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Abstract

This data management plan was created using the OPIDoR (Optimiser le partage et l'interopérabilité des données de la recherche/ Tools and services to support french research data mangement). It describes all data collected and created as part of the postdoctoral research for the project "Circulation of knowledge: between sciences, policies, and practices in education (CIVOIR)" under the scientific direction of Professor Françoise Lantheaume and with the participation of German Fernandez Vavrik, University Lumiere Lyon 2, France. The data produced in this survey was collected through a mechanism specifically created for this project: the cooperative laboratory - CoopLa.
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Introduction

Creating a data management plan in the social sciences and humanities is a new practice required by research authorities in France. While there are some French tools that help in the writing of a data management plan such as OPIDoR, the tools are mainly written for collaborative projects between several laboratories and/or universities, and this raises many questions about our practices as researchers.

This data management plan proposal stems from experimentation carried out for the CIVOIR project "Circulation of knowledge between sciences, policies, and practices in education," funded by IDEX-LYON in 2018–2019, which led to the submission of a research innovation action (RIA) project to the European H2020 program with seven other universities and non-academic partners (Belgium, the United Kingdom, Romania, Portugal, Cyprus, and France) in the field of education.

Construction of a data collection method specific to the CIVOIR project

CIVOIR project

CIVOIR studies the circulation of knowledge between different spheres (social, cultural, political, and economic) with a focus on education and training issues. The aim is to understand how educational actors cooperate or compete around the definition of knowledge that is considered worthy of circulation in an educational dialogue. The CIVOIR project has two steps. The first 2018-2019 consists of creating the coopla and collecting the data. The second steps, in progress, consists of analysing the data and exploiting it.

In 2018, researchers and field actors were brought together for an exploratory Cooperative Laboratory—a "CoopLa" (derived from the expression coined in French laboratoire collaboratif—Labco) to discuss the question: "Do you have to be in school to learn?" This question was sufficiently general and topical to create a real debate between the actors.

This exploratory approach to researching interaction between field actors had the following objectives:

1. to enhance understanding and promote better knowledge of the actors in the Rhône-Alpes-Auvergne region interested in the issue of dropping out of school;
2. to identify the resources mobilized;
3. to understand the circulation of knowledge between science, politics, and practices. The interaction took place and data was generated in a cooperative laboratory—a "CoopLa" setting.
Why a specific method?

In order to study the circulation of knowledge between the sciences, policies, and practices in education and training, we mobilized reflections from two theoretical frameworks. The first was, cognitive anthropology (D'Andrade 1995) which through new approaches combining the fields of knowledge and technology, shows that the reasoning of actors or social groups are situated actions (Schuman 1987). These situated actions depend on the interactions between individuals, various instruments and social conventions that make up the socio-natural and technical environment around them (Vinck 2007). According to Grison (2004), it is a "matter of considering the cognitive processes of situated activity as inseparable from a situation, whose physical elements, both artefactual and social" (Grison 2004), offer significant resources for the action of the subjects (we note here the influence the theory of affordances (Gibson 1977)

Second, the examination of knowledge (Adell-Gombert 2011) "in action" as Bruno Latour (Latour 1987) (from the pragmatic point of view according to Christian Jacob (Jacob 2011); from "justifications" from Boltanski (Boltanski et al. (2006)) shows that a difference is to be made, if the knowledge is understood as being part of identity (to be part of a lineage or a collective history made of shared knowledge, and at an individual level by a singular knowledge which, within the collective, as "experience knowledge") or is mobilized by authority (to justify it, to legitimize it by knowledge whose content and source are exposed as "expert knowledge"). Finally, in all "knowledge", there is exposed knowledge and ignored knowledge. We are looking for a way to have more information on unknown knowledge and to allow participants to specify or give additional references. As a boundary object (Star and Griesemer 1989), the "circulation of knowledge" presupposes a specific methodology.

Cooperative laboratory—a "CoopLa": a method and a socio-cultural environment for democracy

A cooperative Laboratory—a "CoopLa" (or in French laboratoire collaboratif—Labco) was organized around a question "Do you have to be in school to learn?" and brought together ten participants (researchers working on the CIVOIR program as well as other researchers, parents, students, political actors, and teachers). The debate was organized to be both face-to-face (participants took part in a workshop in face-to-face dialogue for two hours) and remotely (through an online platform).

During the face-to-face interaction, the debate was recorded using four cameras as well as a microphone to record sound. The debate began by recalling the question that united the participants and proposed two "triggers". The triggers were excerpts from two video-documentaries, five minutes each, one on a "traditional" french school and the other on parents who school their children at home. Two debates were organised with different participants, with the core project researchers present for both debates. To recruit participants, we launched a "call for participation" at the university and through the school and out-of-school networks in Lyon (France). A free online dialogue platform was used for
the online debate (framateam). All participants were brought together for dialogue via this platform. The platform included five areas:

1. self-presentation (non-compulsory as a pseudonym sufficed),
2. a question: "How do you understand the problem of non-voluntary school leaving?"
3. a question: "What do you think are the main reasons for the voluntary leaving of school in France today? ", and
4. another question: "What do you think families base their choices on? " One of the participants added a fifth theme: “literacy.” CoopLa can thus be seen as both a method of collecting data for the circulation of knowledge and a space for democratic debate (Callon and Barthe 2005).

Material produced

Several types of data were collected. First, personal data about the participants (gender, age, occupation/student, whether the participants were parents or children, the age of the children, and whether they were in or out of school) were gathered at the time the participants signed the consent forms (eight participants for face-to-face n°1 and face-to-face n°2). Second, video and sound data was collected during the face-to-face debate. The sound data was transcribed (Fig. 1). The online debate was captured on a word processor (Fig. 2) and the resources mobilized were photographed and identified by a hyperlink. Finally, these data can be used with NVivo software.

Roles and responsibilites

Data collection and production of material: Amelie Derobert and German Fernandez Vavrik

Supervision of project: Professor Françoise Lantheaume

Data storage: Hard copy to be stored with Laboratory Education, Cultures, Politiques. As part of the data management plan for CIVOIR, all data will also be uploaded to Figshare/socialscience/education (https://figshare.com).
Policies for data sharing and public access

No restrictions on data transcription necessary, and there are no ethical or privacy issues. Intellectual property rights will rest with original authors of the data: Amélie Derobert and German Fernandez Vavrik, and the project supervisors Françoise Lantheaume. Data will be free to use under the expectation that it will be correctly attributed and cited using the Figshare DOI (Licence ODC-ODBL).

Dissemination methods

All data and metadata will be stored privately in the cloud on Figshare until publication (after anonymization and work with the legal services, and valorization work with the University of Lyon 2), after which point it will be made open-access under a Creative Commons licence, and will be citable in its own right.

Data will be searchable on Figshare, and downloadable by any user. Use of universal formats will ensure maximum exchangeability and cross-platform compatibility for all users. All data will be under embargo until publication of scientific articles or chapters.

Conclusion

After one year of work on the circulation of knowledge, the researchers of the CIVOIR project wish to test the "CoopLa" on a new theme and in different countries in Europe: How to study the circulation of knowledge on a transnational educational object? The project consists of looking at a specific object at the crossroads of educational policies (school education, adult education, the judiciary etc.), dedicated to audiences far from education to connect them to education and through education. The focus will particularly be on "Key
competences" in the European Union sense (reading, writing, mathematics, digital and citizenship skills). This new project development could not have taken place without the participation and expertise of Dr Andrea Pietrelli.
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Endnotes

*1 Tools and services to support research data management in France: https://opidor.fr/
*2 https://civoir.hypotheses.org/