, we will look at various possible scenarios both for the evolution of trainer training and the future of the IUFMs.

⁽⁹⁾ Framework and Programme Law on the future of schools No 2005-380 of 23 April 2005, published in the French Official Journal.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Order of 19 December 2006, *op. cit.*

⁽¹¹⁾ Universities (Freedoms and Responsibilities) Act, *op. cit.*

The place and the role of IUFMs in master's degrees

One of the forthcoming reforms whose effects we will try to anticipate, will lead to the recruitment of teachers who have attained the higher (master's) degree level. President Nicolas Sarkozy, anxious to comply with the EU recommendations – particularly those in the Bologna and Lisbon processes – transposed in the Framework and Programme Law on the future of schools ⁽¹²⁾, sent a mission statement to the Minister for National Education, Xavier Darcos, in July 2007 asking him to institute master's degrees. He wrote: 'You will, together with the Minister for Higher Education and Research, ensure that university institutes for teacher training provide teachers with the tools they actually need to do their job [...] Teacher training must last five years and be recognised with the award of a master's degree' ⁽¹³⁾. At the same time, the President invited Valérie Pécresse, the Minister for Higher Education and Research, and Xavier Darcos to start discussions with the CDIUFM (Conference of IUFM directors), university rectors and the trade unions. For the latter, this 'masterisation' was a cause for concern as well as hope about the future of teacher training, trainers and the IUFMs.

The introduction of a master's degree for teachers requires them to meet a combination of conditions that threaten to put the IUFMs and some of their trainers in a difficult position. Among other things, it involves a requirement that not all IUFMs will be able to satisfy. In order to be accredited by the State (under the four-year contracts between universities or IUFMs and the State), a master's degree must be supported by an approved research team. However, according to the latest CDIUFM estimates ⁽¹⁴⁾, only half of IUFMs are supported by or associated with such research teams. A considerable number of UFRs (Training and Research Departments), which make up the greater part of universities, rely on approved teams, and many of them have begun to introduce master's degrees that they will be submitting to the State for accreditation ⁽¹⁵⁾. Students who were previously preparing for competitive recruitment by the

⁽¹²⁾ Framework and Programme Law on the future of schools No 2005-380 of 23 April 2005.

⁽¹³⁾ Mission statement for the Minister for Education, Xavier Darcos, of 5 July 2007, http://www.fcpe34.org/article.php3?id_article=2188 (cited 03.03.2008).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Conversation on 7 May 2008 with Gilles Baillat, Vice-President of the CDIUFM.

⁽¹⁵⁾ An analysis of applications for the accreditation of master's degrees to be submitted to the State by UFRs for 2009 shows two types of degree: 'subject-specific' master's degrees with teaching as a specialism, and a multi-disciplinary master's degree orientated towards teaching and training.

State education system (*Éducation nationale*) fell outside the scope of the master's degrees offered by the UFRs, and by introducing these new degrees or integrating professional options into their existing master's degrees, the UFRs will now be able to retain their student numbers. If, in 50 % of cases, the IUFMs are going to have to collaborate with these UFRs in order to create new professional master's degrees or to offer professional options in their existing (often subject-specific) master's degrees, they will be unable to create them for themselves. A form of partnership between the IUFMs and the UFRs is therefore needed. However, it seems that the CDIUFM is showing signs of mistrust about this partnership, which it wants to be 'genuine' ⁽¹⁶⁾.

The same fears are shared by the trainers. During the first stage, the preparation of a draft of the degree, these trainers sometimes felt that they were being kept at arm's length. A senior lecturer at the Créteil IUFM whom we interviewed during the survey we conducted among a number of trainers described it as follows: 'There is a lack of information [...] Trainers feel that they are being kept at arm's length from the creation of the master's degrees [...] even if they are sometimes themselves to blame for being excluded from the process because they are busy with other tasks such as drawing up training programmes, discussing new programmes, and so on'. It should be noted that this 'feeling of exclusion' is particularly severe in the Créteil IUFM, since the UFRs that have taken responsibility for the master's degrees belong to four different universities, even though the Créteil IUFM is integrated into only one of them. The same respondent also voiced longer-term fears: 'IUFM trainers will mostly be confined to the 'professional section' of the master's degree [...] the range of activity of the IUFMs is being reduced'. However, Gilles Baillat offers a slightly more optimistic reading of the situation: 'Not having all the necessary resources, the IUFMs had already devolved the essentially subject-specific training of secondary-school teachers to the UFRs and they were already responsible for the professional aspects of this training'. From our point of view, this seems to be corroborated in the way that students are prepared for secondary-school competitive examinations, since professional training in the first year has been reduced to a minimum, as the examination papers are essentially based on subject-specific knowledge. On the other hand, this analysis seems a less accurate

⁽¹⁶⁾ CDIUFM, Opinion of the committee monitoring master's-level degrees, 22.02.2008.

reflection of the situation for the trainee teachers that the second-year students become, since the professional section of their training is more important. The fact that these trainees are mainly trained by the IUFMs means that a common and relatively standard professional training can be provided for all teachers, whatever their subject, whereas the introduction of a second year of a master's degree in different UFRs runs the risk of diluting the coherence that the IUFMs were attempting to put in place. However, Gilles Baillat offers a more optimistic reading here too: 'The creation of master's degrees remains under the control of the State, since it is the State that accredits these degrees [...] And it is not in the State's interest to see a profusion of master's degrees, for reasons of consistency and good management [...] It is determined to retain control of teacher training. This is particularly evident from the fact that when it integrated the IUFMs into more autonomous universities, it took steps to ensure that the teachers it intends to recruit have the right skills. It has set stricter recruitment conditions ⁽¹⁷⁾ for them. For example, it has excluded IUFM lecturers from primary EQP (Professional Qualification Examination – *Examens de qualification professionnelle*) boards and has entrusted these to State Education Service personnel. Stipulating the skills required for teachers to be appointed to a permanent post also demonstrates this desire to control recruitment more strictly at a time when training is less controlled [...] The State does not intend to exclude IUFMs from this type of teacher training, but it has the scope to do so by exploiting the accreditation of master's degrees'. The feeling of exclusion among IUFM trainers during the creation of the master's degrees does seem to reflect a certain reality. However, this feeling is also fed by the fear that the IUFMs will lose their power over teacher training in favour of the universities, which are known to be anxious to retain their student numbers, particularly at the master's level. What is happening here is actually a battle between the IUFMs and the UFRs to protect their own interests. The State, meanwhile, if we accept Gilles Baillat's arguments, appears to be both a good manager and basing its decisions on a broader interest. Moreover, again according to Gilles Baillat, there is probably no reason why it should deprive teacher training of the know-how that the IUFMs have shown they have.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Order of 19 December 2006, 'Specifications for teacher training in IUFMs'.

Besides, the IUFMs which have an approved research team or are associated with one are going to be creating their own master's degrees. And where many of them do not have the necessary resources to offer master's degrees in all subjects, they will be creating more general professional master's degrees. This is the case with the Reims IUFM, for example, which has created its own master's degree, intended for future primary-school teachers and education advisers, and which has joined forces with other UFRs to create master's degrees that are more subject-specific, intended for secondary-school teachers. In this case, it seems that a genuine partnership has been formed.

There is still some doubt, however, about the reform of competitive recruitment examinations for teachers, particularly secondary-school teachers. Teachers could sit these examinations before obtaining their master's degree, which would be required to validate the examination. If the content of the examinations is based, as is currently the case, on strongly subject-specific or academic content, the professional training that the IUFMs were trying to put in place, that is to say, training that simultaneously combines theory and practice, risks being consigned to oblivion. After receiving adequate academic and subject-specific training required to sit the competitive examinations, new teachers would be trained in a type of 'mentoring' system by experienced teachers from the time of their entry into the profession. As Patrick Baranger, President of the CDIUFM reports, 'the mentoring system already exists; new permanent appointees have four weeks' training a year and are monitored by a mentor. The mentoring system should be seen as complementary training, as adaptation to the job, and certainly not as a substitute for professional training, which is an integral part of the master's degree' ⁽¹⁸⁾. What Baranger seems to fear, if the competitive examinations mainly evaluated academic and subject-specific knowledge, is that the professional training that the IUFMs were trying to introduce would disappear, and that this would take the training of secondary-school teachers back to the *status quo ante*. Theoretical training and practical on-site training would again be separated. If this were to happen, the IUFMs would have a reduced position and role, since academic training would be provided by the UFRs and professional training by teachers on site.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Aef info*, 29 June 2008: 'Introduction of a master's degree for teacher training: Xavier Darcos was to report to the Council of Ministers in mid-June'.

To sum up, the responsibility given to universities and the IUFMs to introduce these master's degrees is producing very different perceptions of the process. Every case is different and depends, *inter alia*, on the contracts that were concluded when the IUFMs were integrated into the universities, and also on good relations between the decision-making bodies of the universities and those of the IUFMs. Some IUFMs, such as the Burgundy IUFM, have taken the precaution of having it spelled out in their integration contract that no decision concerning teacher training can be taken without seeking their opinion. The nature of the relations between the parties as the process develops will also be important. In the last resort, the State will decide, by accrediting or not accrediting the master's degrees. However, the content that the State decides to give to the tests for the competitive examinations will remain decisive in determining the place and role that the IUFMs have in these degrees.

The future for trainers

From the staff point of view, teacher-researchers seem on the whole to have less of a feeling of exclusion from the process of creating the master's degrees. This is not always the case with secondary or primary trainers who, although represented on the governing boards of the IUFMs, and also quite frequently on university CEVUs, now see their 'official status' being changed in the master's degrees. They see themselves becoming 'professionals' associated with the training provided as part of the master's degrees. It seems that all hope of the unity which seemed to be emerging in the process of professionalisation is vanishing. The term 'trainer' which was becoming widespread in academic literature and had to a certain extent become official, since it was found even in official State documents, is being completely undermined. Are we now likely to see the appearance of 'academics' trained through research, as is the university tradition, on the one hand, and on the other professionals, primary-school teachers, senior trainers and education advisers, and secondary-school teachers, trainee-teacher trainers, whose training is traditionally not provided by universities? This is a whole new question concerning trainer training. Given that one of its essential functions was to develop a common culture and pass on formalised knowledge, will it find the arguments and support it needs in this new configuration for it to be able to continue?

According to Giles Baillat, it seems that the resources made available are for the moment not under threat, particularly now that

the IUFMs have been integrated into the universities as 'Schools'. These Schools have genuine freedom in the budget choices they can make, even though it is the university's governing council that votes on and ratifies the budgets of its constituent bodies. The commitment of IUFMs to trainer training suggests that they will do what they can to preserve it. Gilles Baillat even thinks that this institution could be extended to other UFRs. He mentioned that a number of UFR directors have already contacted him to request IUFM expertise in the teaching field. Universities have for a number of years now had to deal with the wave of democratisation that secondary education experienced earlier. What is more, the Fillon Act has set a target that 50 % of a single age group should obtain a higher-education diploma. Universities will in all likelihood have to work very hard to provide the teaching to respond to this demand from the State. Virtually all teaching unions are demanding that the State should provide the teaching resources needed to limit the drop-out rate in the first year of higher education, and the State has recently taken some measures along those lines, notably the 'Successful degree' (*Réussite en licence*) plan, which earmarked EUR 30 million from 2008 to reform degree courses⁽¹⁹⁾. It therefore seems that the IUFMs might in this context become the preferred partners of the UFRs in this context, particularly in helping teacher-researchers in their teaching tasks. This would be a way to expand trainer training.

Another possibility also seems to be opening up in the field of trainer training, in the form of 'master's degrees in the training of teacher trainers'. Some universities have already embarked on this experiment (Viaud, 2007). Several factors explain why these degrees would be useful. First, because teachers are to be recruited with master's degrees, it is difficult to imagine their trainers not also being recruited with the same level of qualification. A number of trainers who have come from primary and secondary teaching, and also associate trainers, particularly those who do work full-time at the IUFMs, do not hold master's degrees. Even though they could, in the context of the master's degrees that are to be introduced, claim legitimacy from the fact that they would become 'professionals' alongside graduates, it would still be appropriate for them to have a master's degree. As Marie-Laure Viaud (2007) says, the distinction between graduates, professionals and students in the context of

⁽¹⁹⁾ Letter from Valérie Pécresse, Minister for Higher Education and Research, the *Réussite en licence plan*, 15 January 2008, Ministry of National Education.

these master's degrees is less important than in other forms of professional training: graduates who teach on these courses have often been professionals, the professionals are teachers, and the students themselves are very often already professionals. We can see in this context why having a master's degree can confer a certain legitimacy on in-school trainers, if only because it brings transparency to a system where it can be difficult to distinguish people's backgrounds. The second reason why it seems appropriate to create master's degrees concerns the uses made of educational research, and particularly the problems it is having in breaking into the field of teaching and professional teacher training. Reports (Prost, 2001; Caspar, 2002) that called for the better integration of educational research in training for teachers and also for their trainers, are now seeing the establishment of the right conditions for their recommendations to be followed. Master's degrees in the training of teacher trainers can be a forum for some educational research, but also a place where the results of this research can be disseminated.

However, there are still certain obstacles to the development of these master's degrees. To mention just two that we feel are very significant, there is the fact that these training courses are very demanding and difficult for those already working to attend, and the fact that degrees offer no guarantee of being recruited as a trainer. However, the IUFMs are in virtually all cases partners with which the universities have maintained good relations in order to ensure that these 'master's degrees in the training of teacher trainers' are successful (Viaud, 2007).

It is clear from these various scenarios that trainer training can take various forms, and it seems fairly certain that the IUFMs will be able to continue with their trainer training programmes in the short term. Some indicators suggest that universities, which will probably still be facing a massive influx of students, seem to be interested in using the IUFMs' expertise, particularly if they intend to train teachers. As for master's degrees in the training of teacher trainers, these depend on accreditation by the State and it seems difficult for now to see them becoming widespread. Even if they were to become more popular, they do not seem to be competing with the training programmes introduced by the IUFMs, which are also intended to provide continuing training for trainers.

Be that as it may, in all the scenarios envisaged, it appears that the IUFMs could be the universities' preferred partners in

bringing teacher training up to master's degree level. They will be particularly well placed to fulfil their task of training teachers and teacher trainers, since the State itself will see them as its preferred partners in meeting its downstream requirements as regards teacher recruitment, as well as its upstream requirements, by ensuring that they are genuine partners for universities in delivering the master's degrees to future teachers.

Conclusion

The training of teacher trainers has long been a central concern for academics, experts and politicians responsible for the development of teacher training. It seems that, with the creation of the IUFMs, it has won a position and a role that are recognised by all protagonists in teacher training, including the State. The desire to 'professionalise' these trainers, influenced by the sociology of professions, has without doubt helped to redefine the problems underlying their training and to shape the content of that training. A common culture and formalised and transmissible knowledge have emerged. These constitute the necessary conditions for the process of professionalisation envisaged by sociologists, which also meets the initial objective of the founders of the IUFMs: to accord a fundamental importance to teacher trainers. A process of 'professionalisation' of trainers has probably developed in spite of the obstacles it has encountered, particularly to do with the different types of trainers. This professionalisation of trainers has met and continues to meet the IUFMs' aim of training teachers in a context that, put briefly, links theory with practice.

The ongoing and future institutional reforms will undoubtedly change certain aspects of teacher training. Trainer training, seen as a fundamental lever for developing teacher training, is likely to undergo changes to its form and content. In the different scenarios that we have envisaged, there seem to be reasons why it should continue. Some prospective studies even suggest that it could serve as an inspiration for universities, which may need to change the ways they transmit knowledge. Nevertheless, the legitimacy won by trainer training in the IUFMs, which is broadly emblematic of the legitimacy of the IUFMs themselves, still largely depends on the direction taken by the State. The State is able to control the accreditation of master's degrees, and if there is a conflict between the UFRs and IUFMs, which will both be determined to wield power

over teacher training, it holds the real power to decide, thanks to its control over the accreditation. Besides, the State remains the employer, and it is the State that determines the conditions for recruiting and appointing teachers to permanent posts. It will decide on the content of the competitive examinations, which will allow it to control the professional dimension of the training that future teachers receive. The importance given to the academic and subject-specific dimensions in the examination papers and that given to training by 'mentoring' will be decisive for the future of the IUFMs and their trainers. If the mentoring system again becomes a method of training that follows on from academic and subject-specific training as a separate entity, there will be few reasons for retaining the IUFMs and their concept of professional training for teachers.

It is the definition of competitive recruitment examinations and the methods for appointing teachers, far more, perhaps, than the choice of one type of teacher over another, that will show the value that the State attaches to the work of the IUFMs. It will in any case demonstrate to what extent the State recognises the professional nature of the work of the trainers in these IUFMs.

Bibliography

- Altet, M., Paquay, L.; Perrenoud, P. *Formateurs d'enseignants. Quelle professionnalisation?* Brussels: De Boeck, 2002.
- Bancel, D. *Créer une nouvelle dynamique de la formation des maîtres*, report by the rector Daniel Bancel to the Minister of State and the Minister for Education, Youth and Sport. Paris: La Documentation française, 1989.
- Borne, D.; Laurent, G. *Rapport IGEN, IGAEN. Note préliminaire sur l'évaluation de la mise en place des IUFM*. Paris: MEN, 1990.
- Callon, M.; Latour, B. *La science telle qu'elle se fait*. Paris: La Découverte, 1991.
- Caspar, P. *Réflexion sur la formation des formateurs en IUFM. Rapport de mission à Monsieur le ministre de l'éducation nationale*, Paris, MEN, 2002.
- Dubar, C. *La socialisation. Construction des identités sociales et professionnelles*. Paris: A.Colin, 1991.
- Dubar, C.; Triper, P. *Sociologie des professions*, Paris: A. Colin, 1998.
- Peretti (de), A. *Rapport au ministre de l'Éducation nationale sur la formation des personnels de l'Éducation nationale*. Paris: la Documentation française, 1982.
- Lallez, R. *La formation des formateurs d'enseignants*. Paris: Unesco, 1982.
- Lang, V. Formateur en IUFM: un monde composite In Altet, M.; Paquay, L.; Perrenoud, P. (dir.). *La professionnalisation des formateurs*. Brussels: De Boeck, 2002.
- Lévi Strauss, C. *La pensée sauvage*, Paris: Plon, 1962.
- Loi d'orientation et de programme pour l'avenir de l'école*, N° 2005-380 [Framework and Programme Law on the future of schools No 2005-380] of 23 April 2005, published in the French Official Journal, 24 April 2005, No 0096.
- Merton, R.K. *The student physician. Introductory studies in the sociology of medical education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Leselbaum, N. *La formation des professeurs en centres pédagogiques régionaux*, Paris: INRP, 1989.
- Pelpel, P. Les formateurs de terrain. Crise d'identité et évolution du modèle de formation. *Recherche et formation*, No 22. Paris: INRP, 1996.

- Prost, A. L'évolution de la formation des enseignants de 1960 à 1990. *Recherche et formation*, No 32. Paris: INRP, 1999.
- Prost, A. *Pour un programme stratégique de recherche en éducation*, Paris: MEN, 2001.
- Terral, H. *Les humanités techniques et la légitimité de l'enseignement technique*. 127^e Congrès national des sociétés historiques et scientifiques, Nancy, 2002.
- Viaud, M.L. Une pratique pionnière à l'université. Le cas des masters de formation de formateurs à l'université. *Recherche et formation*, No 54. Paris: INRP, 2007.