Becoming a Teacher in University: The First Experiences of Faculty Development in France

Saeed PAIVANDI

──＜Abstract＞──

This paper presents the main results of a survey on the experiences of apprentice teachers in French universities. Apprentice teachers are selected from among the best students enrolled in a thesis by the Centers for Initiation to Higher Education (CIES) for teaching after pedagogical university training. The CIES plan has been the first effort to introduce, at the national level, faculty development in French higher education in 20 years. A nationwide survey was conducted on 3327 apprentice teachers engaged in 84 universities in 2001. This paper analyzes the experiences of apprentice teachers and their contact with academic life as new teachers.

The survey results showed that the apprentice teachers' experiences were often shaped by four major challenges: the balance and tension between research and teaching, teaching practices and training experience, individual ties with lecturers and the collective life of their department, and relationships and social interactions with students. These challenges often caused tense situations but also helped the apprentice teachers to become familiar with the inner workings of the academic profession, and to be involved in the construction of a professional identity.

Associate Professor, Center for Research in Higher Education, University of Paris 8, France
Visiting Professor, Center for the Studies of Higher Education, Nagoya University

1. Introduction

The creation of the Centers for Initiation to Higher Education (CIES) in 1989 introduced a meaningful reform in French higher education. This plan represented the first initiative and effort by the ministry of education to renew the faculty and to offer a pedagogical training for future academics. There were 14 CIES for 84 universities in which their main function was to recruit and to train future teachers (monitors) in higher education[1].

The monitors selected group of the best PhD students with scholarship who are less than 25 years-old (about 1700 each year). Alongside their research, the monitors have to teach undergraduate students (first and second year) for sixty four hours per year under the supervision of an experienced professor. They also have to follow ten days of pedagogical training during the three years of their activities. The monitors receive an additional allowance (+35%) in return.

The organization of training varied according to the CIES: seminars, conferences, workshops, course of one to three days. Also, the CIES propose several topics of training: higher education system, the organization of research in France, teaching methods, sociology of students, student learning, assessment, educative technology. There is not any national teaching program, so each CIES provide a local program.

Being a monitor does not mean a pre-recruitment. Some monitors chose to work in public or private research organizations. But this experience increases their chance to become a lecturer.

This text attempts to present the results of a survey on 3327 monitors. The text focuses mainly on the qualitative data from this survey and tries to analyze the experience of monitors and their first contact with an academic life as a new teacher. I attempt to provide answers to some questions about the new academic generation: Who were they? From where did they come? How did they achieve their experience as monitor? What sorts of careers did they plan for themselves? How did they

balance their teaching and research ?

2. Methodology

The nationwide survey was conveyed between the months of June to September 2001 by CRES[2].　It focused on the monitors who were hired by the CIES in 1998, 1999 and 2000.　A letter had sent to them by email, which had the possibility to access directly to a blank questionnaire.　In 5190 Monitors existing at the time of the survey, 3327 responded to our questionnaire (64% of total).　The sample is widely representative, because a very high rate (almost two monitors on three) participated in the survey.　The ease of access and completion of questionnaire had probably helped getting an excellent response rate.

The survey's goal was to find the essential data on monitors' prior path (school, high school and higher education career) and family, in order to have a better understanding of their activities and perceptions as new teachers and their career plan.　We asked monitors to describe their experiences related to their teaching, research or pedagogical training which followed by CIES and their relation with their colleagues and students.　The questionnaire proposed several open questions in order for them to express different aspects of their teaching experience.

The internal rate of responses to different questions was very high, including the open questions.　For none open questions, the average was 95% and for open questions, the average was 85%.

3. Main Findings about Monitors' Profile

The analysis of monitors' path (school and higher education career) showed they were an elite group in the student population.　All indicators of their academic career converge: a school career without "fault", very little repetition (85% without repeating), the scientific dominance (79%) and literature (11%) field in high school, a high proportion who obtained their baccalauréat[3] with a good mention (71%).　67% of the monitors have completed their Masters degree before reaching 25.

Monitors mainly belonged to families culturally and/or economically "privileged". In two thirds of families, at least one parent had graduated from a university and nearly 30% of monitors have at least one parent who works in education or research fields. Even though a minority of them did not come from privileged families, the dominant figure among the monitors was an "inheritor" (Bourdieu et Passeron, 1964).

Sixty percent of men and forty percent of constituted the monitors. The minority place of women must however be understood in relation to the ongoing feminization of faculty in France. Women are much more numerous in the "no scientific" disciplines, biological and medical sciences.

The monitors were in the majority (88%) between 24 and 28 years (in 2001). The average age at the time of the survey was 26.3 years; the average age at entry into CIES was 24.5 years.

Response monitors to various questions relating to motivations and plans for the future clearly reflect the desire and willingness to integrate higher education as lecturer or researcher. The vast majority (91%) monitors demonstrated their interest in teaching, or think that CIES facilitate their future recruitment as lecturer (69%). The financial advantages are mentioned by 75% of monitors as motivation for choosing CIES.

About the future, the most important project for the vast majority was to become full time lecturer: 68% of monitors ranked this vow in the first place, 19% as the second choice and 4% as third choice. In total, 91 monitors out of 100 plans to integrate higher education. Research in the public sector is the second monitors' wish: 16% of them want primarily a profession of research in the public sector (40% indicate in second and 9% in third preference). Finally, working in the private research companies is the first choice by only 5% of monitors (respectively 12% and 22% as second and third choice).

4. Construction of Professional Identity

CIES' experience allows monitors to be involved to a process of professional identity's construction. They began to work in a complex institution which they already lived with another status (student). How-

ever, entering the academic world did not constitute a rupture. This is not a big leap into the unknown for those young people who knew already the system otherwise. Now, they must develop a progressive membership and rediscover the university as a teacher. The first dimension of experience was the definition of their role and learning their new career in an environment where the human relational dimension is fundamental.

The survey data tended to explain the complexity of the construction of the new identity of the apprentice teacher: *"The opportunity is given to us in relational, pedagogical and intellectual level for imparting a knowledge, a method and a "taste""* (literature, University of Pau)[4] . A student turned to "snap" to a teacher. However, they are recognized like member of community when they succeed to understand and to practice routines, specific rituals and unwritten rules of the profession: "*I had the chance to share my experience with other young colleagues. Overall, I am satisfied with this first teaching experience because it allowed me to see that I was able to teach!* (History, University of Paris 1)". Through daily activities, monitors must show to others (director, colleagues, students, and administrative staff) their new status and their adherence in the academics world. As we can see through the monitors' discourse, the recognition of others is a co-construction act.

The new identity as a teacher seems to be built in three acts:
- Integrating to a teaching team consisting of professors and other teaching staffs.
- Scientific research and publication give them a sense of belonging to an academic group and an intellectual community.
- Preparing and giving a course and direct contact with students is a significant experience to practice the teaching profession.

The monitors began a process of secondary socialization through the " internalization of sub-specialized institutional worlds" (Berger & luckman, 1996). These three acts were actively involved in a dense and transformative socialization. Research and teaching as two separate components gave a dual nature to this identity.

The experience of teaching, with its launch so quick, (they went very quickly "on the other side") was qualified by the vast majority of monitors

as revealing: "*I think CIES throws us into the lions coop, alone in combat. The first year was very difficult to manage in many aspects: organization, lead a class* (computer sciences, University of Nantes)". They must incorporate a world of common sense which is far from being obvious. The real deficiency of this experience was often weak support and inability of the University to assist future teachers efficiently. The difficulties sometimes prevented that CIES became a "conversion device": "*I have taught and I feel enriched without having any significant help. I regret that the pedagogic help has been a chimera*" (literature, University of Besancon).

From the first weeks, monitors were expected to act as an experienced teacher to students who may have the same age. Becoming an adult professional is not purely a technical process. This work takes time and requires a certain maturity, both, professional, social and emotional. The teaching, as a professional situation, is the time of "secondary socialization" that takes place, according to Berger and Luckmann, through the "internalization of sub-specialized institutional worlds" (1997, p.189). The CIES' experience enabled monitors to acquire knowledge and develop specific roles directly or indirectly based on the division of labor within the university. Teaching is a field of action in which the monitors have to learn a combination of knowledge, practices and skills. Such professionals' knowledge contributes significantly to develop a new identity. This socialization in work situation involves a cultural transformation. In other words, the socialization we are talking about is not reduced to mere familiarity with the workplace (university), and its culture and values. It put the interactions between actors at the heart of social action: "*I discover the teaching profession while I planned to research only, and I believe today that I am infected with teaching's* "*viruses*". *I passionately love my course; education is a real pleasure*" (physiology, University of Aix-Marseille 3).

Working as a monitor is not only an economic transaction (earning a salary); it has a strong symbolic and imaginary dimension. The educational career is always exposed to the myths, beliefs and desires in relation to society and individuals. The monitors seemed fairly adhere to the

educational community and its ideals and values. On behalf of these "values" that some monitors engaged in this job and justify their career plan. In this perspective, the construction of identity is realized through an emotional and imaginary process. Despite the temporary nature of their status, monitors developed a strategy of the mobilization of their abilities and desires. The main challenge was to confirm the relevance of the pedagogical and research work within the scientific community and among students.

This construction of identity among the monitors did not always happen in the "ideal" conditions. The discovery of the mass university can be traumatic. Instead of the ideal and imaginative university, they often met the real university with its problems. This disillusionment did not block the progress of experience among the monitors. They tried to adapt and accomplish their mission. Those who disappointed adjusted their plans to abandon the original idea of teaching.

The lexical analysis that was done from an open question shows that despite of the difficulties, the majority of the monitors have enjoyed their experience. In 3022 monitors who responded to a question about evaluation of their job, 2658 (88%) used terms that described a positive experience of teaching.

The survey results revealed that the monitors' experience was often marked by four challenges: the coexistence between research and teaching, teaching practice, integration to academics' world and the relation with the students.

5. Link Between Research and Teaching

The tension on the link between teaching and research was one of the first discoveries by monitors. What was a "natural combination" in their initial perception becomes a real problem. The monitors realized a conflicting coexistence between these two missions: "The *two activities take too much time: I do not know how the lecturers can deal with teaching and research and having a normal life*" (Physics, University of Joseph Fourier). The diversity of opinions expressed by the monitors revealed that the

relation between these two activities was far from obvious to everyone: "*I realized that teaching was very difficult and demanding.   It is difficult to find a real reward for teaching*" (biology, University of Aix-Marseille I).

Contexts and experiences vary greatly, and monitors do not appreciate them the same way.   Some believed in the compatibility between these two activities, and some emphasized on the complementarily of them. Ideal for certain was to oscillate between research and teaching, use teaching to examine research and reveal the key issues and present the results of research to students.   "The *combination of teaching and research seems ideal: each activity affects the other activity positively. Teaching opens up new areas for research and we transfer a part of our research experience in teaching*" (Mechanics, University of Paris 13).

The tension between teaching and research was not only reduced to the time they spent in each activity, it is often amplified by the institutional factors related to the functional logic of the academic profession.   The monitors found that the evaluation of their activities for recruitment or promotion would focus mainly on research and publications.   They discovered that teaching (teaching load, office hours and informal contact with students) was not really valued professionally at the university. Research and publications are the most important activities in the academic culture and career.   In this perspective, the monitors asked why to spend a lot of time for preparation and improvement of teaching? "*Teaching is a good learning and contact with students is very interesting. But, if you want to apply for the post of Lecturer, teaching's importance does not count on a resume*" (Pharmacy, University of Paris 11).

The monitors must be able to motivate themselves to engage in pedagogy.   Their preference for being a teacher-researcher is often motivated by the human environment and the intellectual transaction. Education was often perceived as a personal pleasure while research was considered important to succeed his profession: "*The teaching combines the non-ordinary human relations, the relation to knowledge, and the relation to teaching.   The articulation is sometimes frustrating when there is a tension between teaching and research*" (economy, University of Bordeaux IV).

The contradictions generated by the association between research and teaching may also discourage some of them despite a positive assessment of the teaching experience. The opposition between these two activities seemed to be more vivid in science. "*Good experience has shown me that I'm not overflowing passion for the profession. This showed me that you can not do both missions seriously*" (Physics, University of Lyon I).

The tension between teaching and research was one of the first awareness of monitors and worried them. This was a big frustration for the majority of the monitors. The time devoted to teaching seemed "useless" and "waste of time" for some monitors. They realized that teaching was not much visibility outside the department; it was not valued on a professional and formal recognition in which it remained largely invisible. However, research is widely recognized both within the academic institution, scientific community and in the society. They understood too that faculty tended to be more worried about their research projects than their teaching.

The monitors faced the ambivalence of institutional discourse. On one side, CIES proposed strength training to enhance the mission of teaching. On the other hand, the academic culture and institutional practices continued to place clear emphasis on the importance of research. Teaching may be "rewarding", "interesting", "formative", "seductive", "satisfactory", but it is rarely "necessary" or "essential". It is quite revealing to note that the developments of this feeling among the instructors appear at the beginning of their career: "*The profession of teacher-researcher would be quite nice if the whole career development was not assessed mainly on research*" (Computer sciences, University of Toulouse III). This contradiction was also underlined in Viry's survey on faculty (2006) or by the report of Simon (2006) on the teaching mission. L. Viry described the contradiction between increasingly demand for teaching activities and institution's practice focused on research (2006, p. 202). The analysis of B. Galinon Mélènec who evoked a painful gap in the academic career goes in the same direction.

6. Teaching Experience

The monitors said they had met series of problems related to teaching. They complained of working in a fragmented and atomized environment. Similarly, the university's pedagogical framework seemed "fuzzy" and inconsistent sometimes. Early in their experience, monitors were faced with number of important issues related to course preparation and students' assessment. They often criticized the university for lack of global pedagogical strategy: "*We need training to teach well, we know how to teach not because we have succeeded in our studies*" (Biochemistry, University of Louis Pasteur).

They had various problems concerning the teaching methods by which the course would be taught, the assessment methods and the evaluation methods, by which the course would be reviewed and improved "*The assessment of students is very difficult for me. I never learned how to do it. My supervisor suggested dealing with it. I'm afraid of being unfair and it really bothers me*" (Earth and planetary Sciences, University of Rennes 1). The teaching methods as so many other issues have rarely become the subject of collective debate in the pedagogical team. "*My classes have gone very well. I only regret the lack of consideration and the total lack of integration into a teaching staff that does not exist* · · · (Economy, University of Pierre Mendes France)".

The answers given by the monitors showed that the first step in the new experience was the most delicate and difficult. In response to a question about the major difficulties encountered in the course of their experience, 37% mentioned difficulties in the preparation of classes, and 25% said that they felt tense while teaching. They must overcome the psychological barriers to assert themselves as a teacher. According to monitors, the original "fear" was often followed by a self confidence feeling.

The monitors were concerned about the relevance of teaching methods and their impact on student learning. Some training provided by the CIES and the exchanges and contacts with other monitors or colleagues could help them to improve teaching methods. However, their inexpe-

rience and loneliness bothered them sometimes: "*I am not always able to present things in a simple and understandable manner. I expected a teaching aid. But I did not find support*" (Geography, University of Versailles-Saint Quentin). C. Musselin and E. Friedberg (1989) noted in their survey on teachers lack of collective work in university departments. The first monitors' experience confirmed the results of previous investigations. The luckiest ones were those who were accompanied and assisted by a teaching team or by an experienced supervisor. Some monitors went further when their pedagogy did not meet the expected success. They tried new teaching methods: "It *is a very nice experience, rewarding and also very pleasant. I discovered the university, but, unfortunately, I see the lack of true teaching team, I had to find the pedagogical solution by myself*" (Electrokinetics, University of Orleans).

Although monitors generally appreciated the training of the CIES, they expressed a number of criticisms. Sometime the monitors seemed to prepare their courses with their own experience as a student, but they realized that on top of that "intuitive" knowledge, they must know more things for a relevant course: "The *three years of teaching experience and training seminars with CIES allow obtaining a clearer view of academic career, to enhance our own teaching abilities*" (Law, University of Nantes).

The critics about the training programs focused on contents, duration, organization or the mandatory aspect of training seminars. Some courses were more appreciated: the teaching techniques (voice, conducting meetings, and reading skills), student learning theories and analysis of the context of higher education. Their most important criticisms concerned the abstract aspects of the seminars (too theoretical), unrelated training topics, the lack of practical topics (related to daily tasks like preparing a course or assessment).

The act of teaching was an overwhelming work for monitors who often found teaching like an attractive, exciting and stimulating activity. They said that they had great satisfaction when students were learning, progressing and expressing their gratitude.

7. Enter to the Academic Life

One of the key dimensions in the experience of monitors at the university was establishing relation with faculty. They made an effective entry into the social world of lecturers through daily contacts. This was a crucial element of the construction of professional identity and the formative socialization within the University.

The survey showed that monitors' relation with the teachers - teamwork - was not a very appreciated academic practice. Academics are largely autonomous, and are often rewarded only for their work as independent researchers or teachers. C. Musselin and E. Friedberg emphasized that the academic work at French universities was primarily solitary and uncoordinated and did not create interdependence between faculties (1989). The problem is that the university does not require the faculty teamwork; they are not obliged to cooperate to accomplish their missions (Fave-Bonnet 1993).

Individualistic attitude of teachers surprised the monitors. The teaching issues did not become the subject of authentic teamwork in each department. They complained because of the lack of discussion on pedagogical problems. "*The first time is really hard: We do not receive any help or advice from colleagues (except monitors a little older than us)*" · · · (Geography, University of Paris IV) .

In the organization of CIES, each monitor is formally followed by a supervisor (an experienced professor) who should help her or him to integrate in their new environment. According to the survey's data, only 25% of monitors said that they met with their supervisor weekly, 25% monthly, 19% once a semester, 19% once a year and almost 12% never. The role of teaching supervisor, when properly completed, may be crucial in supporting the monitor in its first steps as a teacher.

The survey asked monitors to give their views on their relations with other academics. According to the results, the monitors were relatively satisfied of their relation with lecturers. The most frequent responses were expressed as followed: "frequent exchanges" (53%), "friendly and attentive reception" (48%), and "help and advice received" (46%). These

responses clearly reflected the positive aspect of their individual relation with lecturers. However, monitors seemed significantly less appreciate the internal and collective life of their departments: 38% of them mentioned the teamwork experience and only 29% said they have participated in the internal life of the department. Another important information of the investigation concerned the impact of disciplinary context (the department). Generally, the monitors from technical and scientific disciplines appreciated the teamwork more than the monitors of other fields. We know that science and technology offer more collective frameworks within the laboratory and humanities' academics prefere individual activities.

Analysis of negative terms to describe their relation with teachers revealed the existence of three types of criticism: the hierarchical relation, lack of teamwork, and a feeling of "exclusion" as the most violent manifestation of human relation within the University. The criticism of the hierarchical link reflects the discovery of a social environment dominated by the power relation: "*My experience is a little mitigated by the fact that in a university as important, the ties between teachers are often superficial. In the middle of Professors of the Sorbonne the monitors are a bit "small class*"" (Literature, University of Paris IV).

8. The Contact with the Student

We could often find two different discourses about students. A recurrent criticism is reproduced about their conception and approach of learning: a gap exist between monitors and students because of their relation to knowledge. They noticed a lack of intellectual effort and compared it with their own experience. But many positive points and comments about their human relations mentioned.

The greatest difficulties outlined by monitors refer to student learning and their conception of learning. Thus, monitors emphasized the lack of intellectual "appetite" among the students (50% of monitors believe this was the most important difficulty). They observed that some students lacked in curiosity, interest and motivation to continue their studies. In

short, according to monitors, students expressed sometimes a culture and an attitude incompatible with the university.　As new teachers, they had a hard task in connection with the first-year students.　For "freshmen" students, the first year is a turning point for understanding the academic world and developing a relevant conception of learning.

Unilaterally, the monitors tended often to establish a relation with the students through their relation with their own educational experience. Both behaviors - lack of intellectual "appetite" and truancy - disappointed a large number of monitors.　The studies show that student culture is invaded by the utilitarian tendency and they tend increasingly to care more about graduation and career than intellectual interest (Coulon, Paivandi, 2008).　The terms of the monitors showed that there was a real difference with the students' relation to knowledge and relation to academic culture.　The relation between teacher and student is organized around knowledge.　The two partners often tend to adopt two different perspectives vis-à-vis the academic knowledge.　The student who is mainly concerned about his employability would be an anti-model of teacher's "ideal student".　This shift caused permanent frustration among the monitors: "*It's an interesting experience, but I discovered that the teaching profession was not a passion for me because of Students who are not very motivated* (geology, University of Louis Pasteur).

Monitors' critical discourse was not often very different from that of lecturers (Coulon, Paivandi, 2008).　For monitors also some students were a "problem group" (Martuccelli, 1995): "passivity", "lack of motivation", "utilitarian behavior", "insufficient level", and "immaturity".　The monitors were concerned about those who "*have no real career plan*" or "w*ho are confused in their learning orientations*".

However, the monitors spoke of "good" and "bad" students at the same time, they worked with students who were "interested", "motivated", "less motivated", "lost" or "passive".　For this reason, the monitors often mentioned the great heterogeneity of students in their classes.　The quality of exchanges, reciprocal communication and friendly dialogue with students are the most positive point for the monitors.　They were impressed by their students' confidence.　The monitors noticed that despite

the small age difference with students, they could have good relations with students: "I *fear that my young age is a disadvantage but it has proven an asset to communicate* (Sociology, University of Paris V)." They were sometimes seduced by a kind of complicity linked to this erasure of the traditional distance that could exist between a student and a teacher. Indeed, the generational proximity may have a downside: "*Former student, young teacher, I'm divided between two attitudes: the sympathetic friend or strict teacher* (Process engineering, University of Louis Paster)".

To better understand the relation between students and monitors, one must recognize the structure of pedagogy in university. Monitors often involve small groups of students in the workshops. Unlike the lecture, small structures are attractive to students. Developing a direct and personal relation with the teacher is easy in workshops, but difficult in lectures. The individualization of the relation, understanding, reduction of severity, encouragement, mutual recognition, changes the teaching climate and creates a dynamic intersubjective between monitors and students. The monitors emphasized the importance of reciprocal communication with students: "They *can deal with my blunders and respect a novice teacher despite my mistakes and hesitations*". The lack of experience of the monitors seemed to be "compensated" with good and emotional relation. The good relation with students was a determining factor for developing a sense of self confidence. The monitors emphasized on the good atmosphere of course as an important educational component to promote student learning. Precisely, that is what lacks in a university and monitors attempted fulfill students' affective need.

9. Conclusion

Monitors Experience is automatically an authentic analyzer the French higher education. The neophyte teachers discover the different dimensions of an unusual career *in situ* by adjusting their perceptions. The monitors faced challenges which created tense situations, but they admitted to become familiar with the inside of academic profession. They found also that research was more valuable than teaching. A significant

number of monitors perceived themselves as academic; this identity "leap" was the most important achievement of this experience. Our survey showed clearly that CIES' objective to encourage the best students to work in higher education was achieved.

This temporary status gives them a posture to judge objectively some elements of university life. The originality of their observation depends on their situation, between the two: dual membership as a student and a teacher simultaneously, they represent the "fresh" spirit of the university. Critical issues such as articulation between research and teaching, academic career's learning, pedagogical training, mission of teaching, evaluation of teaching, pedagogy and educational relation lay at the heart of monitors' discourse. The monitors' experience showed that the teaching in higher education should be learned like any other professions.

The CIES is the first effort made at national level in the field of faculty development in French higher education. This significant innovation has been around for the past 20 years, but its impact has remained limited and faculty training has not developed much. There are a few centers of faculty development "SUP" (University Service of Pedagogy) created by local and individual initiative, but professors do not seem to appreciate this new professionalism in academic career. The academic culture resists changes in teaching, and it will be a big challenge for the future of the university in France.

An optimistic perspective may be positive effects of new reforms. The reform of LMD requires the evaluation of teaching and the new autonomy granted to the universities (LRU 2007) is supposed to enhance locally the teaching and the faculty development. Maybe we should wait several years to see their real impact on pedagogy and faculty development.

Notes

1) The new law (LRU 2007) gave more autonomy to the universities; the CIES is not centralized as before.
2) Center for Research in Higher Education, University of Paris 8.
3) French high school-leaving certificate.
4) Monitor literature working in university of Pau.

References

Berger P. L., Luckmann T., 1966, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Bourdieu P., Passeron J.-C., 1964, *Les héritiers. Les étudiants et la culture*. Paris, Les Éditions de Minuit.

Coulon A., Paivandi S., 2008, *Les relations entre les étudiants, les enseignants et le personnel non-enseignant dans les établissements supérieurs en France*. Paris : Observatoire nationale de la vie étudiante.

Coulon A., R. Ennafaa, S. Paivandi, 2004, *Devenir enseignant du supérieur*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Fave-Bonnet M. F., 1993, *Les enseignants-chercheurs physiciens*. Paris : INRP.

Galinon-Mélénec B., 1996, L'enseignant-chercheur au sein d'une situation complexe et contingente encore insuffisamment analysée, in Danny J., Romainville M. *Enseigner à l'Université. Un métier qui s'apprend ?* Bruxelles : De Boeck Université, 11-31.

Martuccelli D., 1995, *Décalages*. Paris : PUF.

Musselin C., Friedberg E., 1989, *En quête d'universités*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Simon T., 2006, *Accueil et orientation des nouveaux étudiants dans les universités*. Rapport, Ministère de l'Education nationale, de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche (France).

Viry L., 2006, *Le monde vécu des universitaires*. Rennes : PUR.

フランスにおける大学教員準備プログラムの展開

－フランス初の FD の試み－

サイード・ペヴァンディ

───── ＜要　旨＞ ─────────────────

　　本稿の目的は、フランスの大学で実施されている大学教員養成制度
（「モニター制度」）に関する調査結果を紹介することである。この制
度は、高等教育教員入門センター（CIES）が博士課程在籍者の中から
優秀な学生を選抜し、大学教育の一部を担当させるというものである。
彼らは「モニター」と呼ばれる。この取組は、過去 20 年間フランス
高等教育が全国レベルで行った事実上最初のファカルティ・ディベロ
ップメントであった。この制度に関する最初の全国調査は、2001 年に
84 大学のモニター3,327 人に対して行われた。

　　本稿では、モニターが初心者として、モニターがアカデミック社会
と接触した経験について分析した。彼らは、主に以下の経験から多く
を学んでいる。すなわち、①研究と教育、②教育実践と訓練経験、③
教職員との個人的関係と所属組織における集団生活、④学生との教育
的関係と社会的な相互関係の４項目である。彼らにとって、この経験
はしばしば緊張を要するものではあったが、同時に大学教員職に親し
んだり、職業アイデンティティ構築のプロセスに誘ったりするもので
あった。

パリ第 8 大学高等教育研究センター・准教授
名古屋大学高等教育研究センター・客員教授