

Original Research Article

Pragmatics in Agricultural Education: A Socio-Educational Inequality Observed in two Agricultural Establishments: (FASA and a GIC)

NOUKIO Germaine Bienvenue^{1*}, NEMBOT Hermann²

¹Centre National de l'Education Yaoundé

²IRAD Dschang

Article History

Received: 18.08.2025

Accepted: 06.10.2025

Published: 10.10.2025

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: The education of learners nowadays depends on the type of teacher, the location of the lessons, the type of support and documents, in short, several other factors. During this study, the analysis of the contours of teaching in two agricultural schools will be addressed. These are the FASA (Faculty of Agronomy and Agricultural Sciences) and a Joint Initiative Group GIC (GIC). The first is a faculty having within it the necessary system (opening authorization, classrooms, laboratories, qualified teachers, students having completed secondary school, materials etc.) for the training of learners and the second is an association qualified as a "non-formal" school. When we speak of "non-formal" school, we are referring to non-regulatory schools that most often do not have opening authorizations signed by the supervising Ministry. These are schools in which training remains in the shadows and official information is very weak and often non-existent. We investigated at FASA and in a "traditional school (GIC). The teaching methods and the target audience in these two schools are very different. These observed pedagogical differences reinforce social distancing. We will study the contours according to (Vincent, 1980) of the writing practices requested with regard to the academic model inherited from the "school form".

Keywords: Agricultural Education, Fasa, Gic School Form, Socio-School Inequalities, Pragmatics.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between writing and the academic format is particularly relevant when considering the crucial role of language and transmission methods in the reproduction of social inequalities (Lahire, 1993). Writing is analyzed through the concept of competence, which can be approached in two distinct ways: a "minimalist" approach, limited to the basic reading and writing skills essential for learning, and a "maximal" approach, closely associating writing with the body of knowledge it allows to develop (David, 2015, p. 11). The concept of fundamental competence can thus be seen as an activity structuring thought in the same way as all human interactions. Writing plays an essential role in the construction of individuals, by promoting the memorization and categorization necessary for their interaction with the world. In the context of non-formal education, it contributes to the description, explanation and analysis of facts and situations. This perspective invites us to reflect on the use of writing in the observed classes, taking into account the specific characteristics of

writing in agricultural education, where school and work intersect. These writings differ from traditional school forms - where the objective is to make writing an object of distancing to encourage a reflective posture in the student (Lahire, 1993) - but also from strictly professional writings which mainly aim at efficiency, responsiveness, innovation or even operational management (Boutet, Gardin & Lacoste, 1995; Grosjean & Lacoste, 1998).

The school format addressed in this study refers in particular to learning structured by several principles: the separation between school and adult life; the dissociation of knowledge and doing; the emphasis on writing; and finally, compliance with standardized rules embodied by specialized professionals, often civil servants (Chartier, Compère & Julia, 1976; Vincent, 1980, 2008). However, this format may have obscured older modes of transmission based on doing, seeing doing, and doing together. These modes deserve particular attention in the context of agricultural education, particularly within FASA, where great

importance is given to the link between school and daily life. Observation nevertheless reveals significant disparities in the school formats adopted. The school formats studied thus articulate the relationship to writing, the acquisition of generic and transferable knowledge, as well as the connection with concrete practices.

This research focused on the methods of transmitting socio-technical-scientific knowledge from the field of agronomy. This discipline, both scientific and practical, seeks to understand and manage the complex interactions between plants, soils, climates and agricultural techniques in order to propose sustainable solutions for efficient production. Finally, the educational writings produced by teachers for their students constitute a key vector of transmission. The instructions given, the scriptural activities proposed or even the exercises designed - sometimes unevenly progressive - directly influence the cognitive quality of the educational path. These writings can sometimes facilitate ineffective understanding, sometimes offer real emancipatory potential. We will carry out a comparative analysis of the contexts. This will include, among other things, the longitudinal analysis of students' writings which will focus on pedagogical practices and their effects on the modes of cognitive appropriation which converge towards the reproduction of inequalities, and the analysis of the pedagogical activity which will focus on the practices of composing course materials (photocopies, handouts etc).

I. Context of the Study

The context explored here focuses on writing practices in agricultural education, an area where these activities play a central role. The objective is to help learners strengthen their written communication and critical thinking skills, while effectively preparing them for their future professional life in the agricultural sector. Three contextual elements distinguish the content taught and the materials used, giving them a particular form. First, students follow a schooling alternating between school and experimental spaces. They thus evolve in at least two distinct socialization environments, which creates opportunities for integrating academic and non-academic knowledge. This back-and-forth potentially favors a redefinition of the knowledge covered in class, contributing to a decompartmentalization between these two worlds. Second, the educational institution can legitimately promote pedagogical approaches based on the professional experience of learners. This experience constitutes an effective lever to support more formal and in-depth learning. Finally, teaching objects serve as essential mediators, playing a decisive role in the dynamics of porosity between the academic and non-academic spheres. Depending on their selection and use, they can either strengthen this interaction or limit it.

This specificity is coupled with a specific history of agricultural education establishments. This is particularly the case of the Gic, where the

complementarity between two places of learning (school and farm) has been considered as complementary by certain authors (Chartier in Duffaure, 1985) while, for Grignon, these same establishments such as farm schools or even colonies had the function of disseminating an essentially practical education opposed to a scientific education more frequent in high schools (Grignon, 1975). Agricultural education offers its learners an anchoring and a legitimacy in the register of practice and lived experience of the relationship with nature. The comparison of two establishments nevertheless shows a strong porosity between school writings and the world of agricultural work, a porosity graduated according to their own history.

1. FASA and GIC

Two establishments with varying distances from the school system the observations took place in two relatively typical establishments based on their distance/proximity to the school system.

a). FASA

Created in 1993, FASA is one of the establishments of the University of Dschang. It has campuses in the five agro-ecological zones of Cameroon. Its main mission is to implement a coherent policy for training middle and senior managers who are destined for agricultural production, food security and sustainable development. The Faculty of Agronomy and Agricultural Sciences (FASA) is a large establishment in the scientific and professional fields. Courses in plant production, animal production, forest management, mechanization and rural engineering, rural economics and sociology are provided there.

b). GIC Akwantemgong of Ndoh Djuttitsa (Bafou)

This group of farmers and herders, whose name means "good thinking", was created in 1996 but registered only in June 2001, and it started with 5 members; it currently has more than 300 members. Although not a member of any Union and not benefiting from any form of technical or financial assistance, this group demonstrates a remarkable capacity for initiative. Unlike the majority of GICs in the region, which adopted the community field formula from the outset, only to later question or abandon it, this one came to it gradually, after first encouraging mutual assistance in individual fields.

The FASA and the GIC have the same objective: practicing agriculture and/or livestock farming, but delivered in different ways. In terms of training, these two centers aim for the same courses with varying geometry. Diplomas do not exist in the GIC, but rather certificates of completion of training (often nonexistent). The majority of learners who attend are those who have not completed the sixth grade. This graduation tends to transmute into opposition when considering the audiences welcomed, although they are overwhelmingly of working-class origin from rural areas

but also from small towns and, more rarely, from peri-urban residences. GIC learners show little enthusiasm for work, which they often find difficult, especially when it involves tasks such as clearing land or manual plowing.

However, these activities are carried out by participants less accustomed to the agricultural world. In contrast, FASA students are distinguished by a particular rigor regarding respect for work-related schedules. As for the locations of experimentation or internship, marked divergences appear between the two groups. GIC students are attracted to large farms, which they perceive as impressive due to their size. However, this often leads them to be confined to specific and repetitive tasks, following the principles of division of labor typical of large structures. For their part, FASA learners prefer to move towards more modest farms, where they believe they can better understand all aspects of managing an agricultural activity. These frequent observations gathered during the interviews facilitate reflection on the pedagogical approaches adapted to these two distinct groups of students.

II. METHODOLOGY

The research, preparation and organization of teaching materials, as well as their restitution during oral exchanges in class, highlight cognitive and social dynamics. These dynamics are embodied by activities invested with a specific meaning by the learners. Within the framework of the course, these various activities will be illustrated by the technical files. Regarding the production aspect, the created materials will be considered as manifestations of multiple fundamental skills, both diversified and linked to the different school formats. The variations will be explored in depth, while the coherence of the discourses carried out by the teachers will be studied in detail. The teaching materials analyzed reflect a transmission of knowledge mainly carried out by the teachers.

This dynamic seems more pronounced than that described by Forquin (2008), due to the absence of textbooks in the observed classes, thus depriving teachers of reference tools. This reconfiguration of the curriculum can be interpreted as a constituent element of a "professional genre" (Clot & Faïta, 1995), in other words a shared professional culture within the establishment. Indeed, at FASA as at GIC, weekly and monthly meetings bring together teachers by level or similar disciplines in order to define the methods of interpretation and implementation of the curricula. The various data collected guide the activity in the classrooms. While in GICs, the missing documents constrain the learning activity towards other functional professional concerns, those of FASA are more focused on modes of school appropriation. The analyses carried out throughout this study will focus on the contents as well as on a set of semiotic processes that run through them in the types of layout. Indeed, the valorization of

certain elements to the detriment of others are all clues taken into account: Formatting tools such as lists with bullet points, indents, continuous paragraphs, tables, boxes, and other graphic signs facilitate the structured presentation of ideas. Titles, underlining, and typographical choices make it possible to prioritize information and highlight essential elements. Furthermore, the linguistic formulation of instructions plays a key role depending on whether they adopt a verbal form or not, influencing the nature of the work expected of students.

These instructions can also involve different types of writing such as argumentative, descriptive, or even the list of indicators. In a traditional school setting, the argumentation required of students often takes the form of a fixed exercise where writing becomes an end in itself. Conversely, in situations further removed from strict academic logic, writing becomes a tool for active reflection to solve a concrete problem, which is often linked to a sociotechnical object or device. To illustrate these dynamics in the field of agronomy, two perspectives can be analyzed. The first focuses on practical solutions to agricultural problems, while the second focuses on scientific knowledge of plants. The theme chosen here is crop fertilization, a crucial lever for food security on a global scale and particularly in Cameroon.

Regarding the supports, the general observation that emerges is the high number of supports for the FASA (four) compared to the low number in the GIC (01). The supports related to the FASA are ordered as follows: courses (type 1), homework (type 2), tutorials (type 3) and technical field studies (type 4). In the GIC, apart from the instructions given by the trainer, there is explicitly nothing of all that has been listed as supports for the FASA.

A difference naturally emerges in the organization and transmission of knowledge with regard to the FASA and the GIC. This existential difference between a document including everything that students may need and a breakdown of school activities is reminiscent of the old distinction between the daily notebook in primary education and the binder in secondary education (Chartier & Renard, 2000). This rapprochement of the notebook/binder with the sectors could be extended in the present case to the old, but not disappeared, division between vocational primary on the one hand and higher secondary on the other (Baudelot & Establet, 1971).

III. DATA ANALYSIS

For the sake of comparison with the GIC documents, FASA type 4 documents were selected for this study. Indeed, these two types of documents share the drafting of instructions to enable students to write technical files on the farms where they are carrying out their internship.

Table 1: Type of support and school activity in the two classes observed

GIC (non-differentiated support)		FASA (differentiated support)	
School Activities (document)	Types of activities	School Activities (document)	Types of activities
Only one (the instructions)	Inventory of the document to be researched at the internship location and instructions for completing the internship file	Type 1	Notional contributions
		Type 2	Table assignment
		Type 3	Directed work based on documents to be researched at the internship location
		Type 4	Instructions for completing the intership file

IV. RESULTS

1 Pragmatic Adjustments and School Form

a). GIC Supports: A Functional Register Assuming Professional Experience and School Writing Reduced to an Imposed Exercise

The materials developed in the GIC are part of a functional approach requiring mastery of the

profession. The instructions for writing technical files, given to students, are structured around four sub-themes. The example presented does not correspond so much to a pedagogical exercise based on a progression of difficulties, going from the simplest to the most complex (Vincent, 1980), as to a concrete component of the management work carried out by an operator.

Box 1: GIC support relating to the organization of operations

Farmer's objective Produce food to meet consumer needs Increase productivity, maximize yields Reduce costs Develop the farm, invest by expanding cultivation areas Contribute to food security, produce food for local and national populations Preserve natural resources (water, soil biodiversity) Comments: advantages, disadvantages, work organization Fertilization and different types of fertilization Choice of amendment/fertilizer Equipment used for spreading (fertilization) Number of spreading, hours, according to the seasons, time spent Precaution when spreading, rationing per plant for quality sowing and maximum yield Comments: Advantages, disadvantages of fertilization and impacts Quantities of amendment per hectare Fertilization plan for the year Calculation of fertilizer input for an agricultural campaign Distribution plan per campaign Comments: choice of fertilizers and evolution Fertilization of plants and quantities per plant 1st fertilization, 2nd. earthing up, foliar fertilizer, fungal control Comments: advantages, disadvantages of these choices and organization of the work

Source: personal archives following the various works carried out on the Irad plots

Following this box, learners will need to calculate the total quantity of inputs required for a given area. This will involve assessing the necessary supply of fertilizer stocks in relation to what the plants need. The materials are read from the general objective, in connection with pragmatic concerns that can be formulated as follows:

Do the experimental plots have sufficient fertilizers to last a campaign or even a year?

This expected cognitive construction is never fully recorded in the writing and relies on the interpretation of the final table. In short, the GIC materials presuppose familiarity with a socio-cultural space and a technical-economic register such as a farmer exploiting practices in his activity to gain efficiency instead of making it an explicit educational object.

The second characteristic of school writing in the GIC is that it is reduced to a minimum. Several elements indeed restrict the possibilities of developing a written work among learners. A model, a pre-thought-out plan and forms of written instructions for execution without elaboration also demonstrate an imposing logic of knowledge transmission. The general introduction, for example, contains archetypal statements that could thus be reproduced as is without concern for the progressiveness of learning (see example 1).

Examples 1. Excerpt from a GIC Teaching Document, General Introductory Model

"Fertilization is one of the very important elements influencing yield results in an experimental plot." Another example, taken from a document on

another topic, is similar (see example 2). Example 2. Excerpt from a GIC teaching document on another course topic, general introductory model “*Seed selection, sowing, fertilization, earthing up, foliar treatments significantly influence harvest results.*”

This passage highlights a teaching approach where learners often reproduce pre-established sentences used as models, deemed adaptable to the specifics of their farm. These formulations are accompanied by strictly supervised school writing. Indeed, students must write their content following precise instructions requiring them to fill in specific spaces, while excluding other parts of the document. This structure requires, in particular, a clear separation between numerical or textual data (a few numbers or words next to an indicator) and their comments. Areas reserved for comments are indicated by a visual symbol, such as a downward-pointing triangle, which designates the space intended for responses. This method is far removed from the ideals associated with free and developed writing, such as those described by Chervel in 1985.

School writing here appears to be focused on utilitarian considerations, such as optimizing fertilizer use to avoid economic losses. It is based on an extremely simplified and concise style, sometimes even devoid of verbs. These pedagogical constraints reflect the teacher's expectations regarding the students' written production and demonstrate the type of literary skills he seeks to instill in them.

b). FASA Materials: Resources to Initiate a Reasoning Process and Writing Closer to the Academic Format

FASA materials offer resources intended to initiate structured thinking. On the other hand, type 4 documents adopt a progressive organization, in line with

a predefined reasoning method. First, the information already covered in type 1, 2 and 3 documents is recalled in order to sustainably reinforce memorization among learners through repetition (Vincent, 1980). This approach takes the form of a fluid sequence that articulates various types of cognitive resources to be mobilized, ranging from information research to analysis and conclusions: information research, comparisons, interpretations and results. On the informative side, learners must identify the farm's fertilizing resources as well as explanatory elements such as technical sheets or agricultural calendars (including data on the type of soil, climatic conditions and the production cycle of a crop). They are then encouraged to undertake a comparative activity of the nutritional values of the plants. These calculations are often carried out by a specialized service of MINADER (DRCQ) and compared with the farmers' cultivation practices for an informed perspective.

The aim is to produce, based on an exercise that does not involve all the complexity of reality, a well-argued text based on documents from Minader and Irad (low fertilizing values that can be explained by environmental constraints). From these elements, different possible interpretations are then expected to explain the ways of running a farm. This type of requirement, where we start from academic knowledge, but also from averages developed by Irad, tends to develop an attitude of distance from the work being done to construct observations and analyses thanks to a transposable and reproducible approach. In other words, FASA creates in learners a structuring of thought corresponding to the figure of the agricultural engineer, agronomic science is applied to a case, as opposed to that centered on the GIC where, because it is necessary to respond to problems in the here and now, science is relegated to the background and therefore becomes an unattainable citadel to which one must submit.

Box 2: Extract from FASA type 4 educational document

Application exercise

Fertilization of a one-hectare corn field

- What is the approximate quantity of plants?
- What is the total fertilizer input for the campaign?

Why choose this crop

- The farmer's objective
- Corn production cycle - Available area
- Climatic conditions
- Equipment and distribution
- Work organization
- Economic cost

Types of fertilization

Give the reasons for the farmer's choice of fertilizer and justify

The different components of fertilizers and their nutritional contributions to the plant Price / kilogram / Bag

From a semiotic perspective, the focus on the object of plant nutrition has two similarities with the GIC support. First, an item-based structuring in the first

sequencing, and second, the absence of semiotic cues clearly indicating to learners what to deduce from this information.

Box 3: Extract from FASA type 4 educational document

Develop the technical sheet for corn cultivation, indicating the quantity of seeds per hectare and the approximate quantity of first amendment (first fertilization). Why choose speculation? –

Production cycle

- Objective of the farmer. Different equipment used
- Choice of farm
- Agro-ecological zones
- Organization of work.

Financial cost.

From a semiotic perspective, the focus on the plant's food supply shares two similarities with the GIC material. First, it is structured by elements in the first breakdown. Second, no explicit semiotic indications are provided to guide learners in the deductions they must draw from this data.

("What are the reasons that led the farmer to choose this type of fertilization?", "What should we think of the results?", "How are (fertilizers) chosen?").

The materials developed by FASA teachers reflect a particular hybridization between agricultural work and the school setting. Here, the agricultural profession is transformed into an object of schooling, becoming a means by which students must adapt to a methodical approach to knowledge acquisition and argumentation. In other words, the profession is made teachable, expressible, and shareable (Verret, 1975). The variations between these supports also extend to the academic writing activity. For example, while the writing activity expected of GIC students was limited and often accompanied by models, the FASA, on the contrary, targets this practice as a central element, requiring the production of a complete text. This involves writing a long and coherent piece of writing, structured around a precise method of reasoning: describing results, interpreting them in relation to environmental constraints, evaluating the impact of fertilization on corn production, or analyzing its technical and economic implications. Thus, the writing activity of students in the FASA takes on the characteristics of academic writing with a scientific aim, based on a sequence of hypotheses, analyses, and interpretations. In contrast, for GIC learners, it mainly involves reporting numerical data correlated with certain indicators, before offering a commentary isolated from other technical criteria likely to require new observations. This disparity in the forms of writing requests shows a clear difference with the simplifications observed in GICs, where the texts are brief and written in previously defined spaces.

2). The Trainer's Presentation

This part of the analysis is based on the recurring elements of the discourses observed across all the viewed and transcribed course sessions, representing approximately fifty hours. The emphasis is placed as much on the structuring of the discourse as on its content.

One of the aspects that establishes a clear distinction between the approaches of the two teachers studied lies in the degree of permeability or compartmentalization between professional practices and their objects and school activities.

• Avoidance of Academic Writing

In the school setting, traditional writing is often abandoned in favor of technical writing, both in the documents produced and in verbal interactions. Within the GIC, the materials distributed to students are frequently referred to as "guides", a terminology regularly used by the teacher during their presentation. This term evokes the idea of a model to follow and reflects an approach aimed at integrating these documents into a less academic logic, favoring a cognitive framework more oriented towards the technical aspects of the agricultural profession. A particularly representative sequence of this approach is the way in which the dossier that students must produce is introduced. This introduction highlights a rare occasion where purely academic writings are explicitly addressed, thus underlining their exceptional nature in this context.

Example 3:

Report from a GIC trainer on writing an introduction *the introduction... the introduction which is an introduction that you are going to write yourself... I have in front of me an introduction... which is very general... which does not even talk about a specific farm... so in the introduction you will have to present... give information on the farm... very quickly [...] [he reads] ... it is very general... [he reads]... it is very general... it is not adapted to any farm... it is an introduction that must be adapted to your internship farm... so an introduction which at the very least gives... gives again the name of your farm... [...] which perhaps gives again for example the name of the variety of corn... eh... there are for example 8 varieties... 10 varieties... 20 varieties or hybrids eh well etc. eh... okay [3 seconds] so an introduction.*

The substitution of technical descriptive observations reduces the cognitive constraints linked to written production, thus offering learners an avoidance text. The discourse is based on self-referencing to professional experience, which legitimizes it in its context. During a large part of the sessions, teaching takes the form of a monologue, with little relevant

interaction from the learners. The teacher presents the document by reading it and commenting on it as it goes along, introducing explanations, in-depth discussions, clarifications, repetitions, as well as digressions and incisions. These additions disrupt the progression of the discourse by appearing as parentheses in the oral presentation. Consequently, the transposition of notional knowledge becomes diffuse, mixing with an oral narrative focused on practical knowledge of the profession, without constituting explicit learning.

Example 4: Excerpt from a GIC teacher's speech on the definition of sowing

Teacher: *What is sowing...*

Student: *It's planting corn, and...*

Teacher: *It's planting... putting the seed in the ground... sowing is the action of planting seeds in the ground to make plants grow, sowing is a crucial step in agricultural, horticultural and forestry production. There is direct sowing and nursery sowing.*

This discursive pattern, characterized by the fact that the teacher relies on a given answer to develop their own discourse, appears frequently. Learners provide their answers spontaneously, and it is often one of these elements that opens the way to the rest of the lesson. Observation of the exchanges did not reveal moments where the teacher would encourage a student to expand on their answers. This choice, consisting of avoiding asking the student to speak more fully, could be linked to a professional culture specific to this type of teaching, a culture that the learners, for their part, have not yet acquired. By attributing few skills to the learners and by deliberately presenting syncretic knowledge, the teacher updates not only the principle of "indifference to differences" (Bourdieu, 1966), but also a symbolic violence that the students confusingly identify. In short, the narrative richness and reflective possibilities offered by storytelling are of little benefit to learners, mainly because the teacher tends to monopolize the discussion and maintain their dominant position.

This approach evokes an old school form, similar to 19th-century text explanations, where student participation remains undervalued. It is not surprising to find such a dynamic in an institution that defines itself in contrast to more academic schools. Here, the dominant culture, under a strong peasant influence, is legitimized by being transformed into a complex object, reserved for a circle of initiates. It is precisely for this reason that the teacher's discourse relies on expert observations which, in a work setting, in a small group, could nevertheless be subject to rich oral exchanges, particularly around a written document. These exchanges would allow for the development of collaborative interpretations. However, by maintaining exclusive control of these interpretative keys, the teacher blocks any real access to this knowledge for the students.

The course seems to focus more on the objects of the farm than on strictly academic knowledge, inviting learners to understand and analyze them reflectively, just as farmers would. The latter develop a professional culture shaped by the constraints linked to work management. However, it appears that students are far removed from this type of cognitive and cultural approach. By focusing mainly on the objects of the farm and the associated reasoning, the teaching certainly becomes less academic, but also significantly more complex and less accessible. This approach presupposes a certain mastery of the tools and technical discourses specific to the profession, to the detriment of pedagogical support, which tends to fade away.

3). FASA and Its Teaching: A Discourse Close to the School form Applied to the Agricultural Context

At FASA, the discourse seems more academic in that it updates the school form to the agricultural context. As in the GIC class, oral and written language respond to each other. However, the pedagogical discourse deployed by the teacher differs from that held in the GIC in at least three places. First of all, it is centered on academic knowledge and less on the real work required in a professional situation. Then, the construction of the enunciative space is marked by delimited places between the teacher and the learner (it is less a community of workers that is summoned than learners questioned under the control of the teacher) and a strong participation of the learners is required. Finally, the proposed exercises are, on the model of the supports, gradually complexified. These characteristics are archetypal of writing models conforming to the school form, that is to say a social form free from the contingency of practices in the different spheres of social life.

This specific mode of socialization where the student learns at school "through a personal and collective exercise of reason" (Audigier, 2008) aims at the construction of an autonomous and rational subject, while this subject was already supposed to be there in the Gic. The general structure of the sessions is based on the model of science applied to teaching, following a standard format composed of the following stages: observations, formulation of a scientific problem, statement of hypotheses, evaluation of hypotheses, practical exercises and written assignment. The extracts presented below highlight both the role of learners in verbal interactions and the pedagogical progression observable through reminders of the concepts covered previously.

Example 5. Excerpt from a Teacher's Speech. A Visible School Form

Teacher: *Let's look at box 1 together... What are the different fertilizers used in agriculture during an agricultural campaign, what is the necessary quantity of fertilizers per hectare? Learner 1: 3*

Teacher: *Which ones?*

Learner 2: Organic, mineral, biological (40 seconds)

Teacher: So whether it's 3, 4 or 5, list the types of fertilization?

Learner 3: (incomprehensible remarks)

Teacher: apart from the fertilizers mentioned, list others

Learner 4: uh chemical, foliar

Teacher: what is the quantity (kg) of fertilizer per hectare

Learner 5: 3, maybe 4

Teacher: Yes... but that's not quite it?

Learner Ok it's between 3 and 4:

Teacher: Okay... so we have several types of fertilization when it comes to growing crops. There is organic fertilization which is a contribution of compost, manure, green waste, plant slurry; mineral fertilization: NPK fertilizer (nitrogen, phosphorus and magnesium, nitrate fertilizer); biological fertilization: mycorrhizae, nitrogen-fixing bacteria, Trichoderma; foliar fertilization: specific foliar fertilizers for plants. The required quantity is 150kg for an area of 10,000m²

The teaching approach is particularly explicit: it involves simultaneously observing table number one, proposing interpretations, correcting incorrect answers, and then noting the different types of fertilization in order to prepare future work. The written nature of the materials demonstrates a thoughtful and progressive development in advance. Specifically regarding the analysis of tables, the difficulties encountered are addressed collectively, with the answers being returned to the students to encourage their involvement. This type of knowledge, more accessible, also gains in transferability, being able to be applied in other analytical contexts. In the following extract, a similar process is implemented: the teacher returns to the key points of the previous session to introduce the next stage of the work, thus illustrating the continuity and hierarchical organization of the lessons.

Example 6. Excerpt from a Speech on the Path Taken Teacher:

Okay, we're going back to the work we started in the last lesson... so we talked about the farmer's objective, the choice of seed, the agricultural calendar... we had hypotheses and we responded to the hypotheses we had... we also talked about the quality of fertilizers that exist and the different choices for plants and their economic value or their cost... eh... we also talked about the quantity of fertilizer per hectare... that's fine... so we got there... There you go, and then we also talked about what the flowering stage was... that's good.

By reconstructing the path taken, the oral support doubles the written support. The field of practice is the subject of schooling allowing for a deeper exploration of a professional question.

The acquisition of knowledge related to the professions is based on problem situations. One of the indicators allowing the identification of the teacher's

pedagogical practices as distinct from traditional uses of the profession is precisely the integration of these problem situations. During an interview, the teacher emphasizes the importance of this approach, referring to certain specialized authors. He also expresses his interest in this method by exploring concrete examples through videos available on YouTube, showing their application in the classroom. In the spirit of these declared methodologies, the teacher takes the initiative to organize a group visit to a farm operating under an organic system. This site is chosen precisely for its particularities which lead learners to question current professional practices and their obviousness. The approach is divided into two stages: first, the on-site visit allows learners to directly discover the specificities of this farm, accompanied by their teacher. Subsequently, the data collected during the visit serves as a basis for introducing and contextualizing key concepts in the classroom. A concrete example of this approach includes the analysis of the average fertilization per plant, an indicator used by the teacher to encourage students to reconsider a standard commonly integrated into their learning.

The gap between what is generally accepted and the case study forces students to question what in current practices does not raise questions. Solving the problem then involves questioning the habit, the routine, what is most frequently observed on farms where generally the quantity of fertilizer per plant is 5 grams. This standard, known to the learners, and stated by them as an absolute, is here challenged by the teacher.

Example 7: How much fertilizer for the plant and per campaign?

Teacher: [repeats elements deduced from a case] We know that... the quantity of agricultural input necessary for a plant...?

Learner: 10 to 15 grams it depends

Teacher: it depends on what?

Learner: Well, on several factors,

Teacher: which ones? Can you name a few?

Learner: Well yes, soil analysis for example to determine the level of nutrients in the soil? Teacher: Okay... and what others?

Learner: seek the expertise of an agricultural engineer

Teacher: having observed these two factors, can we expect a good yield?

Learner: I don't know

Teacher: and how so?

Learner: I don't know, we can respect everything but nature comes to spoil everything

The case presented by the teacher aims to deconstruct preconceived ideas and current norms (Passeron & Revel, 2005). The classroom discussion influences the students' oral responses. The teacher questions the learners until they begin to formulate hypotheses related to the quantity of fertilizer needed for a corn plant. This approach allows for contrasting

practices considered common or assumed to be so with the principles of scientific reasoning and methods for evaluating plant fertilization. The teacher's constant questioning of the students helps establish work habits, those that they will apply to their written work. In this sense, the oral presentation becomes an opportunity to test the students' arguments, while collectively addressing, in the classroom setting—and not in a professional environment—the shared modes of interpretation. These verbal reflections can then enrich their written productions.

4). Writing a technical sheet for GICs

The most representative passages address two closely related themes: plant fertilization and disease control, both determining factors for production. The learners' written productions reveal notable qualitative differences, both in the formal structure of their remarks and in their use of practical knowledge related to the profession, with regard to content. With regard to the organization of arguments, as shown in the following example, the learner describes the presumed objectives of an agricultural technique.

Example 8. Student Writings Regarding the Farmer's Objectives

First of all, the farmer's main objective is to produce the quota of quality food. Regarding productivity, the farmer is looking for:

- Productivity
- Cost reduction
- Farm development
- Food security

This type of text, written at the beginning of the years of training analyzed, reflects a structuring effort marked by the development of an introductory sentence that highlights a "main objective" while relegating the rest to the background with a formulation such as "as far as...". However, what follows takes the form of a more disparate list where the levels of importance are not clearly established. If the introductory instruction is well respected, the requirement to prioritize the objectives seems to fade thereafter. The author of these writings nevertheless shows that he is a promising learner within the GIC. On the other hand, in the context of training, this difficulty in structuring one's ideas, developing a common thread and maintaining it does not seem to diminish for all learners. On the contrary, these obstacles tend to worsen for a large proportion of them. Consequently, the use of a descriptive mode with little hierarchy reveals the extent to which many become trapped in a local and limited context.

Example 9. Written Excerpts from Students on the Causes of Poor Yields

The drop in production observed recently on farms is due to climate change. This is explained by very strong winds and torrential rain. In addition, excessive rainstorms encourage slugs, which in turn destroy crops.

The sequences "*due to*", "*is explained by*", "*this can be understood*" and "*moreover... because*" indicate the imputations of causality, itself explainable by mobilized knowledge (climate change, strong winds, torrential rain). The technical objects of agricultural work are compared with the teaching materials and the teacher's discourse. This circulation of a set of practices whose purpose remains the best possible performance subject to constraints constitutes an enunciative scheme which is similar to the engineer's mode of reasoning: describing observations, formulating hypotheses, testing his hypotheses, even if the latter are not all dealt with.

CONCLUSION

The study reveals that the dialogue between different literacies is particularly relevant for shedding light on the multiple dimensions that, depending on the context, can favor or disadvantage learners. It also confirmed the hypothesis that the ways in which literacies are articulated, whether reading or writing, within pedagogical systems integrating both oral and written language, influence and sometimes shape individuals' attitudes toward school, work, and the world in general. Furthermore, these educational practices seem to be embodied in school structures that offer a certain flexibility and adaptability. The study highlighted different learner profiles as well as the pedagogical approaches used. Students furthest from academic norms are confronted with literacies primarily focused on professions, integrating the complexity of reality into their learning. In contrast, those who are closest to academic expectations encounter literacies more aligned with the traditional school framework. These observations call into question the principle of avoiding school codes, which is supposed to make learning more attractive for students.

In this situation, as in other similar studies conducted in general education, this avoidance produces clearly marked differentiating effects, raising questions about the relevance of offering teaching deliberately removed from the school framework to students who are least integrated into this system. This observation leads to reflect on a comparative approach taking into account the different dimensions of the education system: levels (middle and high school), streams (vocational, technological, agricultural and general) as well as temporalities. Such a perspective would promote a better understanding of the dynamics between teaching practices and students' learning styles, thus making it possible to rethink the relationships between these two aspects. The case study allowed us to take this reflection further by exploring the precise mechanisms, as well as the spaces for improvisation, through which teachers and the school system influence and shape students' attitudes, expectations, knowledge and ways of reasoning, with a direct impact on their professional future. While GIC learners are taught limited and ephemeral knowledge that makes them dependent on external professional

approaches, as they have not been able to develop any themselves as part of their training, FASA students benefit from teaching that allows them to overcome these limitations. They acquire a more analytical and autonomous posture, as revealed by comparing the written productions of the two groups over time.

Consequently, it is relevant to question the existence, at the secondary level, of a true model of expert and professional training for farmers. Does this difficulty not reflect the structural and historical heterogeneity that has characterized this professional category for several decades, between profiles from working-class backgrounds close to operational tasks and those more linked, both culturally and professionally, to the worlds of engineers, technicians or agricultural advisors?

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- Audigier, F. (2008). Formes scolaires, formes sociales : un point de vue de didactiques des sciences sociales –histoire, géographie, éducation à la citoyenneté. *Babylonia*, 8-13.
- Baudelot, C. & Establet, R. (1971). *L'école capitaliste en France*. Paris : François Maspero.
- Bourdieu, P. (1966). L'école conservatrice. Les inégalités devant l'école et devant la culture, *Revue française de sociologie*, 7(3), 325-347.
- Boutetv J., Gardinv B., & Lacoste M. (1995). Discours en situation de travail. *Langages*, 117, 68-85.
- Chartier, A.-M. & Renard, P. (2000). Cahiers et classeurs, les supports ordinaires du travail scolaire. *Repères*, 22, 135-159.
- Chartier, R, Compère, M.-M., & Julia, D. (1976). *L'éducation en France du XVI^e au XVIII^e*. Paris : SEDES.
- Chervel, A. (1985). Sur l'origine de l'enseignement du français dans le secondaire. *Histoire de l'éducation*, 25, 3-10.
- Denis, B. & Theret, M. (1994). Les grands traités de zootechnie et leur conception de cette discipline. *Ethnozootechnie*, 54, La zootechnie et son enseignement, 3-24.
- Duffaure, A. (1985). *Éducation, milieu et alternance*. Textes choisis et présentés par Daniel Chartier. Maurecourt : Éditions universitaires UNMFRO, coll. « Mésonance ».
- Goody, J. (1979). *La raison graphique, la domestication de la pensée sauvage*. Paris : Minuit.
- [éd. orig. (1977), *The domestication of the savage mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press].
- Grignon, C. (1975). L'enseignement agricole et la domination symbolique de la paysannerie. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 1.
- Grosjean, M. & Lacoste M. (1998). L'oral et l'écrit dans les communications de travail ou les illusions du « tout écrit ». *Sociologie du travail*, 40(4), 439-461.
- Harlé, I. (2009). *La fabrique des savoirs scolaires*. Paris : La Dispute, coll. « L'enjeu scolaire ».
- Hennion, A. (2013). D'une sociologie de la médiation à une pragmatique des attachements. *SociologieS* [En ligne], Théories et recherches, mis en ligne le 25 juin 2013, consulté le 7 mars 2016. URL : <http://sociologies.revues.org/4353>.
- Lahire, B. (1993). *Culture écrite et inégalités scolaires. Sociologie de l'« échec scolaire » à l'école primaire*. Lyon : Presses universitaires de Lyon.
- Landais, E. & Bonnemai, J. (1996) La zootechnie, art ou science ? Entre nature et société, l'histoire exemplaire d'une discipline finalisée. *Courrier de l'environnement de l'INRA*, 27, 23-44.
- Minassian, L. (2015). Unification de l'enseignement agricole et diversité d'établissements : un effet positif en termes de réduction des inégalités ?, *Éducation et sociétés*, 35, 133-150.
- Minassian, M. (2015). Permanence des ordres d'enseignement : réseaux, orientation et classes sociales. L'exemple de la formation agricole. *Recherches en Éducation*, HS7-mars 2015, 111-125.
- Passeron, J.-C. & Revel, J.-F. (dir.) (2005). *Penser par cas*. Paris: Éditions de l'EHESS.
- Trabal, P. (1996). *Le sens commun, les mathématiques et les sciences. Une approche de la sociologie des sciences par une étude des représentations sociales des mathématiques et des sciences*. Paris: École des hautes études en sciences sociales (EHSS).
- Verret, M. (1975). *Le temps des études*. Thèse d'État, Université de Paris V, Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.
- Vincent, G. (1980). *L'École primaire française. Étude sociologique*, Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon; Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Vincent, G. (2008). La socialisation démocratique contre la forme scolaire. *Éducation et francophonie*, 36(2), 47-62.

Cite This Article: NOUKIO Germaine Bienvenue & NEMBOT Hermann (2025). Pragmatics In Agricultural Education: A Socio-Educational Inequality Observed in two Agricultural Establishments: (FASA and a GIC). *East African Scholars J Edu Humanit Lit*, 8(10), 539-548.
