

*From the international discourses about inclusion to their local translation:
Teachers' conceptions about an integration-inclusion reform in the canton of Bern
(Switzerland)¹*

*Dos discursos internacionais de inclusão à sua tradução local:
concepções dos professores sobre uma reforma de integração-inclusão no cantão de Berna (Suíça)*

*International discourses of inclusion and their local translation:
Teachers' conceptions regarding an integration-inclusion reform in the canton of Bern (Switzerland)*

*De los discursos de inclusión internacional a su traducción local: las concepciones de los docentes sobre
una reforma de integración-inclusión en el cantón de Berna (Suiza)*

Joaquim Sieber²
Université of Teacher Education, State of Vaud

Stéphanie Bauer³
Université of Teacher Education, State of Vaud

Corina Borri-Anadon⁴
University of Québec

Resumé: Le paradigme inclusif est un mouvement international porté par les agences onusiennes comme l'UNESCO, et qui influe sur les politiques éducatives de certains pays. La Suisse fait partie des pays qui ont engagé des réformes de leur système éducatif afin de le rendre plus inclusif. Ces réformes ont des impacts sur les enseignants. L'objectif de cet article est de rendre compte des conceptions des enseignants quant à la réforme d'intégration-inclusion actuellement en cours dans le canton de Berne, en Suisse. Une méthodologie qualitative a été utilisée, reposant sur 13 entretiens réalisés et analysés à la lumière du cadre théorique du changement social. Les résultats mettent en évidence qu'en dehors d'une adhésion de principe, les conceptions partagées par les enseignants sont contestataires face à l'intégration-inclusion. Ces dernières sont révélatrices de tensions intrinsèques au paradigme inclusif ainsi qu'à son développement dans des systèmes éducatifs perméables à d'autres influences politiques internationales, telles que la nouvelle gestion publique et le néolibéralisme.

Mot-clé: Intégration-inclusion; Réforme éducative; Changement; Conceptions; Enseignants.

¹ The original article was written in French. In case of any comprehension issues, particularly conceptual ones, the French version shall prevail.

² PhD. in Human and Social Sciences at the University of Neuchâtel (UNINE). Université of Teacher Education, State of Vaud (HEPL), Lausanne, Vaud (VD), Suisse. E-mail: joaquim.sieber@hepl.ch; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0918-6141>.

³ PhD. in Education Sciences, University of Geneva (UNIGE). Université of Teacher Education, State of Vaud (HEPL), Lausanne, Vaud (VD), Suisse. E-mail: stephanie.bauer@hepl.ch; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9806-2397>.

⁴ PhD. in Education Sciences, Université de Québec à Montréal (UQAM). Université de Québec à Trois-Rivières (UQTR), Québec, Canada. E-mail: corina.borri-anadon@uqtr.ca; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/00000-0002-7361-8632>.

Abstract: The inclusive paradigm is an international movement promoted by UN agencies such as UNESCO, influencing the educational policies of certain countries. Switzerland is among the countries that have initiated reforms to make their educational system more inclusive. These reforms have implications for teachers. This article aims to report on teachers' conceptions regarding the ongoing integration-inclusion reform in the canton of Bern, Switzerland. A qualitative methodology based on 13 interviews conducted and analyzed in light of the theoretical framework of social change was employed. The results highlight that, beyond principled adherence, teachers' shared conceptions resist integration-inclusion. These conceptions reveal inherent tensions within the inclusive paradigm and its development in educational systems susceptible to other international political influences, such as new public management and neoliberalism.

Keywords: Integration-inclusion; Educational reform; Change; Conceptions; Teachers.

Resumo: O paradigma inclusivo é um movimento internacional apoiado por agências da ONU, como a UNESCO, que influencia as políticas educacionais de determinados países. A Suíça é um dos países que iniciou reformas no seu sistema educativo para o tornar mais inclusivo. Estas reformas têm impactos nos professores. O objetivo deste artigo é relatar as concepções dos professores a respeito da reforma de integração-inclusão atualmente em curso no cantão de Berna, na Suíça. Foi utilizada uma metodologia qualitativa, baseada em 13 entrevistas realizadas e analisadas à luz do referencial teórico da mudança social. Os resultados destacam que, além de uma adesão de princípio, as concepções dos professores contestam à integração-inclusão e revelam tensões intrínsecas ao paradigma inclusivo, bem como ao seu desenvolvimento em sistemas educativos permeáveis a outras influências políticas internacionais, como a nova gestão pública e o neoliberalismo.

Palavras-chave: Integração-inclusão; Reforma educacional; Mudança; Concepções; Professores.

Resumen: El paradigma inclusivo es un movimiento internacional impulsado por agencias de las Naciones Unidas como la UNESCO, que influye en las políticas educativas de algunos países. Suiza es uno de los países que ha emprendido reformas en su sistema educativo para hacerlo más inclusivo. Estas reformas tienen impacto en los docentes. El objetivo de este artículo es informar sobre las concepciones de los docentes con respecto a la actual reforma de integración-inclusión en curso en el cantón de Berna, Suiza. Se utilizó una metodología cualitativa, basada en 13 entrevistas realizadas y analizadas a la luz del marco teórico del cambio social. Los resultados destacan que, más allá de una adhesión de principio, las concepciones compartidas por los docentes son críticas frente a la integración-inclusión. Estas concepciones son reveladoras de tensiones intrínsecas al paradigma inclusivo y a su desarrollo en sistemas educativos permeables a otras influencias políticas internacionales, como la nueva gestión pública y el neoliberalismo.

Palabras clave: Integración-inclusión; Reforma educativa; Cambio; Concepciones; Docentes.

Received on: September 29, 2023

Accepted on: January 11, 2024

Introduction

The inclusive paradigm has become increasingly important in education systems in recent years. Promoted by international bodies such as the UN or UNESCO, which have developed framework texts to define guidelines, inclusion takes the form of values and norms (RAMEL; VIENNEAU, 2016), which are then taken up by the various countries in their

respective legal texts. These direct the educational policies to transform the school systems' institutional operation, as well as professional standards, teaching training, and the teachers' teaching practices.

This top-down process is thus identifiable in many countries through the legal reforms undertaken there. However, the results and actual effects of these reforms remain uncertain: Several studies show that, despite political will, reforms do not so easily reach the teaching practices of teachers (CROS, 2004; GATHER THURLER, 2000; HOUSSAYE, 2014; THEORET *et al.*, 2006). However, within the educational institution, the teaching staff is the decisive actor called upon to carry out the political will and school reforms (BALUTEAU, 2003; CURCHOD-RUEDI; RAMEL; BONVIN; ALBANESE *et al.*, 2013).

If the paradigm of inclusion, through the legal and structural reforms supposed to make it effective, seems to be present at the international level, its local adaptation is a significant issue that raises two questions: That of its translation into local educational policy and that of its implementation by educational teams. Translating the inclusive paradigm in Switzerland is challenging. The country is a plurilingual Confederation delegating to each canton the steering of its school system and the more or less inclusive direction it wishes to give it. Therefore, the practical implementation of reforms by teaching teams in their teaching practices should be studied to understand the local translations of international trends and their actual effects.

Our article proposes to address these two aspects by highlighting the changes taking place in the French-speaking part of the canton of Bern. After presenting the Bernese context and the political reforms at stake, we will show how teachers give meaning to these reforms and translate them into their teaching practices.

1. The inclusive paradigm in education: From general principles to local translations

1.1. A movement emerging internationally

The inclusive paradigm has developed since 1990 under the influence of UN agencies, in particular UNESCO. *The Salamanca Declaration and Framework for Action on Special Educational Needs of 1994* is often cited as a founding text (UNESCO, 1994). The latter promotes "school for all" based on the right to quality education for all students, breaking with separative education.

The inclusion movement tends to fight against the different forms of exclusion that target specific groups of students. Ramel and Vienneau (2016) identify three waves that

contributed to the development of the inclusive paradigm: The schooling of students with disabilities (1920 to 1984), the integration of marginalized students (1990 to 1999), and the Guiding Principles for Inclusive Schools (years 2000). The second wave marks a broadening of the public of these policies, and the third states in its Guiding Principles (2005; 2009) that quality education must be offered to EVERY student without exception (UNESCO, 2020) and not be limited to specific students. Thus, it intends to go beyond the search for physical or pedagogical accessibility specific to the first waves to also concern itself with the recognition of the diversity of students in all areas of school life to promote their sense of belonging. This requires allowing them to question the contents provided and the educational practices deployed (GOYER; BORRI-ANADON, 2019).

The inclusive paradigm postulates the structural modification of the school in its relationship to students and their educational success. For Potvin (2020, p. 11):

The inclusive approach is a continuous process of transforming learning environments to reflect the diversity of student realities and needs in curriculum, policies, and practices to eliminate exclusion and ensure equity and equality of achievement.

The inclusive approach calls for a change in the school form as a standard-setting institution to "overcome barriers that limit the presence, participation, and success of learners" (UNESCO, 2017, p. 7). Therefore, it calls for the school to become introspective about its role in producing exclusion mechanisms and concrete measures to avoid them. It seeks not only to fight discrimination by promoting equity and taking into account the realities of the public, a fortiori minoritized, but it also engages the responsibility of the system, and therefore of its actors, in its ability to lead a process of change (POTVIN, 2020). Therefore, it requires an examination of "how it [the school system] is organized, the forms of teaching offered, the learning environment, and how learners' progress is supported and evaluated" (UNESCO, 2017, p. 13). The inclusive approach thus breaks with the integrative approach, which does not require any structural change⁵ and tends to perpetuate the deficit perspective around diversity, the beneficiary students being considered in terms of gaps that need filling (EBERSOLD; DETRAUX, 2013).

Several studies that have documented this transformation of the education system highlight the critical issue of the role of teaching teams in the process (CURCHOD-RUEDI; RAMEL; BONVIN; ALBANESE et al., 2013; RAMEL; BENOIT, 2011; CHRISTMAS, 2014).

⁵ The integrative approach is defined as follows: "Learners labelled as having 'special educational needs' are placed in ordinary educational settings with adaptations and resources, provided that they can fit into existing unchanged structures, attitudes and environment. (UNESCO, 2017, p. 7)"

In their daily pedagogical practices, they are first of all responsible for the progress of all their students. From an inclusive perspective, it is a question of recognizing the legitimacy of expressing diversity (Prud'homme et al., 2011). While the principle may seem obvious, its implementation poses several concrete challenges. It involves mobilizing new pedagogical practices related to the universal conception of learning (BERGERON; ROUSSEAU; LECLERC, 2011), such as pedagogical differentiation (TOMLINSON, 2014). The development of inclusive schools also leads to interprofessional collaboration, which seeks to link the profession and its borders (PELLETIER; ALLENBACH; ST-VINCENT, 2023). Altogether, it seems necessary to think of inclusion as a "situated activity," where the changes implemented are "a function of local activity and the tools and discourses associated with it." (WAITOLLER, 2020, p. 3). Thus, this study's national and cantonal contextual anchoring should be explained.

1.2 the Swiss case: Between integration and inclusion

To situate the development of the inclusive paradigm at the national level in Switzerland, we can highlight the agreements signed by the Confederation on this issue. It should be remembered that Switzerland is a federal state that delegates authority over its education system to each of its cantonal governments. It is up to the cantons to respect national agreements and adapt their schools' legal texts so they comply with UN commitments. Let us also note a trend towards harmonization since the 90s, strengthening inter-cantonal cooperation, particularly for special education.

Switzerland signed the Salamanca Declaration in 1994 (UNESCO, 1994). A few years later, in 2002, it adopted a new law, the LHand or Federal Act on the Elimination of Inequalities Affecting Disabled Persons. This law, which is still in force, emphasizes the social participation of people with disabilities and targets training as a lever for this. In particular, it calls on the cantons "to encourage the integration of disabled children and adolescents into regular schools through appropriate forms of schooling, insofar as this is possible and serves the good of the disabled child or adolescent" (SWISS CONFEDERATION, 2002, section 5, art.20). We note that it is instead the term integration that this law highlights, by conditioning it to criteria of feasibility and well-being of the child.

A similar formulation can be found in the *Intercantonal Agreement on Collaboration in the Field of Specialized Pedagogy* [CONFERENCE OF CANTONAL DIRECTORS OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (CDIP), 2007]. This agreement, signed by 16 cantons out of the 26 in Switzerland, intends to break with the separative tradition by mobilizing the integrative paradigm, stipulating that "integrative solutions are preferred to separative

solutions, with due regard for the well-being and opportunities for development of the child or young person concerned and taking into account the environment and school organization" (art. 2). Although it does not mention the term "inclusion," it describes it as an "important milestone" in a country with a strong separative tradition (RAMEL; VIENNEAU; PIERI; ARNAIZ, 2016, p. 48).

Therefore, can Switzerland be placed in an integrative or inclusive paradigm? The question is thorny insofar as using the two terms is frequent in some legal texts, the media, and scientific publications⁶. In his report on the issue at the national level, Kronenberg (2021) highlights the coexistence of different cantonal models, leading him to assert that "there is no clear delimitation between integration and inclusion" (p.56) and that the two terms are often considered equivalent. It brings to light the problem of translation. The term "inclusion" is used in English and becomes "intégration" in French or "integration" in German, for example, in the Salamanca Declaration. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, ratified by Switzerland in 2014, also shows variations between the term "full inclusion" in its English version and the terms "intégration" and "inclusion" in its French version. Article 3 in English: "Full and effective participation and Inclusion in society" becomes "la participation et l'intégration pleines et effectives à la société" in the French translation in Switzerland (UNITED NATIONS (UN), 2014 art. 3). The official page of the Confederation presenting this Convention, however, uses the term "inclusion" when it addresses the objective of this Convention, which commits the country "to eliminate the barriers faced by people with disabilities, to protect women against discrimination and to promote their inclusion and equality in civil society" (SWISS CONFEDERATION, n.d.). Kronenberg thus highlights that the inclusive model, when it differs from the integrative model, refers rather to the idea of "full inclusion," which, as it stands, "does not match the current legal situation in Switzerland" (p.59). What seems to exist is instead a hybrid integration-inclusion model based on the presence of political discourses and training devices mobilizing inclusion and the coexistence of education in ordinary and specialized classrooms, with explicit use of the categorizations of special educational needs to guide the pedagogical action intended for "integrated" students. These categorizations are visible in the *Intercantonal Agreement on Collaboration in the Field of Specialized Pedagogy* (CDIP, 2007), which defines a nomenclature of "needs, disorders, and deficiencies," thus

⁶ For example CURCHOD-RUEDY; RAMEL; BONVIN; ALBANESE et al., 2013; RAMEL; BENOIT, 2011)

building a reference frame for pedagogical action based on an essentially psycho-medical approach (BENOIT, 2005).

The reference to an "inclusive" or "integrative" school or a hybridization of both may vary depending on the canton. Moreover, variations also exist depending on whether it is legislation or implementation. In this context, how is the Bernese case positioned?

1.3. And the canton of Bern?

The canton of Bern is not yet a signatory to the Intercantonal agreement on specialized pedagogy. However, the canton's membership is on the political agenda, as it seeks to transform its school system to become eligible (CONSEIL EXECUTIF (BERN), 2018).

Regarding specialized pedagogy, the Bernese school system gives municipalities room for maneuver. They can choose between setting up special classes (separative model) or integrating students into ordinary classes (integrative model). While the two models still coexist, integration is explicitly encouraged by the 2001 school law (DEPARTEMENT DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE (DIP), LEO, art.17). Despite this, the use of the separative model in the canton was still increasing in the early 2000s (DIP, 2007).

Subsequently, in 2007, the canton further strengthened the integrative model by way of decree (DIP, OMPP, 2007): "As a general rule, pupils who require special educational measures attend regular classes." (art. 3). If this decree still leaves separative possibilities, it redistributes resources to make it an incentive for integration.

Since 2008, several follow-up reports (PFISTER, 2013; STRICKER & PFISTER, 2015; PFISTER, JUTZI, STRICKER & BURGNER, 2016) show a sharp decrease in special classes and a sharp increase in specialized teaching hours in ordinary classes. These reports also highlight that the adoption of integrative measures is gradually taking place. Various projects remain to be carried out, particularly a transformation of the cantonal school law, which entered into consultation in 2019 and became effective in 2022 (after our data collection), reinforcing the integrative model once again.

These various milestones demonstrate that the canton of Bern seeks to encourage an integrative model by transforming its legal framework and institutional functioning. While this change was initiated several decades ago, reports show it has not yet been achieved. Huberman (1973) notes that a change can take about 20 years to impact the classrooms in the school context. Therefore, the analysis of the effects of the integrative policies of the canton of Bern remains relevant. Indeed, this reform generates significant changes, especially for teachers, bringing a new audience of students previously detached from the regular system into their classroom. To better understand the nature of this change and its consequences for

the teaching staff, it is essential to define the dimensions of this concept and its indicators, allowing us to evaluate its substance. The following section presents a theoretical framework for this purpose.

2. Social change as a theoretical framework

We have defined change ontologically as an action process applied to an object inscribed in a specific context (alter, 2000; BERNOUX, 2004; CROS, 2004; GROSSETTI, 2004; LAHIRE, 1996).

As a process, five successive and irreducible sequences of actions aimed at change were identified in a previous study (SIEBER, 2022): The first considers irreversibility, i.e., an identifiable and definable "already there" (GROSSETTI, 2004). Faced with a situation where it is no longer adequate, this irreversibility is questioned by the actors, constituting a sequence of deconstruction, which produces uncertainty. Adaptation can reduce this, which does not lead to a changing process. As uncertainty grows and reaches its apex, irreversibility disintegrates, leading to a rupture identifiable as a "Vu jade"⁷ situation, where actors no longer find a reference point and no longer know how to act (WEICK, 1995). The fourth sequence is the reconstruction, at first fragile and uncertain, which, if consolidated, can lead to the final sequence of stabilization of a new already there, different from the first without being independent of it (alter, 2000).

This description is an ideal type; in reality, the process is not linear, and its complexity can contain several ruptures. Moreover, this changing process is not sanitized; it takes place on a particular object in a specific context, which must be considered.

Regarding the context, Lahire (1996) and Grossetti (2004) propose to decline it using three scales: Mass (the population concerned), field of action (politics, school, sports), and temporality. Indeed, change can affect some people and not others, be inscribed in a specific field, non-existent in another, and invisible according to the chosen temporality.


As for the object of change, it is not trivial since it participates in and guides conceptualization (CROS, 2004). In this case, we are interested in social changes. Following Bernoux (2004), we consider that social facts can be grasped with the help of three dimensions: The actor and its constructs of meaning, the organization and its roles, and the institution and its norms.

⁷ This term is proposed by Weick (2003), in opposition to déjà-vu.

The first dimension relates to the actor-tress, their conceptions, and actions to create meaning (WEICK, 2003). This micro dimension touches individual psychological processes, particularly learning, which describes a change in conception (GIORDAN, 2016). The second dimension, more mid-level, concerns the role systems of actors, i.e., "pre-established models of actions" (GOFFMAN, 1973, p.23) and thus shared and recognized, which constitute organizations (Weick, 2003). This dimension is necessary for change to be social since it shows the transformations that affect the relationships between actors and actresses, their networks, their power relationships, expectations or social practices, and, in our case, pedagogies. These organizations have an inertia with which actors and actresses have to cope and can be brought into a process of change through collective learning processes (CROZIER; FRIEDBERG, 2007), which will successively transform each person's role (expectations, responsibilities, hierarchy, recognition, prestige) and the boundaries of the organization, which is especially salient in the case of integration-inclusion. The third, more macro, dimension concerns the norms and functioning of institutions, which align both organizations and actors, notably through allocating resources and establishing structural constraints (DUBET, 2002). This dimension makes it possible to measure the scope of change and its social acceptance beyond the boundaries of organizations, also giving indications of temporalities. To exist, a social change should thus be visible in each of these dimensions, which correspond, according to the context, to specific elements.

By taking up this conceptualization and adapting it to our problem around the challenges of the transformation of the Bernese education system, we consider the school as an institution (dimension 1) with several levels of context and norms (international influences, Confederation, canton, establishment), then the class as an organization with its role system (dimension 2), which affects both students and teachers. However, we focus on the teaching personnel as an actor (dimension 1), since in this institution, it is responsible for making pedagogical choices (HONORE; BRICON, 1981; HEER; AKKARI, 2003).

Figure 1 – Ideal type of pedagogical change



Source: Sieber, 2022

With this reading grid, we consider that the 2008 directive implements an integrative system in the canton of Bern, this being a legal, normative change affecting the institutional dimension. However, it redefines the framework conditions of the class as an organization, directly affecting the role system since boundaries are questioned and a new type of public invests in it.

According to Lessard and Carpentier (2015), who draw on the work of Ball (2008), educational policies are not only formal texts that frame action but are also primarily the product of interpretations, tinkering, and compromise. Thus, the international injunctions on inclusion are contextualized, deconstructed, and reconstructed in the canton of Bern's reform. Constituting symbolic systems and devices "contributing to the production of social institutions and cultural products" (LESSARD; CARPENTIER, 2015, p. 84), this reform reveals divergent conceptions about the school and would have an impact beyond its content.

The question we face is how teachers, as actors and actresses custodians of pedagogy, give meaning to this new reality, particularly how they conceive their class's role system. To this end, to document the change the reform underway brought in the canton of Bern, we will focus on the teacher's conceptions. The following section explains the methodology we used to answer these questions.

3. Research methodology

This study takes a qualitative perspective (MILES; HUBERMAN, 2003), considering that the construction of meaning and the practices' intentions can only be accessible in the actors' discourse. Our methodology involves data collection through comprehensive interviews (KAUFMANN, 2011). These interviews were conducted between 2019 and 2020 with 13 teachers from the canton's Francophone compulsory school, including primary education (cycle 1 and 2) and lower secondary education (cycle 3). The teachers interviewed were chosen randomly. The table below summarizes their information:

Table 1 – Summary of the situations studied

Alias	Aiko	Basil	Carl	Charles	Dana	Eli	Kaela
Level of education	C1 ^s	C1	C3	C2	C2	C2	C1
Professional experience	20	2	8	6	42	5	30
Alias	Lucie	Jean	Jeanne	Jude	Yohann	Zahir	
Level of education	C2	C3	C1	C3	C3	C2	
Professional experience	6	16	25	7	21	42	

This article's data come from a more extensive study (SIEBER, 2022), for which the interview guide was constructed to understand the teacher's life history, values, pedagogical choices, and attitude towards changes in general. It then proposes questions on specific reforms, including integration-inclusion, to access teachers' conceptions and understand their understanding of the reform and their posture. Questions inspired by explanatory interview techniques have been proposed to access role systems (VERMERSCH, 2011) in order to obtain a partial and declared overview of the class's organizational system. The results

^s C1 corresponds to "Cycle 1", i.e. students aged 4 to 8. Cycle 2 is for students aged 8 to 12 and cycle 3 is for students aged 12 to 15.

presented here focus more specifically on teachers' conceptions regarding the integration-inclusion reform of the canton of Bern.

The interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed in full. The analysis used a coding grid constructed from dimensions and indicators derived from our conceptualization of change (MILES; HUBERMAN, 2003) in an abduction approach (HALLEE; GARNEAU, 2019). Following the coding, the discourses were reconstructed (BLAIS; MARTINAUX, 2006) to bring out the changes induced by the reform of the teachers' conceptions.

4. Presentation of the results: Conceptions of French-speaking Bernese teachers

4.1 Integration-inclusion: A change in practice or a simple change in vocabulary?

When we ask teachers about the changes they are currently experiencing in their profession, most of them spontaneously evoke the issues related to integration and inclusion, mainly in relation to the realities that have become everyday matters: the observation of a substantial heterogeneity of their students, the presence of specialized teachers in their class or school failures for which they try to find solutions.

The two terms, integration and inclusion, are often used without any clear distinction, consistent with Kronenberg's analyses (2021). When we address the subject of closing special classes and integrating students with special needs, nine teachers use the term inclusion in their discourse, three use the term integration and inclusion in a way that makes it very hard to differentiate between them, and only one teacher uses only the word "integration." When we asked them about the meaning of these words, the teachers interviewed reported having had training on the subject and said they do not remember much. Three of them, however, try to distinguish between the two approaches:

Eli: But then inclusion is the fact, uh, of including all the students in the same classroom context. This is different from integration. Integration, if I remember my courses on inclusion and integration. Integration is to integrate students or some students who have disabilities or have particular challenges, but they come from time to time in class or from time to time in specific structures and certain activities. However, for me, inclusion is the same class together all the time.

It thus seems the boundaries between integration and inclusion are somewhat blurred for teachers, especially since some of them clearly explain that they consider these conceptual questions to belong in the realm of noosphere theories that concern them minimally and to which they grant little or no legitimacy:

Yohann: But because there are people like Geiser (alias), I think you know him (author's note: A recognized trainer in the field of inclusion) because he advocates that now in the HEP,⁹ inclusion, something, and it remains a big word, in 5 years, we will change and we will have I don't know what (...) I think it is a fashion, it is a beautiful and lovely term, like ten years ago we were talking about I don't know which other term, I don't know, like there are lots of pedagogical currents and now, obviously, it is HEP compatible, so it's good, but in fact I think it's more of a fashion.

Thus, Teachers seem to borrow to discern whether inclusion and integration are mere fashions or participate in a long-term vision, while their effects on their practice and framework conditions are very concrete and are part of their daily concerns.

Indeed, teachers see a new population of students previously excluded arriving in their classes, and they are responsible for these students' success. This situation has the particularity of directly questioning the class's role system since teachers are forced to position themselves in front of this new audience. However, our interviews show that the general principle of a fairer, more accessible school, where each student has their place, does not meet opposition in itself. Above all, the modalities of application provoke the participants' reluctance, to the point of bringing profound contradictions, as the following sections support.

4.2. The postulate of educability: An accepted principle

In their speeches, teachers say they believe in each of their student's ability to learn and consider that it is their responsibility to put in place the necessary conditions for their progress:

Eli: My goal is to really make each student progress, uh, finally, to use each student's potential to bring them as far as possible with the potential they have in them. That's my goal, my objective; it's really that each student progresses, uh, until... finally they give everything they have, and they can progress, go as far as possible, that's my goal. And that I do everything and implement everything to help them progress, help them achieve their goals. That's the purpose of my teaching, uh, that's it.

In this, they are part of what Prud'homme et al. (2011, p.6) describe as an ethical posture concerning the diversity of students, "choosing to believe in each student's potential for success, to believe in universal educability, whatever the specificities of each."

The teachers interviewed seem aware of each of their students' value; they seek to be benevolent and are sensitive to the difficulties their students encounter. They are aware of the

⁹ (Haute école pédagogique, teacher training institution)

heterogeneity of their classes and sincerely wish to take it into account. Many of them wish to implement differentiation practices.

Yohann: (...) once you have inclusion, you have to differentiate clearly; it is a consequence (...).

This opinion widely shared by teachers seems to highlight conceptions favorable to integration-inclusion and, more broadly, to inclusion, initiating, in particular, the practices of differentiation necessary for its implementation.

4.3. Doubts and constraints regarding the implementation of integration-inclusion

However, their discourses are much less favorable when we dig into the subject and discuss the application details with the teachers. Most teachers have serious doubts about its implementation, explaining in particular many limitations at the practical level. In our interviews, teachers' conceptions can be categorized using three arguments: The first is structural, the second pedagogical, and the third political.

4.3.1 Structural argument: The problem of "school level"

The teachers' discourses indicate a conception that the school's organization comprises age classes, each supposed to have an expected "academic level" and a roughly homogeneous "pace of progress." Therefore, given the diversity of students, teachers consider that integration-inclusion is positive for a majority of students but not for all because some would simply "not be adapted" to school:

Zahir: I expect a student to behave correctly, and when they are supposed to do an exercise, if they have the sheet matching the exercise and their pencil and eraser, and that at the end of the lesson they have asked no questions, it means they managed to do everything. And if they can't hold in place and are forced to stand up, the other students always tell them: Stop, stop, shut up, stop bothering us. It is because they don't fit. Because a 12-year-old student is able to raise their hand to ask a question, they are, there is still essential learning; I do not speak of training, I speak of learning. And there are rules of life indispensable in a class. Because a group can survive only if it has rules of life. If a student systematically disrespects the rules of life, something does not work. And they must not stay here. Let them go and work that elsewhere. And for that, you don't need teachers, you need shrinks. And I'm not one.

Teachers thus seem to have a system of conceptions articulating what the school is as a system, a class, school work, and the student profession, which cannot be questioned (even

in the case of integration) without which the school is no longer the school, and the teacher is no longer a teacher.

Moreover, the school's function would be to establish uniform social norms and participate in some form of selection; it cannot and must not make everyone succeed at any cost. School failure is thus intrinsically part of the system. The possibility of failure is seen as a motivator.

Jeane: After that, if everyone always enjoys it and everyone succeeds every time, it's not a school anymore (laughs).

As a result, teachers will consider that the school cannot and should not meet all needs on its own. Other structures and institutions would be necessary to meet the needs of some students, and this would have to be done at the social and non-school levels. The teachers consider the universal scope of inclusion in school to be unachievable and utopian:

Yohann: After that, we will want, parents will want to include, I do not mean everything and anything, but in fact, there are students we will not necessarily be able to include in, as part of a school.

While inclusion requires a questioning of the school form and, more specifically, of its standards relating to academic level, failure, and selection, teachers refuse to enter this path, considering that this would contribute to a general decline that would negatively impact the learning of other students. This prospect of a decline in level is not considered a problem only in relation to other students; it directly impacts the professional identity of the teacher. Indeed, our analyses show that teachers consider themselves "good teachers" when their students reach a "good school level," which is defined in a very personal way depending on the teachers' objectives and requirements.

John: Keep a school level that is enough ... it seems to me we always level it down, (...) we mix things in ways that are not necessarily positive. We always adapt to the weakest student, and then it goes down, it goes down... Some parents sue us, they appeal, etc. It pushes you sometimes to give good grades so they won't bother you... (...) so there it is: if you give good grades, well, the students are not better, but ...

By limiting separative solutions, integration brings into classes the students considered as having academic difficulty, who will have trouble reaching the "academic level expected" by the teacher, which will question his or her professional skills since he or she will not have succeeded in making the student succeed. Teachers are led to

consider the presence of students with special needs as a high probability of failing the injunction to succeed.

The solution is obtaining medical expertise attesting that it is the child, because of their handicaps, peculiarities, and difficulties, who fails, and not the teacher who teaches poorly. Some students are, therefore, considered as having neither sufficient capacity nor sufficient academic level to be in a class. Even more, teachers will consider that integration-inclusion has no pedagogical meaning for these students quite the contrary.

4.3.2. Pedagogical argument: "ill-being" of integrated students

Teachers consider that in some cases, integration-inclusion makes students in difficulty even more aware of their difficulties because they are confronted with others, and thus victims of stronger stigmatization, which questions their well-being and their ability to live a positive school experience:

Jane: (...) not only is the child uncomfortable because they notice there is a difference, and they notice that they slow everyone down, and they notice that they cannot do the same as the others, so I mean, for them, it is a permanent failure, (...) (1.913-918)

Zahir: That's behavior inclusion; we're on the wrong track for me. After the level of learning, I wonder if having a student who can't manage, who has learning difficulties, with 19 students who learn without too much trouble, he is faced with his difference very quickly. That's precisely what we want, what we want to hide.

These interventions show that teachers are not convinced integration-inclusion is positive, seeing adverse pedagogical effects, on the one hand for the class, which sees its supervision and teaching quality decrease, on the other hand for the integrated student, for whom integration increases his suffering at the psycho-affective and relational level while depriving him of a framework considered more appropriate if it were given in a specialized environment. Thus, teachers consider they cannot meet integration-inclusion requirements, which is considered unachievable with current resources, leading them to question policy choices.

4.4.3 political argument: Insufficient resources leading to mistrust of the authorities

Following the reform putting in place an integrative system, faced with their failure to make all students succeed, teachers also mention a lack of resources at several levels. They consider their training sometimes insufficient, not enabling them to meet every specific need.

Jeane: (...) for the teacher, it's more work, and we are often not trained to have children that different, and then well, we are in a large group and then uh, so I think, nine times out of ten, there is a lack (...)

The teachers agree that they do not have the necessary resources to achieve inclusion-integration, whether in terms of material, knowledge and training, human resources, or the framework conditions of the system. Teachers talk about several solutions: Staff reduction and co-teaching development notably.

Carl: I was told about this severe case that would be integrated into this class, and then I said: Well, I just need help... To co-teach, you know, you can always make a request at this level, and then they said that there was a specialized teacher who was assigned to this particular student anyway who would be there for the English lessons, so luckily he's here because it's quite... It's quite peculiar...

However, teachers willing to share a class are rare. Our analyses show that the professional culture is rather individualistic; teachers prefer to be the lone masters of their class. As soon as a colleague is present, especially a specialized teacher, fears arise: fear of being judged, of not being up to the task, of being contradicted or even discredited by the colleague. In our sample, two teachers have tried co-teaching and have been convinced, but few are ready to try the experiment, let alone can because institutional operation does not allow the implementation of this strategy.

These barriers stem in part from legal norms and, in part, from cultural norms specific to the teaching profession. Indeed, they hinder the implementation of integration-inclusion, leading teachers to lose courage when faced with the scale of the task, to feel alone, and to develop a feeling of skepticism in the face of the reform's transformative potential, resulting in a certain distrust towards the authorities.

Researcher: Inclusion, we talk a lot about it today. What is it for you?

Zahir: (6s) a lure. A lure with which I get the impression there are some, some political decision-makers who give themselves good conscience but who know nothing about our realities. And (6s) the problem we are experiencing is such situations (3s) these are individual situations and we take general answers.

Carl: Sometimes I have the impression; I'd like to tell you that sometimes this differentiation is just a big joke. We're talking about it, and nobody knows how it should be set up; nobody has a key to set it up. But we try to save money, or whatever, and then suddenly they throw these concepts of inclusion at us, differentiation, school is great, but basically, we're on our own... (...) Then sometimes you are there, but they have to stop giving us this crap at some point. (...)

4.4. As a result, a lack of transformation of the role system

Our analyses show that, apart from an endorsement of principle, the conceptions shared by teachers dissent in the face of integration-inclusion. This leads the vast majority of them to reject the transformation of the role system in their class, keeping traditional pedagogy and its modes of exclusion well in place. Indeed, our analyses of the explanatory interview excerpts show very few changes in pedagogical practices, which the comprehensive interview excerpts confirm. Few teachers differentiate to provide more accessibility and justice, and even fewer question the assessment or boundary standards of the class to extend them to the new audience they teach.

However, teachers have no choice but to accept integrated students. We observe that the behavior considered "out of the norm" of these students facing traditional pedagogy leads teachers to a crisis of their conceptions. Arrived at this stage, teachers react by refusing to move (WEICK, 2003) or initiating adaptations, reporting role issues outside the classroom, on the specialists in the psycho-medical field, on the specialized teacher, or the school management, never questioning their pedagogical practices or, by extension, their class's role system:

Jeanne: But I mean it is, he does nothing, just nothing, and he, he can't integrate writing, he can't, reading was fine, but he can't integrate grammatical notions, he can't integrate... with us, in first, second year, his big thing was the laminator, the laminator! So, I appointed him chief of the laminator. (...) so he was cute, he was endearing, he disturbed nothing, but he could not, he was not, he could not progress like the others, so as a teacher, it was, it was frustrating (...) As a different child, well he, he needs someone next to him all the time.

Our analyses show very little rupture and even less change in roles: Only 2 cases out of 13 show changes in the relationships and expectations established between students and teachers. Most of the comments are from a deficit perspective towards integrated students for whom the principle of educability, although defended initially, seems no longer to apply. Integration would ultimately be a reform without social change since it fails to change teachers' conceptions or teaching practices.

5. Discussion

Our data shows teachers are mostly skeptical about the Bernese reform instituting integration. Beyond a discourse of adhesion to the principle of educability, their remarks focus

on the fact that this paradigm's standards endanger their professional identity and the "well-being" of the students themselves.

Indeed, at the level of the actors' conceptions, the situations of rupture and crisis prevail in our field: Our interviews show that teachers do not know how to react to integration-inclusion, uncertainty prevails, and they are in complete *Vu jadé* (Weick, 2003). The teachers' withdrawal seems to be partly due to structural factors: A hectic agenda leading to rather transmissive practices; a lack of resources of various kinds; the time needed to obtain help; the support measures themselves, which are considered far too limited; unstable teaching teams; the "sausage" schedule that feeds silo work and the maintenance of a selective and sectorized model that regroups and ranks students according to their academic level.

Therefore, the school form is not questioned but legitimized; in the end, the problem is the very principle of integration, considered "utopian," but not the school itself. This situation is characteristic of a phase of rupture that can potentially lead to a process of social change: At the institutional level, the separative paradigm constitutes the initial irreversibility, which has been questioned and has become ruptured, the integrative paradigm emerging as reconstruction, not without hurting the professionals supposed to carry it.

As it stands, it seems that institutional operation does not make the success of integrated students feasible, confirming the need for transformation of the school system as a whole. The results indeed show a paradox on two levels. On the one hand, institutional obstacles and their legitimation within the school form are criticized, mainly through assessments and the selection process that validates the teachers' sense of competence and professional identity. Would an inclusive school, where everyone would succeed, still be a school? Inclusive education, which is supposed to be "for all," would, in fact, amount only to "the integration of some" (RAMEL; NOEL, 2017). The inclusion paradigm still seems far from competing with the normalizing logics called into question in its transformative purpose. On the other hand, while saying they are overwhelmed and alone, the teachers claim they want to safeguard what makes their social position and responsibility, that is, their ability to maintain the school form, especially in its construction of the "school level" of the students.

We think this tension reveals a discourse centered on the professional autonomy of the new public management. Indeed, according to Giauque (2017), since the '90s, we have seen the advent of remote or indicator-based state governance inducing a greater bureaucratization focused on the accountability of the actors in the field. Despite its top-

down imposition, this public policy management approach would be implemented through a "managerial discourse celebrating the empowerment of professionals" (p. 12), which would generate an internalization of constraints and the impossibility of questioning the models at work. The teacher holds responsibility for the success of the change, but his action is not facilitated; it may be hindered. A paradox, if any, in an inclusive paradigm that wants to be transformative through the empowerment of its actors. These considerations enlighten us on the collected teachers' comments' position and help us think about the relationship between inclusive education policies and this new form of governance.

In its principles, inclusion requires a transformation of the hierarchy of social values, with the school becoming a hub of solidarity, justice, and social cohesion rather than economic performance and selection. We thus hypothesize that the teachers' attitude towards inclusion highlights their dismay at transforming their conceptions and pedagogical practices into an incompatible school organization, questioning the very meaning of an apparently contradictory social project.

6. Conclusion

This article shows how an international trend, school integration-inclusion, translates into a local context, the canton of Bern. Concerning the successive appropriation phases of UN texts by a country, a canton, and finally, a specific school system, we highlighted the requirements of the inclusive paradigm regarding the school form. The Swiss context specificities and the ongoing reforms within the canton of Bern were subsequently presented, highlighting a hybrid integration-inclusion model that favors a watered-down and cautious translation but has led to concrete institutional transformations, although incomplete in relation to UNESCO's objectives.

We then highlighted how teachers conceive this reform and react to it from an operational theoretical framework for analyzing social changes to document the change accomplished. Integration-inclusion is now contested; our analyses highlight several obstacles related to the lack of resources and the immutability of the school form. Our analyses tend to show that inclusion can be seen as a social change taking place, the process being at a crucial phase of rupture, without it being possible to determine in which direction it will be aimed. The teachers' disarray seems to indicate that a social debate would be desirable in order to choose in which direction and on which values to orient the school for the coming decades.

The change studied in this article, at the scale of a Swiss canton, highlights tensions in the development of the inclusive paradigm found in other contexts. (HARDY; WOODCOCK, 2015). The inclusive paradigm does not guide educational policies alone at the international level. Other logics are at work. In particular, Waitroller (2020) shows that neoliberalism, as an economic, cultural, and political paradigm, is a barrier to inclusive education. Indeed, the unequal distribution of resources it generates, the ideology of ablism on which it is based, and the instrumentality of democratic participation limit any attempt at transforming school systems since the school is brought to keep its role in selecting elites. School inclusion would then become a "selective inclusionism" that would be far from benefiting all minorized groups but would ultimately serve only the interests of the dominant groups.

How can we support change by recognizing the strength of current barriers to the inclusive paradigm? In our opinion, a first step would be to recognize its transformative implications and question, or even collectively negotiate, the school form so changes are carried by all, without exception.

Bibliography

ALTER, N. *L'innovation ordinaire*. Paris: PUF, 2000.

BALL, S. J. *The education debate: Policy and politics in the twenty-first century*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2008.

BALUTEAU, F. *École et changement: une sociologie constructiviste du changement scolaire*. L'Harmattan, 2003. p. 1-214.

BLAIS, M.; MARTINEAU, S. L'analyse inductive générale: description d'une démarche visant à donner un sens à des données brutes. *Recherches qualitatives*, 26, n. 2, p. 1-18, 2006.

BENOIT, H. Inégalités sociales et traitement ségrégatif de la difficulté scolaire: histoire ou actualité? *La nouvelle revue de l'AIS*, 31, p. 91-100, 2005.

BERGERON, L.; ROUSSEAU, N.; LECLERC, M. La pédagogie universelle : au cœur de la planification de l'inclusion scolaire. *Éducation et francophonie*, 39, n. 2, p. 87-104, 2011.

BERNOUX, P. *Sociologie du changement. Dans les entreprises et dans les organisations*. Paris: Seuil, 2004.

CONFÉDÉRATION SUISSE. Loi fédérale sur l'élimination des inégalités frappant les personnes handicapées. *Confédération helvétique*, Berne.

CONFÉDÉRATION SUISSE. *Convention de l'ONU relative aux droits des personnes handicapées*. n.d. Disponível em : <https://www.edi.admin.ch/edi/fr/home/fachstellen/bfeh/droit/international0/ueber-einkommen-der-uno-ueber-die-rechte-von-menschen-mit-behinde.html>. Acesso em: 1.09.2023.

CONFÉRENCE DES DIRECTEURS CANTONAUX DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE (CDIP). Accord intercantonal sur la collaboration dans le domaine de la pédagogie spécialisée.

CONSEIL EXECUTIF (BERNE). *Pédagogie spécialisée: rapport du conseil exécutif*. Berne. Direction de l'instruction publique du canton de Berne, 2018.

CROS, F. *L'innovation scolaire aux risques de son évaluation*. L'Harmattan, 2004. 2747568121.

CROZIER, M.; FRIEDBERG. *L'acteur et le système*. Paris: Seuil, 2007.

CURCHOD-RUEDY, D.; RAMEL, S.; BONVIN, P.; ALBANESE, O. *et al.* De l'intégration à l'inclusion scolaire: implication des enseignants et importance du soutien social. *Alter*, 7, n. 2, p. 135-147, 2013.

DIRECTION DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE (BERNE). *Rapport relatif à l'ordonnance régissant les mesures pédagogiques particulières à l'école enfantine et à l'école obligatoire (OMPP)* Berne,. Direction de l'instruction publique du canton de Berne, 2007.

DUBET, F. *Le déclin de l'institution*. Paris: Seuil, 2002.

EBERSOLD, S.; DETRAUX, J.-J. Scolarisation et besoin éducatif particulier: enjeux conceptuels et méthodologiques d'une approche polycentrée. *Alter*, 7, n. 2, p. 102-115, 2013.

GATHER THURLER, M. *Innover au cœur de l'établissement scolaire*. ESF, 2000. 2710114682.

GOYER, R.; BORRI-ANADON, C. Le paradigme inclusif à travers le prisme des rapports sociaux inégalitaires. *McGill Journal of Education*, 54, n. 2, p. 194-205, 2019.

GIAUQUE, D. Préface. In: PARAZELLI, M. e RUELLAND, I. (Ed.). *Autorité et gestion de l'intervention sociale. Entre servitude et acte de pouvoir*. Québec et Genève: Presses de l'Université du Québec et Editions ies.

GIORDAN, A. *Apprendre!* Editions Belin, 2016.

GROSSETTI, M. *Sociologie de l'imprévisible*. Paris: PUF, 2004.

HALLÉE, Y.; GARNEAU, J. M. L'abduction comme mode d'inférence et méthode de recherche: de l'origine à aujourd'hui. *Recherches qualitatives*, 38, n. 1, p. 124-140, 2019.

HARDY, I.; WOODCOCK, S. Inclusive education policies: discourses of difference, diversity and deficit. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19, n. 2, p. 141-164, 2015.

HEER, S.; AKKARI, A.-J., 2003, *Recherches sur l'enseignement, les didactiques disciplinaires et la formation des enseignants: regards croisés*. 71-91. Disponible em: <http://www.hep-bejune.ch/medialibrary/website/ActesForumRecherche.pdf>.

HONORÉ, B.; BRICON, J. *Former des enseignants: approche psychosociologique et institutionnelle*. Toulouse: Privat, 1981. 2708974181.

HOUSSAYE, J. *La pédagogie traditionnelle: une histoire de la pédagogie; suivi de Petite histoire des savoirs sur l'éducation*. Ed. Fabert, 2014. 2849222542.

HUBERMANN, M. *Comment s'opèrent les changements en éducation : contribution à l'étude de l'innovation. Comment s'opèrent les changements en éducation: contribution à l'étude de l'innovation*. UNESCO/BIE, 1973.

KAUFMANN, J.-C. *L'entretien compréhensif*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2011. 220027114X.

KRONENBERG, B. *Pédagogie spécialisée en Suisse. Rapport mandaté par le Secrétariat d'État à la formation, à la recherche et à l'innovation (SEFRI) et par la Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique (CDIP) dans le cadre du Monitoring de l'éducation*. Berne. 2021.

LAHIRE, B. La Variation des Contextes en Sciences Sociales. Remarques épistémologiques. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 51, n. 2, p. 381-407, 1996.

LESSARD, C.; CARPENTIER, A. *Politiques éducatives. La mise en œuvre*. Paris cedex 14: Presses Universitaires de France, 2015. 224 p. 9782130606673.20

CANTON DE BERNE : Loi sur l'école obligatoire. Berne, canton de Berne 2022.

MILES, M. B.; HUBERMAN, A. M. *Analyse des données qualitatives: Méthodes en sciences humaines*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2003.

NOËL, I. *Jeunes enseignants en transition entre formation et emploi : le défi de l'accueil d'élèves présentant des besoins éducatifs particuliers. Du sens à la mise en actes*. 2014. (Doctorat) -, Université de Fribourg, Université de Fribourg.

DEPARTEMENT DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE DU CANTON DE BERNE. *Loi sur l'école obligatoire (LEO)* Berne, 2001.

DEPARTEMENT DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE DU CANTON DE BERNE. *Ordonnance régissant les mesures pédagogiques particulières*. (OMPP) Berne, 2007.

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES (ONU). Convention relative aux droits des personnes handicapées (CDPH). ONU, New York, pp.

PELLETIER, L.; ALLENBACH, M.; ST-VINCENT, L.-A. Éducation inclusive: Pleins feux sur leadership et collaboration. *La nouvelle revue. Éducation et société inclusives*, n. 95, 2023.

PFISTER, M.; JUTZI, M.; STRICKER C.; BURGNER, N.. *La scolarisation spécialisée intégrée dans le canton de Berne. Cinq projets d'intégration réussis*. Berne: Planification de la formation et de l'évaluation (BiEv). Direction de l'instruction publique du canton de Berne, 2016).

POTVIN, M. La centralité de l'éducation inclusive, pour une école «capacitante». *Bulletin du Centre de recherche sur l'enseignement et l'apprentissage des sciences*, n. 7, p. 9-22, 2020.

RAMEL, S.; BENOIT, V. Intégration et inclusion scolaire: quelles conséquences pour le personnel enseignant? *In: DOUDIN, P. A.; CURCHOD-RUEDI, L., et al (Ed.). La santé psychosociale des enseignants et des enseignantes* Québec: PUQ, 2011. p. 203-224.

RAMEL, S.; NOËL, I. De l'intégration de certains à l'éducation pour tous: partir des conceptions de futurs enseignants suisses pour (re) penser leur formation. *Éducation comparée, nouvelle série*, n. 18, p. 151-171, 2017.

RAMEL, S.; VIENNEAU, R. Des fondements sociologiques de l'inclusion scolaire aux injonctions internationales. *In: PRUD'HOMME, L.; DUSCHESNE, H., et al (Ed.). L'inclusion scolaire: ses fondements, ses acteurs et ses pratiques*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2016. p. 25-37.

RAMEL, S.; VIENNEAU, R.; PIERI, M.; ARNAIZ, P. Des injonctions internationales aux législations nationales et locales. *In: PRUD'HOMME, L.; DUSCHESNE, H., et al (Ed.). L'inclusion scolaire: ses fondements, ses acteurs et ses pratiques*. Bruxelles: De Boeck, 2016. p. 39-52.

SIEBER, J. *Le changement pédagogique : un processus entre acteurs, organisation et institution. Analyse de trois réformes scolaires de l'espace francophone bernois : entre changements et inertie*. 2022. (Doctorat) -, Université de Neuchâtel et Haute école pédagogique du canton de Vaud, Neuchâtel.

STRICKER C.; PFISTER, M. *Evaluation de la mise en œuvre de l'article 17 LEO. Mesures pédagogiques particulières à l'école enfantine et à l'école obligatoire*. Berne: Planification de la formation et de évaluation (BiEv). Direction de l'instruction publique du canton de Berne, 2015.

STRICKER C.; PFISTER, M. *Elèves ayant droit à une scolarité spécialisée et élèves bénéficiant de leçons de soutien pédagogique spécialisé: une étude longitudinale entre les années 2005-2006 et 2010-2011. Rapport Partiel*. Berne: Planification de la formation et d'évaluation (BiEv). Direction de l'instruction publique du canton de Berne, 2013.

THÉORÊT, M.; GARON, R.; HRIMECH, M.; CARPENTIER, A. Exploration de la résilience éducationnelle chez des enseignants. *International review of education*, 52, p. 575-598, 2006.

TOMLINSON, C. A. *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria: Ascd, 2014. 1416618600.

UNESCO. *Déclaration de Salamanque et cadre d'action pour les besoins éducatifs spéciaux*. UNESCO, 1994.

UNESCO. *Un Guide pour assurer l'inclusion et l'équité dans l'éducation*. UNESCO, 2017.

UNESCO. *Inclusion et Education: tous sans exception*. UNESCO, 2020.

VERMERSCH, P. *L'entretien d'explicitation*. Paris: ESF Editeur, 2011.

WAITOLLER, F. R. Why are we not more inclusive? Examining neoliberal selective inclusionism. *In: Inclusive education: Global issues and controversies*. Brill, 2020. p. 89-107.

WEICK, K. E. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage, 1995. 080397177X.

WEICK, K. E. L'effondrement du sens dans les organisations: L'accident de Mann Gulch. VIDAILLET, Bénédicte, coord., *Le sens de l'action. Karl Weick: sociopsychologie de l'organisation*. Paris: Vuibert, p. 59-86, 2003.