

CAPES/CAFEP EXTERNE D'ANGLAIS SESSION 2015

EPREUVE DE MISE EN SITUATION PROFESSIONNELLE

Première partie :

Vous procéderez à la présentation, à l'étude et à la mise en relation des trois documents proposés (A, B, C non hiérarchisés).

Deuxième partie :

Cette partie de l'épreuve porte sur les documents A et B.

A partir de ces supports, vous définirez des objectifs communicationnels, culturels et linguistiques pouvant être retenus dans une séquence pédagogique en cycle terminal, en vous référant aux programmes. En vous appuyant sur la spécificité de ces supports, vous dégagerez des stratégies pour développer les compétences de communication des élèves.

Document A



From Martyn Ford and Peter Legon, *The How to be British Collection* (2003)

Document B

Wednesday July 29th 1981
ROYAL WEDDING DAY!!!!!!

How proud I am to be English!
Foreigners must be as sick as pigs!

5 We truly lead the world when it comes to pageantry! I must admit to having tears in my eyes when I saw all the cockneys who had stood since dawn, cheering heartily all the rich, well-dressed, famous people going by in carriages and Rolls-Royces. . . .

10 Prince Charles looked quite handsome in spite of his ears. His brother is dead good-looking; it's a shame they couldn't have swapped heads just for the day. Lady Diana melted my heartstrings in her dirty white dress

We watched television until the happy couple left Victoria Station on a very strange-looking train. Bert said it was only strange-looking because it was clean.

15 Mrs O'Leary came in and asked if she could borrow our old chairs for the street party. In my father's absence I agreed and helped to carry them out on to the pavement. Our street looked dead weird without cars and with flags and bunting flapping about.

Mrs O'Leary and Mrs Singh swept the street clean. Then we all helped to put the tables and chairs out into the middle of the road. The women did all the work, the men stood around on the pavement drinking too much and making jokes about Royal Nuptials.

20 Mr Singh put his stereo speakers out of his lounge windows and we listened to a Des
O'Connor LP whilst we set the tables with sandwiches, jam tarts, sausage rolls and sausages
on sticks. Then everyone in our street was given a funny hat by Mrs O'Leary and we sat down
to eat. At the end of the tea Mr Singh made a speech about how great it was to be British.
Everyone cheered and sang 'Land of Hope and Glory.' But only Mr Singh knew all the words.
25 Then my father came back with four party packs of light ale and two dozen paper cups, and
soon everyone was acting in an undignified manner.

Mr O'Leary tried to teach Mrs Singh an Irish jig but he kept getting tangled up in her sari.
I put my Abba LP on and turned the volume up high and soon even the old people of forty
and over were dancing! When the street lamps came on Sean O'Leary climbed up and put red,
white and blue crepe paper over the bulbs to help the atmosphere and I fetched our remaining
30 candles and put them on the tables. Our street looked quite Bohemian.

Bert told some lies about the war, my father told jokes. The party went on until one
o'clock in the morning! Normally they get a petition up if you clear your throat after eleven
o'clock at night!

Sue Townsend, *The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole, Aged 13 ¾* (1982)

Document C

No English person can look at the swearing of allegiance that takes place in American
schools every day without feeling bewilderment: that sort of public declaration of patriotism
seems so, well, naïve. When an Irishman wears a bunch of shamrock on St Patrick's Day, the
English look on with patronising indulgence: scarcely anyone sports a rose on St George's
5 Day. This worldly wisdom soon elides into a general view that any public display of national
pride is not merely unsophisticated but somehow morally reprehensible. George Orwell
noticed it as long ago as 1948 when he wrote that

10 *'In left wing circles it is always felt that there is something slightly disgraceful in being
an Englishman, and that it is a duty to snigger at every English institution, from horses-
racing to suet puddings. It is a strange fact, but it is unquestionably true, that almost any
English intellectual would feel more ashamed of standing to attention during 'God Save the
King' than of stealing from a poor box.'*

15 No one stands for 'God Save the Queen' any more, and any cinema manager who tried to
revive the custom of playing the national anthem would find the place empty before he'd
reached the end of the first verse. At the time of Orwell's irritation, left-wing intellectual
disdain was cheap because the English didn't need to concern themselves with the symbols of
their own identity: when you're a top dog in the world's leading empire, you don't need to.
20 And since 'Britain' was essentially a political invention, it was necessary to submerge the
identities of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom within it. The beleaguered trip of
Protestant settlers transplanted to the north of Ireland clung to the British identity fiercely
because they had nothing else, but in other places on the Celtic fringe, traditional identities
could easily co-exist with being British, a fact the English were happy to acknowledge, since
25 it rather proved the Union was what it said it was, a Union of distinct places. Hence, the
nicknames: Scots are Jocks, Welshman Taffies and Irishmen Paddies or Micks, but – another
sign of their dominance – it is noticeable there is no similar designation for the English. . . .

The popular novelist E M Delafield gave it as her belief that the English Creed included
four elements: firstly, that 'God is an Englishman, probably educated at Eton, secondly that all
30 good women are naturally frigid, thirdly that it is better to be dowdy than smart,' and lastly

35 that 'England is going to rack and ruin.' When Nirad Chaudhuri visited England in 1955, he told a politician how welcoming and civilised he found the country. 'You are seeing it at a very favourable time,' came the Eeyoreish reply. When Richard Ingrams, the former editor of *Private Eye*, tried to compile an anthology of writing about England he was so struck by the prevailing pessimism that he decided it would have been as easy to pull together a collection called *Going to the Dogs*.

Jeremy Paxman, *The English* (1998)

Sujet : EMSP 19

Première partie en anglais

This set of three documents revolves around the theme of British / English identity and its expression (or lack of expression) through certain clichés, or stereotypes.

Document A is taken from the 'How to Be British' collection, a set of postcards giving illustrations of a certain tongue-in-cheek view of Britishness expressed in the form of instructions to people of other nationalities on how to interpret various aspects of British quirkiness. In this particular extract, there is a series of illustrations depicting different facets of Britishness as expressed by British people themselves as opposed to those which foreign visitors might anticipate.

Document B is an excerpt from *The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole aged 13 ¾*, written by Sue Townsend and published in 1982. In this book, the main protagonist Adrian gives a realistic but inadvertently humorous account of one of the many street parties which took place on 29th July 1981 to celebrate the wedding of Prince Charles and Lady Diana Spencer. He expresses his own surge of pride in the royal occasion and then relates how he, his family and his neighbours of Irish and Indian origin let down their hair and enjoy the street celebration held in the evening following the ceremony.

Document C is a passage taken from *The English* written by Jeremy Paxman and published in 1998. Jeremy Paxman is a well-known BBC journalist and television presenter, who is noted for having hosted the daily *Newsnight* programme for 25 years. As is typical of many British journalists, he has a direct, uncompromising style while often using humour in the form of understatement and irony to illustrate his arguments.

Taken as a whole, this set of documents requires the candidate to analyse how British people identify with their culture, how their sense of national pride finds expression in explicit or implicit ways and to set this against the reactions of people of other nationalities towards Britain and the British.

A preliminary study of these documents should allow candidates to note the common themes which are present. For example, they may highlight the fact that the illustration in Document A claiming that typical Britons 'are not bothered about a bit of dust' ties in neatly with the character Bert in Document B remarking upon the fact that the royal train 'was strange-looking because it was clean.' Several other illustrations of the sort could also be provided to prove that these three documents seem to complement each other well, to give a portrait of a typical British citizen. However, candidates who content themselves with a simple identification of common points between these documents fall into the trap of remaining at an overly

Another danger inherent in the discussion of this set of documents would be to use the examples and illustrations they provide to draw together an excessively stereotypical representation of the typical British citizen (ie the bowler-hat-clad, pet-loving, sausage-roll-eating, royalty-worshipping yet stiff-upper-lipped citizen who can only relax after having had a drink or two). One can indeed glean such an impression of Britishness from aspects of these documents but candidates who do so without providing any analysis would give an unsatisfactory impression of their understanding of the documents.

One aspect of these documents which candidates should notice on their first reading is their humour. This is present in all three documents and should not only be identified but analysed as another representation of Britishness. Indeed, on studying Document A, candidates may note that not only do we smile at the marked contrast between the various images (the smartly dressed businessman in the first picture and the outrageously dressed young lady in the second, for instance), but that we may pick up on the aspect of self-deprecation often identified as typical in British humour. This can be seen in the portrayal of British men turning red in the sun, or having rings run around them by their dogs. Furthermore, Document C points out in its quote from Orwell the 'duty to snigger at every English institution'. However, the reader may snigger himself on reading E. M. Delafield's description of the

English Creed, at the end of Document C. Document B uses elements of burlesque to mock the absurdity of the characters' drunken behaviour at the street party in contrast with their more reserved behaviour in the earlier part of the document. This is another feature of what we could identify as 'British' humour.

As mentioned before, this set of documents clearly addresses the expression or lack of expression of national pride. A satisfactory analysis would bring out the contrasting aspects highlighted by the different documents. The smiling illustrations in Document A hint at the pleasure Britons derive from their sense of belonging to this nation. However, Documents B and C draw the reader's attention to certain differences in attitudes to the expression of national pride. This can be seen in Document B through an examination of the behaviour of Mr and Mrs O'Leary (of Irish origin and unashamed to demonstrate it) and Mr Singh (of Indian origin) who 'makes a speech about how great it was to be British' and was the only one to know the lyrics of Land of Hope and Glory, a hymn to the glory of England and often used these days as an English national anthem. These attitudes can be contrasted with the behaviour of the native-born British characters who only grudgingly acknowledge national pride while sober, although they celebrate the royal occasion more freely under the influence of a few drinks. Further illustration of British reluctance to openly acknowledge pride in their nation is provided by Document C which also puts forward elements of analysis of the reasons for such inhibitions. Indeed, Document C, which looks specifically at the English as opposed to the British, hints at the embarrassment felt over what is perceived as excessive demonstration of national pride (singing the national anthem in a cinema, for example.) Openly demonstrating national pride would be seen as being somewhat arrogant and Document C goes on to point out that in any case this is unnecessary since the English position as 'top dog in the world's leading empire' was obvious to all and did not require open expression.

The most astute candidates were able to offer a more nuanced understanding of the differing ways of expressing Britishness by backing up their arguments with sound knowledge of elements of historical background. They may have discussed the contrasting ways of expressing national pride demonstrated by other nations mentioned in Document C. Indeed the Americans, the Irish, the Northern Irish, the Scots and the Indians all embrace their national identity more openly, and well-informed candidates may have seized this opportunity to address these points, giving justification for the various differences touched on in Document C from their own knowledge of these countries' history. Finally, observant candidates will have noticed the association of certain aspects of Britishness with a particular social class and will have used this as an opportunity to mention the importance of social class in determining identification in the UK.

Susan Walters-Galopin

Seconde partie en français

L'étude des documents A (planche de dessins caricaturaux datant de 2003) et B (extrait du journal intime d'Adrian Mole) invitait le candidat à formuler une problématique pour séquence de classe de 3^{ème}, en lien avec la notion «l'ici et l'Ailleurs». Ceci pouvait amener le candidat à se pencher sur l'évolution des stéréotypes liés à l'identité Britannique de 1982 à nos jours et à proposer «la découverte de l'Autre» comme objectif culturel. Le potentiel et la spécificité des documents devaient l'alerter et lui permettre de dégager une tâche finale permettant aux élèves de dépasser «la vision figée et schématique véhiculée par les stéréotypes et clichés», comme cela est déjà préconisé au Palier 1.

Si les éléments facilitateurs de ce dossier semblaient évidents (le récit du journal intime relativement accessible à une classe de 3^{ème}, ainsi que les stéréotypes légendés), plusieurs obstacles étaient

présents : l'accès à l'implicite, aux '*understatements*' nombreux dans le journal, la difficulté d'établir une problématique écartant tout risque de dérive quant aux représentations.

Si le candidat annonçait les objectifs communicationnels à bon escient (par exemple, l'activité langagière de compréhension écrite concernant le document B et la production orale pour le document A), il semblait encore plus pertinent d'insister sur l'interdépendance de toutes les activités langagières, et de choisir une activité langagière dominante, tout au long de la séquence.

Certaines prestations ont été insuffisantes parce qu'elles se résumaient à un simple «catalogue» de compétences, sans lien avec la finalité annoncée du projet. Au contraire, une hiérarchisation judicieuse et organisée des documents devait permettre aux candidats d'intégrer la dimension culturelle dans l'exploitation des supports de manière progressive et cohérente, et d'envisager une progression en spirale, intégrant les savoirs aux savoirs faire.

Trop souvent, le jury a pu constater le traitement des documents de façon isolée et fragmentaire. Par exemple, bon nombre de candidats ont vu dans le document B—le texte devenant simple prétexte thématique—une invitation à traiter le thème de la famille royale, ou ont envisagé le travail de la compréhension du texte de manière linéaire, purement factuelle ('*what is happening?*'), et sous forme de vérification (les élèves ont-ils compris ?) plutôt que d'entraînement (qu'ont-ils compris ?). Occulter ici l'étude de l'humour, du point de vue ou des sous-entendus revient ici à nier le sens. De même, une simple étude des caricatures en tant que telles semblait superficielle, voire équivoque, si le candidat ne proposait pas de réel appui pour entraîner les élèves à l'analyse du point de vue et à l'argumentation (références au niveau visé B1 du CECRL).

A l'inverse, il était pertinent d'inscrire le traitement des documents dans une perspective actionnelle, en proposant des stratégies d'apprentissage ciblées : étude du document B par groupes et tâches respectives (par exemple : chaque groupe est chargé d'un personnage), en procédant d'abord par simples repérages collectifs, pour aller ensuite plus loin dans la compréhension individuelle du sens (de l'explicite vers l'implicite). S'il appartenait au candidat de déterminer et de justifier des objectifs linguistiques, grammaire, lexique et phonologie devaient être présentés en contexte.

Un certain nombre de prestations ont manqué de construction didactique, de gradation entre les séances proposées et de corrélation entre les objectifs en vue de la tâche finale envisagée. Beaucoup de candidats ont cependant amorcé une réflexion sur ce qui distingue évaluation formative et évaluation sommative, et ce qui peut distinguer évaluation et tâche finale : dans les cas où cette dernière était proposée, elle déterminait nécessairement le sens même du projet et se devait d'être en adéquation avec les apprentissages réalisés, mais pouvait ne pas coïncider avec une évaluation. Certains candidats ont su l'envisager en faisant des propositions pertinentes : par exemple, la réalisation de campagnes de sensibilisation pour lutter contre les stéréotypes, sous la forme d'expositions, l'organisation d'un voyage scolaire (avec la préparation en amont de questionnaires élaborés par les élèves eux-mêmes), l'écriture d'un journal «à la manière d'Adrian Mole» d'un jeune anglais le jour du mariage du Prince William et Kate Middleton (permettant de surcroît une mise en perspective intéressante sur l'évolution des comportements sociaux...).

Certains candidats, proposant un travail en interdisciplinarité (l'art plastique pour les illustrations éventuelles, la technologie pour le montage de l'exposition, l'éducation civique pour le respect de soi et des autres...) ont montré une capacité à prendre en compte les compétences professionnelles C1 (partager les valeurs de la République) et C10 (travail en équipe éducative). De même, si l'éducation à la citoyenneté et la dimension européenne étaient prises en compte, renforçant ainsi la perspective actionnelle d'un tel projet, les prestations des candidats s'en retrouvaient valorisées. Enfin, certains candidats ne se sont pas limités à la seule utilisation des documents A et B mais ont subtilement suggéré d'autres supports afin d'enrichir le travail sur les stéréotypes, tels qu'un extrait de *Mr Bean* (offrant un contrepoint animé au document A), ou de la bande dessinée *Astérix chez les Bretons* (offrant

un regard continental), ou encore des *Simpsons* (offrant un contrepoint américain aux documents A et B). Toute ouverture ou prolongation pertinente de la séquence a aussi été vivement appréciée : l'étude du multiculturalisme au Royaume-Uni ('*What would Mr Singh say today?*'), l'utilisation des TICE (visioconférence avec une école anglaise, e-twinning, création d'un blog...).

Nicole Maïer