Communication and Culture Review
2019, Vol. 2, No.1 & 2, 73-77
ISSN: 2582-2829

The role of educational media and digital devices in the evolution of education and school in France

Michel Durampart

Until recently, when we look at the history of media education or the media, we quickly realize that the introduction of the media into the school produced a proliferation of new practices. However, media education did not manage to impose itself as a school discipline in the full sense and without transforming pre-existing practices. A form of disillusionment or even a lack of interest is palpable as school institutions want to experiment with technology-based education by norms, habits and traditions. It is also necessary to underline the capacities of institutional or educational collectives to return to a structural and usual state, which leads thus, to stifle or lessen a succession of initiatives carried out within the national education. As a result, the regulation of initiatives is often experienced as too rigid and normative by the key actors (educators, teachers, surrounding trades, institutional actors) who have led projects or experiments (Latour, 1998, Moeglin, 2005).

One can draw inspiration from the most radical aspect of the expression of the ethos of the school itself: education towards compliance (the breeding of the "little man" as mentioned by Sloterdijk, 2000). It would then be possible to say that teachers and students, unlike such a radical invocation, see digital tools as another way through which experiences, practices and knowledge between the inside and outside can be exchanged. Conversely, schools experienced a period wherein they kept innovation under a hermetic bell, a form of stasis. On the other hand, disseminating, sustaining and stabilizing experiments related to information and communication technologies have always embodied a desired ideal. However, technology-driven education is complex and delicate to reach due to lack of continuity and of will to generalize, due to difficulties to extend the experiments on the ground on a large scale and due to practitioners who remain mostly within the enclosure of classrooms until they are exhausted and realise the will to innovate. In addition, institutional orientations and policies since the 1980s tended to focus more on technicality and equipment than the objective of paying attention to changing educational contexts and orientations.

In fact, the school has always known how to integrate and digest the succession of educational media (the image in different forms, the audiovisual in multiple media, CD ROM, different computer applications etc.) without always being able to make it the pivot of dynamic teaching practices. It seems that digital media and tools pose new and many difficulties in this sense as they evolve faster, as they display competitive forms of knowledge acquisition while at the same time offer a mix of applications and uses of playful, private, professional facades of technologies (Moeglin, 2005, Peraya, 2018).

In other words, these more reactive and ever-expanding technologies are problematic at school until they are sometimes rejected. It is the question of acclimatization, of integration, as if schools had to tame these technologies as part of their missions and educational actions in linkage with pedagogy that is both attentive and collective, that is public, privileges singularity - a protected environment and a rooted transmission. Indeed, these technologies can induce and crystallize the risk of an individualization of sparse and non-homogeneous knowledge that the school has difficulty in grasping, which therefore supposes that the school is no longer the only vector for transmitting knowledge. Between tools and the media, digital technologies radically transform the relationship to knowledge and question the continuity of the transmission of humanistic knowledge with a demand for citizen education based on the book and the homogeneity of disciplinary knowledge (Sloterdijk, 2000).

One of the priorities of the "re-foundation of the school" affirmed in the official texts is to "change the school with the digital". The Ministry of National Education, France, has long opted for a crosscutting of digital technology at all levels in all disciplines, institutions, management and support bodies. Recently, the Ministry decided to open up perspectives to computing suited to different disciplines by introducing computer code learning into primary and secondary school curricula. It also makes the choice to open the school to its periphery in favor of the changes in progress. Different partners, industrialists, local authorities and parents of pupils are called upon to contribute. This is why research actions are encouraged everywhere, with objectives and means depending on the context. In this regard, actions carried out involve communities, publishers of content or devices, support structures such as the Canopé network in France, inter-ministerial missions and bodies designated by the Ministry of National Education and the government as experts. The Ministry of National Education, France, relies on these initiatives and encourages teachers to seize these new tools. If the recent trend officially expressed by the ministry and government discourse is for once to place teachers at the center of projects evoking real training (colossal task for the education system, probably insurmountable in the short term), the current reality is to a succession of many projects, pilot experiments, associating an effective decentralization with the support and the financing of the initiatives by the central State. However, a downward vertical logic, a deliberate, injunctive discourse persists as, for example, the invocation of a new cycle helping to solve the problems and discomforts of the school, persist.

The new educational media, which involve the use of digital tools, actually produce porosity, openness, other possible pedagogical practices oriented towards interdisciplinary (hardly effective) and mobility (sometimes very contradicted). They propose a sociotechnical context, which is not without constraints and difficulties in the pedagogical dynamics. The context of experimentation in front of other proposals and competing forms can also delegitimize the school. In recent years, there has been an evolution of conceptions. For example, we can talk about the projects as E Fran type , incubators (experiments set up in recent years both local and contextualized but generalized while leaving room for maneuvering to actors in the field and directly including the contribution of researchers in the progress of programs). These initiatives can offer something valuable: reflexive dispositions which then lead the school to become a learning organization on its own framework of activity by accompanying the approaches and at the same time producing a reflection on the innovations carried out (Here the role of researchers summoned become indispensable).

This process of organizational learning and reflexivity would require at least a re-examination of the academic form that remains substantially stubbornly vertical while constantly encouraging

the autonomy of practitioners and teams. It is at this level that the new experimental approaches and their intentions, rather than the technics and deterministic temptation, could become interesting. These new approaches are and should be rooted in the field, the local, the initiatives of teams and teachers. It will take time to conduct ambitious innovative educational projects accompanied by laboratories and research teams. But, investing in the local, helps in reconciling an institutional approach and an approach rooted in local innovation with a more horizontal bottom-up model. This does not prevent ministries and bodies from their efforts to generalize tools (distant learning, use of tablets) which continue to depend on accessibility, equipment etc. The technical prism is often caught up in debates on digital divide and non-access from right-centered perspectives.

In fact, comments, invocations, and discourses of digital innovation centre more on the gains and rarely, if not the losses, on displacement, transfigurations, aporia, and asymmetries. In an article produced after a conference TICEMED in Toulon (Durampart, 2014), it was observed that in school:

(...) the cursor of the mediation in the context of the change is certainly much more on the transformations made of which one of the major points resides in the mastery and the acclimatization of the technical supports at the level of proven knowledge. This implies being lucid about the hybridizations, deviations, displacements, deregulations introduced by these technologies in the face of existing knowledge and educational media, the practices present in collectives, among exposed users and within the local and general institutional framework. These few observations illustrate what we seek to implement in the research works carried out by faculty and PhD students at the IMSIC laboratory (University of Toulon) at the heart of the school system and form.

We work with concepts such as numerical acculturation, using in context, experience, and the assessment of the aporia between de-centering and re-centering (while drawing inspiration from previous theoretical work). It is a question of thinking about the school between closing and opening, starting from the hybridization of socio-technical uses, and the school of porosity which also seeks to incorporate innovations into acquired practices. To return to the evolution of the school institution taken within the framework of social systems, it is obvious that this continuation of a debate on the role of the school, its field of action and its missions, is reactivated. A reluctance and a craze for digital devices are expressed jointly. However, this debate is as old as the birth of organized civilizations (and therefore has been only slightly retraced here) and it is ultimately a major issue that places the academic form in its alterity / alteration by its environment while the digitalization of the world happens.

We therefore see what issues are at stake. The desired modalities revolve around the extension of the class, from within / outside. It is ultimately a matter of accompanying and guiding the porosity so that there is continuity between the classroom and its environment by focusing the process more on interactive content, with spaces that prolong school activity outside the classroom walls. Education must be opening up on initiatives with some autonomy for pupils.

Overall, it is de-concentration, decentralization and externalization that could generate collective work but also change the role and place of students in a project activity. This is the possibility the collective spirit entails without standing in the way of individual initiatives. It is the capacity to stimulate - the activities done in class to obtain a collective creativity, which must be situated between individuation and collective creativity in a concern for valorization of the implications and participation of pupils.

Finally, it is the idea of installing another form of work within the walls of the school that reproduces the class but by installing it outside the constraints of time, place and space. The ideal sought is to create an open, multifunctional place, supposed to favor a form of synthesis between the class and the hors clase by making school space a socialized place, if one can say. In the new model driven by technologies, a school's activity is not only about providing education but transmission of the same outside the class for which technological infrastructures become key resources. Further, it is the issue of openness and rupture with closure that is at stake. Closing, from our point of view, remains one of the most sensitive issues. Legitimately, the class at school must be able to continue to assert a certain singularity (protection) with the social world in action, the outside of the school.

This is one of the conditions that schools in future will predominantly embrace. But, on the other hand, this closing can no longer be erected in isolation and separation from its environment and the social world. The school must learn to find opportunities for intersection, interaction with its environment and continue to be a singular, protected space that operates on the basis of its legitimacy and its necessities. In other words, the stake is in a hybridization between closure and openness, which appears to be a very dense job site. It should lead to an evolution, which could take place between the will to resist technics standardization, unlike other organizations, while altering to avoid a rigid fence. This kind of fence is open to criticism, if it only embodies the preservation of conformity, a tradition of closing the class on its environment and the other realities of the social world. At this level, digital technologies are very revealing phenomena of porosity without being free of aporia and asymmetries between the search for innovations and the technical determinism they may imply.

Finally, it is not a question of idealizing a form of digital magic, of flexibility of education with the digital. The new educational media introduce new complexities, new constraints, crucial issues, integration difficulties that must not be underestimated. It seems that the hybrid approaches between a desire to harmonize experiments and to favor local initiatives, innovations call for taking into account the aporias of digital acculturation. Let us note finally that these programs and approaches cannot remain without consequences on how the idea of school evolves in the context of the coalescence of space, time, and environment, the weakening of the traditional top-bottom model, the issues of transmission and communication, all of which have to be placed in the same plane as education or instructional issues.

Notes on the Contributor

Michel Durampart is Professor at the UFR Ingemedia in Information and Communication Sciences, Universite de Toulon. He is also a publishing researcher at the IMSIC Toulon Laboratory. Further, he is responsible for the Information Communication section and director of the I3M Laboratory, member of the Hermès review committee and responsible for the Varia section, member of GDRI-CNRS COMMED, IRMC Tunis (communication and Cyber space in the Maghreb,) and full member of the CNU 71st section.

References

Durampart Michel, (2017), « Le passage d'un enjeu cognitif à un hors jeu stratégique pour les organisations », article issu du colloque TICEMED, journées scientifiques Neptune « Dispositifs, jeux, enjeux, hors jeux», Questions de communication, actes, Bonfils P., Dumas P. Massou L.(sld).

Durampart, M., Maniscalco, P, Collet, L., (2015) « Techno--pedagogical innovators: between autonomy and heteronomy », Montréal, juillet 2015, Congrès IAMCR-CPT, atelier Communication Policy and Technology .

Mœglin, P., (2005), « Outils et médias éducatifs : une approche communicationnelle», Grenoble, Pug, 296p.

Peraya, D. (2018). Technologies, innovation et niveaux de changement : les technologies

peuvent-elles modifier la forme universitaire ? Distances et médiations des savoirs. 21. Repéré sur : http://journals.openedition.org.proxy.scd.univ-lille3.fr/dms/2111

Sloterdijk P., (2000), Règles pour le parc humain: Une lettre en réponse à la « Lettre sur l'humanisme » de Heidegger, Paris, Ed. Mille et une nuits, 2000.