Help for Personal Work: Who are the Real Actors?

Diallo SEYKHOU¹

¹Research teacher, University of Reunion, laboratory ICARE, Reunion, France, Email: seykhou.diallo@univ-reunion.fr

Abstract: On a recent thesis supported analyzes the real actors in charge of personal work assistance in seven colleges in priority education. A questionnaire distributed to 1638 middle school students focuses on the different support systems and the actors who fight against failure, school dropout, and inequalities. How much does personal work help to different stakeholders? Is the discourse on externalised aid as a means of reducing inequalities and social justice justified? The theoretical framework is the work of Houssaye (2011), Maubant (1999), Meirieu (1998) and Zakharchouk (2011). The results of the statistical processing software Spad 7 show the various actors involved in helping school work, of which a very significant proportion of families from working-class background deconstruct prejudice on the alleged resignation of these categories of population.

Keywords: *actors; personal work assistance; students; priority education.*

How to cite: Seykhou, D. (2019). Help for Personal Work: Who are the Real Actors? *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(1), 187-194.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/105>

1. Introduction

A recent research on a recent thesis analyses the real actors in charge of personal work assistance in seven priority education colleges. A questionnaire distributed to 1638 middle school students focuses on the different support systems and the actors who fight against failure, school dropout, and inequalities. How much does personal work help to different stakeholders? Who are the real actors in helping with school work? The objective is on the one hand to establish the phenomenon of outsourcing but on the other hand to identify the real actors of the help to the personal work. The methodology is quantitative by a statistical and qualitative study by an observation.

1.1 Problematic

The issue of personal work assistance remains important in that it has changed the organization of institutions in the management of academic difficulty in colleges. With the opening of the school as part of the ZEP policy of 1981, partnerships were formed between the school and external stakeholders such as AFEV, zupdeco, associations, municipalities, educators of psychologists, etc. Aware of the difficulty of the school in fulfilling its missions, these actors invest a social fight, the fight against the failure of students of middle class, equity, and social justice. For example, by a tutoring of zupdeco students at school, or a follow-up at home by AFEV students, help with volunteer homework. With the law of orientation 1989 or the law of orientation and program for the future of the school of April 23, 2005, on the institutional level, multiple approaches of help to the pupils in difficulty are put in place. With the multiplicity of speakers, one wonders about the real actors of the help.

1.1.1 The theoretical framework

The devices put in place are analysed and perceived as devices to help students in difficulty to help poor students, reduce failure, avoid dropping out and promote success. Thus, they contribute to strengthening personal work assistance. The theoretical framework describes the construction / growth of a personal work assistance sector inside and outside the school.

As such, Houssaye (2011) analyzes the *pedagogy of support* which results in externalized help outside the classroom for students categorized in difficulty. According to the author, the characteristic of the educational field

through the policy recommendations is the superposition and the density of the devices. Zakharchouk (2011) notes that the reasons for educational support are: *to occupy* pupils considered as "orphans of sixteen hours". For all the reasons mentioned, the author, a college professor, defends the helpers and advocates for help with personal work outside the classroom. In an analysis of recent pedagogical arrangements of devices inside and outside the classroom, Maubant (1999) distinguishes several rationales. An approach that is more centered on the acquisition of *culture minimum and the social skills base* to students. Another approach aims at restoring the *pupil's* profession or a *socialization*. Other approaches favour a reflection *on the meaning and the legitimacy of this common culture*, on the norms and laws and on the learning of the common culture". From another angle, Meirieu (1988) reflects on the accompaniment of young people in separate areas of the school where they come to do their homework and underlines the importance of *educational attitudes*.

1.1.2 Methodology

The purpose of this study is to identify the stakeholders in personal work assistance. The survey took place in seven colleges classified ÉCLAIR or RRS (colleges Valdo, Iris, Duclos in Vaulx-en-Velin, Triolet colleges, Eluard in Venissieux, Alain College in Saint-Fons, College Brassens in Décines). The questionnaire focused on students' personal work assistance. They had to note the different types of help they receive outside of their schedule, indicate the places where they are helped and the quality of the people who accompany them. The method is a closed questionnaire distributed to college students. The count was performed on an Excel spreadsheet and then on the Spad 7 software. The control population is 1,638 middle school students, in the 7 colleges classified ÉCLAIR, of which 743 boys and 867 girls are in total: 1,610. 28 students did not complete their gender and 68 students did not give their age.

1.1.3 Results

	Girls	Boys	Total students/ percentage	Girls/No response	Boys/No response
Teachers	239	160	339 / 24,8%	628	582
Facilitator	46	40	86 / 5,3%	821	703
Assistant	62	32	94 / 5,8%	805	711

Help for Personal Work: Who are the Real Actors?
Diallo SEYKHOU

Supervisor	36	31	67 / 4,2%	831	712
Student	85	65	150 / 9,3%	782	678
Parents	402	332	724 / 45%	465	420
Volunteer	23	21	44 / 2,7%	844	722
Others	82	57	139 / 8,6%	783	686

Stakeholders

Teachers

628 girls and 582 boys are not followed by teachers. 399 students, of which 239 girls and 160 boys, or 24.8%, are followed by teachers. This shows that teachers are very well involved in monitoring outside the class of students. They are solicited by school heads or CPEs and help students in difficulty. Inescapable actors, they are engaged in the fight against school failure. Teachers come in second place, after parents, in helping with personal work.

The parents

465 girls and 420 boys are not followed by their parents. But 402 girls and 322 boys, in total 724 students, or 45%, have parental monitoring. Parents are the primary actors in helping with personal work. In contrast to the criticisms of parents' disempowerment, families in the working class play a decisive role in student follow-up. This is one of the results of this survey. It remains to be seen whether this monitoring of families is of quality and likely to lead to academic progress.

The supervisors

831 girls and 712 boys did not provide information. But 36 girls and 31 boys, a total of 67 students, or 4.2%, are followed by a supervisor. This number is very small. Supervisors are often called upon to help students, resulting in a lack of staff for school life. School visits and the lack of teaching assistants require the use of supervisors who are secondary actors.

Students

782 girls and 678 boys did not provide information. 85 girls and 65 boys, in total 150 students, or 9.3%, are followed by students. These are involved through associations like Zupdeco, AFEV, which help college

students classified priority education. They are relatively important and do tutoring often.

Volunteers

844 girls and 722 boys are not followed by volunteers. 25 girls and 21 boys, ie 44 students, or 2.7%, ensure that they are followed by volunteers. This very low proportion shows the low contribution of volunteers in helping pupils, who are also secondary actors in helping to work.

The animators

821 girls and 703 boys are not followed by animators. Only 46 girls and 40 boys, totalling 86 students, or 5.3%, are followed by facilitators. They work in organizations, social centers, neighbourhood house, MJC.

The assistants

805 girls and 711 boys did not provide information. 62 girls and 32 boys, a total of 94 students, or 5.8%, are attended by assistants. The pedagogical assistants in the colleges constitute a very small staff of one to five people. They are responsible for helping students in their personal work and manage many help devices. They play an important role but their number is very small due to a lack of middle school means.

Other speaker

In this section, 783 girls and 686 boys did not provide information. 82 girls and 57 boys have another speaker, in total 139 students, or 8.6%. The other actors are brothers, sisters, aunts, grandparents, friends, speech therapists, retired teachers, etc.

1.2. Discussion

First point

866 students claim to benefit from family monitoring. This figure is important and raises some questions:

On the one hand, it shows that the parents of the working classes are not also resigning as is often claimed. The help with the personal work returns moreover to the families with the tasks to control for the children in the evening. Parents get involved in monitoring the schooling of their children. The figures re-examine the need to outsource aid. Should we continue to create devices outside the classroom? It is questionable whether

this important follow-up leads to significant results in child labour. Or is this follow-up akin to creating favourable learning conditions in the evening?

On the other hand, this figure questions us on several levels. Did students hide an absence of family support? Can this important follow-up correspond to the educational difficulties of the families of popular milieu? Admittedly, there are children in priority education who are accompanied by their families. But the teachers questioned reject such a significant follow-up of the pupils. Homework is not often done. Students do not show an interest in learning in class. This monitoring, if it exists, is it of quality? So many questions that call into question such massive follow-up;

The educational constraints of the families of the popular milieu (illiteracy, professional and domestic work, weak cultural resources) do not favour a large support of the pupils.

But for this principal of the college Aime Cesaire:

It is not necessary either to imagine that in priority education, the family abandons the child to its difficulties. It would be very simplistic. No, I think there is a clumsy follow-up, sometimes families expect a lot from school and do not invest enough perhaps to our tastes. At first glance, it is hard to believe in the disempowerment of families.

But for another principal, Jacques Duclos College:

I know that there are about ten students registered for homework help at the town hall. So many parents ask, "Did you do your homework? Yes, the child answers. But did the parent come to recite the lesson or demand accountability? That, I'm less sure.

Family monitoring is light. Sometimes, on the other hand, there are families who follow their children very well, question us about Pro note when the homework is not recorded, yes that is for sure, but they never come, even to appointments. There is a chasm between what young people perceive as family follow-up and what families actually do at home, not quality.

Family follow-up is a discrepancy and is not confirmed in its magnitude. The quality of the caregiver is questioned, far from school requirements. We nevertheless retain an important follow-up of the popular circles of their children. The resignation of families is debatable.

It should first be noted that the family help is the most used help: 776 students, or 48.2%. To these students, we must add the other 90 who, in

the heading *Other device*, said to be helped by the more distant family. This is a total of 866 students helped in the family.

Second point.

• Are students followed by families also followed by devices outside the classroom?

230 homework helpers have a home help.

62 students in PPRE have a family caregiver.

84 individualized help students have a family caregiver.

34 students enrolled in a particular course have a home help.

6 students in tutoring have a caregiver.

66 pupils in school accompaniment have a home help.

31 students benefiting from other helpers have a family carer.

Total: 513 students have other help and family follow-up as well.

513 students are followed by family and devices. Family monitoring doubles the monitoring of the school.

Third point.

• Yes or no, does family monitoring compensate for the lack of follow-up outside the classroom?

866 pupils out of a total of 1 638 pupils have a family follow-up of which 513 are also followed by the devices.

866 students are already followed by families but it should be noted that more than half of these students or 513 students have help in school. So $866 - 513 = 353$ students end up with a family follow-up but no follow-up outside the classroom.

392 students, or 23.9%, say in the questionnaire do not receive any help, either at home or from school.

In conclusion, out-of-class devices support half of the students on all students who have a caregiver. Family monitoring does not completely compensate for the lack of follow-up outside the classroom because 392 pupils have no help but on the other hand it doubles it up because 513 students have family help and help outside the classroom.

1.2.1 Conclusion

This study demonstrates the importance of homemaking in personal work assistance. It deconstructs prejudices about an alleged resignation of families from a popular background. But does this family help generate

school inputs? Or is it only an establishment of favourable working conditions? She questions the meaning of outsourced aids.

In summary, outsourcing does not support all students who do not have family support but instead partially duplicates the follow-up of students who already have a family follow-up.

Acknowledgment

The article has been presented at The XIXth Congress of the AMSE-AMCE-WEAR, 4 – 7 June 2018, Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania.

References

- Houssaye, J. (2011). The triumph of support pedagogy: a trompe l'oeil? *Specialized digital exercise books*, 22, 74-78.
- Maubant, P. (1999). Features in and out of school new teaching configurations? In *Learn differently today?* Paris, France: 10th Interviews of the Villette.
- Meirieu, P. (1998). Complementarity and specificity of the interveners with students in difficulty. In D. Glasman (Coord.), *Insights on school support* (pp. 14-15). Lyon, France: Alain Savary Center.
- Zakharchouk, J. M. (2011). Tracks for useful educational support. *Specialized digital exercise books*, 22, 72-73.