

SWG REFORPRO 2019 report

1°) 8 contributions stemmed from the SWG REFORPRO have been published in a “dossier” of *Revista Lusofona de Educaçao* n° 43 (2019 first semester) about the theme conservatism and progressivism in education (André Robert coordination) pp. 109-233. Introduction by André D. Robert : “Conservatisme et Progressisme en éducation : approches critiques et éclairages internationaux ».

Contributions from :

Akira-Alix (France)

Ottavi (France)

Ascolani (Argentina)

Pintassilgo & Alda Namora (Portugal)

Monin (France)

Verneuil (France)

Mole (Switzerland)

Kahn (France)

The “dossier” is available on:

revistas.ulusofona.pt/index.php/rleducacao/issue/view/737

2°) In ISCHE 41 in PORTO, the SWG REFORPRO has organized 2 sessions and heard 10 communications (see the details below) from:

Ottavi (France)

Mole (Switzerland)

Pereira Peres (Brazil)

Pintassilgo e Alda Namora (Portugal)

Robert (France)

Riondet (France)

Serina-Karsky (France)

Verneuil (France)

Valdemarin (Brazil)

Wagnon (France and Belgium)

Each panel has gathered 20-25 auditors.

Panel 1.

Chair: A. Robert and J. Pintassilgo

VERNEUIL Yves (France) ECP 4571 Université Lumière Lyon 2
yves.verneuil@univ-lyon2.fr

Réformisme pédagogique et progressisme politique : les élections des représentants de l'enseignement secondaire au Conseil supérieur de l'Instruction publique en 1880.

WAGNON Sylvain (France) Université de Montpellier LIRDEF
sylvain.wagnon@umontpellier.fr

Theosophy and education at the beginning of the XXth century : between progressivism and conservatism

MOLE Frédéric (Switzerland) ERHISE Université de Genève
frederic.mole@unige.ch

Ecole publique et Education nouvelle : un débat en 1950 en Suisse romande

SERINA-KARSKY Fabienne (France) CIRCEFT-HEDUC Université Paris 8 Vincennes Saint-Denis and LIRDEF Montpellier
fkarsky@gmail.com

Le montessorisme dans l'institution publique de l'après seconde guerre mondiale : l'expérience de l'école nouvelle de Boulogne (1947-1956)

PEREIRA PERES José Roberto (Brazil) PUC of Rio de Janeiro

Institute of Arts of the University of the Federal District (RJ) in the space of power of Brazilian Republic (1935-1939)

Panel 2.

Chair: F. Mole (University of Geneva)

OTTAVI Dominique (France) Université Paris Ouest-Nanterre-La Défense
ottavi@wanadoo.fr

Retour sur Hannah Arendt

PINTASSILGO Joaquim, **NAMORA** Alda Instituto de Educação, Universidade de Lisboa
japintassilgo@ie.ulisboa.pt

Pedagogical renewal in Portugal between the 1950s and the 1970s: actors, reception of ideas, educational experiences

RIONDET Xavier (France) Université de Lorraine

Equipes Normes et Valeurs, LISEC EA 2310 and ERHISE, Université de Genève
xavier.riondet@u-lorraine.fr

“Pas de théorie pédagogique révolutionnaire, pas de pratique pédagogique révolutionnaire », un mot d’ordre progressiste ou marxiste-léniniste ?

VALDEMARIN Vera Teresa State University of Sao Paulo

They are dressed up in their proper clothing: innovation and method to teach

3°) The full communication by André D. Robert and J.-Y. Seguy about the French “Classes Nouvelles” will be published in the review:

Espacio, Tiempo y Educacion, 7 (1), 2020

“The French Classes Nouvelles (1945-1952): Why is it so difficult to change traditional Pedagogy?”

4°) The SWG REFORPRO has begun in ISCHE 39 in Buenos Aires; it continues in ISCHE 42 and will finish in ISCHE 43 included.

Call for papers ISCHE 42:

Teachers all act according to what Sensevy called their *practical epistemology* (Sensevy, 2011). They organize their teaching based on ideas pertaining to what they conceive as knowledge. These ideas constitute for them a kind of theory of knowledge which springs from practice and controls it. But, more largely, every teacher acts according to a coherent overall conception of his work and its meaning (a horizon of meaning). If the teacher’s task is constrained by legislation and regulatory documents, every teacher adopts a critical position towards them in the discharge of his duties as well as in his political, union, or associative activism.

It therefore seems relevant to investigate not only the tensions that may divide teachers between “conservatism(s),” “reformism(s),” and “progressivism(s),” but also to examine the critical arguments they use to foster or overcome these distinctions when some teachers endeavor to theorize their positions and practices. Now, the history of schooling inclines us to think that it is sometimes difficult to find out which position is progressive in a context of struggles within societies. Likewise, deciding, in such a context, whether critical assessments of a given situation are to be considered progressive or not and why is no easy task. Indeed, it is not uncommon for teachers to adopt positions conceived as progressive on the political and social side and which are, at the same time, regarded as fundamentally conservative on the educative side; such a phenomenon was called *demo-elitism* (Robert, 2006). Conversely, a progressive, innovative educational view may be rooted in conservative political conceptions or in backward-looking, if not reactionary, philosophical options. For instance, eugenics, which can be considered historically and philosophically as a reactionary ideology, may have had advocates among the strong supporters of democratic schooling, such as Édouard Toulouse and Henri Piéron (Garnier, 2015).

Among the numerous questions that may be explored, one concerns the determination of progressive positions within Hannah Arendt’s framework of the necessary *conservatism* of

teachers (Arendt, 1972). How is it possible to identify progressive positions, given that the school is a conservative institution? Such a question underlines the fact that certain contradictions may prove to be important in teachers' critical thinking: can an avowedly progressive position jeopardize, under certain circumstances, the things worthy of being *preserved* within the school? And, conversely, can an apparently conservative view prove itself to be a determined stand against the squandering of the cultural legacy which it is the school's duty to preserve? The recent debates in France surrounding middle school reform (without prejudice to anyone's position on that matter) may constitute in this regard a contemporary illustration of this issue. In any case, the Standing Working Group will strive to identify in the history of education (whether in long-run history or in the history of present times) situations emblematic of this debate pertaining to the various meanings of terms such as conservatism, or even reactionary philosophy, reformism and/or progressivism.

For the Orebro University session (19-22th August), in addition to the above indications, a certain emphasis could be placed on the way in which various authoritarian regimes have developed their pedagogical action (conservative or reactionary) and whose resistance to this action has been organized. Resistance in the form of frontal or underground opposition or in the form of appropriation of progressive pedagogical themes revisited, adapted, transformed, such as the "active school" or others.

During this session, we could also look at other forms of appropriation: for example, those of school policy actors who, moderate progressives, aim to take into account the resistances (and conservatism?) that are expressed within the teachers face the militancy of innovators considered as too adventurous.

The papers, based on empirical studies, must include analysis and reflections about at least one of the three notions and their variations (progressivism, reformism, conservatism).

Procedure for submitting papers for SWGs.

All paper submissions for SWGs from now on must be submitted through the conference electronic system by selecting the respective SWG in the Abstracts area. The deadline for submitting papers to any SWG is January 15th 2020. Proposals should be a maximum of 500 words excluding bibliography. Submitted papers will be redirected to the convenors to be reviewed.

NB: authors with submission for Standing Working Groups are advised to additionally select a second choice while referring to one of the 7 thematic strands of the conference theme. This way their submission will be redirected during the reviewing process.

The convenors: **A. Robert (France), F. Mole (Geneva), J. Pintassilgo (Portugal)**

andre.robert@univ-lyon2.fr

frederic.mole@unige.ch

japintassilgo@ie.ulisboa.pt
