
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34768/r1.2020.v462.15>

Magdalena Kohout-Diaz*

University of Bordeaux, France

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3838-1470>

e-mail: magdalena.kohout-diaz@u-bordeaux.fr

**INCLUSIVE TEACHER: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES
BASED ON THE INTERPRETATION OF DIVERSITY,
UTOPIA OR REALITIES?**

INCLUSIVE TEACHER: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES BASED ON
THE INTERPRETATION OF DIVERSITY, UTOPIA OR REALITIES?

Keywords: teachers, professionalism, inclusive education, diversity.

What does the notion of inclusive teacher's identity imply? If he is destined to become an interpreter of diversity, he is called to subjectively assume the singularity of his analysis, appropriate to the consideration of the unforeseen and the variety of the specific courses. The subjective identity of the teacher does not become confused with the typical hypertrophied "ego" of our contemporary digital age, nor with a communitarian "we" that tends to swallow the social link to a conflictual "us or them", nor with a scientific "it" that excludes the subject. Answering the question of the identity of the inclusive teacher can therefore be difficult and constitutes a possible analysis of what is emerging today as a crisis for the teaching professions, constrained by new logics of performance. From our longitudinal ethnographic surveys and document studies, we will compare the precise coordinates of these tensions in France and in the Czech Republic: in these two countries, there seems to be a vast movement of de-expertise that inclusive education implies and

***Magdalena Kohout-Diaz** – Ph.D., full professor; research interests: inclusive education, mental health in education, comparative research in Central and Balkan Europe, professionalisation of teachers.

gives rise in return not only to recurrent major identity tensions but also to a certain confusion in the education of pupils.

NAUCZYCIEL INKLUZYWNY: PRAKTYKA ZAWODOWA OPARTA NA INTERPRETACJI RÓŻNORODNOŚCI, UTOPII CZY REALIÓW?

Słowa kluczowe: nauczyciele, profesjonalizm, edukacja inkluzywna, różnorodność.

Z czym wiąże się pojęcie tożsamości nauczyciela inkluzywnego? Jeśli ma on zająć się interpretacją różnorodności, powinien subiektywnie przyjąć odrębność swojej analizy, właściwą z punktu widzenia nieprzewidywalności i różnorodności poszczególnych przedmiotów. Subiektywnej tożsamości nauczyciela nie należy mylić z przerośniętym „ego” typowym dla współczesnej epoki cyfrowej, ani ze wspólnotowym „my”, które zazwyczaj redukuje połączenie społeczne do konfliktowego ujęcia „my albo oni”, ani z naukowym „to”, które wyklucza podmiot. Odpowiedź na pytanie o tożsamość inkluzywnego nauczyciela może być zatem trudna. Może ona stanowić pole do analizy zjawiska, które można określić mianem narastającego kryzysu zawodu nauczyciela, ograniczanego przez nową logikę działania. Autorka wykorzystuje podłużne badanie etnograficzne oraz dokonuje analizy dokumentacji w celu dokładnego porównania specyfiki tego typu napięć we Francji i w Czechach. Wydaje się, że w obu krajach istnieje szeroko zakrojony ruch mający na celu zmniejszenie znaczenia wiedzy specjalistycznej, który wiąże się z edukacją inkluzywną, i powoduje nie tylko nawracające napięcia tożsamościowe, ale również prowadzi do zamieszania w procesie kształcenia uczniów.

The development of inclusive teacher skills is on the agenda of good practice recommendations made by international organizations (UNESCO, 2015). We can only agree with these good intentions. For teachers and trainers, however, the question arises as to “who is – in practice – this inclusive teacher?”. Thanks to a comparative approach between France and the Czech Republic, we propose to contextualize and inform the development of inclusive teaching practices in these two countries. This comparison cannot be made without taking into account the educational tradition of the two countries. We therefore compare the French Cartesian tradition which, in the first half of the 17th century, founded a scientific approach to education to the Comenius tradition which, at the same time, carried the inclusive

utopia of a universalist humanist and irenist project. It seems particularly interesting to compare the development of the inclusive approach to teaching in these two countries in relation to these two different traditions, one of which represents the beginnings of a scientific approach to education while the other is rooted in an approach that has its origin in faith and belief.

The survey is based on a number of sources, namely the study of international and national documents, the action-research approach in training, interviews with students, teachers and other education and training professionals as well as school visits in both countries.

The results show that in contemporary times, the inclusive transformation of education is experiencing difficulties related to aligning teaching principles and teacher training with globalized, ahistorical and decontextualized approaches that are struggling to be effective. Two main results can be highlighted. The need for a profound epistemological and ethical change in the approaches to the teaching profession is a first given. On the other hand, the definition of the teacher as a subject interpreting the diversity of school audiences on a case-by-case basis and situated in a specific context appears to be a promising lead.

Why is it interesting to compare inclusive education in the Czech Republic and France: tensions between the humanist paradigm and the scientific paradigm of inclusion?

The first contemporary advances in inclusive education are not recent. They are traditionally linked to two references that have become classic: the Warnock Report (1978), establishing the concept of “special educational needs”, and the Salamanca Declaration (1994), setting the common framework for “education for all” as a global imperative. However, from the point of view of the history of thought, we can bring up the universalist idea of inclusive education well in advance, at the time of the Renaissance.

Comenius, a philosopher and teacher of Moravian origin, a true “Galileo of education”, aspired (not without messianic mysticism and utopia; he remains a Renaissance man) to constitute pedagogy as a “universal art of teaching everything to all” [*pampaedia*]. In this sense, he was a precursor to universalist conceptions of education, of schooling independent of individual differences and of welcoming diversity (Kohout-Diaz, 2008). Also a forerunner of the notion of global citizenship during the troubled period of the Thirty Years’ War, he sought “what could, even better than the sword, end all war: an education system, which, when applied to diverse nations, diminishing their diversity, erasing more apparent than real oppositions, would prepare for great harmony” (Michelet, 1870, chap. 3, p. 175).

This brief historical reminder makes it possible to understand that inclusive education is deeply articulated to a pan-European cultural humanism of Czech origin, to the democratic ideal and to social justice from an irenic perspective. It is a historically entrenched response to the question of the origins of inclusive reforms in educational policy at the international level. In other words, the development of the inclusive process in education is not anhistorical. To refer it to the historical moment of the emergence of pedagogy/didactic as a specific field of knowledge is to make inclusive education a stage where tensions are played out between a vision of the world based on belief (Comenius, the end of the Renaissance) and that which will allow the advent of science through the Cartesian revolution of the *cogito* in France. Comenius is indeed a metaphysical and universalist reformer but remains resolutely on the threshold of rationalist and technical modernity inaugurated by cartesianism (Denis, 1973; Prévot, 1981). The mystical dimension of the work, typical of the millennial conviction inherited from the Renaissance thought, is undeniable (Bayle, 1697). We hypothesize that even today, the work on inclusive education gives us the evidence of analyses crossed by the antagonism between scientific (or pseudo-scientific) and humanistic aims.

In contemporary France, the extension of “specific needs” tends to increase, now partially covering the scope of ethnic and cultural or health diversity, the same is true in the Czech Republic where ethnic (Rom), gender or generational (older) diversity is deemed to cause “Special Needs” (Hájková, Strnadová, 2010). But in the Czech Republic, more than in France, the implementation of inclusive processes seems laborious. The abandonment of the deficit and compensatory model inherited from Czech defectology and special pedagogy is difficult. The paradigm of specialized education and that of inclusive school’s clash and juxtapose, compromising the clarity of analysis and the efficiency of actions. In particular, the new educational law of 2004 [Školský zákon č. 561/2004, MŠMT] introduced the idea of the schooling of pupils with special educational needs [The Czech Republic then ratified a Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in September 2009 in Law 198/2009. The resulting National Action Plan for Inclusive Education (Národní akční plán inkluzivního vzdělávání, NAPIV <http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/socialni-programy/napiv>) was developed for a period of 4 years [2010-2014] but could not be re-established in 2016, having given rise to an open letter which was sent to the Minister of Education in 2011 by the NAPIV Working Group to alert him to the failure to comply with the planned restructurings and their reduction to pure formalism. These complications also reveal the extent to which the Czech

educational context remains permanently embarrassed by the totalitarian heritage, where the naturalization of intelligence and segregation (Štech, 2006) was an instilled school *habitus*.

Many projects have been opened in France since the 2005 Disability Act and numerous articles, books, journals, reports have been published, numerous congresses and seminars have been organized on the theme of school/inclusive education. What can be called “proliferation” of activities around the inclusive process is in stark contrast to “difficult” implementation on the ground (Reverdy, 2019). The balance between the normativity of the school and the always singular situations of the students (with specific needs sometimes divergent) is very fragile.

These remarks should be placed in the contemporary societal context where there is a consensus on diversity, particularly in educational settings (Lantheaume, 2011). The question, however, remains what diversity is exactly: pedagogical, psychic, or neurobiological? The consideration of neurodiversity, claimed in particular by the autistic community, requires an increased analysis of pedagogical adaptations supported by neuroimaging (neuro-education, neuro-pedagogy, Trocmé-Fabre, 1987; Sotto, Oberto, 2016). This community is called to grow because we can refer to all people “outside the neurological norm” as “neurodivergent”. In the absence of analysis, this important development is bound to reverberate on education systems without the ethical and democratic question being asked in the face of the rise of technocratic recovery of the phenomenon.

Indeed, artificial intelligence (AI) tools are expanding (e.g. *Lalillo*, adaptive learning tool, Zerrouki, 2019), proposing to respond to academic difficulties, whether or not they are related to a situation of disability and disorders. The competency-based learning approach is not antithetical to the inclusiveness of diversity. The answer is a differentiated pedagogy and education that takes into account the diversity of profiles because they are able to offer highly individualized paths. The Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a design based on neuroscience, allows individual learning differences to be taken into account. Its universality seems at first to be harmoniously articulated with an education in democratic citizenship. However, this is not the case. The neuro-pedagogical “for all” approach is not immediately synonymous with the “for everyone”. There is no guarantee that presumed universality is in fact the result of a concerted representation of individual singularities. This vision takes place without a global reflection on the educational aims that characterize subjectivity (critical thinking, reflection, argumentation). It can only take situations into account by reducing them to typical cases already listed, ignoring their specific

contexts. An articulation of pedagogical differentiation referred to neurodiversity (neuro-pedagogy developed from neuroimaging) with artificial intelligence markets applied to education is already established. As Pearson's Director of AI explains, the creation of a paid personal virtual tutor and "a unique digital platform including e-books, online courses and educational materials for rent, a kind of 'Netflix of Education' is already underway" (Marinova, 2018), as shown by the opening of the platform "Cape inclusive school" (<https://www.reseau-canope.fr/notice/presentation-de-cap-ecole-inclusive.html>) in France in 2019.

Consideration of diversity, a major feature of inclusive education, can therefore be understood as either neurobiological properties or subjective stories and cultures. These meanings are diametrically opposed, directing educational policies, sometimes towards rather economic and neuro-digital issues, sometimes towards the fight against discrimination and for the founding freedom of speech of a democratic and open citizenship supported by inclusive professionals based on their subjective enrollment in the exercise of their work.

Survey context and methodology: diverse comparative approaches in two countries on the road to inclusive transition of educational practices. We propose to present a part of our research on inclusive education, research that we have lead for twenty years from a perspective of comparative education. We focus on issues of inclusive teacher training because it seems that we are living no more than a change in global educational paradigm, a change in training models, which gives us the ambitious goal of training teachers as interpreters of diversity.

It must first be emphasized that inclusive education is a typical process of educational globalization, which involves multiple internal tensions, such as the difficult articulation between the humanist approach and the scientific approach of education, as mentioned earlier. This is why inclusive education encounters the typical difficulties of educational globalization in its implementation, that is to say, the difficulties linked to the articulation between general, international recommendations and their deployment in specific and singular contexts.

We can say schematically that two logics of training and education confront each other. The first is a rather scientific prescriptive and downward, and the second is descriptive, concrete and empirical.

The first logic aims at establishing a list of profiles to which technical recommendations and good pedagogical or training practices respond. For this reason, this logic is based on categorizations, classifications and taxonomies that are related to the individual student profile, for

example their learning disabilities or other mental disorders, or that are related to different devices and learning and education pathways that are offered to young people. This logic shapes public policies and drives the vast majority of international consensus texts on inclusive education, such as the Incheon Declaration (2015), which outlines a program of action for inclusive education up to fifteen years (“Education 2030” <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/education-2030-incheon-framework-for-action-implementation-of-sdg4-2016-fr.pdf>). As we can see, the prescriptive posture translates into the production of numerous technical guides and repertoires of actions and good practices.

The main problem faced by the training of an inclusive teacher is this difference between the representations of the training. The prescriptive and technical approach, based mainly on a repertoire of disorders or difficulties to be compensated, is not very effective as it relies more on the principles of conditioning, both in terms of training and education, as shown for example by some rehabilitative programs for people with autism spectrum disorder. This approach also encounters difficulties related to the paradoxes of positive discrimination, which reduces diversity and difference, which is sometimes a cultural difference, to a defect, to a lack that would be compensated and normalized.

In the second perspective, rising and empirical, we can instead consider that if the diversity of the concrete situations is irreducible, it is the source of the true innovations in teaching practices and that it is also a catalyst of the structural changes of the education and training. It is a driving force in the evolution of public policies in favor of a reduction of discrimination and inequalities in education and a greater tolerance of cultural diversities.

Our research shows that the opposition between these two perspectives is reflected in the concrete practices of teachers, for whom it generates significant tensions regarding their professional identity. The gap between the professional identity prescribed by the standards and the professional identity lived and implemented is not well felt. The teacher tries, for example, to take into account general recommendations that are not possible to be implemented without taking into account the contexts and is deprived of adaptations to be made. He also sometimes has difficulty in asserting to the institution the unique, specific know-how he has built, which does not always correspond to these general recommendations. A typical example of these tensions is the teacher’s assumption, or a lack of it, of a diagnostic assessment of mental disorders such as learning disabilities: should he or she not rely on the categories of mental health to define special educational

needs?

These tensions exist in the two countries where we conducted our research. In both cases, we end up highlighting the analyses of professional practices and research activity as essential factors in the professional development of the inclusive teacher. However, in both countries, work on the definition, scope and theoretical support of these practice analyses needs to be reconsidered.

In France, the law of 11 February 2005 strongly reaffirms the principles of inclusive education while paradoxically constituting the general need for “compensation”, which implicitly reduces any difference to a deficiency. In the 10 years since the publication of this law, public policies have stimulated evolutions of the devices making them more permeable and have also put forward terminologies more in line with global terminologies in favor of inclusion and the limitation of discrimination, segregation and inequality in education.

For about five years, we can observe the consequences of this process on teacher training. The first consequence in France is the development of educational research on different aspects of the inclusive process and it should be noted that this research is not limited to the psychopathology of disorders or disabilities.

The second consequence is that public policies are now oriented more and more resolutely towards the dislocation of specialized education and specialized training for the benefit of wide dissemination of inclusive skills to each teacher. Of course, most specialist teachers experience this as a loss of expertise and de-professionalization.

In the Czech Republic, as we’ve seen before, the implementation of the national plan NAPIV was blocked because of a supposed “excessive confiscation of the inclusive process by the Roma population”. Public opinion was that the inclusive process had been absorbed by the problems of inclusive education of the Roma population, which had previously tended to be discriminated against in specialized institutions for the mentally handicapped. It was said that other aspects of inclusive education for all had been neglected and the whole process was frozen. Since 2015, the situation has gradually been unblocked, as analyses of inclusive teaching practices appear to be an essential operator of inclusive practices, but they remain very closely linked to psychopathological diagnoses and are often confused with a kind of psychological supervision of teachers.

Some quick words on the method of data collection: we rely here on longitudinal research, conducted since 2012, that is to say, for five years. The methodologies are all qualitative in nature, inspired by ethnographic ap-

proaches, relevant to describing the object (Becker, 2002), in a comparative perspective. These are visits to institutions, clinical case studies, document analysis and above all formal and informal interviews with the different actors of inclusive education in both countries, such as students, teachers and also other inclusive education partners, psychologists, speech therapists, school assistants, university leaders of specialized teacher trainings, or actors and policy makers at the academic, regional or national level. The sources are varied, complementary and the material is quite abundant.

Most of the empirical work has been carried out in the Czech capital and in a major provincial capital in France. The institutions visited (schools but also training institutes/universities) are therefore marked, in both countries, by a strong concern to adjust quickly to the reforms of education, since they are in the position of pilots. The themes of our surveys in these locations have been the representations that directly impact education and the educational and coordination activities in favor of inclusive approaches. First, we identified the main elements of tension between the school and students with special educational needs/difficult situations through interviews and observations with students, teachers and trainers or institutional managers with whom we have discussed individually and in groups. We then sought to systematically gather their views and highlight the circumstances that contribute, prevent or limit inclusive approaches to education, as described by international institutions (UNESCO, 2015 for example). As we saw earlier, this research shows a sort of fairly realistic picture that comparatively illustrates the implementation of inclusive education in these two European countries.

Results and discussion

The first major result shows that the overall educational transformation required by the implementation of inclusive education puts the issue of the vocational training of all teachers, and even the question of professional identity and the expected skills of teachers, at the forefront. Inclusive change therefore invites us to refine and deepen our research on these points.

The second result shows that an epistemological and ethical reversal is required by the development of inclusive processes of diversity. Contrary to the prescriptive viewpoints, it is rather a question of describing and analyzing emerging concrete practices that prove themselves in situ and make the inclusive process possible in context.

This perspective is somewhat subversive insofar as it shows that the teacher must be essentially able to be in constant research, and in permanent activity of interpretation of the various concrete situations encountered in

the field. It is in this sense that to train professional inclusive teachers is to train interpreters of the irreducible diversity of concrete situations, that is to say professionals who assume the commitment of their subjectivity in a recurring interpretation activity. This activity is in principle of their educational creativity.

Assuming the part of the teacher's subjective involvement in his or her day-to-day professional activity can effectively improve the school climate, which is often degraded because of a lack of perspective on the part of the various actors (and especially teachers) who have tendency to reduce the analysis of difficult situations to a binary identity crisis between "them" and "us", as Eric Debarbieux (2002) shows.

The challenge is to assume the involvement of a subject, the subject of a language and a culture, which says "I", that is to say who assumes his subjective interpretation of cultural diversity knowingly, and that is not lost in the mass of a "we" general or a narcissistic "me" as Clotilde Leguil (2018) shows.

If we adopt data from the ethical and epistemological theories of care, we can hypothesize that this subject teacher interpreter of diversity is characterized by its concrete act in situ, act that precedes and exceeds its own rationalization in the context of analyses of professional practices.

The professional as an interpreter subject: utopia or reality? The reason for the personalization of school careers is not the conformation to a vague and general educational "ready-to-wear" based on the scientific diktat of biological neurodiversity. What would an "a-subjective neuro-citizen" be? Inclusive education is based on an ethic of the subjective act of speech, which ushers a democratic expression and social participation for everyone. An inclusive and democratic understanding of citizenship in no way means homogenization at the expense of diversity. Rather, it would be a source of totalitarianism.

There may be a temptation to rely on the Teachers of yesterday and to allow traditional educational models to persist in the contemporary environment. This forcing produces institutional violence. It does not take into account the changes in knowledge (horizontalized) and cultures (mobility and brewing; Appadurai, 1996). On the contrary, when every child or student feels that he or she is being treated fairly, that is, that their uniqueness is valued and has a voice in the decision-making process, they will feel included.

Inclusive education therefore evolves between three types of discourse: that of a traditional teacher whose discriminatory power would be challenged, that of a universal, de-subjectivized, insignificant, a-cultural and

an-historical scientism (contemporary hygienism) that no longer allows to locate or anchor one's motivation to learn, and finally that of a subject interpreting diversity, builder in his act of word of a shared global citizenship.

If we want to reduce the confused and paradoxical evolution of education policies, it is therefore a question of firmly anchoring the inclusive process in a democratic humanism not only exclusive intolerances but also containing homogenizing discourses generated by the excesses of the productivity race and to pass this on to teachers' training and professional practices.

In practical terms, inclusive education policies are consistent with respect for some key guiding principles. A fair approach of individuals, based on their distinctive specificities rather than on stereotypes related to classifications, an appreciation of this uniqueness related to diversity (differences remain today a factor of exclusion), acceptance of errors, different points of view and constructive criticism, a focus on the person, concern for common goals rather than that of his personal interests, acceptance of a risk and risk sharing responsibilities with confidence and a solicitude.

These principles are known, however, and are often in the state of consensual rhetorical figures rather than being the concrete humus of sustainable professional actions.

Conclusion

While inclusive rhetoric now seems relatively overused in education, the fight against segregation and inequality, but also against injustice and the homogenization of school careers, is more relevant than ever. The current era is indeed one of confused discourse and heightened passions for technoscience objects. It can be read as the "implementation, on a large scale, of ways of dealing with men and things that are given as inevitable because they are without recourse or scientifically based; based on expertise and 'efficiency'; which are imposed through the economic actors which carry them and the 'civil society actors' who support them; which have led to the impotence of politics and thus to the devaluation and marginalization of democratic forms – and which, ironically, call upon the 'participation' of the populations, their commitment, their duty to adapt" (Pestre, 2014, p. 311).

The challenge of inclusive education today is immense: it is to step aside, towards inclusiveness as a strategy for a humanistic approach to education.

More specifically, as it really allows teachers to be more inclusive, the professional practices must be rigorously addressed to the examination of

the concrete conditions for the accessibility of educational contexts in their broadest spectrum, implying the need for everyone to construct meaning of these steps. The professionalism of teachers therefore implies a relationship with the activity which is by no means a simple transfer from prescriptions of recommendations and good inclusive practices, but requires a great capacity for analysis, reflection, interpretation and adaptation in the face of teaching situations which are always complex and varied (Altet, 2001; Kohout-Diaz 2018).

Literatura | References

- ALTET M. (2001), Les compétences de l'enseignant-professionnel : entre savoirs, schèmes d'action et d'adaptation, le savoir analyser – in : L. Paquay, M. Altet, E. Charlier et Ph. Perrenoud (éd.) Former des enseignants professionnels. Quelles stratégies ? Quelles compétences ? (27-40). Bruxelles, De Boeck.
- APPADURAI A. (1996), *Après le colonialisme. Les conséquences culturelles de la globalisation*. Paris, Payot, 2001.
- BAYLE P. (1697), *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. Paris, PUF, 1995.
- BECKER H. S. (2002), *Les ficelles du métier. Comment conduire sa recherche en sciences sociales*, Paris, La Découverte, coll. "Grands repères Guides".
- DEBARBIEUX E. (ED.) (2002), *L'oppression quotidienne. Recherches sur la délinquance des mineurs*. La Documentation française, Paris.
- DENIS M. (1973), *Contribution aux études coméniennes*. Thèse de troisième cycle, éditée par le CNRS et l'Académie des sciences de Prague.
- HÁJKOVÁ V., STRNADOVÁ I. (2010), *Inkluzivní vzdělávání*. Praha, Grada.
- KOHOUT-DIAZ M. (2018), *Éducation inclusive. Un processus en cours*. Toulouse, Érès, collection *Connaissances de la diversité* dirigée par C. Gardou, p. 153.
- KOHOUT-DIAZ M. (2008), J. A. Komenský (Comenius) pédagogue? Place de l'éducation dans le projet de réforme systématique: l'apport de la Consultation universelle sur l'amendement des affaires humaines. *Penser l'éducation. Philosophie de l'éducation et histoire des idées pédagogiques*. N° 24, octobre 2008, p.79-97.
- LANTHEAUME F. (2011), La prise en compte de la diversité : émergence d'un nouveau cadre normatif? *Les dossiers des sciences de l'éducation*, 26, pp. 117-132.

- LEGUIL C. (2018), *Je. Une traversé des identités*. Paris, PUF.
- MARINOVA M. (2018). *Building Brains: How Pearson Plans To Automate Education With AI*.
- MICHELET J. (1870), *Nos fils*. Paris, Nathan, 1912.
- PESTRE D. (DIR.) (2014), *Le gouvernement des technosciences. Gouverner le progrès et ses dégâts depuis 1945*. Paris, La Découverte.
- PRÉVOT J. (1981), *L'utopie éducative, Comenius*. Paris, Belin.
- REVERDY C. (2019), *Apprendre (dans) l'école inclusive*. Dossier de veille de l'IFÉ, 127, janvier 2019. Lyon, ENS de Lyon.
- SOTTO A., OBERTO V. (2016), *Donner l'envie d'apprendre*. Paris, Le livre de poche.
- STECH S. (2006). *De la justice statistique à la justice libérale dans une société en transition du centre de l'Europe*. Communication dans le cadre du colloque *Repenser la justice dans le domaine de l'éducation et de la formation*, 15-17 mai 2006 à Lyon. In *Educations et Politiques/INRP*
- TROCMÉ-FABRE H. (1987), *J'apprends, donc je suis*. Introduction à la neuro-pédagogie. Paris, Éditions de l'Organisation.
- UNESCO (2015), *Déclaration d'Incheon et Cadre d'action pour la mise en oeuvre de l'Objectif de développement durable 4. Éducation 2030*. En ligne: <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/education-2030-incheon-framework-for-action-implementation-of-sdg4-2016-fr.pdf> [access: 05.01.2020].
- UNESCO (1994), *Déclaration de Salamanque*. Paris, Unesco.
- WARNOCK M. (1978), *Special Educational Needs. Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People*. London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- ZERROUKI R. (2019), *De la salle des profs à la salle des machines*. Enquête Libération, 29 janvier 2019.