



Forme scolaire et accessibilisation pédagogique et didactique

Sylviane Feuilladieu, Anne Gombert, Hervé Benoit

► To cite this version:

Sylviane Feuilladieu, Anne Gombert, Hervé Benoit. Forme scolaire et accessibilisation pédagogique et didactique. Ebersold Serge. L'accessibilité ou la réinvention de l'école, ISTE éditions; ISTE Group, pp.103-121, 2020, 10.51926/ISTE.9011.ch5 . hal-03038775

HAL Id: hal-03038775

<https://amu.hal.science/hal-03038775>

Submitted on 8 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

5

School Form and Pedagogical and Didactic Accessibilization

Sylviane FEUILLADIEU¹, Anne GOMBERT¹ and Hervé BENOIT²

¹ADEF, Aix-Marseille University, Aix-en-Provence, France

²Grhapes, INSHEA, Suresnes, France

5.1. Introduction

The accessibility imperative refers to three approaches to accessibility (Ebersold 2019). The first, the universal one, defines the accessibility of everything for everyone, in the name of the right to equality and the principle of non-discrimination, as adopted by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2006: “‘Universal design’ means the design of products, environments, programmes and services to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design” (UN 2006). All users must have the convenience of use of all products, goods and services. A second, integrated accessibility, refers to the set of measures that take into account the needs of all people with special needs (accessible design) to enable access to places, products and services (UN 2006, p. 102). A third, corrective accessibility, deploys the necessary compensatory measures to meet the identified needs of certain people in certain situations (UN 2006, p. 102). At school, the need for accessibility differs from deficient, essentialist, medicalizing and individualizing approaches, which rely on the typical or atypical profiles of students to adapt schooling. “The universal design for learning aims to compensate for the inaptitude and disability of schools, not that of pupils, and to lead school actors to focus on the obstacles to learning and knowledge imposed on pupils (Rose and Meyers 2002). Rather than focusing on the act of teaching, this perspective looks at learning processes, their contextualization and

pedagogical situations” (Ebersold 2017, p. 89). In France, the right of children, adolescents and adults with disabilities to access institutions open to the general population and to stay in mainstream school, work and living environments was established by the Act of February 11, 2005 on equal rights and opportunities, participation and citizenship for persons with disabilities. In view of the French school form, accessing and staying in mainstream schooling requires a combination of these three approaches to accessibility: use, design and compensation.

The perspective of access for persons with disabilities is being broadened in public and educational policies towards an inclusive society and school aimed at universal accessibility. If goods and services are accessible to all from the outset, it is because their design and/or use has been subject to a process of accessibilization. As a result, one cannot think of the accessibility imperative without thinking “in dynamic terms of accessibilization rather than in static terms of accessibility” (Plaisance 2009, p. 70). The *accessibility of learning situations* is the end result of the *accessibilization process*, defined here as a set of operations organized over time, combined with evolving actions, and leading to a result. Indeed, the accessibility imperative cannot be decreed. It is at the heart of organizations, professions, strategies for legitimizing practices and their concrete implementation (Ebersold 2017).

The accessibility imperative thus combines three notions: access, accessibility and accessibilization as “if *access to* implies *accessibility of*, then *accessibility* is based on *making accessible to*” (Ebersold 2020, p. 77 onwards.). As noted in Chapter 11 of this book, “access to” refers to the social visibility of individuals, to their “belonging” to society or to the school; the access of pupils with SEN to mainstream schooling implies that they are considered to be mainstream pupils with a formal place in the school. “Accessibility of” refers to social readability as the degree to which society or the school is receptive to diversity; the mainstream school is therefore accessible to them, and the teaching methods, tools and practices are readable and operational. Accessibilization refers to social legitimization enabling the actors to give meaning, commit themselves and concretely implement practices, knowledge and conventions of use, thereby making it possible to establish this receptivity; the operability of these pedagogical methods, tools and practices has been the subject of active and reflective work with an aim of inclusion for these pupils. As a result, if pupils have access to learning in a mainstream classroom (access), it is because the knowledge, skills and cultural codes are accessible (accessibility), and therefore because they have been made accessible (accessibilization). Schooling in mainstream schools for young people with SEN implies the accessibilization of the school environment at various levels: equal access, equal treatment, coherence and continuity of pathways, access to employment, construction and recognition of

identity, and the capacitating or disabling effect of situations for learning and socialization (Ebersold and Mauguin 2016). As such, pedagogical and didactic accommodations are indispensable to reducing the disabling effect of certain situations (Gombert *et al.* 2008). Teachers deploy professional practices and know-how based on technical aids, specific or generic gestures that promote the participation of pupils with SEN in school tasks within the classroom (Benoit and Sagot 2008). The accessibilization is aimed at the development and recognition of the child's capacity to act as a pupil, to learn and progress, to develop in school, and to take his place in the social life of the school.

This chapter proposes a model for analyzing¹ teachers' gestures and postures in order to make a learning situation in the regular classroom accessible to students institutionally designated as having "special educational needs", namely those designated as disabled because of a health problem or a disability, or those designated as having severe academic difficulties². This analysis presents a reflection on pedagogical and didactic accessibilization within the traditional **school shape**, based on three studies: the first on study aid gestures in elementary school; the second on the use of digital tools in the classroom; and the third on pedagogical and didactic adaptations by elementary school teachers.

The designation "pupils with special educational needs" points to the limits of the school form in the implementation of school for all, signifying the difficulties students have in accessing to learning as it is usually provided, and the difficulties teachers have in providing access to it. These limits refer to the commonly shared understandings of the difficulties of pupils with SEN, centered on adapting to the pupil's needs (judged not to be adapted to the school environment), and not necessarily on making accessible the school environment in which the student learn. Implementing accommodations is not enough to make a situation accessible if the reasoning is static and focuses on a practice or a tool. In order to be empowering, accommodations must include intentions and modalities to make the entire school learning environment accessible, so that these accommodations enable pupils to take up their places as pupils on an ongoing basis. It might therefore be thought that the accessibilization of school situations presupposes a change of the school form.

1 This analysis model does not pretend to be a model. It articulates and combines the results of the three research papers presented, taking into account the dynamic movement of the practices studied and the resulting complexity. A diagram proposes a first outline of this theorization based on empirical data.

2 This chapter develops and completes the elements presented in a paper at a symposium on accessibility at the meetings of the international research network in education and training in Paris in July 2017.

However, the accessibilization practices studied in these researches take place within the short temporality of this form, the co-construction of everyday schooling (Pirone and Rayou 2012). The analysis of data collected on study aid gestures (first research study), the use of digital tools (second research study), and pedagogical and didactic adaptations (third research study), testifies to movements in practices that are part of this form. As this mode of school socialization remains dominant “not only because the school form is widely disseminated in the various socializing bodies but also (and this is linked) because the relationship with childhood that it implies and the type of socializing practices it presupposes are the only ones considered legitimate” (Vincent *et al.* 1994, p. 43), the inclusion of a reflection on accessibilization within the framework of the traditional form of school represents a major challenge.

The conceptual framework of the analysis model articulates the concepts that emerged and were mobilized during these three research studies, with a descriptive perspective of the way in which the actors grasp the accessibility imperative. The conceptual anchoring refers to four notions that form the basis of the practices of the teaching profession: *habitus*; *bodily hexis* (Bourdieu 2000); *gestures* (Mauss 1985); and *postures* (Payet *et al.* 2011). Three new concepts produced in this research formalize the updating of these practices in the situations studied: the *degree of generality/specificity* of study aid gestures in elementary school (Dunand and Feuilladiou 2014; Feuilladiou and Dunand 2020); the *inclusive operability* of the use of digital tools for human learning in the classroom (Benoit and Feuilladiou 2017); and the *process of adapting teaching in an inclusive context* for elementary school teachers (Gombert *et al.* 2016; Gombert *et al.* 2017; Gombert and Million-Fauré 2020). The aim is to go beyond the mere qualification of teachers’ gestures and postures, to analyze the dynamic movement of these gestures and postures in their operational use.

After recalling the characteristics of the school *shape* (section 5.2), we will present a synthesis of the results of each research and define the concepts produced (sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5), in order to propose in section 5.6 the outline of the model for analyzing the practices studied.

5.2. Characteristics of the school form

In France, five features characterize the traditional school form : school as a specific place and time; the pedagogization of social learning relationships based on set knowledge codifying the subjects to be taught and the way they are taught; the systematization of teaching producing lasting socialization effects; submission to impersonal rules shaping the study of knowledge; and mastery of the written

language (Vincent *et al.* 1994). This form can be identified at three levels: a generic level of *long temporality*, historically instituted as described above; a level of *average temporality* of “relative continuity” declining the school form at different times; and a *short* level of *temporality* of “daily coconstructions” that both maintain and specify it in concrete classroom situations ((Rockwell 2000) cited in (Pirone and Rayou 2012, p. 59)).

This mode of school socialization is currently being questioned through its porosity with regard to the social and cultural influences of young people, its loss of the monopoly of dissemination and transmission of knowledge nowadays via the Internet, its declining legitimacy in terms of democratization and integration, and the great diversity of situations linked to the decentralization of decisions to the local territory (Bautier and Rayou 2009). Various surveys have studied examples of school form changes aimed at bringing young people and schools closer together, in the context of specific devices aimed at pupils designated as having great difficulties or as having to move away from their backgrounds in order to become pupils (relay classes, micro-schools, boarding schools of excellence). The arrangements observed in these systems enable a symbolic requalification of these pupils, who then mobilize a learning dynamic. However, this is not enough to ensure the long-term establishment of the aptitudes necessary for success at school. These arrangements must become routine and act as genuine working collectives, to lead pupils to “secondarization”, a “complex learning process enabling pupils to put their experience and knowledge at a distance through the appropriation of common values, impersonal rules and objectified standards specific to school knowledge” (Pirone and Rayou 2012, p. 50). Access to knowledge and to the position of pupil in a short period of time must be sustainable in a medium-length period of time in order to be efficient, and have an impact on the trajectory of young people. Even if this access has been made operational through a system of diversion from the regular school system, it must also be re-enrolled in it in order to be sustainable. Consequently, these results from externalized institutional arrangements are of interest to the process of making school situations accessible within the school system itself. These devices are part of a corrective conception of accessibility, which offers a compensatory measure to young people who do not have access to schooling. These young people then have access to learning, but on a one-off, temporary, off-course basis. To get them back in the game of school form again, the empowering effect of the arrangements deployed in these devices must be integrated into the mainstream environment, the accessibilization of which should be thought of in connection with these arrangements (universal and integrated accessibility covering both the use of and access to school goods).

The three research studies on which our model of analysis is based focus on teaching practices that are part of a universal and integrated conception of accessibility in the regular classroom. Indeed, on the one hand, they show the dialectical articulation of a specific way of thinking for some and a generic way for all, in a situation of shared learning within the common school game. On the other hand, they question the accessibility of the school form itself through its limits, by addressing pupils institutionally designated as having “special educational needs”, who are considered not very suited to the teaching usually provided. The study aid gestures (first research study), the use of digital tools (second research study), and pedagogical and didactic adaptations (third research study), appear to be vectors for the accessibilization of school situations relating to the school shape. The dialectical articulation of the specific and the generic can be seen at different levels: individual (institutionally designated pupil(s) with SEN) versus collective (class group); teacher versus pupil(s); teaching versus learning. In our opinion, reflection on accessibilization, and its implementation in practice, cannot avoid taking into account and analyzing these dialectical axes. Our research findings explore some examples of teaching practices that combine and interweave the specific with the generic at the heart of these axes, as elements that contribute to the accessibilization of school situations. The study aid gestures (first vector) work in particular on the teacher-student and teaching-learning axes. The degree of generality/specificity of these gestures makes it possible to go beyond the corrective conception of accessibility in which gestures are thought to be specific or generic, to develop an integrated conception of accessibility in which teachers vary their gestures (the same for all) in order to meet all needs in context. The didactic use of digital tools (second vector) works in a privileged way on the teaching-learning axis. Inclusive operability refers to a universal conception of accessibility by proposing tools that can be directly used by all for the proposed use. Pedagogical and didactic adaptations (third vector) mainly work on the teaching-learning and individual-collective axes. The process of adapting teaching, through the teacher’s reflection on removing obstacles to access to knowledge, is part of a universal and integrated conception of accessibility by deploying measures that meet the different needs within the framework of collective learning in the classroom. These three examples of teaching practices are vectors for the accessibilization of school situations, in that they sketch out a path joining and mixing on the one hand the traditional school form focused on the collective (leaving on the edge number of pupils), and on the other hand the particular compensatory measures focused on the individual (dropping pupils from the collective). The accessibilization process of school environments requires the linking of these two components.

5.3. Practical ways of making school situations more accessible

5.3.1. Study aid gestures

The first research study correlates the accessibilization of school environments to study aid gestures used by elementary school teachers (cycles 2 and 3)³, intended for pupils designated as having major academic difficulties and benefiting from a personalized educational success program, or designated as having a disability by the departmental center for disabled persons and benefiting from a personalized schooling project. In reference to a typology of aid gestures⁴ for severely dyslexic pupils published earlier (Gombert *et al.* 2008), and to the questions raised by the results obtained, such as the redefinition of basic professional gestures or the use of these aids with the whole class, this research has established a new typology specifying the generic or specific character of each gesture and its diffusion (circulation of aids between the different categories of pupils in the class, designated and not designated) (Dunand and Feuilladiu 2014). This new typology focused on six types of support gestures evoked in the declared practices of six teachers. Three were mobilized during the preparation of lessons: adjustments to the work environment, to course materials and written instructions, and to the level of difficulty of the task. Three were used during class work: oral instructions for starting work, guidance during task completion, readjustment of the work approach and the level of difficulty during task completion. Generic aids were those that were usually used for mainstream students and are used for students designated as having SEN, whether or not they were redesigned. Specific aids were those specifically designed and operated for the student designated. While there were more specific aids overall, the analysis shows that all the uses of aids reported were both generic and specific. Teachers demonstrated a double adjustment: an adaptive adjustment where they orchestrated the usual work methods in a different way by playing on the frequency and the fine declination of the aids offered, and a creative adjustment where they adapted their methods to a new audience of students by finding new solutions. The concept proposed to describe these results is the *degree of generality/specificity*. This makes it possible to consider the combination of routines and innovations, as shown by the generic and specific activation of study aid gestures. The idea of degree is essential. If the gestures taken one by one can be qualified as generic or specific, the pedagogical accessibilization of the school situation by the teachers orchestrates the

3 In France, cycles 2 and 3 of elementary school enrol pupils aged 6 to 11.

4 Gestures are defined here in the sense of Altet (2002). For this author, teaching practices are acts, observable (or not) both in the planning of the action, in the action in the presence of the pupils and in the *a posteriori* evaluation of this action. These teaching practices are actualized in professional gestures addressed to students in order to interact with them. They can be physical as well as verbal and are culturally shared.

aids by making them oscillate between generic and specific polarity like a cursor. The study aid gestures, recorded in a occasional and particular way, are embodied techniques (*bodily hexis*), integrating the system of practical dispositions that make up the teaching profession (*habitus*), a “matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions, [which] makes possible the accomplishment of infinitely differentiated tasks” (Bourdieu 2000). The *degree of generality/specificity* makes it possible to describe and think about this dynamic movement of gestures and postures inserted into the routines of the traditional school form.

At the beginning of the school year, the gestures declared most frequently used in class concerned oral instructions for getting to work and aids for carrying out the task. These two types of gestures were therefore targeted during the observation of the practices of 18 teachers. These gestures played an essential role in making school situations accessible in order to enter into tasks, understand them and carry them out. The gestures to help students understand instructions were divided into eight categories, referred to here as “instructions”, and those aimed at supporting students in carrying out the exercises were divided into seven categories referred to here as “guidance”. A total of 15,314 gestures were observed during 192 sessions (96 sessions in French, 96 in mathematics) in 18 classes, eight of which were with pupils designated as having major academic difficulties and 10 with pupils designated as having a disability (Feuilladiou and Dunand 2020). Gestures are said to be generic when there is no difference between the types of classes (difficulty/disability) or between categories of students (designated/undesignated). They are said to be specific when there are significant differences. The results show both generic and specific activation of aid gestures in context, varying these gestures according to the *degree of generality/specificity*. In fact, if differences are observed in the implementation of certain aid gestures between the “disability” classes and “difficulty” classes, or between “designated” pupils and “undesignated” pupils, these differences do not allow us to conclude that the gestures used are either fully generic or fully specific. On the one hand, because this does not concern all types of gestures. On the other hand, because both generic and specific activation describe variations of the same set of aid gestures, all are listed for all types of classes or students. Specifically, the generic activation of aid gestures concerns: the orchestration of aids according to their nature (“guidance” more frequent than “instruction”); the orchestration of aids according to academic discipline (“instruction” in mathematics as well as in French, “guidance” in mathematics as well as in French in “difficulty” classes); the use of aids within the class group (“instruction” more often addressed to the group, “guidance” more often individualized); and the types of gestures most often used for understanding the “instruction” (additional explanations, verification of comprehension). The specific activation of aid gestures in “disability” classes (with regard to “difficulty” classes) concerned a more frequent “guidance” in mathematics

than in French, and a “guidance” more oriented towards controlling the progress of the pupil’s activity. Specific activation also concerned the frequency of support for “designated” students with regard to “undesigned” students (“instructions” and “guidance”, in the “difficulty” and “disability” classes).

5.3.2. The use of digital tools

The second research study correlates the accessibilization of school environments with the use of digital tools. Very often, these tools are used as compensatory forms of support in a corrective conception of accessibility. They are then established in a supplementary and complementary way to the classroom situation. In order for them to take on an accessibilizing dimension, it is necessary to anchor these tools within the situation itself, as a central element of the didactic preparation of teaching-learning scenario. Universal design as defined in Article 2 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities “shall not exclude assistive devices for particular groups of persons with disabilities where this is needed” (UN 2006). It refers to a dialectic of the universal and the individual, showing the complementarity and interplay of these two notions of accessibility and compensation, articulating them dynamically to enable the accessibilization of situations. As a result, educational and school practices are stuck between accessibility of a shared learning situation and specific individual help. The pole of accessibility is committed to the transformation of school and social systems and operations, whereas the pole of specific individual assistance focuses on the individual and the repercussions of their medically and/or institutionally attributed deficiencies and difficulties.

A study carried out with classes of the fourth-year “mainstream” and “Segpa” classes educating students institutionally designated as “having major academic difficulties” (general and adapted vocational education in the French system) examined the impact of a digital working environment on the quality of scientific documentary texts produced by students, and illustrates our point ((Marin 2008), cited in (Benoit and Feuilladiu 2017)). The same task was asked of students in both classes: produce a documentary text on freshwater pollution using a bank of 10 scientific texts in which they had to search for important and relevant information to enable them to write their own text. They had to read the help texts based on key words given by the teacher, search for the informational cores in these help texts, and write their own text. In each class, two groups of students were formed, each working on a different medium: one on paper and the other on a computer. The students’ work was then compared according to the following work modality variable (ANOVA method, paper versus computer). The groups working on the

computer produced richer and more relevant texts than the groups working on paper, including in Segpa classes. This benefit was also observed in the reduction of the performance gaps usually observed between “mainstream” and students “having major academic difficulties”. The automated search for keywords in word processing software, avoiding the cognitive overload associated with the full scanning of texts in search of informational cores, made semantic understanding and restitution accessible to all. In terms of accessibilization, the accommodation implemented via a generic application is part of a specific teaching approach consisting of generating the gesture of individual compensation (by which it is customary to put a computer at the service of one or more students “having academic difficulties”). The empowering benefit is there, shared by all.

The notion developed in the context of this research is that of *inclusive operativity*, describing and analyzing pedagogical and didactic accessibilization through the use that teachers make of digital tools (Benoit and Feuilladiu 2017). We consider that it is not the tool that makes the task accessible, but the technical gesture that makes the tool operational in terms of its accessibility. We refer here to Mauss’ definition of bodily techniques, these “effective traditional acts”: “The body is man’s first and most natural instrument. Or more accurately, not to speak of an instrument, the first and most natural technical object, and, at the same time, the technical means of man is his body” (Mauss 1985, pp. 371–372). The techniques of the body may or may not be supplemented by an instrument. They are effective in the sense that they produce the expected effect: “The effect in the exact sense that physicists give to this term when they speak of the Joule effect, the Doppler effect, and so on.” This means two things: (1) the effect is perceptible, whether or not it is produced by certain devices; and (2) its perception is independent of all beliefs and theories” (Sigaut 2010, pp. 360–361).

The digital system developed for individual compensation does not necessarily allow for the accessibilization of learning situations in the classroom. The pedagogical and didactic use of a compensatory tool can in fact keep a pupil away from this collective learning situation, in individualized work, disconnected from the collective framework of the class group. This is illustrated by the contrast of some computer artifacts for education with the typological model of *Environnements informatiques pour l’apprentissage humain* (Computerized Environments for Human Learning), which crosses a didactic axis and an accessibility-compensation axis. Inclusive operativity is the third axis of this model, a driving axis that makes it possible to migrate tools towards accessibility, whether or not they are designed for that purpose, through the use that is made of them in context. It is indeed this dynamic movement, the technical use of tools in teaching gestures aimed at an

inclusive approach, that makes the school situation accessible, and not the internal logic of digital resources.

As a result, the pedagogical and didactic use of the tool is decisive, through the gestures and significant postures of this use. Gestures, in the manner of “skills acquired through learning allowing the performance of a task oriented towards a specific goal” (Bril and Roux 2002), make sense because they are inserted into professional postures, meaning “ways of approaching a problem posed in the practice of the trade, of dealing with it, of solving it, guided by a background of representations, experiences and expectations” (Payet *et al.* 2011, p. 25). The accessibilization process is actualized at the heart of the bodily techniques at the three levels of their definition (effective traditional acts). The constant adaptation of the individual to a goal is embodied in a series of acts with an intention, interwoven and linked in a technical operating chain, until the desired effect is produced.

5.3.3. Pedagogical and didactic adaptations

The third research study correlates the accessibilization of school environments to the process of adapting a teaching sequence, in the context of the regular classroom schooling of a pupil with an autism spectrum disorder, Léo⁵, in the first year of Cycle 2⁶. This language sequence of five one-hour sessions, based on the use of three books for young people⁷ (Gombert *et al.* 2016), was designed to work on social skills (e.g. understanding and producing the lexicon of emotions, processing inferences, interaction adjustments). These three books had been selected, following an *a priori* didactic analysis (Sensevy 2008), for their high inferential level and their wide range of mental states relevant to working with students. The same pedagogical process was used for each book. Initially, students in large groups were seated on the floor in a semi-circle in front of a stage to listen to the books, which was presented in an offered reading⁸ and a scripted one (different processes: use of puppets, actors, cartoons). This was followed by guided exchanges between the pupils themselves, between the pupils

5 Léo is not the student's real first name, in order to preserve his anonymity.

6 In France, the first year of cycle 2 of elementary school (*cours préparatoire*) enrolls 6–7-year-old pupils.

7 Album 1: Könnecke, O. (2006). *Anton est magicien*. École des Loisirs, Paris. Album 2: De Pennart, G. (2005). *Le loup, la chèvre et les 7 chevreux*. Édition Kaléidoscope, Paris. Album 3: Donalson, J. (1999). *Gruffalo*. Éditions Gallimard Jeunesse, Paris.

8 Offered reading is a pedagogical modality often used in kindergarten to work on reading comprehension. It is a moment of collective listening to a text (often a children's album). The teacher “offers”, i.e. takes charge of a reading while fully respecting the text.

and the teacher, workshops (groups of four pupils), consolidation of the work in large groups and a time of formalizing the knowledge.

A clinical approach made it possible to study the pedagogical choices and adaptations proposed by the teacher, assisted by the school life assistant and the school psychologist, as well as the adjustments made as the sessions progressed. These adaptations and adjustments, resulting from the student's needs about points and difficulties observed in class, were part of a dialectic of reciprocity between adaptation for the student and management of the classroom group. The analysis thus focused on the accessibilization of learning based on the pupil's needs in relation to classroom context (Pelgrims and Bauquis 2016), while fitting in with the 2015 programs of cycle 2 for all, under the heading "social and civic competencies". This step-by-step collaborative and constructive work was focused on basic professional teaching gestures, such as the working framework, task prescription and interaction modalities.

Léo presented the learning and behavioral difficulties usually identified in children with autism spectrum disorders: engaging in interactions with the teacher and/or peers, understanding pragmatic cues, (e.g. deictic gestures), performing certain motor gestures, and sharing experiences, activities and thoughts with others. At the framework level, Léo was placed near quiet students and his companion, in order to minimize the perception of other students' movements and the surrounding noise. In terms of task prescription, the teacher made the work situations and instructions more explicit in order to make them clear. The aim was to lift the opacity of the teaching situation so that Léo would grasp what was at stake in the work and what was expected of him, that he would mobilize his knowledge and get involved in the task, and that he would not perceive the reading of a book to be a solely recreational activity. In a second step, she introduced into her instructions elements on the predictability of the tasks (Gombert *et al.* 2016) that were to follow, so that Léo would no longer get stuck during the break between the different tasks, and would remain mobilized as long as possible in each one of them. As for the modalities of interaction, the teacher introduced a turn to speak in order to allow Léo to express his thoughts, without necessarily being influenced by the responses of his classmates.

In the end, the observations made during the sessions made it possible to identify favorable developments both in terms of social skills and in terms of the processing of emotions. The adaptations implemented enabled Léo to mobilize and optimize his attention. By the end of the teaching sequence, he was better able to initiate certain exchanges, to express his point of view in an act of language and to grasp the subtleties of the emotions. The progressively woven accessibilization process helped

Léo to be able to offer, exchange and construct more autonomous responses. Moreover, by taking into consideration the elements of the context that prevent or, on the contrary, favor the expression of certain skills, and by positioning pedagogical and didactic adaptations as one of the powerful constitutive elements of the teaching system, the process of making things accessible was integrated into the classroom collective.

The notion put forward, highlighting the complexity of developing the adaptation of teaching in regular classroom contexts, is that of *processes of adapting teaching in inclusive contexts* (Gombert *et al.* 2017). Far from being the application of a catalog of good practices, this process requires a reflective and enlightened analysis on the part of the teacher of the pupil's needs, which are necessarily situated in situations of teaching for all, notably through the analysis of epistemic obstacles to access to knowledge (knowledge; know-how; know-how to be). This analysis will form the basis for the adaptations implemented. These adaptations may lead to very little change in the knowledge issues for the pupil in relation to the other pupils in the class (in the example of Léo, they allowed him to go through the same book as his peers). Conversely, they can modify them (for example, the student should be given another book to work on anticipation rather than inferential strategies). They can also be distributed to other students in the class, with the same needs but not the same disorders. This process of adaptation is integrative of multiple dimensions, individual-collective, pedagogical-didactic, etc. Knowledge about student development and learning processes, the relationship to knowledge, *didactics* and pedagogy are used to analyze situations, create adaptations and orchestrate them within the collective class.

Concretely, this dialectic of the individual and the collective can follow two reflexive paths. The first starts from the analysis of the student's points of support and difficulties, translates them into needs and proposes educational, pedagogical and/or didactic adaptations. The analysis of epistemic issues will be conducted before and after the adaptation time of the teaching situation. This gesture, a guarantee of conscious maintenance by the teachers of the learning objectives that they had set, compensates for the phenomenon of denaturation of these objectives often observed in special education (Pelgrims-Ducré 2001), and more recently for the teaching of literacy (Cèbe and Paour 2012) or numeracy (Perez and Assude 2013). Finally, the teacher judges the relevance of disseminating these adaptations to all or some of the other students in the class (Feuilladieu and Dunand 2016). This pre- and post-engineering analysis time is part of the time for planning teaching action, as described by Goigoux (2016). Conversely, the second path anchors the reflection in the teaching situation proposed to the collective class. The didactic analysis identifies the obstacles to learning for all students, makes it possible to

develop adjustments for all within the framework of pedagogical differentiation, and then links the new teaching situation to the student's situated needs, in order to create more targeted adaptations if necessary.

5.4. Elements for reflection on a model of analysis of teachers' gestures and postures with a view to accessibilization

The results of the three research studies presented constitute elements for reflection on the pedagogical and didactic accessibilization of learning situations, within the framework of the traditional school form. We propose a descriptive analysis of teachers' gestures and postures aimed at making school learning situations accessible to students in regular classrooms, based on the three practical vectors described (see Figure 5.1): study aid gestures (first research study), the use of digital tools (second research study), and pedagogical and didactic adaptations (third research study).

The anchoring of the gestures in the professional *habitus* and the *bodily hexis* of the teachers allows us to think of this accessibilization within the traditional school form, apprehended here in its short temporality of "daily co-constructions" (Pirone and Rayou 2012). *The habitus* is the matrix of generic dispositions, the basis of possibilities, the *hexis* its embodiment into various and varied techniques, of which *gestures* are a part (Mauss 1985; Bourdieu 2000). The teacher's *posture* is a particular way of practising the profession, drawing and combining, in an adjusted and context-specific way, from the possibilities of the *habitus* and the *bodily hexis*. *posture* orchestrates gestures in context, in view of the teaching objective and the way in which the teacher conceives of their profession (Payet *et al.* 2011). For example, when the teacher varies the *degree of generality/specificity of his or her gestures* to help a student with special educational needs understand the instruction given in class (Dunand and Feuilladieu 2014; Feuilladieu and Dunand 2020), considering that their role is to teach all students at the same time. The insertion and activation of gestures in The insertion and activation of gestures in an accessibilization posture, triggers the reflexive path pushing teachers to refine the pedagogy of their didactic gestures, the process of adapting teaching in an inclusive context (Gombert *et al.* 2016, 2017). The practices are then stuck between the pole of accessibilization of the shared learning situation and the pole of individual specific assistance. *Inclusive operationality* refers to this gesture-oriented dynamic (Benoit and Feuilladieu 2017). It makes visible the way in which the study aid gestures and pedagogical and didactic adaptations allow students' access to knowledge, to a student's profession, to a recognized social identity. The *student's access to learning situations* is the final result of the accessibilization process, defined here as a set of

operations organized over time, leading to a result that is both evolutionary and a set combination of actions. This process of making things accessible is the driving force behind the local and contemporary development of the school form.




Figure 5.1. Model for analyzing teachers' gestures and postures in order to make school learning situations in regular classrooms accessible to students institutionally designated as having "special educational needs". For a color version of this figure, see www.iste.co.uk/ebersold/accessibility.zip

COMMENT ON FIGURE 5.1.– *The accessibility vectors (in blue: gestures, usage, adaptation) are positioned in the figure as examples, in the sense that some of them may occupy another position when working on other dialectical axes.*

This analysis model is not only concerned with the qualification of gestures and postures (for example, one gesture is specific, another is generic, or one posture is inclusive, another is not). It makes it possible to analyze the dynamic movement of teachers' gestures and postures in their operational use, the embedding of enabling accommodations in the action of teaching to all, and inclusive operability as a vector for the pedagogical and didactic accessibilization of learning situations. In this sense, the process of pedagogical and didactic accessibilization is the avatar of the traditional school form; at the same time, it is a hazard, an incident, of a school form strewn with pedagogical and didactic obstacles for many pupils, and a transformation, an internal metamorphosis of this same form, allowing it to become more democratic and to maintain itself.

5.5. Conclusion

Thinking of inclusive school in terms of gestures or postures alone immobilizes the movements described, as does thinking of practices as undifferentiated or differentiated or adapted, one excluding the other. The perspective of our three studies and the articulation of the concepts that emerged from them show, in our view, that it is essential to place gestures within the postures that guide them and make them efficient, and in the inclusive operability that makes them empowering for both teachers and students. The activation of study aid gestures, the use of digital tools, and adaptation and differentiation practices are analyzed based on notions that make visible, through descriptive cursors, the movements that characterize these gestures, these uses and these practices, in their aim of accessibility. This model of analysis proposes an analysis of accessibilization practices for reflection, in which it is not a question of naming each gesture or posture, but rather of describing the path to student access to knowledge that is made possible, or not, by the interweaving of the gestures and postures deployed in context.

5.6. References

- Altet, M. (2002). Une démarche de recherche sur la pratique enseignante : l'analyse plurielle. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 138, 85–93.
- Bautier, E., Rayou, P. (2009). *Les Inégalités d'Apprentissage : Programmes, Pratiques et Malentendus Scolaires*. PUF, Paris.

- Benoit, H., Feuilladieu, S. (2017). De la typologie des outils numériques dans le champ des EIAH à leur opérationnalité inclusive. *La Nouvelle Revue de l'Adaptation et de la Scolarisation*, 78, 25–45.
- Benoit, H., Sagot, J. (2008). L'apport des aides techniques à la scolarisation des élèves handicapés. *La Nouvelle Revue de l'Adaptation et de la Scolarisation*, 43, 19–26.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Esquisse d'une Théorie de la Aratique*. Le Seuil, Paris.
- Bril, B., Roux, V. (2002). *Le Geste Technique. Réflexions Méthodologiques et Anthropologiques*. Érès, Toulouse.
- Cèbe, S., Paour, J.-L. (2012). Apprendre à lire aux élèves avec déficience intellectuelle. *Le Français Aujourd'hui*, 177, 41–53.
- Dunand, C., Feuilladieu, S. (2014). Les aides pédagogiques aux élèves à besoins éducatifs particuliers : pratiques génériques ou spécifiques ? *La Nouvelle Revue de l'Adaptation et de la Scolarisation*, 65, 113–126.
- Ebersold, S. (2017). L'école inclusive face à l'impératif d'accessibilité. *Éducation et Sociétés*, 40, 89–103.
- Ebersold, S. (2019). L'accessibilité ou la solidarité reconfigurée ? *Vie Sociale*, 27, 89–103.
- Ebersold, S. (2020). La grammaire de l'accessibilité. *Éducation et Sociétés*, 44, 15–36.
- Ebersold, S., Mauguin, M. (2016). Droit à l'éducation et accessibilité. In *Réinventer l'École ? Politiques, Conceptions et Pratiques Dites Inclusives*, Pelgrims, G., Perez, J.-M. (eds). INS-HEA, Paris.
- Feuilladieu, S., Dunand, C. (2016). Des situations d'enseignement spécifique au service de tous ? In *Réinventer l'École ? Politiques, Conceptions et Pratiques Dites Inclusives*, Pelgrims, G., Perez, J.-M. (eds). INS-HEA, Paris.
- Feuilladieu, S., Dunand, D. (2020). Gestes d'aide à l'étude en école élémentaire : comparaison entre des classes scolarisant des élèves désignés en situation de handicap et des classes scolarisant des élèves désignés avec des difficultés. *Les Sciences de l'Éducation Pour l'Ère Nouvelle*, 52, 31–48.
- Goigoux, R. (2016). Les fondements d'une pratique démocratisante. Les cinq focales pour l'analyse de l'enseignement et le conseil pédagogique [Online]. Available at: <http://centre-alain-savary.ens-lyon.fr/CAS/nouvelles-professionnalites/formateurs/roland-goigoux-quels-savoirs-pour-les-formateurs>.
- Gombert, A., Millon-Fauré, K. (2020). Inclure ou scolariser ? Adapter une situation d'apprentissage en mathématique : le cas d'une élève présentant une dyscalculie [Online]. *Ressources*, 22. Available at: <https://inspe.univ-nantes.fr/recherche-innovation/nos-publications/ressources-pour-la-formation-l-ecole-et-les-apprentissages-scolaires-1408481.kjsp>.

- Gombert, A., Feuilladiéu, S., Gilles, P.Y., Roussey, J.-Y. (2008). La scolarisation d'élèves dyslexiques sévères en classe ordinaire : lien entre adaptations pédagogiques, points de vue des enseignants et vécu de l'expérience scolaire des élèves. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 164, 123–138.
- Gombert, A., Bernat, V., Roussey, J.-Y. (2016). Albums de jeunesse pour le développement d'une théorie de l'esprit. *Enfance*, 3, 329–345.
- Gombert, A., Bernat, V., Vernay, F. (2017). Vers une formalisation des pratiques inclusives d'adaptation de l'enseignement : étude de cas pour un élève avec autisme. *Carrefours de l'Éducation*, 43, 9–25.
- Mauss, M. (1985). *Sociologie et Anthropologie*. PUF, Paris.
- Payet, J.-P., Sanchez-Mazas, M., Giuliani, F.-E., Fernandez, R. (2011). L'agir scolaire entre régulations et incertitudes. Vers une typologie des postures enseignantes de la relation à autrui. *Éducation et Sociétés*, 27, 23–37.
- Pelgrims, G., Bauquis, C. (2016). Des “élèves à BEP” à la notion de besoins pédagogiques et didactiques particuliers pour apprendre en classe ordinaire. In *Réinventer l'École ? Politiques, Conceptions et Pratiques Dites Inclusives*, Pelgrims, G., Perez, J.-M. (eds). INS-HEA, Paris.
- Pelgrims-Ducré, G. (2001). Comparaison des processus d'enseignement et d'apprentissage en classes ordinaires et spécialisées : des processus aux contraintes. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 134, 147–166.
- Perez, J.M., Assude, T. (eds) (2013). *Pratiques Inclusives et Savoirs Scolaires. Paradoxes, Contradictions et Perspectives*. PUN, Nancy.
- Pirone, F., Rayou, P. (2012). Nouveaux internes, anciens décrocheurs : de l'évolution de la forme scolaire. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 179, 49–62.
- Plaisance, E. (2009). *Autrement Capables, École, Emploi, Société : Pour l'Inclusion des Personnes Handicapées*. Autrement, Paris.
- Sigaut, F. (2010). La Formule de Mauss [Online]. *Techniques & Culture*, 54–55, 357–367. Available at: <http://tc.revues.org/5007>.
- UN (2006). Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities and optional protocol [Online]. Available at: <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprote.pdf>.
- Vincent, G., Lahire, B., Thin, D. (1994). Sur l'histoire et la théorie de la forme scolaire. In *L'éducation Prisonnière de la Forme Scolaire*, Vincent, G. (ed.). PUL, Lyon.