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French public school was first established contrary to territories, or at least contrary to territorial identities. The desire to create a school for all resulted in the plan to establish the same school everywhere, because this alone could convey the values of the French Republic as well as national feeling. As pointed out by Prost [PRO 92, p. 63]: “One of the functions of primary school was to contribute to the unification of minds. Henceforth, the particularities (“dialects” for example) had to be eradicated: the common reference of all students had to solely be the national framework, both for the study of language as well as for history (“French civilization” in old textbooks) or geography (which taught the “natural boundaries” of the territory). By setting up the predominant primary school system known as “people’s school”, the conditions for decontextualization or “uprooting” were realized, which was to facilitate integration into the national community: “following the Revolution, the French model claimed to be a unified political body, and was developing the territory in a centralizing way, asserting the primacy of the capital and authorities residing there; the primordial, if not unique, sense of belonging to the “nation” being inculcated in education” [BER 05, p. 11]. At the same time, however, education was given the mission of participating in the “methodical socialization of the younger generation”, in other words, developing in the child “a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states, which are demanded of him/her by both the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he/she is specifically designed” ([DUR 03 & 51], 1st ed., 1922), which implies adaptation to the socioeconomic context, including its territorial dimension. The issue of the relationship between school (in the generic sense of the term) and its territory was therefore posited from the outset, and from the end of the 19th Century it formed a central aspect of education policies, which would attempt (most of the time without success) to reconcile two imperatives: one of political nature, that of the national unity of public schools, and the other socioeconomic in nature, including the adaptation of education to local conditions to promote local
development and the participation of school education to the modernization of the economy.

To these objectives would be added, after 1960, the taking into account of the inequalities of education and academic success. Alongside the socioeconomic and cultural determinants of these inequalities, the analyses of which were carried out by the sociology of education (Bernstein, Bourdieu and Passeron, Baudelot and Establet), works which were often sponsored or financed by public authorities (those of INED\(^1\) or DEP\(^2\) for example) highlighted the consequences of the territorial distribution of educational provision on trajectories and academic performances. Progressively, the extension of the education system vertically (extension of study period) and horizontally (diversification of educational programs), the widening of access to studies and the (relative) democratization of access to diplomas [BAU 89, DUR 02] as well as the emergence of a more utilitarian conception of education [TAN 86] based on the “competency model” (and not just on that of “knowledge”), changed the relationship between the school and its territory.

At the same time, the territories involved in the increased competitiveness dynamics linked to the comparative advantages between areas witnessed a strengthening of the assertion of the need for a return to the local system and an identity demarcation. The rise of local assertions and regional languages, the typicity of terroirs and heritages, the multiplication of quality labels, etc., were increasingly found, directly or indirectly, in schools and education in the broad sense.

It was from the 1980s that education science started to focus on the concept of territory and, more broadly, on the territorial contexts of education. First, it was the spatial dimension resulting from the work of geographers that served as a framework for a number of territorialized education analyses [GUM 80], continued today within the framework of studies on spatial inequalities [CAR 14] or the Observatoire de l’école rural (Rural School Observatory) – Observatoire education et territoires (Education and Territory Observatory) [ALP 01]. Then, in the 1990s, emphasis was successively placed on territorialized education policies, educational territory planning policies [DER 92, CHA 94, VAN 01], on the “effects” such as “master effect”, “class effect”, “establishment effect”, “circumscription effect” [DUR 88, BRE 94] and finally in the 2000s on territory effects [CHA 13]. Just before this last period, the Evaluation and Long-Term Planning Department (DEP) of the French Ministry of Education [DAV 98] highlighted (which was a surprise to

---

1 National Institute of Demographic Studies.
2 Evaluation and Long Term Planning Department (whose name has been changed several times) attached to the French Ministry of National Education.
(many) the right level of success of students of the schools in rural areas, which was confirmed, in particular, by all the works of the Rural School Observatory [ALP 01].

On another level, at the end of the 1980s, the territory appeared as a pedagogical as well as didactic opportunity that facilitated learning and developed students’ motivation. Many pedagogical movements (following, in particular, the Freinet school) claimed this stance, which was usually accompanied by great attention given to local relations (with local elected representatives, association movement, etc.). Later, it generally constituted the subject of innovative educational practices, such as “learning territory” [JAM 11] or the “educating village” [FEU 02].

At the same time, since the 1990s, with the emergence of environmental education, followed by education for sustainable development and heritage education, there seemed to be an emerging link between education and territories. The rise of education à, “education for”, in National Education, the emergence of a field of research structured around this theme, such as continuity beyond explicit incentives included in the Rocard law of 1985 within agricultural education, of a strong link between the institutions and territories, contributed to making them education “actors” in the sense that they impacted on school and university curricula [BAR 12]. But “education for” can also take a utilitarian function in projects of economic valuation of territories, hence raising the issue of legitimacy and ethics [BAR 13].

The primary objective of this summative book on the topic “Education and Territories” is to re-examine the school combination, understood in the broad sense (in France: school, junior high and high school3), and territory, according to three key aspects and fundamental questions which underlie its internal organization:

– the first part of the book focuses on historical developments, with a specific focus on the current situation, of the various links that have gradually developed between education and its territory. The contributions that make up this first part attempt to identify and characterize the relationship between the school and its territory, which has been established over a long period of time. Beyond that, the contributors attempt to specify the contemporary modalities within this framework that are of key significance to emerging innovations. They thus question old institutional arrangements (school projects, for example) as new (educational projects in territories, for example), as well as original and innovative forms recently adopted by education in relation to its territories (“learning territories”, “educating

3 In the United States, a collège would be recognized as junior high and a lycée would be a high school.
villages”, etc.) and new curricular arrangements such as “education for” (for example education for sustainable development);

– Part 2 covers the role of territories in education and their effects on education in terms of the pedagogical and didactic innovations that have developed. In this context, it asks whether and how the territory, in terms of learning, can be included in the strict discipline (geography, in particular), in the multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary area (sustainable development, environmental education, for example) and in educational partnership projects. It also addresses in this respect the question of the place currently occupied by the territorial system, which gives meaning to professorial activity, in the construction of the professional identity of teachers and, beyond that, the possible necessity introducing the territorial dimension in their initial training;

– finally, the third part deals with the findings and analyses resulting from field research, including aspects of the topic of more theoretical education and territories, by mobilizing its operational concepts. It thus poses various successive questions for this purpose. To what extent and through which processes do territories and territorialities weigh on education? Are “territory effects” at work to this end? More precisely, are some of the observed inequalities in education and orientation of territorial origin? Do the public policies carried out really correspond to the needs of education in the territories? Are the rural educational characteristics observed in the past still relevant today, or are the rural and urban schools converging?

All of these questions are based on numerous field studies carried out in multiple laboratories (ADEF, ECP, EDUTER, ESO, GEODE, Géographie-cité, LDAR, LIPHA, LIRDEF, LSE, etc.) within French and Canadian universities, as reflected by the various signatories to the chapters. These questions are also fueled by the scientific work carried out in the last 20 years on these topics, by, among others, the Education and Territories Observatory and its Spanish Iberian partners (universities of Barcelona, Granada and Saragossa in particular) and Portuguese partners (University of Lisbon) [CHA 14]. The question and development of the main concepts used in this summary book owe much to this work based on field surveys [LE 01].

Through the diversity of these approaches (and the quality of the work gathered here), a central issue arises at the theoretical level: the issue of the constitution of a field of research structured around multiple and complex relations between education and territories. Although it may seem difficult to highlight a thematic unit, it is however possible to bring out the main aspects, which pool recent research together:

– that of the territorial inequalities of education, probably the oldest in the field of university research constituted around its initial sociological dimension,
subsequently supplemented by more geographical concepts (different types of spatial segmentation, territoriality, etc.), a field which is increasingly recognized as such;

– that of the consequences of the territorial context on the contents of education, in close connection with the development of “education for” (EDD, ERE, heritage education, etc.), which refers to a long tradition of the primary school (the “object lesson”, the Freinet school, etc.), whose main theoretical dimensions fall within the fields of pedagogy, didactics and (partially and, without doubt, inadequately to date) the epistemology of scholastic knowledge;

– that of the so-called “territorialized” educational policy, a well-identified research subject inspired by the contributions of political science, and also by the sociology of organizations, which could include more widely than today, not only more global issues (effects of globalization on education and territories), but also more “local” issues, which do not belong to the usual register of “educational policies” such as that of proximity networks of all kinds that can help to “circumvent” public decision, the consequences of urbanistic conceptions (settlement patterns, etc.), or conflicts in the use of typical territories, for example of “new rural communities”.

Beyond these key questions, such a field of research would have everything to gain by developing scientific cooperation around the issue of social representations [BAR 16], which covers all of the topics addressed here, including territorial (we are thinking here of territoriality), and which has the merit of possessing methodologies likely to be shared by many researchers, as evidenced by the contributions of some authors present here. The construction of this field of research, which is already well under way but undoubtedly still little formalized today, is an enormous challenge for education science, often questioned by the actors and decision makers on these issues. The aim of this book is to modestly contribute to the achievement of this objective.
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PART 1

Historical Developments and Contemporary Modalities of Interactions between Education and Territories
Introduction to Part 1

The various contributions that constitute this first part all attempt to characterize, from their historical roots, the complexity of the relations that have gradually been built between education and its territory. The idea is to clarify the various modalities that they are currently adopting by further specifying the long historical framework on which they are based, and then focusing on the recent multiple factors of their developments.

Bruno Garnier first of all posits a historical perspective on the whole by raising the question of the purposes of socialization of education and that of the relationship between the construction of individual identity and the belonging of each person to collective identities registered in the territories of students’ life or origin. He then endeavors to provide a detailed analysis of the expectations and objectives of public educational policies that have followed one another over the past two centuries. Developed recently to build and unify Republican France beyond local peculiarities and regional identities, today they increasingly integrate, in what resembles a pendulum swing, the territorial dimension. The author ends up wondering, ultimately, if an aggiornamento could not be sketched between these two apparently contradictory, or at least diametrically opposed, political positions.

The other chapters of part 1 all show a particular dimension of recent developments, often of a somewhat managerial tendency, all of which seriously raise the issue of integration of territories in education issues. Thus, moving from the macrolevel to the mesolevel, Alain Bouvier, Michel Boyer, Thierry Eymard and Laurent Rieutort distinguish, in the progressive development initiated in the 1990s, partnership managerial practices among the heads of local public educational institutions (EPLE created in 1985), new tools for managing interactions between education and territories. They note that these professional practices are increasingly
observed in territorial school networks that are part of a co-construction partnership process. This brings us to the work of Maryvonne Dussaux, who explicitly shows that the partnership projects that are now multiplying within the field of education and training, provide *de facto* frameworks for the development of “learning territories” based on a collective cooperative approach supported by potential territorial assets that they have.

The issue of “education for”, more specifically education for sustainable development and its links with the territories, is subsequently introduced by Jean-Marc Lange and then Christian Peltier, one for general education and the other for agricultural education. Jean-Marc Lange shows, through an in-depth analysis of educational partnership projects, which are increasingly frequent and widely implemented within the framework of education for sustainable development, that school in the broadest sense (school, junior high and high school), as an institution where the threads of citizenship are tied, is gradually developing into the center of a territory that has become, or has become again, a learner.

Chapter 5 discusses a new age of relations between education and territories. The author indicates that after the time of project-based learning, there is situation-based learning, tied around an integrative territorialized object. This tendency is becoming more and more evident today, particularly in agricultural education, which a long time ago, as recalled, developed close ties with the territories (see at the institutional level, the Rocard law of 1985).

Finally, as in each part of the book, a case study provides a specific complement to the overall reflections. Valérie Guillemot then shows, through the case of the Regional Center for Vocational Training on Bioconstruction of the Southern Alps, that the professional field and institutional control are factors that influence behaviors and collective action. She identifies in the original professional practices of this training center, based on local contexts, the main levers likely to prevent inequalities of education and the orientation of territorial origin in the training of adults.
What Role Should Territories Play in Public Education Policies?

1.1. Summary

The project of making individuals living in the same society aware of the ties that bind them together seems today to be thwarted by the relationship between the construction of individual identity and the belonging of each person to collective identities registered in territories of students’ life or origin. In France, education, in its school form, places the “emancipation” process at the center of its socialization mission: educating means stepping away from your condition, withdrawing from your condition to become yourself and a member of a larger community, in a movement of universalization whose term must be specified: how is it constructed and under what universalizing banner (religion, political principles, values, circulation of objects, devices)? Becoming a citizen requires more than ever a school concerned with universal values, but it must not deny the existence of identities and the interests of the inhabitants of a territory.

1.2. Introduction

Before the school can form, in the individual being, a social being, the territory of origin or the individual’s residence has already forged cultural references that structure their identity. School must deal with this process undertaken outside of it. Several authors have studied it, showing the diversity of territorial levels to which individuals can refer to in order to find invariant characters, the founder of their own identity [SOU 81, TIE 11]. There are subnational territories, such as districts,
villages, regions, or foreign national territories (especially for people of immigrant origin), or supranational territories (for example religious territories, such as Islam which is a religion with universalist vocation), not to mention non-territorialized identities.

How can the challenge of identity and/or community claims related to the territories of origin or residence of inhabitants be responded to, while the mission of the French school system was established around the project to emancipate individuals from all the particular groups that act upon them (family, social class, various affiliations, especially religious)?

1.3. Can the policy of recognition be established in France?

The influence of territories of life on the construction of collective identities is not new, and the French school of thought has long based its mission of socialization on the integration of local identities in the national whole, with the help of republican values that claim to be universal. But what makes this integration particularly complicated today is that the solidarity of the local in the national, through universally shared values, is no longer obvious. The abstraction of local identities in the national whole can lead to tension between the demand for values and interests specific to the human communities that live on the territories of the Republic. These communities have become aware of the specificity of the identities they represent and demand “recognition” for them. This new dimension of identity emerged during the struggles in the United States in the years 1950–1960 led by black minorities or minority cultural groups. Charles Taylor strived to theorize this identity claim. He began by arguing that “identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others” [TAY 94, p. 41]. The devastating effect of the lack of recognition comes, he said, from the internalization of this identity in the form of self-deprecation. Charles Taylor then attempts to define a “policy of difference”, which opposes the policy of universal equality insofar as it allows “reverse discrimination” in favor of ill-considered minorities. Henceforth, a liberal society “distinguishes itself as such in the way it treats its minorities, including those who do not share the public definitions of good, and above all the rights it grants to all its members” [TAY 94, p. 81].

But this North American approach, generally accepted in so-called “communitarian” English-speaking societies, is criticized in “holistic” societies, such as France. For Paul Ricœur, the reverse discrimination advocated by Taylor poses a threat to the existence of a social space that is blind to differences. The liberal conception of dignity refers to the idea of a universal human potential shared by all: it is this potential that has allowed the widening of the sphere of individuals with
recognized rights. On the contrary, “in the case of the policy of difference, it is from
the differentiated cultural fund that the demand for universal recognition proceeds,
the assertion of a supposed universal human potential being itself considered for the
simple expression of a hegemonic culture, that of the white man, male, at his peak in
the Age of Enlightenment” [RIC 04 p. 334]. Paul Ricœur criticizes Taylor for
condemning the search for a universal human identity, accused of being
discriminatory, a particularism disguising itself as a universal principle. Henceforth,
it is the general will dear to Rousseau that is accused of homogenizing tyranny.
These debates have taken root in France [LEP 95, MES 99, REN 99, TOU 97, WIE 96].
Proponents of the universal and relativists clash, and the debate is enriching many works
(see [MAA 01, p. 40].

These debates are being updated nowadays. On the whole, the recognition of
differences does not cross the barrier of the granting of specific rights with regard to
education. Each time a minister seems to be moving in this direction, their projects
give rise to criticism made in the name of multiculturalism contrary to the tradition
of the Republican school system. One of the manifestations of this opposition was
the ratification of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages signed
on May 7, 1999 by France. The political significance of this decision had been
announced shortly before by Lionel Jospin, the then Prime Minister:

“The government’s approach has a strong symbolic dimension. Indeed,
it shows that the time when national unity and the plurality of regional
cultures appeared to be antagonistic is over. The Government’s
approach is inspired by the desire to enhance, in its richness and
diversity, the entire national cultural heritage” [ALE 02, p. 25].

But the Conseil constitutionnel (French Constitutional Council) opposed the
ratification of the text on the basis of the first paragraph of Article 2 of the
Constitution of the Fifth Republic, according to which “the language of the Republic
is French”, on grounds that certain clauses of the Charter tended to “recognize the
right to practice a language other than French not only in ‘private life’ but also in
‘public life’, to which the Charter associates justice and administrative authorities as
well as public services” [COU 99, p. 11]. That is why the historical reconciliation
between national unity and the plurality of regional cultures was nipped in the bud.
It may be concluded that France and its schools will never recognize that there are
“minorities” on the soil of the Republic, that is not only groups within a numerically
larger community, but groups of citizens united by the demand for the recognition of
their rights [LE 04, SIM 99].
Yet, the French nation was not first defined in 1789 based upon an identity or on a culture common to the citizens, but on the refusal of the old regime and feudalism. The Constitution of 1793 thus placed less emphasis on nationality than on citizenship. It is in this sense that Jean Leca wrote that “France is first a political community before being a cultural community” [LEC 85]. France is not a cultural community formed around a people center that has spread its culture to others. It is rather a political community built around a state. French citizenship should therefore have remained independent of the community to which its citizens belong [GAR 12].

In addition, even if a French tradition of citizenship (rather from the founders of the Third Republic than from the Revolution of 1789) opposes resistance to the recognition of rights attached to the nation’s subgroups, the visibility of a multicultural society becomes more significant every day, at a time when the management methods of the educational institution give an increasingly important place to the local system. In this context, the perfect equality of the provision of education throughout the territory of a Republic indifferent to differences remains only dependent on its founding principles, and little by little, it is being replaced by equity, giving right to new forms of the recognition of identities [MAR 96, pp. 65–66].

1.4. Globalization and national identity

But the construction of national identity must not only confront the threats of territorialized collective identities. An inverse phenomenon, called globalization, which can be described as a process of deterritorialization of human identity, is a threat to relativism and obsolescence, as well as the construction of national identity and the link between the nation and universal values that France claims to embody.

Even before identifying globalization as such, the ability of the national territory to establish the collective identity of its inhabitants has been discussed and even disputed. Criticizing Littré’s definition of the nation, Renan said: “The existence of a nation is (forgive me this metaphor) a daily plebiscite, as the existence of the individual is a perpetual affirmation of life” [REN 82, p. 32]. A century later, Eric Hobsbawm was hardly affirmative: “There were no satisfactory criteria for deciding which of the multiple human communities could carry the title of nation” [HOB 90, p. 18]. This explains why national identities are in reality processes that must be constantly supported, notably by schools. History is thus more often mobilized to achieve national identity than geography, as evidenced by the doubts of Vidal de la Blache: “Is France a geographical being?” [VID 03, p. 19] and as Fernand Braudel explained: “The decisive element is not land, nature or environment, it is history, man, in short prisoner of himself/herself, for he/she is heir to those who preceded him/her on
his/her own land and shaped its landscape, committing him/her in advance to a series of retrospective determinisms” [BRA 86, p. 202].

Yet, precisely the historical connections of man to the national territory tend to give way today in view of the opening of borders to the world. Marshall McLuhan was the first to use the expression “global village” to describe the deterritorialization of human culture [MCL 62, p. 31]. Furthermore, in the field of teaching history, it can now be argued that it is the history of humanity that makes it possible to think of the globality of today’s world in the complexity of the connections between territories and peoples. The emergence of global history, or connected history, has started being included in school curricula at the expense of a currently unfinished didactization effort [MAU 13]. Connected history leads one to think that all identity is the result of a series of influences of “accompanying” cultures that are incorporated into one another. The idea that there exist collective identities arising from fixed systems and pure territories is, at best, an absurdity, at worst, a mortifying fantasy that nourishes totalitarian ideologies [LAP 93, p. 25].

Thus, modern man would be led to relativize any form of identity salience and would also find himself possessing resistance ability and personal freedom, the fruit of the new education in the world, all these being the characteristics that define them, according to Alain Touraine, as a “subject” [TOU 92]. The modern individual would move from their territory of life, from their community of origin, to more inclusive territories and communities, networks to the entire planet, the homeland which is gradually accessing universal consciousness [MOR 93]. Still within the perspective of a globalization of citizenship, many authors from the field of political science, history, sociology and anthropology have questioned the emergence of a “nationalization of the world” or that of a transformation of international cultural identities into political identities [BAY 96, CAH 99, DEL 99, POU 95, REV 99].

Unlike previous contributors, other authors perceive, in the face of globalization, the reaffirmation of national identities [GUE 08]. In view of the weaknesses of the European construction and the difficulty of making a sustainable European identity to emerge through schooling, the affirmation of national identity and its support by the school would constitute the only bulwark against the decay of values in the cauldron of globalization, and, paradoxically, the national territory could become a space for the protection of regional identities, threatened by the steamroller of global culture. Anthony Giddens noted that during the advent of the first modernity, at the time of the 19th Century European industrial revolution and colonial development, Western societies imposed the nation-state model on the world as the most successful form of political sovereignty. Nowadays in crisis, the nation-state is making persistent and considerable efforts to mark its seal on every corner of its territory. Not only did it
impose its language and culture on all, it made its territory the framework for collecting information as well as economic and social statistics, and compelled users of these data to legitimize the validity of the partitioning off of national territories [GID 94, BEC 00]. Nationalism, far from being superseded, is on the contrary full of vigor. The resurgence of the national identities of former colonies shows that the national territory is quick in regaining its identity dimension when this dimension has been deliberately denied. This is illustrated by Algeria since decolonization, despite the considerable efforts previously deployed by the French colonial administration to destroy existing tribal affiliations [KAT 08]. In Europe, nationalist mobilizations in Scotland or Flanders testify to the vitality of national or subnational feeling [DIE 00].

These two a priori irreconcilable approaches agree on one fundamental point: the recognition of the diversity of territorial identities (whether or not they have the nation-state as a framework) is a means of training modern man and citizen. This concerns, in short, not confusing unity of the human being, wherever they live, with a uniformity of cultures, which are the salt of humanity. This reflection is based on the assessment of the crisis of identities, according to which the globalized world seems to standardize identities, while everywhere, multiculturalism helps further the affirmation of irreducible but sometimes disordered identities that are incompatible with one another, or even strongly antagonistic and exclusive, and therefore contrary to the movement of the universalization of humanist values [TOU 92, p. 213].

1.5. Territorialization of education policies

The Old Regime was marked by the absence of national unity of education. The schools were attached to the parishes and their territories, which were referred to as “church premises” [SAI 98, p. 35]. Though the idea of an equal education throughout the national territory was born in 1789, Christian Nique showed that the public primary school, as a public service, was built with François Guizot under the July monarchy: the period between 1830 and 1840 witnessed the organization of the elementary school, the division of tasks between the communes, departments, the state and the establishment of an inspection body as well as the unification of programs and methods [NIQ 90]. Secondary education, founded under Napoleon I, was based on the principle of a state monopoly, but in reality the administrative unit of the educational territory concealed a great geographical diversity and marked inequalities of access to schooling throughout the 19th Century [CHA 10]. The French Goblet Law of October 30, 1886 organized primary education based on decentralization, centralization and deconcentration: the three levels of primary school (nursery schools and kindergartens, elementary primary schools, upper primary schools and complementary courses) had the same legal status and the same municipal funding. But the determination of programs was national, and in secondary education the state