



Policy Department
Structural and Cohesion Policies

EFFICIENCY AND EQUITY IN EUROPEAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS

CULTURE AND EDUCATION



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Directorate General Internal Policies of the Union

Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies

CULTURE AND EDUCATION

**Efficiency and Equity in
European education and training systems**

NOTE

IP/B/CULT/FWC/2006_169

15/05/2007

PE 389.581

EN

This note was requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education.

This paper is published in the following language:

- Original: EN

Authors: Prof. Marc Demeuse
Institut d'Administration scolaire
Université de Mons-Hainaut (Belgium)

Ariane Baye
Département Education et Formation
Université de Liège (Belgium)

Richard Doherty
Deloitte, Brussels (Belgium)

Responsible Official: Mrs Constanze Itzel
Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies
European Parliament
B-1047 Brussels
E-mail: ipoldepb@europarl.europa.eu

Manuscript completed in May 2007.

This note will be available on the Internet at:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/expert/eStudies.do?language=EN>

Brussels, European Parliament, 2007.

The opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorized, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given prior notice and sent a copy.



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Directorate General Internal Policies of the Union

Policy Department Structural and Cohesion Policies

CULTURE AND EDUCATION

**Efficiency and Equity in
European education and training systems**

NOTE

Content:

The note gives a critical analysis of the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament entitled “Efficiency and Equity in European education and training systems” (COM(2006) 481 final). On the basis of this analysis, the Commission's recommendations are examined and further recommendations for action are made.

IP/B/CULT/FWC/2006_169

PE 389.581

EN

Executive summary

The Commission calls for consideration of the double challenge posed to European education and training systems: to ensure both competitiveness and social cohesion. It immediately sets the background against which this challenge must take place: a context of limitation of public spending, and four significant pressures - globalisation, population issues, the rapid development of the nature of the labour market, and technological innovation. A resolutely economic approach is therefore clearly outlined right from the second paragraph, and is maintained throughout the text as a whole. This orientation translates into the approach of the two central concepts of the text: equity and efficiency.

Equity is defined as “the extent to which individuals can take advantage of education and training, in terms of opportunities, access, treatment and outcomes”. This definition combines, without specifying as such, different concepts. These different concepts are based on very different demands: firstly, equal opportunities, and secondly, actual equality of access, treatment and results (internal or external). While the first concept addresses the idea of *potential* equality, the three others concern *actual* equality, whether being able to have access to the same educational service, benefiting from equal treatment, or obtaining equal results.

According to the Commission, a system is defined as equitable if, firstly, “the outcomes of the education and training are independent of socio-economic background and other factors that lead to educational disadvantage” and secondly, if “the treatment reflects individuals’ specific learning needs”. However, the Commission has not retained the notion of “threshold” which states that beyond a certain level or “threshold” of skills, individuals are sufficiently equipped to continue their schooling and confront the demand for higher skills required in order to integrate satisfactorily into civil society and the labour market. Gender, ethnic origin, or a handicap (other than socio-economic) are just as much constitutive of conditions from which individuals cannot escape, which makes the inequalities of which they are victim particularly unfair. This idea seems to be neglected by the communication.

Equity is a normative notion, in the sense that it is intimately linked to the notion of fairness. The Member States must therefore define unfair inequalities in education. For replacing the term equality with the term equity does not detract from the necessity to make a statement on the model of fairness, something which seems to go unmentioned in the Commission’s communication.

With a view to pedagogical effectiveness, the objectives defined in the context of the Lisbon partnership by the Member States of the European Union could be considered as the minimum objectives to be attained. The follow-up reports from the Lisbon process can henceforth be read as much as evaluations of the pedagogical effectiveness of European educational systems. As for the evaluation of the (economic) efficiency of European educational systems, this would suppose that there is agreement on an ideal relationship between the investments and the results or, at least, that the inputs are explicitly taken into account, when viewing the results. In fact, the reports on which the Commission’s proposal was based, although they use the term “efficiency”, tend to confuse this notion with that of effectiveness, since the evaluations performed are done so mainly in relation to cognitive data, measuring the acquired knowledge of the pupils (and therefore the “cognitive” yield of the educational systems), and not according to the inputs (in terms of money, teaching loads, time, and so on) invested in the various educational systems. Although recent literature in the field of educational sciences clearly shows

that effectiveness and equity can be mutually beneficial, such an analysis has not yet been carried out on a European level on the link between efficiency and equity. The examination of the effectiveness of European educational systems should include the evaluation of objectives defined within the context of the Lisbon partnership and should be more criteria-based (linked to specific objectives in terms of well-being or actual options to continue training throughout life) than normative (in terms of comparison or percentages).

The proposals of the Commission are largely based on the theoretical model proposed by Cunha, Heckman, Lochner and Masterov. This economic model for the development of the child holds that skills which are innate or acquired at a certain age are the foundation on which subsequent learning is built. Starting out from this principle, which is backed up by common sense, the authors affirm that the earlier the investment, the better its rate of return, since the fruits of this investment will last for a lifetime. Conversely, later investments will yield a lesser return, since they are only effective over a shorter period, and will have to be more substantial since, the older the child, the harder it is to remedy shortcomings accumulated since early childhood. The model relies on empirical data which is hardly convincing for European countries, as it is essentially based on data from tests given in the United States. The data used is not suitable for testing the general model of the authors. One must be aware of the specific nature of pre-school education in the United States. International data concerning attendance at pre-school education indeed shows that national traditions in this area vary hugely. Furthermore, given the diversity of the national contexts in terms of participation in pre-school education, a common policy within the European Union cannot be uniformly valid. The weakness of the Commission's rationale should not, however, makes us forget the importance of pre-school education. More than a prioritisation of resources, on the level of pre-school education, more efficiency must without doubt be sought via the coordination of policies and services, and to implement measures available for initial and further training of staff, for the improvement of the status and salaries of staff and for better services for the most disadvantaged children, especially through working with families. The need to invest in favour of children from disadvantaged families as a priority is well known. However, this observation calls for a reflection on the method of helping the poorest populations the best without stigmatising or blaming them when, despite the help given, the anticipated results are not achieved.

The Commission's communication reserves a relatively limited space for the study of effectiveness/efficiency and equity in the area of compulsory education. However, decision-makers must remain vigilant about compulsory education, to the extent that, firstly, some children, and in particular those from disadvantaged backgrounds, effectively only have access to compulsory education and, secondly, that research has shown that different pedagogic structures and practices can produce different results both in terms of effectiveness and equity. On the level of primary education, the Commission does not mention any specific analysis and does not set out any particular measure. However, data from international studies shows that countries can already largely diverge, both in terms of average output and social inequalities, gender inequalities or the proportion of pupils attaining a certain threshold of skill, from the primary level.

Research in education sciences has shown how much educational structures can reinforce these inequalities on all school levels, since all the explicit or implicit selection mechanisms, established or not countered by the systems, can produce this effect. Heterogeneity of classes therefore appears to be the most effective solution to maximise the progress of the underperforming pupils without proportionally burdening the progress of the strongest pupils. A market of more and more diversified schools is a vector for social segregation. And yet, the

results of the international assessment PISA 2000 indicate that the overall majority of top performing countries in reading show a large degree of homogeneity of performances between schools, which shows that it is important to pursue the objectives of equality and effectiveness simultaneously at this level. If all the implicit and explicit differentiations have the effect of producing inequality, and often ineffectiveness, it is in particular because they involve the choice of unequally informed parents, unequally equipped to support their children and unequally capable of investing financially in their schooling. The moments when children choose their courses and the different levels in schooling are also moments of (self) selection, socially differentiated depending on the schools, pupils and their parents. The different levels of support from which each pupil may benefit at home, throughout his/her school career, and the sometimes very unequal nature of the education provided, during compulsory schooling, are clear evidence of the need to monitor all school careers, particularly at moments of choice (orientation), so that the latter are not transformed into moments of selection.

More local or school autonomy may therefore lead to unequal strategic choices, depending on the quality of user information, or the forms of family self-selection. The proposal to increase local autonomy may also be called into question by an international comparison of school results.

To identify actual good practices, it is important to identify accurately the conditions in which these practices are effective, both in order to increase the average level of apprenticeships and to reduce the disparities between pupils and limit failures for the weakest pupils. Analysing education systems and the impact of a certain organization method or another is a difficult job that requires access to and processing of huge amounts of data. Most often, there is no isolated parameter, but a set of parameters that must be identified. To obtain a result, it is therefore generally necessary to act in several areas at once, otherwise the system runs a severe risk of adapting to the new situation with no notable improvement.

The teaching-efficacy factors, in addition to overall school structures, are even less well understood and the research is intended to analysis standard practices, by means of direct observation of the latter to be supported and encouraged.

Regarding higher education, if the observations of the Commission can be largely shared, the solutions proposed must be questioned. In effect, the generalization of the tuition fees, and measures helping the neediest in the form of loans, risk making higher education even more unequal. The tuition fees introduce market mechanisms to higher education. The solution does not seem to present guarantees that one would expect from an in-depth reform of financing methods. The central idea, to increase private participation, owing to, as mentioned right at the beginning of the Communication, a context of restriction of public spending, if it regulates the problem of financing higher education, without increasing public spending, does not seem to offer any guarantee with regard to equality of access for a certain number of reasons that the Commission itself mentions.

Regarding vocational education and training, the Commission proposes two steps, the first being a reinforcement of the partnerships between the public and private sectors and the social partners and the second being the adaptation of training programmes to employers' needs. The Commission underlines the difficulty in persuading the private sector to finance vocational training, as the latter has no direct link to the needs of the company concerned. This reflection makes a case for the public sector to preserve an important role in the sphere of the social promotion of workers, especially those without much training, so as to allow the acquisition

both of general skills, not directly linked to the work posts held, and skills allowing the acquisition of a better position on the labour market.

In the field of education, an international collaboration by the countries of the European Union is essential. By virtue of their common destiny, it is in these countries' interest to work together to establish the objectives to be attained and the methods to be implemented in order to evaluate them. With regard to the methods to be implemented to achieve these objectives, the Commission recommends an exchange of good practices, and recognizes the specific responsibility of Member States. It would be illusory to imagine that identical methods would produce identical results in different historic, cultural, economic and educational contexts. The assessment of promising practices must deal not only with their efficacy and their capacity to increase equity, but also with the conditions of transferring or generalizing them in other contexts. An ambitious and multilingual policy for developing the results of European research into education science must be set up. It is important to support the development of a cumulative approach, especially by establishing or sustaining the development of European research centres concerning education and the dispersion of knowledge in the field, from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Table of contents

	Page
Executive summary	iii
Chapter I - Summary of the Commission's Communication	1
Chapter II - Note	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Pre-school teaching: focusing on learning at an early age	5
3. Primary and secondary education	8
4. Higher education	11
5. Vocational education and training	12
6. Actions by the European Union	13
Bibliography	15
Useful websites	35

Chapter I – Summary of the Commission’s Communication

The communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament entitled “Efficiency and Equity in European education and training systems” (COM(2006) 481 final) is aimed at informing policy makers on developments in Member States and on research available at European level concerning efficiency and equity of education and training systems. It stresses the importance of combining these two objectives within the context of the Lisbon agenda. It puts forward the social and economic benefits of reducing injustice in education and training, while emphasising the need to proceed with long-term planning of expenditure.

The recommendations of the Commission are presented by education level, considering in turn 1) pre-school education, 2) primary and secondary education, 3) higher education and 4) vocational education and training (in upper secondary education and for adults).

The Commission suggests reinforcing expenditure in pre-school education, particularly in favour of children from underprivileged backgrounds, arguing that this will lead to lasting social and economic benefits resulting from this early investment, while further measures during children’s school careers allow the fruits of these initial investments to be consolidated. The Commission points out the need to involve parents in the schooling of their young children and to develop programmes aimed at developing skills in pre-school education.

With regard to primary and secondary education, the Commission emphasises the need for equality in terms of acquiring basic skills, with particular attention to the situation of people from disadvantaged backgrounds and ethnic minorities. The Commission makes two recommendations concerning the structures most suited to achieve this objective: first, it points out the inefficiency and inequity of structures which make an early selection on the basis of subjects or groupings of children with similar aptitudes, and second, it recommends independence for individual schools while monitoring results centrally. As for teachers, it recommends an improvement in teacher quality in underprivileged areas.

The Commission notes that the broadening of access to higher education has not been accompanied by an increase in financial investment, and that the most disadvantaged still have less access to higher education than other pupils. It recommends increasing individual investments, in the form of enrolment rights, while providing financial aid to the neediest. For the latter, it notes however that improving equality of access inevitably leads to more efficient and equitable school structures, and to better information on the benefits of higher education.

With regard to vocational education and training, the Commission recommends the elimination of the blockages within some vocational programmes in upper secondary education, so that they provide real access to higher education and employment. The Commission underlines the need, for adults in insecure economic situations, to have access to vocational training responding to business requirements. In these cases, public bodies and private companies should share the cost of the training.

The Commission concludes by pointing out the need to make a priority of efficiency and equity, to establish a culture of evaluation, and to promote the validation and dissemination of good practice.

Chapter II - Note

The structure of the note reflects the structure of the Commission document

1. Introduction

The communication of the Commission (COM(2006)481 final) calls for consideration of the double challenge posed to European education and training systems: to ensure both competitiveness and social cohesion. It immediately sets the background against which this challenge must take place: a context of limitation of public spending, and four significant pressures - globalisation, population, rapid changes in the labour market, and technological innovation. A resolutely economic approach is therefore clearly outlined right from the second paragraph, and is maintained throughout the text as a whole, supported by a “Commission staff working document” (SEC(2006) 1096), itself prepared with the help of a text written by the experts of the “European Expert Network on Economics of Education” (EENEE) (Wößmann and Schültz, 2006)¹. This orientation translates into the approach of the two central concepts of the text: equity and efficiency.

Equity is defined as “the degree to which individuals can benefit from education and training, in terms of options, access, treatment and results”. This definition combines, without specifying as such, different concepts which nevertheless deserve greater attention than a footnote (note 2, page 2). These different concepts (which were, for example, well covered in the work of the *European Group for Research on Equity in Educational Systems* (EGREES, 2005)), are based on very different demands: firstly, equal opportunities, and secondly, actual equality of access, treatment and results (internal or external). While the first concept comes back to the idea of potential equality (having virtually the same chance, statistically, of getting a degree, for example), the three others concern actual equality, whether being able to have access to the same educational service (equality of access, for example, to higher education), benefiting from equal treatment (benefiting from teachers or premises of equal quality), or obtaining equal results (for example, mastering basic skills). Continuing its definition, the communication of the Commission specifies that a system is defined as equitable if, firstly, “the results of the education and training are independent of the socio-economic environment and other factors leading to an educational handicap” and secondly, if “the treatment reflects the specific needs of the individuals in terms of learning”. The concept of educational equity retained by the Commission, in other words independence between the socioeconomic status and the results of the education, corresponds to the common denominator on which most theoreticians on fairness are in agreement (on this subject, see the overview of Meuret, 2001). However, the Commission has not retained the notion of “threshold” suggested by the EGREES (2005), which states that beyond a certain level or “threshold” of skills, individuals are not sufficiently equipped to continue their schooling and confront the demand for higher skills required in order to integrate satisfactorily into civil society and the labour market. The explanatory note continues in rather a strange way, however: “Unfairness based on an individual’s belonging to one sex or another, or to an ethnic minority, on a handicap, or regional disparities, etc, are not the main topic of this document, but must be taken into consideration to the extent that they contribute to the overall socio-economic disadvantages”. It would therefore seem that the Commission, in its communication, wishes only to cover inequalities of socio-economic origin, to the exclusion of

1 Réseau Européen d'Experts en Economie de l'Education in French and Europäisches Expertennetzwerk Bildungsökonomik in German (<http://www.education-economics.org>).

any other source which does not come under this origin. Yet at the same time, it is difficult to isolate the causes from each other, and notably when they interact with one another, and it is regrettable not to take into consideration such determining factors as those cited by the Commission itself. Indeed, sex, ethnic origin, or a handicap (other than socio-economic) are just as much constitutive of conditions from which individuals cannot escape, which makes the inequalities of which they are victim particularly unfair, thus fitting into the definition proposed by the Commission. The situation of a handicap, where this affects the mental faculties, may nevertheless, fairly generally, be handled in a different way, since it would prevent the individual from attaining the same cognitive objectives, despite an increase in educative resources. It therefore remains to determine to what extent it is appropriate to focus on the attainment of objectives other than the shared objectives for this specific population group, which will be unable to attain the objectives of competitiveness and excellence.

An equitable system is therefore a system which does not produce unfair inequalities. The recent works of the EGREES (EGREES, 2005, Baye, Demeuse, Monseur and Goffin, 2006) therefore explain that equity is a normative notion, in the sense that it is intimately linked to the notion of fairness. The Member States must therefore define the unfair inequalities in education. Replacing the term equality by the term equity does not detract from the necessity to make a statement on the model of fairness, which seems to go unmentioned in the Commission's communication.

With regard to effectiveness and efficiency, the Commission's communication defines this as "the relationship, in a process, between the resources brought into play and the results obtained". It is therefore more a measure of efficiency (achievement of results at lower cost) than of effectiveness in the teaching sense (achievement of objectives)². The note specifies that a "system is effective if the resources brought into play give a maximum result". The perspective is therefore clearly comparative or relative. In fact, this last term is that used by the Commission when it specifies that the relative effectiveness of educational systems "is generally measured using the results of tests and exams, while their effectiveness with regard to society as a whole and to the economy is judged against their rate of return on a private and social level". This approach is the same as the Lisbon strategy: it is not so much a matter of providing everyone with a certain level of life which is satisfactory with regard to defined criteria, as of becoming the most competitive knowledge economy (European Council, 2000). This utilitarian approach, in the sense that the aim is the maximisation of the average result, at the risk of leaving to one side a large part of the population, while another part compensates for this weakness, confirms the need to take an interest, at least in the name of equity, in the fringe of individuals below the threshold, and not only in the gaps between those who are better off and those who are less so.

In the context of educational equity, the objectives defined by the Member States in the context of Lisbon could be considered as the minimum objectives to be attained. The follow-up reports from the Lisbon process (Commission of the European Communities, 2004 *et sq.*) can henceforth be read as much as evaluations of the teaching effectiveness of European educational systems. As for the evaluation of the (economic) efficiency of European educational systems, this would suppose that there is agreement about the ideal relationship between the investments and the results or, at least, that the inputs are explicitly taken into account, when viewing the results. However, not only are there not yet any indicators to suggest this, but it is also evident that the Commission has not made any proposal in these terms, which seems logical in that the

2 On the subject of the distinction between effectiveness and efficiency, see the short review of the available literature presented by Reezigt (2001, pp. 2-4).

objectives established in the context of the Lisbon partnership envisage increasing spending, including private spending³. In fact, the reports on which the Commission's proposal was based, although they use the term "efficiency", tend to confuse this notion with that of effectiveness, since the evaluations performed are done so mainly in relation to cognitive data, measuring the acquired knowledge of the pupils (and therefore the "cognitive" yield of the educational systems), and not according to the inputs (in terms of money, teaching loads, time, and so on) invested in the various educational systems. Although recent literature in the field of educational sciences clearly shows that effectiveness and equity can be mutually beneficial, such an analysis has not yet been carried out at European level on the link between efficiency and equity.

Recommendations:

The examination of the effectiveness of European educational systems should be accompanied by an examination of their efficiency. The examination of effectiveness should include the evaluation of objectives defined within the context of the Lisbon programme and should be more criteria-based (linked to specific objectives in terms of well-being or actual options to continue training throughout life) than normative (in terms of comparison or percentages).

There should be a clarification of terminology, both for effectiveness / efficiency and for equity.

The examination of the equity of European educational systems should include the notion of a threshold, present in the Lisbon objectives, extended to other areas. Individual characteristics from which an individual cannot escape, such as sex or national origin, should be included in the examination of equity.

2. Pre-school teaching: focusing on learning at an early age

The proposals of the Commission are largely based on the theoretical model proposed by Cunha, Heckman, Lochner and Masterov (2005). This economic model for the development of the child holds that skills which are innate or acquired at a certain age are the foundation on which subsequent learning is built. Starting out from this principle, which is backed up by common sense, the authors affirm that the earlier the investment, the better its rate of return, since the fruits of this investment will last for a lifetime. Conversely, later investments will yield a lesser return, since they are only effective over a shorter period, and will have to be more substantial since, the older the child, the harder it is to remedy shortcomings accumulated since early childhood.

As attractive as this economic theorising on the development of the child may seem, it can be called into question on several points. First of all, because it does not take into account the fact that learning difficulties can occur relatively late in the development process of the child or the adolescent, without these difficulties being easily attributable to a deficit during previous stages. The difficulties observed at a given schooling period or level could therefore be too easily and routinely attributed to the previous schooling period or level. This could have the effect of absolving subsequent educational workers of responsibility, while depriving them of the attention and tools required to prevent and remedy school dropouts, particularly in terms of secondary education. Secondly, the model of Cunha et al. (2005) relies on empirical data which is scarcely convincing for European countries, as it is essentially based on data from tests given

³ *Investing effectively in education and training: an imperative for Europe*, Communication of the Commission COM(2002) 779 final (10 January 2003).

in the United States. The data used is not suitable for testing the general model of the authors, since the databases used do not take into account the development of skills measured at the pre-school level and whose progression has been monitored until at least the end of secondary schooling (no ongoing long-term follow-up).

Furthermore, in order to grasp the range of the proposed model, one must be aware of the specific nature of pre-school education in the United States. International data concerning attendance at pre-school education indeed shows that national traditions in this area vary hugely: while the rate of participation of children of less than 4 years old stands at 52.9 % in the United States, it is on average 73.5 % in the countries belonging to the European Union (EU-19, according to the OECD, 2006, p. 266). This high average can be explained both by a strong tendency to attend pre-school education which has long been present in certain Member States (Belgium, France, Italy, Spain) and by the significant efforts carried out in this area during the course of the last decades in the European Union, as revealed by Eurydice data on the progression (1979-2002) of rates of participation in pre-school establishments among 4 year old children (2005, p. 133).

The affirmation that pre-school education displays the highest yield in terms of the results obtained and the social adaptation of the children is not based on empirical data from within the Member States of the European Union. Furthermore, given the diversity of the national contexts in terms of participation in pre-school education, a common policy within the European Union cannot be uniformly valid.

Moreover, it must be stressed that the works assessing the impact of childcare structures preceding obligatory schooling are fairly discordant. While the impact is positive overall, it is more so in terms of social adaptation than from a language viewpoint (Duru-Bellat, 2003). In her overview of social inequalities at school, Duru-Bellat also states that the social gaps can be slightly increased by attendance of primary school because, with all children benefiting from early schooling, the better-off children could benefit even more from the situation.

On the level of European Union countries, the data from the recent PIRLS study (Mullis et al., 2003), concerning the reading skills of pupils in primary education, can be called upon to support the debate. It does not concern longitudinal data allowing a response to the statement formulated in the Communication. However, the context questionnaires used in this study allow correlational analyses between the reading results and the length of participation in pre-school education. On average, for the EU countries who participated in the study, no correlation is observed (or rather a slightly negative one, -0.14) between the proportion of children having attended pre-school education for more than two years and the average primary reading results. However, the attendance of pre-school structures seems beneficial for the poorest performing, whilst the participation rate for children aged 4 years in pre-school education programmes (Eurydice, 2002, p.133) is positively correlated (0.41) to the rate of pupils reaching at least the 25th percentile in reading (Sources: Mullis et al., 2003, Eurydice, 2002).

The weakness of the Commission's rationale should not, however, makes us forget the important of pre-school education. Above all, it raises the question of the state of research on the long-term benefits of pre-school education in the countries of the European Union.

Furthermore, the recommendations of the Commission would benefit from integrating the policies already implemented by Member States. For this reason, the examination of the education and training of young children before the age of mandatory schooling carried out for

the OECD (2001), including 9 countries from the European Union⁴, indicates converging policy tendencies. First of all, the report notes a tendency towards an extension of services so that all children have at least two years of free subsidised services before mandatory schooling. A centralisation of financial measures at this level, as proposed by the Commission, will no doubt only reinforce the current policies, to the detriment of obligatory schooling for which too few measures are proposed by the Commission.

The OECD report (2001) states that current concerns involve above all the quality of services, due to a lack of coherence of policies and services with regard to education and training of young children, the lack of training of certain staff and the tendency for low-income families to have worse services.

More than a prioritisation of resources, on the level of pre-school education, more efficiency must without doubt be sought via the coordination of policies and services, and to implement measures available for initial and further training of staff, for the improvement of the status and salaries of staff and for better services for the most disadvantaged children, especially through working with families. The definition of framework documents and pedagogic objectives centred on the overall development of the child must allow the setting of standards and the assessment of their achievements for a better control of the systems of education and childhood services, thus guarding against decentralised measures which place no limits on variations in access and quality of services. Finally, it indicates the necessity of an international harmonisation of data collection concerning this level of education.

The need to invest in favour of children from disadvantaged families as a priority is well known. However, this observation calls for a reflection on the method of helping the poorest populations the best without stigmatising or blaming them when, despite the help given, the anticipated results are not achieved. Priority education policies can in fact sometimes turn out to be disappointing, for many reasons, not least because in reality they do not always have the means on the ground which they are given in principle. This may be because, in particular, the most experienced teachers are assigned elsewhere or choose establishments attended by less needy children. Another handicap in the area of priority education arises mainly from the absence of serious assessments taking into account both the problems upstream (targeting the audience, definition and selection of programmes, allocation of human and material resources etc.) and the manner in which these actions are implemented on the ground (Salvin & Fashola, 1998; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1998).

4 Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Czech Republic, United Kingdom, Sweden.

Recommendations:

The data on which the communication is based, in particular the Cunha, Heckman, Lochner and Masterov text (2005) does not offer sufficiently robust elements, in particular in the European context, to indicate with certainty, as the Commission appears to believe, that financial effort must be concentrated in pre-school education. More research on pre-school education is necessary on an EU level, in particular in the domain of early and targeted actions in order to identify the practices which produce the expected effects.

The recommendation to concentrate the available means on disadvantaged pupils seems better supported, but programmes still need to be put in place which avoid negative labelling effects for selected children or their separation from other pupils, which further reinforces the effects of segregation.

From the pre-school level, social diversity of classes and establishments must be ensured in order to avoid a differentiation of curricula and expectations.

3. Primary and secondary education

The Commission's communication reserves a relatively limited space for the study of effectiveness and equity in the area of mandatory schooling. However, mandatory schooling must be subject to complete vigilance of decision-makers, to the extent that, firstly, some children, and in particular those from disadvantaged backgrounds, effectively only have access to mandatory schooling and, secondly, that research has shown that different pedagogic structures and practices can produce different results both in terms of effectiveness and equity (Mullis et al., 2003, 2004a, 2004b).

On the level of primary education, the Commission does not mention any specific analysis and does not set out any particular measure. However, data from international studies shows that countries can already largely diverge, both in terms of average output and social inequalities, gender inequalities or the proportion of pupils attaining a certain threshold of skill, from the primary level.

In this respect, one could place the cumulative and multiplying model of acquired skills proposed by the Commission alongside a cumulative and multiplying model of inequalities. Therefore, for example, the specific effect of the social environment on school productivity, which may be slight at the start of schooling, and on a one-year scale, is progressively incorporated at the school level, which will be the main ingredient for the progression on the ulterior level. In other words, the social inequalities which are in place on one level will have a perennial effect, via the school level achieved at the start of the following year (Duru-Bellat, 2003).

However, research in education sciences (Demeuse, Crahay & Monseur, 2001, 2005, Crahay, 2000, Demeuse & Baye, not yet published) has shown how much educational structures can reinforce these inequalities on all school levels, since all the explicit or implicit selection mechanisms, established or not countered by the systems, can produce this effect.

On the level of implicit mechanisms, let us take a look at the regrouping of pupils in homogenous classes. If this practice may be favourable to the most competent pupils, it

seriously harms the worst performing students. It places the latter in conditions which are often less favourable, both in terms of work climate and expectations from teachers, but equally in terms of time devoted effectively to learning. However, this concerns factors of pedagogic effectiveness (Scheerens, 2000). What underperforming pupils would gain from the generalisation of heterogeneous classes is twice as important as what the stronger pupils would lose. Heterogeneity of classes therefore appears to be the most effective solution to maximise the progress of the underperforming pupils without proportionally burdening the progress of the strongest pupils (Crahay, 2000, Duru-Bellat, 2003).

Certain EU Member States are also characterised by major differences between establishments. Often, these establishments are far more unequal than the pupils that they take in (Coleman, 1966, OCDE, 2004, Grisay, 2006). A market of more and more diversified establishments is a vector for social segregation. And yet, the results of the international assessment PISA 2000 indicate that the overall majority of top performing countries in reading show a large degree of homogeneity of performances between establishments (OECD, 2005), which shows that it is important to pursue the objectives of equality and effectiveness simultaneously at this level.

One example of an explicit mechanism generating social inequalities is the practice of holding pupils back a year, still possible from the primary level and more so on the secondary level in certain Member States (Eurydice, 2005). In his synthesis on social failure, Crahay (1996) demonstrated that this practice was not only ineffective, since it did not allow pupils to make up for their being held back, but also unfair in the sense that it is marked on a social and gender basis.

Other structural mechanisms may reinforce the inequalities at certain key moments of the educational system: all transitions (between two levels of education, two courses, two options etc.) are susceptible to reinforcing disparities between pupils (Boudon, 1973). In particular, the regular accumulation of inequalities seems to mark an acceleration at the time of the passage from primary to lower secondary school (Sammons, 1995, Duru-Bellat, 2002), to such an extent that in two years, as many social inequalities are created as during the entire primary education (Duru-Bellat, 2003). With courses and options, pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds are offered more concrete programmes. With these programmes, teachers are more concerned with motivation than with content, and they have less ambitious expectations of the pupils, a situation which may risk creating negative portrayals and “self-fulfilling prophecies” or a “Pygmalion effect” (Rosenthal et Jacobson, 1971).

The Commission has put forward the ineffective and unequal character of the creation of early courses. In fact, research in education sciences confirms that a long period of a common-core syllabus before any selection appears less selective socially (Crahay, 2000, OCDE, 2005) and avoids the trap of “segregated democratisation”, denounced by Merle (2000). To ensure the success of all pupils requires stopping a multi-speed system in which certain pupils are led to pursue a valued education which others, having accumulated setbacks, are “reoriented” towards different special schools or courses. This also raises the problem of the assessment of courses, school orientation and the place of specialist teaching, organised separately, rather than integrated into an ordinary system⁵.

5 Even if specialised education organised in different establishments only involves relatively few pupils (on average 2%), the recourse to this type of organisation varies strongly (from 0.5% to around 5%), depending on the educational systems considered (Eurydice, 2005; Baye, Demeuse, Monseur, & Goffin, 2006).

Aside from Scandinavian countries, who have adopted voluntary policies leading to both great effectiveness and great equality in cognitive results, let us take a look at the recent example of Poland, which has profoundly changed its educational structures and has notably lengthened the common-core syllabus, which has resulted in a reduction of social inequalities in performances at 15 years, whilst raising the average level (OECD 2004).

If all the implicit and explicit differentiations have the effect of producing inequality, and often ineffectiveness, it is in particular because they involve the choice of unequally informed parents, unequally equipped to support their children and unequally capable of investing financially in their schooling. The moments when children choose their courses and the different levels in schooling are also moments of (self) selection, socially differentiated depending on the schools, pupils and their parents. In the discussion on effectiveness and equality, the Commission does not get involved with strategies of positioning families depending on their social contexts. However, family strategies must be taken into account to avoid a waste of talents.

In this respect, the Commission's structural proposal, which pleads for a combination of local autonomy and central responsibility, must be handled with a lot of prudence. In fact, "each time that the possibilities of choice are introduced, they are used above all by well-off families, in particular to ensure that their child is well educated amongst their peers, in a school which is not too heterogeneous socially or ethnically." (Duru-Bellat, 2003, p. 60). More autonomy may therefore lead to unequal strategic choices, depending on the quality of user information, or the forms of family self-selection.

The proposal to increase local autonomy may also be called into question by an international comparison of school results. These do not show a net relation between more autonomy for establishments and better performances from pupils (Duru-Bellat, 2003, OCDE, 2004). Furthermore, the superiority of results from autonomous and private establishment can largely be attributed to the socio-economic composition of their public (OECD, 2005). On the other hand, the reinforcement of local autonomy may favour geographic disparities, offering optimal conditions so that a differentiated offer of unevenly prestigious courses, options and establishments becomes more marked.

The Commission makes few recommendations regarding effective and equitable structures and teaching practices. It identifies a single structural mechanism which is both ineffective and inequitable: premature differentiation on a subject basis. Education systems are complex systems, in which the players have a tendency to seize any strategic opportunity (Demeuse, Crahay & Monseur, 2001, 2005). These natural mechanisms, which are highly understandable, particularly in discriminating systems where nobody wants to be on the wrong side of the education barrier, must be taken into account as a whole to promote efficacy and equity in the education system. It is therefore imperative to take note of all implicit and explicit differentiation mechanisms, and to anticipate players' strategies, in order to propose effective solutions.

To identify actual good practices, it is important to identify accurately the conditions in which these practices are effective, both in order to increase the average level of apprenticeships and to reduce the disparities between pupils and limit failures for the weakest pupils. It is useful to study protocols that allow identification of practices and conditions for generalisation thereof, involving specialists in research and education methods. To do this, the Commission should support research in this field, including analysing practices in the sector, by direct observation in a real context, and evaluating the results of these practices. This support also entails assistance to distribute these practices.

Recommendations:

Analysing education systems and the impact of one or other form of organisation is a difficult job that requires access to and processing of huge amounts of data. Most often, there is not one isolated parameter, but a set of parameters that must be identified. To obtain a result, it is therefore generally necessary to work on several dimensions at once, otherwise the system runs a severe risk of adapting to the new situation with no notable improvement (e.g. prohibiting the resitting of years can accentuate selectivity in the most prestigious subjects or an increase of interest in specialist education).

Factors affecting teaching efficiency, apart from those linked to school structures, are even less well understood and research focusing on classroom practices by means of direct observation should be supported and encouraged.

The equity objectives must also be used to limit discrepancies between the weakest and the strongest in order to allow all pupils, including the weakest, to master basic skills considered essential to lead a worthwhile and active life as a citizen and not merely as a worker. With regard to compulsory education, the equality of results is therefore the aim, not merely equalisation of opportunities for children in the school system. Contrary to the implications of the Commission's Communication, it is therefore not sufficient to invest in the early years (pre-school) in order to place all young people on the same starting line and give them equal chances. The different levels of support from which each pupil may benefit at home, throughout his/her school career, and the sometimes very unequal nature of the education provided, during compulsory schooling, are clear evidence of the need to monitor all school careers, particularly at moments of choice or orientation, so that these do not become mechanisms of selection.

4. Higher education

The observations presented in the Commission's preparatory working document (SEC(2006) 1096) indicate rightly that the increase in higher education has not been accompanied by a democratization of this level of education: young people from underprivileged families are still clearly disadvantaged in terms of equality of access and consequently achievement of corresponding qualifications. Furthermore, those going on to higher education do not choose the most profitable subjects, and have a tendency to give up more quickly if they fail. This situation is harmful both in terms of efficacy and equity, as there is a waste of talent, the latter determined by individuals' independent characteristics.

Given that mass higher education is a relatively recent phenomenon, this observation may appear logical, in that it is more privileged families who continue to be best placed when access to a level of education traditionally reserved for the elite is generalized. However, even without taking into account the recent nature of the increase in higher-education staff, this phenomenon is coherent with regard to other levels of education: the most prestigious subjects, options or establishments are selected and in turn largely select a favoured public. This level of education is however designated, more than others, as inequitable, by virtue of the inequitable distribution of collective financial resources that it mobilizes. The rationale is simple: the overall scenario contributes to an educational good of which the most privileged are the greatest beneficiaries. The unfair nature of this situation is countered only if one takes into account the positive externalities that the most qualified produce, especially in terms of innovation and productivity. This observation may be made, *mutatis mutandis*, for secondary education, but here the personal contribution of the beneficiaries of the system is envisaged as a means of making the system

more equitable. This can effectively justify itself more than other levels, if one takes into account the unequal division of their relative costs (cf. EGREES, 2005, p. 175).

If the observations of the Commission can be largely shared, the solutions proposed must be questioned. In effect, the generalization of the rights of enrolment, and measures helping the neediest in the form of loans, risk making higher education even more unequal. The rights of enrolment introduce market mechanisms to higher education (SEC(2006) 1096, p. 25). They should at the same time introduce a healthy pressure to the heart of the system, pressure leading to greater quality of teaching and greater motivation to success on the part of pupils (increase in attendance at lesson, reduction in failure rate). On the one hand, as the Commission recognizes, the data are not fully sufficient, with regard to countries of the European Union, to support these arguments, and, on the other hand, this method could have the inverse consequences. Therefore, the countries of Northern Europe, which traditionally use the system of loans in higher education, have observed that students preferred not to have to finance their studies with paid work. Student work has a tendency to prolong studying length, which leads these countries to increase grants (Eurydice, 1999).

Bayenet and Demeulemeester (2005), in their review of the literature concerning public finance policies with regard to higher education in the countries of the OECD, cite three arguments for preferring the grant system to the loan and enrolment-right system: i) the non-existence of studies on the effects of these policies in terms of choice of programmes and length of studies, ii) the difficulty in determining the incidence of reimbursement obligations and iii) the example of countries in Northern Europe faced with the results of a policy favouring loans.

Recommendations:

As for pre-school education, the Commission's analysis seems generally acceptable with regard to the "diagnosis" element. Higher education, with its growth should benefit from greater financing than it currently receives. However, the favoured solution does not seem to present guarantees of success that one would expect from an in-depth reform of financing. The central idea, to increase private financial participation (owing to, as mentioned right at the beginning of the Communication, a context of restriction of public spending), does not seem to offer any guarantee of equality of access for a certain number of reasons that the Commission itself mentions. One can therefore only raise questions at this part of the Communication and hope for a more solid document.

5. Vocational education and training

The Commission groups into the same section vocation education and training, whether provided in the context of secondary education or training programmes for adults. This unconventional grouping is interesting, as it recognises the need to improve the quality of all training directly linked to the labour market. In effect, the Commission recognizes that some vocational training skips certain subjects, and that we are dealing with vocational education organized at a secondary level which does not ensure access to employment and further training, or with programmes for adults aimed at those with few qualifications.

To improve the situation, the Commission proposes two steps, the first being a reinforcement of the partnerships between the public and private sectors and the social partners and the second being the adaptation of training programmes to employers' needs. If the dialogue between the labour market and the sector of vocational education and training must be reinforced, we should

be under no illusions that this collaboration might guarantee greater efficacy of the education and training systems. Therefore, an excessively strong adaptation of training programmes to the occasional requirements of the labour market could lead, in a recession, to a severe discrepancy between the specific skills acquired and the new requirements of the labour market. Furthermore, the Commission underlines the difficulty in persuading the private sector to finance vocational training, as the latter has no direct link to the needs of the company concerned. In effect, excessively general training or training allowing attainment of levels with no direct relationship with the jobs carried out may lead workers to take advantage of the new skills acquired to leave the employer who has financed them for other companies that are more generous from a salary point of view, but less generous in terms of training. This reflection makes a case for the public sector to preserve an important role in the sphere of the social promotion of workers, especially those without much training, so as to allow the acquisition both of general skills, not directly linked to the work posts held, and skills allowing the acquisition of a better position on the labour market.

Recommendations:

Both public and private partners should cooperate to define needs, develop and finance programmes, while preserving the final decisions on programme content and access for the public authorities. This will avoid the emergence of “ad hoc” training, exclusively reflecting the short-term needs of companies. The speed of change in the labour market requires training to equip people with general and adaptable competences, allowing them to benefit from lifelong learning.

To avoid the redundancy or under-valuing of competences acquired during working life, the recognition of experience gained on-the-job should also be improved. This is not to promote competition with qualifications earned through formal (usually initial) training, but to allow people to benefit from their real experiences in both working and non-working life.

Public investment should focus on the most disadvantaged target groups, as they are the ones who benefit least from continuing training, either because they lack the basic competences required to exploit the opportunities, or because they are unable to access training during their working life, being outside the world of work or confined to low-skill activity areas.

6. Actions by the European Union

International cooperation by the countries of the European Union is essential. By virtue of their common destiny, it is in these countries’ interest to work together to establish the objectives to be attained and the methods to be used to evaluate if they have been achieved. With regard to the methods to be implemented to achieve these objectives, the Commission recommends an exchange of good practices, and recognises the specific responsibility of Member States. It would be illusory to imagine that identical methods would produce identical results in different historic, cultural, economic and educational contexts. The assessment of promising practices must deal not only with their efficiency and their capacity to increase equity, but also with the conditions of transferring or generalising them in other contexts.

The Commission sees, in the improvement of efficacy and equity of education systems, a source of mobility of people. It is not clear whether mobility will be extended as a corollary result or as an intended objective of the Commission’s Communication. If it is an objective, it seems appropriate to ask: From what kind of mobility will people benefit? A mobility alleviating the

problems of regional employment without resolving them? Mobility centred on jobs? On exchanges between citizens? In any event, questions can be asked with regard to the added value of an investment centred on an objective of mobility. It seems more important to underline the added value of an investment centred on the development of basic skills of all citizens, including as a priority disadvantaged citizens and those with few qualifications. On the other hand, we must reflect on mobility conditions with regard to students and rethink the fair allocation of exchange grants as well as the amounts thereof, as the latter do not allow equitable access to training in other Member States. Without rebalancing, the gap between well-off and mobile students and underprivileged and therefore less mobile students will widen, all the more so as mobility is important for employment. The establishment of centres of excellence with regard to education and training, rather than a universal service, accessible throughout the European Union, if not coupled with assistance properly in proportion to the costs generated by this mobility, will lead at the same time to a reinforcement of regional disparities and discrepancies between individuals on the basis of their own resources

The Commission concludes that the priority is to provide equity and efficiency in European education systems. The introductory remarks concerning the precision required in defining these concepts are extremely resonant here. The culture of assessment and exchanges must be developed to reach these objectives. The Commission calls for this culture only in the field of pre-school education, whereas it should be provided for at every level of education. Education and training must be conceived as a coherent combination in close interaction with other major economic and social sectors. Wider policies aimed at reducing inequalities in living conditions and financial security are required to increase equality of opportunity (Shavit and Blossfeld, 1993). Coherency of policies and the evaluation thereof must therefore be looked into. With regard to policy evaluation, work already carried out under the aegis of the Commission (regarding for example the EURYDICE network, NESSE⁶, EGREES) must be developed. An ambitious and multilingual policy for developing the results of European research into education science must be set up. While the economy of education is a relatively structured discipline sharing largely common methods, the same does not apply to social sciences, where national and international financing is generally modest. It is important to support the development of a cumulative approach, especially by establishing or sustaining the development of European research centres concerning education and the dispersion of knowledge in the field, from an interdisciplinary perspective.

6 Network of experts in Social Sciences of Education and training (<http://www.nesse.fr>).

Bibliography

- Ball, S. J., and Gewirtz, S., "Education Markets, School Competition, and Parental Choice in the UK: A Report of Research Findings", *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 5 (2), pp. 152-158, 1996.
- Ball, S. J., and Gewirtz, S., 'Girls in the Education Market: choice, competition and complexity', *Gender and Education*, 9 (2), pp. 207-222, 1996.
- Ball, S. J., Bowe, R., and Gewirtz, S., "School choice, social class and distinction: the realisation of social advantage in education", *Journal of Education Policy*, 11 (1), pp. 89-112, 1996.
- Ball, S.J., and Van Zanten, A., "Logique de marché et éthique contextualisées dans les systèmes scolaires français et britannique", *Éducation et sociétés*, 1, pp. 47-71, 1998.
- Ballion, R., "Les stratégies scolaires", in J. C. Ruano-Borbalan (Éd.), *Eduquer et former*, Auxerre, Editions Sciences humaines (entretien avec R. Ballion, Sciences Humaines, n°10, octobre 1991), 1998.
- Barnett, S., "Long term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes", in *The future of children*, Los Altos (CA), The David and Lucile Packard Foundation. 5(3), 1995.
- Baudelot, C., and Establet, R., *Le niveau monte. Réfutation d'une vieille idée concernant la prétendue décadence de nos écoles*, Paris, Seuil, 1989.
- Baye, A., Banadusi, L., Bottani, N., et al., *L'équité des systèmes éducatifs européens. Un ensemble d'indicateurs*, Liège, Service de Pédagogie expérimentale et théorique de l'Université, 2005.
- Baye, A., Banadusi, L., Bottani, N., *Equity in European Educational Systems. A set of indicators*, Liège, Service de Pédagogie expérimentale et théorique de l'Université (152 pages), 2005.
- Baye, A., Benadusi, L., Bottani, N., et al., "Equity in European Education Systems. A set of indicators", *European Educational Research Journal*, 4(2), 2005.
- Baye, A., Demeuse, M., Monseur, C., et al., *Un ensemble d'indicateurs pour mesurer l'équité des vingt-cinq systèmes éducatifs de l'Union européenne*, Bruxelles, Rapport remis à la Commission européenne, Direction générale Education et Culture, 2005.
- Bayenet B., and Demeulemeester, J.-L., "Politiques publiques de financement de l'enseignement supérieur: une tentative d'évaluation", In M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.-H. Straetent et al., *Efficacité et équité des systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, Coll. "Economie, société, région", 2005.
- Beaton, A., Martin, M., Mullis, I., et al., *Science Achievement in the Middle School Years: IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)*, Chestnut Hill, MA, Boston College, 1996.
- Beaton, A., Mullis, I., Martin, M., et al., *Mathematics Achievement in the Middle School Years: IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)*, Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, 1996.
- Beckers, J., "Les politiques scolaires de l'égalité dans l'enseignement", in D. Grootaers (Éd.), *Histoire de l'enseignement en Belgique*, Bruxelles, Editions du Centre de Recherche et d'Information socio-politiques (CRISP), pp. 302-371, 1998.
- Behar, D., Estebe, P., and Epstein, R., "Les détours de l'égalité, remarques sur la territorialisation des politiques sociales en France.", *Revue française des affaires sociales*, 4, 1998.
- Bell, D., "On meritocracy and equality", in J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (Eds), *Power and ideology in education*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Benson, C.S., and O'Halloran, K., "The economic history of school finance in the United States", *Journal of Education Finance*, 72, pp. 495-515, 1987.
- Berthelot, J.M., *Ecole, orientation, société*, Paris: PUF, 1993.
- Bidou-Zachariasen, C., "La prise en compte de «l'effet de territoire» dans l'analyse des quartiers urbains", *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXVIII-1, pp. 97-117, 1997.
- Billiet, C. and Nizet, J., "L'égalité des chances ou la grande illusion", *La Revue Nouvelle*, Bruxelles, 9, pp. 145-154, 1974.

- Birlein, L.A., *Controversial Issues in Educational Policy*, Newbury Park (CA), Sage, 1993.
- Birzea, C., *La pédagogie du succès*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Collection «L'éducateur», 1982.
- Bloom, B.S., *Human Characteristics and School Learning*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Borman, G.D., and D'Agostino, J.V., "Title I and Student Achievement: A meta-Analysis of Federal Evaluation Results", *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(4), pp. 309-326, 1996.
- Borman, G.D., and D'Agostino, J.V., "Title I and Student Achievement: A Quantitative Synthesis, in G.D. Borman, S.C. Stringfield & R. Slavin (Eds), *Title I. Compensatory Education at the Crossroads*. Mahwah (USA), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Bottani, N., and Benadusi, L., (a cura di) *Uguaglianza e equità nella scuola*, Gardolo, Erikson, 2006.
- Boudon, R., *L'inégalité des chances. La mobilité sociale dans les sociétés industrielles*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1973.
- Boudon, R., and Bourricaud, F., *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, Quadrige, 1982.
- Boudon, R., Bulle, N., Cherkaoui, M. (Eds.), *Ecole et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, 2001.
- Bourdieu, P., "L'école conservatrice. L'inégalité sociale devant l'école et devant la culture", *Revue Française de sociologie*, 3, pp. 325-347, 1996.
- Bourdieu, P., "Avenir de classe et causalité du probable", *Revue française de sociologie*, XV, pp. 3-42, 1974.
- Bourdieu, P., *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1979.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. C., *Les héritiers. Les étudiants et la culture*, Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1966.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J. C., and Chamboredon, J. C., *La reproduction. Eléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*, Paris, Editions de Minuit, Collection «Le sens commun», 1970.
- Bouveau, P., "Les ZEP et la Ville: l'évolution d'une politique scolaire", in A. Van Zanten (Éd.), *La scolarisation dans les milieux «difficiles»*, Politiques, processus et pratiques, Paris, INRP, 1998.
- Bouveau, P., "L'efficacité des systèmes éducatifs. ZEP: le miracle se fait attendre", *Sociétal*, 26, pp. 62-65, 1999.
- Bouveau, P., and Rochex, J. Y., *Les ZEP, entre école et société*, Paris, CNDP-Hachette Éducation, 1997.
- Boyd, W.L., "The power of paradigms: reconceptualizing educational policy and management", *Education Administration Quarterly*, 28, pp. 504-528, 1992.
- Bressoux, P., "Les effets du contexte scolaire sur les acquisitions des élèves: effet-école et effets-classes en lecture", *Revue française de Sociologie*, 36(2), pp. 273-294, 1995.
- Bressoux, P., Coustere, P., and Leroy-Audouin, C., "Les modèles multi-niveaux dans l'analyse écologique: le cas de la recherche en éducation", *Revue française de Sociologie*, 38(1), pp. 67-96, 1997.
- Brinbaum, Y., and Duru-Bellat, M., *La méritocratie scolaire, une idéologie partagée?*, 2^e congrès de l'AFS, Bordeaux, 5-8 septembre 2006, "Dire le monde social. Les sociologues face aux discours politiques, économiques et médiatiques", France, 8 p., 09/2006.
- Brizard, A., Comparaison des performances des élèves scolarisés en ZEP et hors ZEP, *Éducation et formations*, 41, pp. 39-42, 1995.
- Broccolichi, S., and Van Zanten, A., "Espace de concurrence et circuits de scolarisation, L'évitement des collèges publics d'un district de la banlieue parisienne", *Les annales de la recherche urbaine*, n°75, 1997.
- Broccolichi, S., "Orientations et ségrégations nouvelles dans l'enseignement secondaire", *Sociétés contemporaines*, 21, 1995.

- Cabitsis, S., Fusulier, B., Stegen, P., et al., *Prolongation de la scolarité obligatoire: 10 ans après*, recherche effectuée à la demande du Ministre Philippe Mahoux, chargé de l'Éducation, Université catholique de Louvain, Université libre de Bruxelles et Université de Liège, 1994.
- Caille, J.P., "Les entrants en sixième, comparaison des panels de 1980 et 1989", *Note d'information*, n°91, 1991.
- Caille, J.P., and Vallet, L.-A., "Les carrières scolaires au collège des élèves étrangers ou issus de l'immigration", *Éducation et formations*, n°40, 1995.
- Calves, G., "L'affirmative action dans la tradition juridique américaine", in C. Daniel et C. Le Clainche (Éds), *Définir les inégalités: des principes de justice à leur représentation sociale*, Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité, DREES-MIRE, 2000.
- Caroli, E., Les fonctions du système éducatif vues par les économistes: quelques conceptions fondatrices, *Éducation et Formations*, 35, 53-60, 1993.
- Carroll, J.B., Research in Education: Where Do We Stand? *Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin*, 5(3), pp. 2-7, 1960.
- Carroll, J.B., A Model of School Learning, *Teachers College Record*, 64, pp. 723-733, 1963.
- Carter, L.F., The Sustaining Effects Study of Compensatory and Elementary Education, *Educational Researcher*, 13(7), pp. 4-13, 1984.
- Castro, M., A Carcassonne: Périmètre scolaire à la carte, *Le Monde de l'Éducation*, pp. 32-33, octobre 1996.
- Central Advisory Council for Education, *Children and Their Primary Schools. A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, Volume 1: The Report*, London, England, Department of Education and Science, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967a.
- Central Advisory Council for Education, *Children and Their Primary Schools. A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, Volume 2: Research and Surveys*, London, England, Department of Education and Science, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967b.
- CERI, *Mesurer le capital humain: Vers une comptabilité du savoir acquis*, Paris, Organisation de Coopération et de développement, Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement, 1996.
- CERI, *L'investissement dans le capital humain. Une comparaison internationale*, Paris, Organisation de Coopération et de développement, Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement, 1998.
- Chambon, A., Proux, M., Zones d'éducation prioritaires: un changement social en éducation? *Revue française de pédagogie*, 83, 31-38, 1988.
- Chapelle, G., Meuret, D. (éd.), *Améliorer l'école*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, coll. «Apprendre», 2006.
- Charlot, B., "La territorialisation des politiques éducatives: une politique nationale", in B. Charlot (Éd.), *L'école et le territoire: nouveaux aspects, nouveaux enjeux*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1994.
- Charlot, B., "Ce qui se pense dans les Zones d'éducation prioritaires: analyse de demandes de financement", In B. Charlot (Éd.), *L'école et le territoire: nouveaux aspects, nouveaux enjeux*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1994.
- Charlot, B. (Éd.), *L'école et le territoire: nouveaux aspects, nouveaux enjeux*, Paris, Armand Colin.
- Charpentier, L., "L'arrêt Kalanke. Expression du discours dualiste de l'égalité", *Revue trimestrielle de droit européen*, 32(2), 281-303, 1996.
- Chauveau, G., *Comment réussir en ZEP. Vers des zones d'excellence pédagogique*, Paris, Retz, 2000.
- Chauveau, G., "Qu'est-ce qu'une Zone d'Éducation Prioritaire? L'exemple français", in *Actes des journées internationales de réflexion et d'échanges sur le programme d'éducation prioritaire «PEP»*, Hammamet Tunisie, 22-24 mars 2001, Ministère de l'éducation, Centre national d'Innovation pédagogique et de Recherches en Éducation et UNICEF, 42-45, 2001.
- Chauveau, G., and Rogovas-Chauveau, E., *A l'école des banlieues*, Paris, ESF éditeur, 1995.

- Chauveau, G., and Rogovas-Chauveau, E., "Equipe et stratégies éducatives dans les ZEP", in A. Van Zanten (Éd.), *La scolarisation dans les milieux «difficiles», Politiques, processus et pratiques*, Paris, INRP, 1997.
- Cherkaoui, M., "Modèles de démocratie et types d'école", in R. Boudon, N. Bulle, M. Cherkaoui (Éds), *École et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie* Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, pp. 17-37, 2001.
- Chubb, J.E., Moe, T.M., *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1990.
- Clary, F., "Discrimination positive: la controverse intellectuelle", *Revue française d'études américaines*, 81, pp. 25-45, 1999.
- Coeffic, N., "Amélioration des carrières scolaires au collège, mais maintien d'orientations différenciées en fin de troisième", *INSEE, Données sociale*, 1996.
- Coleman, J.S., "Equal schools or equal students?" *The Public Interest*, 4, pp. 70-75, 1966.
- Coleman, J.S., "Toward open schools", *The Public Interest*, 4, pp. 20-27, 1967.
- Coleman, J.S., "The concept of equality of educational opportunity", *Harvard Educational Review*, 38(1), pp. 7-37, 1968.
- Coleman, J.S., "Equality of Opportunity and Equality of Results", *Harvard Educational Review*, 43(1), 129-137, 1973.
- Commission européenne, *Livre blanc sur l'éducation et la formation. Enseigner et apprendre. Vers la société cognitive*, Luxembourg, Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes, 1995.
- Commission européenne, *Rapport européen sur la qualité de l'éducation scolaire. Seize indicateurs de qualité. Rapport établi sur la base des travaux du groupe de travail "Indicateurs de qualité"*, Bruxelles, Commission européenne, Direction générale de l'éducation et de la culture, 2000.
- Coq, G., "La démocratie condamne-t-elle l'école à la crise?", in R. Boudon, N. Bulle, M. Cherkaoui (Éds), *École et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, pp. 57-77, 2001.
- Coulton, C. J., and Pandey, S., "Geographic concentration of poverty and risk to children in urban neighborhoods". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35(3), 238-257, 1992.
- Courgeau, D., and Baccaini, B., "Analyse multi-niveaux en sciences sociales", *Population*, 52(4), pp. 831-864, 1997.
- Cousin, O., "L'effet établissement. Construction d'une problématique", *Revue française de sociologie*, 34(3), pp. 395-419, 1993.
- Crahay, M., *Peut-on lutter contre l'échec scolaire?*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 1996.
- Crahay, M., *L'école peut-elle être juste et efficace? De l'égalité des chances à l'égalité des acquis*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 2000.
- Crane, J., "The epidemic theory of ghettos and neighborhood effects on dropping out and teenage chilbearing", *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(5), pp. 1226-59, 1991.
- Cribb, A. and Gewirtz, S., "Towards a sociology of just practices: an analysis of plural conceptions of justice", in Vincent, C. (ed.) *Social Justice, Education and Identity*, London, Routledge Falmer, 2003.
- Crittenden, B., "Equality and education. In J.V. D'Cruz and P.J. Sheehan (Eds), *The renewal of Australian schools: A changing perspective in educational planning*, Hawthorn, Vic., Australian Council for Educational Research, 1978.
- Cronbach, L.J., "How can instruction be adapted to individual differences?" in R.M. Gagne (Ed.), *Learning and Individual Differences*, Columbus (Ohio), C.E. Merrill, pp. 23-39, 1967.
- Cronbach, L.J., and Snow, R.E., *Aptitudes and Instructional Methods*, New York, Irvington Publisher, 1977.
- Cuvier, C., "La nouvelle carte de l'éducation prioritaire: une construction rationalisée", *Éducation et formation*, 61, pp. 41-59, 2001.

- Dal, L., Dupierreux, J.M., Guyot, J.L., et al., *Étude prospective de la population étudiante des universités de la Communauté française de Belgique*, Bruxelles, Document de synthèse, Projet FNRS N° 24564.90, 1994.
- Damas, M., "Les défis de l'enseignement de masse. Le collège unique", in P. Tronquoy (Éd.), *Le système éducatif*, Paris, La Documentation française, 1998.
- Damay, L., Entre discrimination positive et stigmatisation, *La revue nouvelle*, 1, 58-69, 2002.
- Darling, N., and Steinberg, L., "Community influence on adolescent achievement and deviance", in J. Brooks-Gunn, G.J. Duncan & J. L. Aber (Eds), *Neighborhood Poverty, Vol. 2, Policy Implications in Studying Neighborhoods*, New-York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.
- Dauphin, N., Waltenberg, F.D., Bodson, X, et al., *Recherche sur la mobilité des élèves en cours de scolarité primaire en Communauté française Wallonie-Bruxelles. Rapport final*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Université catholique de Louvain, Groupe interfacultaire de Recherche sur les Systèmes d'Éducation et de Formation, Rapport non publié, 2002.
- De Jong, R. Demeuse, M., Denooz, R, et al., *Effective School Improvement Programmes in the UK and the USA. A re-analysis of school improvement programmes*, Groningen, the Netherlands, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Gronings instituut voor onderzoek van onderwijs, opvoeding en ontwikkeling, 2001.
- de Landsheere, V., *Faire réussir, faire échouer. La compétence minimale et son évaluation*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1998.
- De Schutter, O., "Egalité et différence: le débat constitutionnel sur la discrimination positive aux Etats-Unis", *Revue trimestrielle des Droits de l'Homme*, 7, pp. 347-368, 1991.
- Delvaux, B., "L'échec scolaire en Belgique", *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol 21, n° 2/3, pp. 161-198, 1998.
- Demeuse, M., "Capital humain, niveau d'instruction et performances scolaires. Des concepts à leur mesure", in *Capital humain et croissance régionale. Quatorzième Congrès des Economistes belges de Langue française*, Charleroi, Centre interuniversitaire de Formation permanente, pp. 27-57, 2000.
- Demeuse, M., "Mesurer le capital humain: qu'y a-t-il dans la «boîte noire»?", in D. De La Croix, F Docquier, C. Mainguet, et al., *Capital humain et dualisme sur le marché du travail*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, Collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 239-258., 2002.
- Demeuse, M., "A Set of Equity Indicators of the European Education Systems. A synthesis", in L. Moreno Herrera and G. Francia (eds), *Educational Policies. Implications for Equity, Equality and Equivalence*, Örebro, Sweden, Örebro University, Reports from the Department of Education, 2004.
- Demeuse, M., "La marche vers l'équité en Belgique francophone", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formatio*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 191-216, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., and Baye, A., "Pourquoi parler d'équité?", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 150-170, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., and Baye, A., (sous presse) "Els indicadores d'equitat en els sistemes educatius. Eines per a l'avaluació de les desigualtats educatives", in Fundación Europea Sociedad y Educación, *Libertad, Calidad Y Equidad En Los Sistemas Educativos (Buenas prácticas internacionales)*, Madrid, Ed. Comunidad de Madrid y Fundación Europea Sociedad y Educación.
- Demeuse, M., Baye, A., (sous presse) "Measuring and Comparing the Equity of Education Systems in Europe", In N. Soguel & P. Jaccard (eds.), *Educational Systems and the Challenge of Improving Results: Explaining and Enhancing Performance and Equity*, Dordrecht, Springer.
- Demeuse, M., Baye, A., Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", 627 p., 2005.

- Demeuse, M., Baye, A., Straeten, et al., "Equidade dos sistemas educativos europeus. Síntese e propósito da construção de um conjunto de indicadores de equidade", *Revista de Estudos Curriculares*, 2(2), 2004.
- Demeuse, M., Baye, A., Straeten, M.H., et al., "Introduction", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds). (2005), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 5-12, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., Crahay, M., and Monseur, C., "Efficiency and Equity", in W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane, N. Bottani, in *Pursuit of Equity in Education, Using international indicators to compare equity policies*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp. 65-91, 2001.
- Demeuse, M., Crahay, M., and Monseur, C., "Efficacité et équité dans les systèmes éducatifs. Les deux faces d'une même pièce?", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 391-410, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., Crépin, F., Jehin, M., et al., "Behind the Positive Discrimination in French Community of Belgium: Central Criteria vs. Local Actions", in L. Moreno Herrera G. Jones & J. Rantala (eds), *Enacting Equity in Education. Towards a Comparison of Equitable Practices in Different European Local Context.*, University of Helsinki, Research Centre for Social Studies Education, pp. 59-79, 2006.
- Demeuse, M., and Denooz, R., "De l'accroissement de l'efficacité des pratiques éducatives: le cas du programme "Success for All" mis en œuvre par Robert Slavin", *Cahiers du Service de Pédagogie expérimentale*, 7-8, pp. 103-127, 2001.
- Demeuse, M., and Lafontaine, D., "L'orientation scolaire en Communauté française de Belgique", *Revue internationale d'éducation Sèvres*, 38, 35-51, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., Lafontaine, D., and Straeten, M.H., "Parcours scolaire et inégalités de résultats", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 260-273, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., and Mainguet, C., "Chapitre 9 - Enseignement", in B. Merenne, H. Van Der Haegen et E. Van Hecke, *La Belgique - Diversité territoriale. Atlas du Recensement général de la population de 1991*, Bruxelles, Crédit communal de Belgique, 202, pp. 66-72, 1997.
- Demeuse, M., Matoul, A., Schillings, P., et al., "De quelle efficacité parle-t-on?", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 15-27, 2005.
- Demeuse, M., and Monseur, C., "Analyse critique des indicateurs déterminant l'attribution des moyens destinés à la politique de discrimination positive en Communauté française de Belgique", *Mesure et évaluation en éducation*, 22(2-3), 97-127, 1999.
- Demeuse, M., and Nicaise, J., "Discriminations et actions positives, politiques d'éducation prioritaire... : vers une rupture de l'égalité formelle en matière d'éducation", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 233-257, 2005.
- Derouet, J. L., *Ecole et Justice. De l'égalité des chances aux compromis locaux*, Paris, Métailié, 1992.
- Desjardins, R., Rubenson, K., and Milana, M. *Unequal chances to participate in adult learning: international perspective*, Paris, UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, Fundamentals of Educational Planning, 2006.
- Dias da Graça, P., *Décentralisation, partenariat et carte scolaire: le cas français*, Paris, UNESCO, Institut international de planification de l'éducation, 1998.
- Direction de la Programmation et du Développement, "Les zones d'éducation prioritaires en 1997-98", *Note d'information n°98.15*, Paris, Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, de la Recherche et de la Technologie, Direction de la Programmation et du Développement, 1998.
- Donni, O., and Orban, V., *Les inégalités sociales à l'université. Le cas de la Communauté française de Belgique*, Liège, Cahier du CREPP 95/05, 1995.

- Dubet F., and Duru-Bellat M., "Déclassement. Quand l'ascenseur social descend", *Quotidien Le Monde*, 22, 24/01/2006.
- Dubet, F., *L'école des chances. Qu'est-ce qu'une école juste?*, Paris, Seuil, La république des idées, 2006.
- Dubet, F., and Duru-Bellat, M., "Qu'est-ce qu'une école juste?" *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 146, pp. 105-114, 2004.
- Duru, M., and Mingat, A., "La gestion de l'hétérogénéité des publics d'élèves au collège", *Cahiers de l'IREDU*, 1997.
- Duru-Bellat, M., "Peut-on diminuer les inégalités sociales à l'école?", in G. Chapelle & D. Meuret (éd.), *Améliorer l'école*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, coll. "Apprendre", pp. 25-36, 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Henriot-Van Zanten, A., *Sociologie de l'école*, Paris, Armand Collin, 1992.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Mingat, A., "Le déroulement de la scolarité au collège: le contexte fait des différences", *Revue Française de Sociologie*, XXIX, pp. 649-666, 1988.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *Effet de l'origine sociale des élèves sur les résultats en lecture d'après PISA*, 10/2005.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *Recent advances in sociology of education research: which facts for which theories?* ECSR Conference "Comparative European Studies: Assessing ten years of sociological research 1995-2005", Paris, 25-26 November 2005, France, 3 p., 11/2005.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *The role and theoretical relevance of study choices in explaining social inequalities of educational outcomes*, Start-Up Workshop of the EDUC Research Theme of the 6th EU Framework Network of Excellence "Economic Change, Quality of Life & Social Cohesion (EQUALSOC)", Mannheim Centre for European Social Research, Dec. 2-3, Germany, 13 p., 12/2005.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *Le fonctionnement de l'orientation. Genèse des inégalités sociales à l'école*, Neuchâtel, Delachaux & Niestlé, 1988.
- Duru-Bellat, M., "L'adaptation des enseignements. Les inégalités sociales à l'école: les théories sociologiques à l'épreuve des faits", in P. Tronquoy (Éd.), *Le système éducatif*, Paris, La Documentation française, 1998.
- Duru-Bellat, M., "Les inégalités face à l'école en Europe: l'éclairage des comparaisons internationales.", in A. Van Zanten (Éd.), *L'école. L'état des savoirs*, pp. 322-329, 2000.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *Les inégalités sociales à l'école. Genèses et mythes*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, coll. "Education et Formation", 2002.
- Duru-Bellat, M., "Ecole et égalité des chances", in *Le Dictionnaire des Sciences Humaines*, 1376 p., 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *Etudes et emploi: des bénéfiques "micro" aux incertitudes "macro"...* *Diversité Ville-École-Intégration*, 146, pp. 35-41, 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., *L'inflation scolaire: Les désillusions de la méritocratie*, Paris, Seuil, coll. "La république des idées", 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Giret, J.-F., "De quelques effets pervers de l'expansion scolaire", *Débat dans Formation-Emploi*, N°95, pp. 89-96, 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., Jarousse, J.P., and Mingat, A., "Les scolarités de la maternelle au lycée", *Revue française de sociologie*, 34(1), pp. 43-60, 1993.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Kieffer, A., "La démocratisation de l'enseignement en France: polémiques autour d'une question d'actualité", *Population*, 55(1), 51-80, 2000.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Kieffer, A., "Les deux faces – objective/subjective – de la mobilité sociale", *Sociologie du Travail* 48(4), pp. 455-473, 2006.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Mingat, A., "Le déroulement de la scolarité au collège: le contexte fait des différences". *Revue française de sociologie*, 29, pp. 649-666, 1988.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Mingat, A., "Constitution des classes de niveau dans les collèges. Les effets pervers d'une pratique à visée égalisatrice", *Revue française de Sociologie*, 38(4), pp. 759-789, 1997.

- Duru-Bellat, M., Mons, N., and Suchaut, B. "Organisation scolaire et inégalités sociales de performances. Les enseignements de l'enquête PISA", *Education & formations*, 70, pp. 123-131, 2004.
- Duru-Bellat, M., and Suchaut, B. "Organisation and Context, Efficiency and Equity of Educational Systems: what PISA tells us", *European Educational Research Journal* 4(3), 1pp. 81-194, 2005.
- Duru-Bellat; M., Mons, N., and Suchaut, B., *Caractéristiques des systèmes éducatifs et compétences des jeunes de 15 ans: l'éclairage des comparaisons entre pays*, Dijon, IREDU, 2004.
- Edmonds, R., "A black response to Christopher Jencks' inequality and certain other issues", *Harvard Educational Review*, 43(1), pp. 76-91, 1973.
- Elley, W.B. (Ed.), *How in the World do Students Read?*, Hamburg, Grindelbruck GMBH, 1992.
- Emin, J.C., "Une autre politique de discrimination positive: la politique anglaise des Education Action Zones", *Éducation et formation*, 61, pp. 33-38, 2001.
- Entwisle, D.R., Alexander, K.L., and Steffel-Olson, L., "The gender gap in math: its possible origins in neighbourhood effects", *American Sociological Review*, 59, pp. 822-838, 1994.
- Erikson, R., and Goldthorpe, J.H., "Commonality and variation in social fluidity in industrial nations: I. A model for evaluating the 'FJH-hypothesis' ", *European Sociological Review*, 3, pp. 54-77, 1987a.
- Erikson, R., and Goldthorpe, J.H., "Commonality and variation in social fluidity in industrial nations: II. A model of core social fluidity applied", *European Sociological Review*, 3, pp. 145-166, 1987b.
- Erikson, R., and Goldthorpe, J.H., "The class schema of the CASMIN Project", Provisional draft. CASMIN Conference, Guenzburg, Federal Republic of Germany, March 1988.
- Erikson, R., Goldthorpe, J.H., and Portocarero, L., "Intergenerational class mobility in three Western European societies: England, France and Sweden", *British Journal of Sociology*, 30, pp. 415-451, 1979.
- Erikson, R., Goldthorpe, J.H., and Portocarero, L., "Social fluidity in industrial nations: England, France and Sweden", *British Journal of Sociology*, 33, pp. 1-34, 1982.
- Erikson, R., Goldthorpe, J.H., and Portocarero, L., "International class mobility and the convergence thesis England, France and Sweden", *British Journal of Sociology*, 34, pp. 303-343, 1983.
- Esquieu, P., "L'orientation des élèves au sein de l'enseignement secondaire depuis vingt ans", *Éducation et formations*, 48, 1996.
- Euriat, M., "Au service de l'égalité des chances, des outils pour une répartition inégale des moyens", *Administration et éducation*, 58, pp. 41-52, 1993.
- Euriat, M., and Thelot, C., "Le recrutement social de l'élite scolaire en France. Evolution des inégalités de 1950 à 1990", *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXVI, 3, pp. 403-438, 1995.
- European Group for Research on Equity in Educational Systems⁷, "Equity in European Educational Systems: a set of indicators", *European Educational Research Journal*, Volume 4 Number 2, pp. 1-151, 2005.
- Eurybase - *The information database on education systems in Europe*, Brussels: European Commission, http://www.eurydice.org/portal/page/portal/Eurydice/DB_Eurybase_Home
- Eurydice, *L'enseignement secondaire dans l'Union européenne: structures, organisation et administration*, Bruxelles, Commission européenne, 1997.
- Eurydice, *Questions clés de l'éducation en Europe. Volume 2. Le financement et la gestion des ressources dans l'enseignement obligatoire. Évolution des politiques nationales*, Bruxelles, Commission européenne, 2000.
- Evans, W. N., Oates, W. E., Schwab, et al., "Measuring peer groups effects: a study of teen age behaviour", *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(5), pp. 966-991, 1992.
- Fashola, O.S., and Slavin, R.E., "Promising programs for elementary and middle schools: Evidence of effectiveness and replicability", *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 2, pp. 251-307, 1997.

⁷ Référence collective (20 auteurs européens issus de 6 institutions universitaires de 5 pays).

- Felouzis, G., Liot, F., and Perroton, J., *L'apartheid scolaire. Enquête sur la ségrégation ethnique dans les collèges*, Paris, Seuil, 2005.
- Filp, J., *Increasing and improving the quality of basic education (Monograph No. 9). The 900 Schools Programme: improving the quality of primary schools in impoverished areas of Chile*, Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO, 1993.
- Fischer, C.S., Hout, M., Jankowski, M.S., et al., *Inequality by Design. Cracking the Bell Curve Myth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Fitoussi, J.P., and Rosanvallon, P., *Le nouvel âge des inégalités*, Paris, Seuil, 1996.
- Fitz-Gibbon, F., "Measuring value added in schools", In *Education and training statistics* (Conference Papers), London, Imac Research, 1995.
- Forquin, J. C., "La sociologie des inégalités d'éducation: principales orientations, principaux résultats depuis 1965 - 1", *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 48, pp. 90-100, 1982a.
- Forquin, J. C., "La sociologie des inégalités d'éducation: principales orientations, principaux résultats depuis 1965 - 2", *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 49, pp. 77-92, 1982b.
- Forse, M., "L'évolution des inégalités des chances sociales et scolaires en France au cours des quinze dernières années", in R. Boudon, N. Bulle et M. Cherkaoui (Eds), *Ecole et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, 2001.
- Fowler, F.C., "School choice policy in France: Success and limitations", *Educational Policy*, 6, pp. 429-443, 1992.
- Gamoran, A., and Mare, R. D., Secondary school tracking and educational inequality: Compensation, reinforcement, or neutrality? *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp. 1146-1183, 1989.
- Garcia-Huidobro, J.E., "Positive discrimination in education: its justification and a Chilean example", *International Review of Education*, 40(3-5), 209-221, 1994.
- Gewirtz, S., "Choice, Competition and Equity: Lessons from Research in the UK", *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11 (3), pp. 205-228, 1996.
- Gewirtz, S., "Conceptualizing social justice in education: mapping the territory", *Journal of Education Policy*, 13, (4), pp. 469-484, 1998.
- Gewirtz, S., "Post-Welfarist Schooling: A Social Justice Audit", *Education and Social Justice*, 1: 52-64, 1998.
- Gewirtz, S., "Social Justice, New Labour and the Reconstruction of English Schooling", in Lewis, G., Gewirtz, S. and Clarke, J. (eds.), *Rethinking Social Policy*, London, SAGE, 2000.
- Gewirtz, S., "Rethinking Social Justice: a conceptual analysis", In Demaine, J. (ed.) *Sociology of Education Today*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2001.
- Gewirtz, S., "Equity in Education - what counts as success?", in L. Moreno Herrera and G Francia, G. (eds), *Educational Policies: Implications for equity, equality and equivalence*, Orebro, Orebro University Department of Education, pp. 25-40, 2004.
- Gewirtz, S., "Towards a contextualized analysis of social justice in education. Educational Philosophy and Theory", *Special Issue on Iris Marion Young*, 38 (1), pp. 69-81, 2006.
- Gewirtz, S., and Cribb, A., "Plural conceptions of social justice: implications for policy sociology", *Journal of Education Policy*, 17 (5): pp. 499-509, 2002.
- Gewirtz, S., Ball, S., Bowe, R., *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1995.
- Gibson, A., and Meuret, D., "The Development of Indicators on Equity in Education", *Measuring the Quality of Schools*, Paris, OECD, CERI, 1995.
- Glasman, D., *L'école réinventée? Le partenariat dans les Zones d'éducation prioritaires*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1992.
- Goldthorpe, J. H., *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1980.

- Goldthorpe, J. H., "Class analysis and the reorientation of class theory: the case of persisting differentials in education attainment", *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(3), pp. 481-505, 1996.
- Goldthorpe, J.H., Payne, C., and Llewellyn, C., "Trends in class modality", *Sociology*, 12, pp. 441-468, 1978.
- Gordon, E.W., "Toward defining equality of educational opportunity", in F. Mosteller and D.P. Moynihan (Eds), *On equality of educational opportunity*, New York, Random House, 1972.
- Gould-Ellen, I., Austin-Turner, M., "Does neighborhood matter? Assessing recent evidence", *Housing Policy Debate*, 8(4), pp. 833-866, 1997.
- Goux, D., and Maurin, E., "Démocratisation de l'école et persistance des inégalités", *Economie et statistique*, 306, 27-39, 1997.
- Green, A., Preston, J., and Janmaat, J.G., *Education, Equality and social Cohesion. A Comparative Analysis*, New York:, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Grisay, A., "Quels indicateurs pour quelle réduction des inégalités scolaires?", *Revue de la Direction générale de l'Organisation des Etudes*, Bruxelles, 9, 3-14, 1984a.
- Grisay, A., "Les mirages de l'évaluation scolaire (1). Rendement en français, notes et échecs à l'école primaire?", *Revue de la Direction générale de l'Organisation des Etudes*, Bruxelles, XIX, 5, 29-42, 1984b.
- Grisay, A., *Examens et échecs dans l'enseignement fondamental. Une recherche-action sur les pratiques d'évaluation-bilan de cinquante écoles primaires en Communauté française de Belgique*, Liège, Service de Pédagogie expérimentale, 1992.
- Grisay, A., *Le fonctionnement des collèges et ses effets sur les élèves de sixième et de cinquième*, Paris, Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, Direction de l'Évaluation et de la Prospective, Les Dossiers Éducation et Formation. 32, 1993.
- Grisay, A., "Comment mesurer l'effet des systèmes scolaires sur les inégalités entre élèves?", in D. Meuret (Éd.), *La justice du système éducatif*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 1999.
- Grisay, A., "Evaluer des dispositifs de prise en charge d'élèves faibles (ou forts): l'utilisation de groupes naturels entraîne des artefacts", *Cahiers du Service de Pédagogie expérimentale*, 7-8, pp. 129-151, 2001.
- Grisay, A., "Que savons-nous de l'«effet établissement»?", in G. Chapelle, & D. Meuret (Eds.), *Améliorer l'école*, pp. 215-230, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2006.
- Grissmer, D., Flanagan, A., *Making Title 1 more effective: Lessons from recent research*, Rand Corporation, 1998.
- Grootaers, D., "Cent cinquante ans d'instruction publique à la poursuite de l'intégration sociale et de la promotion individuelle", in D. Grootaers (Éd.), *Histoire de l'enseignement en Belgique*, Bruxelles: Editions du Centre de recherche et d'information socio-politiques (CRISP). 86-108, 1998.
- Groux; D., Helmchen; J., and Flitner, El., *L'école comparée. Regards croisés franco-allemands*, Paris, l'Harmattan, 491 p., 2006.
- Guillarme, B., Philosophie de l'égalitarisme, *Philosophie politique*, 7, pp. 97-118, 1995.
- Guttman, C., *All Children Can Learn: Chile's 900 Schools Programme for the Underprivileged. Education for All: Making It Work*, Paris, Unesco, 1993.
- Hallak, J. *A qui profite l'école?*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Economie en liberté, 1974.
- Hallak, J., *La mise en place de politiques éducatives: rôle et méthodologie de la carte scolaire*, Bruxelles/Paris, Editions Labor / Fernand Nathan / Les presses de l'Unesco, 1976.
- Halsey, A.H. (Éd.), *Educational priority, Volume I : EPA problems and policies*, London: HMSO, 1972.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L., "Does Educational Tracking Affect Performance and Inequality. Differences-In-Differences Evidence across Countries", *CESifo Working Paper n° 1415*, 2005.
- Henig, J.R., *Rethinking School Choice. Limits of the Market Metaphor*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press, 1994.

- Henriot-Van Zantem, A., *L'école et l'espace local. Les enjeux des Zones d'éducation prioritaires*, Lyon, Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 1990.
- Henriot-Van Zanten, A., "Les ressources du local. Innovation éducative et changement social dans les ZEP", *Revue française de pédagogie*, 83, pp. 23-30, 1988.
- Henriot-Van Zanten, A., "Les politiques éducatives locales entre l'Etat et le marché", *Société française*, 106, 1994.
- Henriot-Van Zanten, A., "Ecole: la nouvelle donne", in J. C. Ruano-Borbalan (Éd.), *Eduquer et former*, Auxerre, Editions Sciences humaines, 1997.
- Herpin, N., "Exclusion sociale et pauvreté. L'Urban Underclass chez les sociologues américains", *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXIV, pp. 421-439, 1993.
- Hickox, M., Lyon, E.S., "Vocationalism and Schooling: the British and Swedish experience compared.", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19(1), 1998.
- Hirschhorn, M., "Consumérisme scolaire et démocratie", in R. Boudon, N. Bulle, M. Cherkaoui (Eds), *Ecole et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, 2001.
- Hodson, G., "Do schools make a difference?", in D. M. Levine & M. J. Bane (Eds.), *The Inequality Controversy : Schooling and Distributive Justice*, New York, 1973.
- Hogan, D., Kitagawa, E.M., "The impact of social status, family structure, and neighbourhoods on the fertility of black adolescents", *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(4), pp. 825-55, 1985.
- Hohl, J., "Les politiques scolaires à l'égard des milieux défavorisés et l'émergence d'un nouveau monde de production pédagogique", *Sociologie et sociétés*, XII, 1, pp. 133-153, 1980.
- Husén, T., and Postlewaite, T.N. (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education*, London, Pergamon Press, Second Edition, 1994.
- Husén, T., *Social background and educational career*, Center Educational Research and Innovation, traduction française: *Origine sociale et éducation*, Paris, OCDE, 1972a.
- Husén, T., *Origine sociale et éducation. Perspectives et recherches sur l'égalité devant l'éducation*, Paris, OCDE, 1972b.
- Husén, T., *Social Background and Educational Career*, Paris, OCDE, 1972c.
- Husén, T., *Social influences on educational attainment*, traduction française: *Influence du milieu social sur la réussite scolaire. Perspectives des recherches sur l'égalité devant l'éducation*, Paris, OCDE, CERI, 1975a.
- Husén, T., *Influence du milieu social sur la réussite scolaire*, Paris, OCDE-CERI, 1975b.
- Husén, T., *Social Influences on Educational Attainment*, Paris, OCDE, 1975c.
- Hutmacher W., Cochrane., D., and Bottani, N. (Eds), *In pursuit of equity in education. Using international indicators to compare equity policies*, Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- Hutmacher, W., *L'échec de la lutte contre l'échec scolaire dans l'enseignement primaire genevois. Eléments statistiques pour un bilan*, document inédit, Genève, Service de la Recherche Sociologique, 1991.
- Hutmacher, W., "L'école peut-elle se considérer comme partie du problème de l'échec?", in B. Pierrehumbert (Ed.), *Echec à l'école. Echec de l'école*, Neuchâtel, Suisse, Delachaux et Niestlé, pp. 43-48, 1992.
- Hutmacher, W., *Quand la réalité résiste à la lutte contre l'échec scolaire. Analyse du redoublement dans l'enseignement primaire genevois*, Genève, Service de la Recherche sociologique, Cahier n° 36, 1993.
- Hutmacher, W., Cochrane, D., Bottani, N. (Eds), *In Pursuit of Equity in Education. Using international indicators to compare equity policies*, Dordrecht / Boston / London, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Isambert-Jamati, V., "Quelques rappels de l'émergence de l'échec scolaire comme problème social dans les milieux pédagogiques français", in E. Plaisance (Éd.), *Echec scolaire, nouveaux débats, nouvelles approches sociologiques*, Paris, Editions du CNRS, 1985.

- Isambert-Jamati, V., "Les choix éducatifs dans les Zones d'éducation prioritaires", *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXI(1), pp. 75-100, 1990.
- Jackson, G. B., "The research evidence on the effects of grade retention", *Review of Educational Research*, 45(4), pp. 613-635, 1975.
- James, E., "The Netherlands: Benefits and costs of privatized public services – lessons from the Dutch educational system", in G. Walford (Éd.), *Private Schools in Ten Countries, Policy and practice*, London and New-York, Routledge, pp. 179-199, 1989.
- Jarousse, J.P., and Leroy-Audouin, C., "Les nouveaux outils d'évaluation: quel intérêt pour l'analyse des «effets-classe»?", in J. Bourdon, C. Thélot (Éds), *Éducation et formation. L'apport de la recherche aux politiques éducatives*, Paris, CNRS Éditions, pp. 163-185, 1999.
- Jencks, C., "Inequality in Retrospect", *Harvard Educational Review*, 43(1), pp. 138-164, 1973.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., et al., *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*, New York, Basic Book, 1972. Traduction française: Jencks, C., *L'inégalité: influence de la famille et de l'école en Amérique*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1979.
- Jenks, C., and Mayer, S.E., "The social consequences of growing up in a poor neighbourhood: a review", in M. Mc Geary & L. Lynn, *Concentrated Urban Poverty in America*, Washington DC, National Academy, pp. 111-186, 1990a.
- Jencks, C., and Mayer, S.E., "Residential segregation, job proximity, and black job opportunities", in M. Mc Geary & L. Lynn, *Concentrated Urban Poverty in America*, Washington DC, National Academy, 2, pp. 187-222, 1990b.
- Jennings, J.F., "Title I: Its Legislative History and Its Promise", in G.D. Borman, S.C. Stringfield and R. Slavin (Eds), *Title I. Compensatory Education at the Crossroads*, Mahwah, USA, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Kallen, D., "L'autonomie de l'école aux Pays-Bas", *Politiques d'éducation et de formation. Analyses et comparaisons internationales*, 1, pp. 71-81, 2001.
- Karmel, P.H. (Éd.), *Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission*, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1973.
- Keeves, J.P., "Approaches to the goal of educational equality", in J.V. D'Cruz and P.J. Sheehan (Eds), *The renewal of Australian schools: A changing perspective in educational planning*, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australian Council for Educational Research, 1978.
- Kellerhals, J., Modak, M., and Perrenoud, D., *Le sentiment de justice dans les relations sociales*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1997.
- Kesteloot, C., De Turck, A., Vandermotten, C., et al., *Structures sociales et quartiers en difficulté dans les régions urbaines belges*, Bruxelles, Cabinet du ministre chargé de la politique des grandes villes, 2001.
- King, M., Preston, S.H., "Who lives with whom? Individual versus household measure", *Journal of Family History*, 15(2), pp. 117-132, 1990.
- Kirsch, I., de Jong, J., Lafontaine, D., et al., *Reading for Change. Performance and engagement across countries. Results from PISA 2000*, Paris, OECD, 2002.
- Kymlicka, W., *Les théories de la justice. Une introduction*, Paris, La Découverte/Poche, 2003.
- Lafontaine, *Performances en lecture et contexte éducatif. Enquête internationale menée auprès d'élèves de 9 et 14 ans*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, 1996.
- Lahire, B., *Culture écrite et inégalités scolaires*, Lyon, Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1993.
- Lamoure, J., "La scolarisation en France: de fortes inégalités régionales", *L'orientation scolaire et professionnelle*, 11(3), pp. 195-213, 1982.
- Lassalle, D., "La généralisation progressive du recueil de statistiques ethniques au Royaume-Uni", *Population*, 3, pp. 609-630, 1998.
- Leger, A., and Tripier, M., *Fuir ou construire l'école populaire?*, Paris, Méridiens-Klincksieck, 1986.

- Leloup, X., *La ségrégation résidentielle. Le cas d'une commune bruxelloise*, Paris, L'Harmattan, Villes et Entreprises, 1999.
- Lemaire, S., "Que deviennent les bacheliers après leur bac", *Note d'information* 98.05, Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, de la Recherche et de la Technologie, Direction de la Programmation et du Développement, 1998.
- Levasseur, J., *La politique des Zones d'éducation prioritaires de 1981 à 1985*, Paris, Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, 1986.
- Levin, H.M., "The economics of choice in education", *Economics of Education Review*, 10, pp. 137-158, 1991.
- Levin, J.R., *Learner differences: Diagnosis and Prescription*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.
- Levy, Liensol, Meuret, D., et al., "Disparités entre collèges publics. Analyse d'ensemble", *Éducation et formations. Dossiers et documents*, 1983.
- Liebman, J.S., "Voice, not choice", *The Yale Law Journal*, 101, pp. 259-314, 1991.
- Liensol, B., & Oeuvarard, F., "Le fonctionnement des Zones d'éducation prioritaires et les activités pédagogiques des établissements", *Éducation et Formations*, 32, 1992.
- Litt, J. L., *Origine sociale et scolarité, les processus générateurs d'inégalité scolaire: analyse longitudinale d'une cohorte d'élèves de la province de Luxembourg*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Université catholique de Louvain, 1980.
- Lorcerie, F., "La "modernisation" de l'Éducation nationale et "le partenariat", *Migrants-Formation*, 85, pp. 49-67, 1991.
- Louis-Etxedo, D., "La hiérarchisation sociale des lycées", *Revue française de pédagogie*, 124, pp. 55-68, 1998.
- Madaus, G.F., & Kellaghan, T., *Examination systems in the European Community: Implications for a national examination system in the United States (I-100)*, Contractor Report for the Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC, March 27, 1991.
- Mainguet, C., and Demeuse, M., *Scolarisation, niveau d'instruction et insertion professionnelle - Monographie du Recensement général de la population de 1991*, Bruxelles, Institut national de Statistique, 1998.
- Maroy, C. (éd.), *Ecole, régulation et marché. Une comparaison de six espaces scolaires locaux en Europe*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, coll. "Éducation et société", 2006.
- Marpsat, M., "La modélisation des "effets de quartier" aux Etats-Unis. Une revue des travaux récents", *Population*, 54(2), pp. 303-329, 1999.
- Martin, M., and Kelly, D. (Eds), *TIMSS. Technical Report. Volume I: Design and development*, Chesnut Hill, Massachusetts, Boston College, 1996.
- Martin, M., and Kelly, D. (Eds), *TIMSS. Technical Report. Volume II: Implementation and analysis*, Chesnut Hill, Massachusetts, Boston College, 1997.
- Martin, M., Mullis, I., Gonzalez, E., et al., *School contexts for learning and instruction. IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study*, Chesnut Hill, Massachusetts, Boston College, 1999.
- Martucelli, D., "Les contradictions politiques du multiculturalisme", in M. Wieviorka (Éd.), *Une société fragmentée? Le multiculturalisme en débat*, Paris, La Découverte, 1996.
- McDill, E.L., & Natriello, G., "History and Promise of Assessment and Accountability in Title I", in G.D. Borman, S.C. Stringfield & R.E. Slavin, *Title I. Compensatory Education at the Crossroads*, Mahwah (N.J.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Merle, P., *Sociologie de l'évaluation scolaire*, Paris, PUF, Coll. «Que sais-je?», 1998.
- Merle, P., "Le concept de démocratisation de l'institution scolaire : une typologie et sa mise à l'épreuve", *Population*, 55(1), pp. 15-50, 2000.

- Merliè, D., Proteal, L., & Soulié, C., *De la profession du responsable à l'origine sociale des élèves*. Paris, Maison des sciences de l'Homme, mai, 1997.
- Mesliand, C., "Les Zones d'éducation prioritaires: évolution et perspectives", *Savoir*, 8(2), 1996.
- Meuret, D., "L'efficacité de la politique des zones d'éducation prioritaires dans les collèges", *Revue française de pédagogie*, 109, pp. 41-64, 1994.
- Meuret, D., "Inégalités scolaires et environnement: ampleur et origine des inégalités sociales devant l'école", in P. Bouveau (ed), *Enseigner en ZEP, quelles perspectives pour quelles formations?* CRDP Nord-Pas-de-Calais, 1998.
- Meuret, D., "La justice du système éducatif", Paris, Bruxelles, De Boeck & Larcier, 1999.
- Meuret, D., "L'équité en éducation selon les théories de la justice", in A. Alcouffe, B. Fourcade, J.M. Plassard & G. Tahar, *Efficacité versus équité en économie sociale. Tome I - XXèmes Journées de l'Association d'Economie Sociale*, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp. 237-247, 2000a.
- Meuret, D., "Les politiques de discrimination positive en France et à l'étranger", in A. Van Zanten (Éd.), *L'école. L'état des savoirs*, Paris, Editions la Découverte, pp. 112-129, 2000b.
- Meuret, D., "A system of Equity Indicators for Educational Systems", in W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane & N. Bottani (Eds). *In Pursuit of Equity in Education. Using international indicators to compare equity policies*, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001a.
- Meuret, D., "School Equity as a Matter of Justice", in W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane, N. Bottani (Eds), *In Pursuit of Equity in Education. Using international indicators to compare equity policies*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 93-111, 2001b.
- Meuret, D., "Les Charter schools: un compromis d'avenir?" *Politiques d'éducation et de formation. Analyse et comparaisons internationales*, 1, 97-105, 2001c.
- Meuret, D., *Les recherches sur la réduction de taille des classes. Rapport établi à la demande du Haut Conseil de l'Evaluation de l'Ecole*, Paris, Haut Conseil de l'Evaluation de l'Ecole, 2001d.
- Meuret, D., "Tentative de comparaison de l'équité des systèmes éducatifs français et américain", *Carrefours de l'éducation*, 13, pp. 126-151, 2002.
- Meuret, D., "La régulation par les résultats: pourquoi est-ce si choquant?" *Administration et éducation*, 98, pp. 57-66, 2003.
- Meuret, D., "La autonomía de los centros escolares y su regulación", *Revista de Educacion*, 333, pp. 11-39, 2004a.
- Meuret, D., "La régulation de l'éducation en France et dans les pays anglo-saxons. Une comparaison", *Revue Suisse des Sciences de l'Education* 26 (1), pp. 33-52, 2004b.
- Meuret, D., "French and U.S. Modes of Educational Regulation Facing Modernity", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 12 (1), pp. 285-312, 2005.
- Meuret, D., "Valutare l'equità dei sistemi scolastici", in N. Bottani, & L. Benadusi (a cura di), *Uguaglianza e equità nella scuola*, Gardolo, Erikson, pp. 39-62, 2006.
- Meuret, D., and Duru-Bellat, M., "English and French Modes of Regulation of the Education System: a comparison" *Comparative Education* 39 (4), pp. 463-477, 2003.
- Meuret, D., and Morlaix, S., "Conditions of success of a school's self-evaluation: some lessons of an European Experience," *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 14 (1), pp. 53-71, 2003.
- Meuret, D., and Morlaix, S., "L'influence de l'origine sociale sur les performances scolaires: par où passe-t-elle?" *Revue Française de Sociologie* 47(1), pp. 49-79, 2006.
- Michel, A., "L'école en quête d'équité", *Administration et éducation*, 81, pp. 73-87, 1999.
- Miller, T.C., "Conceptualizing inequality", in M. Guttentag & S. Saar, *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, Volume 2, pp. 334-349, 1977.
- Mingat, A., "Evaluation analytique d'une action ZEP au cours préparatoire", *Cahiers de l'IREDU*, 37, 1983.

- Mingat, A., Richard, M., *Evaluation des activités de rééducation GAPP à l'école primaire*, Dijon, IREDU, 1990.
- Ministère de l'Éducation nationale – Direction des Études et de la Prospective, *Les Zones prioritaires, Les dossiers Éducation & Formations*, Paris, Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, 1986.
- Ministère de l'Éducation nationale – Direction des Études et de la Prospective, *L'évaluation des Zones d'éducation prioritaires. Description, typologie, fonctionnement, résultats. Les dossiers Éducation & Formations*, 14, 1992.
- Moisan, C., "Les ZEP: bientôt vingt ans", *Éducation et formation*, 61, pp. 13-22, 2001.
- Moisan, C., and Simon, J., *Les déterminants de la réussite scolaire en Zone d'éducation prioritaire*. Paris, INRP, 1997.
- Monseur, C., and Demeuse, M., "Quelques réflexions méthodologiques à propos des enquêtes internationales dans le domaine de l'éducation", *Politiques d'éducation et de formation. Analyses et comparaisons internationales*, 11, pp. 37-54, 2004.
- Monseur, C., and Demeuse, M., "Les évaluations externes permettent-elles une régulation efficace?" in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 499-517, 2005.
- More, R., "Back to the Future: the problem of change and the possibilities of advance in the sociology of education", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(2), pp. 145-161, 1996.
- Moreno Herrera, L., Jones, G., and Rantala, J. (eds), *Enacting Equity in Education. Towards a Comparison of Equitable Practices in Different European Local Contexts*, Helsinki, University of Helsinki, Research Center for Social Studies Education, 2006.
- Mosteller, F., and Moynihan, D.P. (Eds), *On equality of educational opportunity*, New York, Random House, 1972.
- Muglioni, J., "La république et l'école", *Philosophie politique*, 4, pp. 73-87, 1993.
- Mullin, S.P., and Summers, A.A., "Is more better? The effectiveness of spending on compensatory education", *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64, pp. 339-347, 1983.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Gonzales, E. J., et al., PIRLS 2001, *International Science Report*, IEA's Study of Reading Literacy Achievement in Primary Schools in 35 Countries, Chestnut Hill, MA, Boston College, 2004a.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Gonzales, E. J., et al., TIMSS 2003 *International Mathematics Report*, Findings From IEA's Trends in International, Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades, Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, 2004b.
- Munoz-Darde, V., *La justice sociale. Le libéralisme égalitaire de John Rawls*, Paris, Nathan Université, Collection 128, 2000.
- Murphy, J., *The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980's. Perception and Cases*, Berkeley, McCutchan, 1990.
- Neave, G., "Trends in research on the equality of educational opportunity", in M.D. Carelli and J.G. Morris (Eds), *Equality of opportunity reconsidered: Values in education for tomorrow: Proceedings of the Third European Colloquy for Directors of National research Institutions in Education*, Hamburg, September 1978, UNESCO / Swets and Zeitlinger, 1979.
- Nicaise, I. (ed.), *The Right to Learn. Educational strategies for socially excluded youth in Europe*. Bristol, University of Bristol, The Policy Press, 2000.
- Nicaise, J., Straeten, M.H., Baye, A., et al., "Comment développer un système d'indicateurs d'équité au niveau européen?", in M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, et al. (eds), *Vers une école juste et efficace. 26 contributions sur les systèmes d'enseignement et de formation*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Université, collection "Economie, Société, Région", pp. 337-353, 2005.
- Oakes, J., "The reproduction of inequity: The content of secondary school tracking", *Urban Review*, 14, pp. 107-120, 1982.

- Oakes, J., *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1985.
- OECD (year of reference). *Education at a Glance*. OECD Indicators, Paris, OECD.
- OECD, *School Factors Related to Quality and Equity. Results from Pisa 2000*, Paris, OECD, 2005.
- Osborn, M., Broadfoot, P., McNess, E., et al., Note critique: "A World of Difference? Comparing Learners Across Europe Maidenhead", Open University Press, 2003, XIV - 282 p., in *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 153,169-171, octobre-décembre 2005.
- Parsad, B., Heaviside, S., Williams, C., *Title I Migrant Education Program Summer Term Project, 1998*, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 2000.
- Paugam, S., "La construction d'un paradigme", in S. Paugam (Éd.), *L'exclusion. L'état des savoirs*. Paris, La découverte, 1996.
- Paugam, S. (Éd.), *L'exclusion. L'état des savoirs*, Paris, La Découverte, 1996.
- Paul, J.J., *Le redoublement: pour ou contre?*, Paris, ESF, coll. Pratiques et enjeux pédagogiques, 1997.
- Paul, J.J. (Éd.), *Administrer, gérer, évaluer les systèmes éducatifs. Une encyclopédie pour aujourd'hui*, Paris, ESF éditeur, 1999.
- Peignard, E., and Van Zanten, A., "L'adaptation des enseignements. Les zones d'éducation prioritaires", in P. Tronquoy (Éd.), *Le système éducatif*, Paris, La Documentation française, 1998.
- Perez, S., L. Porcher, L., et al. (sous la direction de Groux, D.), *Dictionnaire d'éducation comparée*, Paris, l'Harmattan, 436 p., 2003.
- Perrenoud, P., "De l'inégalité quotidienne devant le système d'enseignement. L'action pédagogique et la différence", *Revue européenne des sciences sociales*, XX, 63, pp. 87-142, 1982a.
- Perrenoud, P., "L'évaluation est-elle créatrice des inégalités de réussite scolaire?", *Cahiers du Service de la Recherche Sociologique* (août, 17), 1982b.
- Perrenoud, P., *La fabrication de l'excellence scolaire*, Genève, Droz, 1984.
- Perrot, J., "La carte scolaire. Un instrument efficace mais inégalitaire", *L'orientation scolaire et professionnelle*, 10(1), pp. 83-96, 1981.
- Persell, C., *Education and inequality: A theoretical and empirical synthesis*, New York, Free Press, 1977.
- Plassard, J.M., Rosolen, A., and Serandon, A., *Evaluation d'actions d'accompagnement scolaire, un exemple en ZEP à Toulouse*, Note 259 du LIRHE, Toulouse, 1997.
- Prost, A., *L'enseignement s'est-il démocratisé?* Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1986.
- Radica, K., "Taux plafonds" d'élèves en zones d'éducation prioritaires", *Education et Formations*, 41, pp. 31-38, 1995.
- Rawls, J., *Théorie de la justice*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, Collection «Essais», 1997.
- Renauld, B., "Les discriminations positives. Plus ou moins d'égalité?" *Revue trimestrielle des Droits de l'Homme*, 31. pp. 425-460, 1997.
- Rhein, C., Le Pape, A., and Grosbras, P.A., "Division sociale de l'espace et inégalités de scolarisation", *Rapport de recherche ministère de l'Équipement et du Logement*, 1996.
- Ritzen, J.M.M., Van Dommelen, J., and De Vijlder, F.J., "School finance and school choice in the Netherlands", *Economics of education review*, 16(3), pp. 329-335, 1997.
- Rochex, J. Y., "Les ZEP: un bilan décevant", in J. P. Terrail (Éd.), *La scolarisation de la France: critique de l'état de lieux*, Paris, La Dispute, 1997.
- Rosenbaum, J. E., *Making Inequality: The Hidden Curriculum of High School Tracking*, New York, Wiley, 1976.
- Rosenbaum, J.E., "Changing the geography of opportunity by expanding residential choice: lessons from the Gautreaux program", *Housing Policy Debate*, 6(1), pp. 231-269, 1995.

- Rosenthal, R., Jacobson, L., *Pygmalion in the classroom: teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Ross, K.N., *Social Area Indicators of Educational Need*, Hawthorn (Victoria), Australian Council for Educational Research, 1983.
- Ross, K.N., "The Measurement of Disadvantage", in Commonwealth Schools Commission (Eds) *Disadvantaged Schools Program Review Conference: Collected Papers*, Geelong (Victoria), Deakin Institute for Studies in Education, 1984.
- Ross, K.N., "The potential contribution of research to education policies for the poor in Asia", *Prospects*, XX(4), pp. 489-501, 1990.
- Ross, K.N., Farish, S., and Plunkett, M., *Indicators of Socio-economic Disadvantage for Australian Schools*, Geelong (Victoria), Deakin Institute for Studies in Education, 1988.
- Ross, K.N., Levacic, R., *Needs-Based Resource Allocation in Education via Formula Funding of Schools*, Paris, UNESCO Publishing, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1999.
- Rubenstein, M.C., & Wodatch, J.K., *Stepping up to the Challenge: Case Studies of Educational Improvement in Title I Secondary Schools*, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, 2000.
- Rychen, D.S., and Hersh Salganik, L. (Eds), *Defining and Selecting Key Competencies*, Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, 2001.
- Sabbagh, D., *L'égalité par le droit. Les paradoxes de la discrimination positive aux Etats-Unis*, Paris: Economica, coll. «Etudes politiques», 2003.
- Saunders, L., "A Brief History of Educational "Value Added": How Did We Get To Where We Are?" *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10(2), pp. 233-256, 1999.
- Scheerens, J., and Demeuse, M., "The theoretical basis of the effective school improvement model (ESI)", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Volume 16, Number 4, pp. 373-385, 2005.
- Sen, A., *Development as Freedom*, New York, Alfred Knopf Inc., 1999.
- Simon, P., "La statistique des origines. L'ethnicité et la «race» dans les recensements aux Etats-Unis, Canada et Grande-Bretagne", *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 26, pp. 11-14, 1997.
- Sinclair, B., and Carroll, J., *State ESEA Title I Participation Information for 1997-98. Final Summary Report*, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2000.
- Slavin, R. E., "Réussite pour tous. Une restructuration de l'enseignement fondamental", *Les cahiers du Service de Pédagogie expérimentale*, série "Réflexions et perspectives", 44, 1999.
- Slavin, R.E., "Making Chapter I make the difference", *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, pp. 110-119, 1987.
- Slavin, R.E., and Fashola, O.S. *Show Me the Evidence ! Proven and Promising Programs for America's Schools*, Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, 1998.
- Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Madden, N.A., *Effective programs for students at risk*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1989.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dy, L.J., et al., *Every child, every school. Success for all*, Thousand Oaks (Calif.), Corwin Press, 1996.
- Smeesters, B., "Discriminations positives: solution ou poison?" *Agenda Interculturel*, 163, pp. 4-11, 1998a.
- Smeesters, B., "Actions et discriminations positives", *Journal du Droit des Jeunes*, 175, pp. 3-8, 1998b.
- Stullich, S., and Donly, B., *Targeting Schools: Study of Title I Allocations Within School Districts*, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1999.
- Swanson, J.C., "Efficiency in Education", in L.C. Deighton (Éd.), *The Encyclopedia of Education*, MacMillan Company and Free Press, 1971.

- Tarrou, A.-L. H., "Inégalités dans une société égalitaire. Une recherche sur les enseignants issus de cultures différentes dans l'enseignement secondaire norvégien", *Politiques d'éducation et de formation. Analyses et comparaisons internationales*, 2, pp. 105-122, 2001.
- Tashjian, M., *Study of Local Agency Activities Under the Title I, Part D, Program. Program Profiles*, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, 2000.
- Terrail, J.P., *De l'inégalité scolaire*, Paris, La Dispute, 2002.
- Tesser, P., "A framework for educational priority routines", in G. Driessen and P. Jungbluth (Eds), *Educational opportunities*, Münster/New York, Waxmann, 1994.
- Thélot, C., *L'évaluation du système éducatif. Coûts, Fonctionnement, résultats*, Paris, Nathan Université, Série «éducation», 1993.
- Trancart, D., "L'évolution des disparités en collèges publics", *Revue française de pédagogie*, 124, pp. 43-59, 1998.
- Trancart, D., "L'enseignement public: les disparités dans l'offre d'enseignement", in A. Van Zanten (Éd.), *L'école. L'état des savoirs*, Paris, Editions la Découverte, pp. 54-62, 2000.
- Trimble, K. D., and Sinclair, R. L., "On the wrong track: Ability grouping and the threat to equity", *Equity and Excellence*, 23, pp. 15-21, 1987.
- Turnbull, B., Welsh, M., Heid, C., et al., *The Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance In Title I Schools. Interim Report to Congress*, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1999.
- Vallet, L.A., "La mesure des évolutions des inégalités sociales et scolaires en longue période", in R. Boudon, N. Bulle et M. Cherkaoui (Eds), *Ecole et société. Les paradoxes de la démocratie*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, Sociologies, 2001.
- Van Haecht, A., *L'enseignement rénové de l'origine à l'éclipse*, Bruxelles, Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1985.
- Van Haecht, A., *L'école des inégalités. Essai sur les politiques publiques d'éducation*, Mons, Editions Talus d'approche, Collection «libre choix», 2001.
- Van Parijs, P., *Qu'est-ce qu'une société juste? Introduction à la pratique de la philosophie politique*, Paris, Seuil, Collection «La couleur des idées», 1991.
- Van Parijs, P., *Sauver la solidarité*, Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1995.
- Van Zanten, A., "L'action éducative à l'échelon municipal: rapport aux valeurs, orientations et outils", in F. Cardi, A. Chambon (Eds), *Les métaphores de la formation. Alternance, partenariat, développement local*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1997.
- Van Zanten, A., *Les politiques d'éducation*, Paris, PUF. 126 p., 2004.
- Van Zanten, A. (Éd.), *La scolarisation dans les milieux «difficiles». Politiques, processus et pratiques*, Paris, INRP, 1997.
- Vandenbergh, V., "The Monetary Cost of Education in the Presence of Peer Effects", Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut de Recherches économiques et sociales, Université Catholique de Louvain, Discussion Paper 9921, 1999.
- Vandenbergh, V., *Functioning and regulation of educational quasi-markets*, Louvain-la-Neuve, CIACO, Nouvelle série N°283, Ph. D. Dissertation, 1996.
- Vandenbergh, V., Zachary, M.D., "Efficacité-équité dans l'enseignement: quel dilemme? Une comparaison inter-pays basée sur les données TIMSS, in A. Alcouffe, B. Fourcade, J.M. Plassard et al. *Efficacité versus équité en économie sociale. Tome I. XXèmes Journées de l'Association d'Economie Sociale*, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp. 213-224, 2000.
- Vander Gucht, D., "Les investissements éducatifs des familles en Communauté française", *Revue de l'Institut de sociologie. Université Libre de Bruxelles*, 3-4, pp. 223-274, 1995, publié en 1998.
- Vincent, C. (ed.) *Social Justice, Education and Identity*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

- Vinovskis, M.A., "Do federal compensatory education programs really work? A brief historical analysis of Title 1 and Head Start", *American Journal of Education*, p. 107, 1999.
- Vogel, J., "Les droits de l'Homme en procès. L'égalité des droits contre le droit à l'égalité", *La revue nouvelle*, 105(4), pp. 67-77, 1997.
- Wacquant, L., "Pour en finir avec le mythe des «cités-ghetto». Les différences entre la France et les Etats-Unis", *Annales de la recherche urbaine*, 54, 1992.
- Wacquant, L., "Three pernicious premises in the study of the American ghetto", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21/2, pp. 341-353, 1997.
- Walford, G. (Éd.), "School choice and the Quasi-Market", *Oxford Studies in Comparative Education*, 6(1), 1996.
- Walzer, M., *Sphères de justice*, Paris, Le Seuil, 1997.
- Wang, M.C. & al., *A national study of Title I Schoolwide programmes: A synopsis of interim findings*, Laboratory for student success, Publication series n° 7, 1999.
- Wells, A.S., Lopez, A., Scott, J., et al., "Charter schools as post modern paradox: Rethinking social stratification in an age of deregulated school choice", *Harvard Educational Review*, 69(2), pp. 172-204, 1999.
- West, A., "Comparer les systèmes éducatifs: Débats et problèmes méthodologiques", in Lallement, M., & Spurk, J. (Eds), *Stratégies de la comparaison internationale*, Paris, CNRS Editions, 2003.
- West, A., "School choice, equity and social justice: The case for more control", in: *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54, 1, pp. 15-33, 2006.
- West, A., et al. *ICT Learning and Training: Data, Policies and Practice in Selected EU Countries*. Final Report 2004 / <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/ICTObservatory/>
- West, A., Pennell, H., Travers, T., et al., "Financing school-based education in England: poverty, examination results, and expenditure", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 19, pp. 461-471, 2001.
- West, A., Pennell, H., and West, R., "New Labour and School-based Education in England: changing the system of funding?" *British Educational Research Journal*, 26 (4), pp. 523-536, 2000.

Useful Websites

- **EUROPE**

Association pour le Développement des Méthodologies d'Evaluation en Education en Europe (ADMEE)
<http://www.irdp.ch/admee-europe/index.html>

Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE)
<http://www.atee.org/>

Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
<http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/>

The Centre for Research on Lifelong Learning
<http://crell.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Comparative Education Society (CESE)
<http://www.cese-europe.org/>

Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE)
<http://www.cidree.org/>

eEducation Europe: the online observatory on education policies
<http://www.e-education-europe.org/uk/rubriques/home/1.asp>

ENQA (the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education)
<http://www.enqa.eu/>

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education
<http://www.european-agency.org/>

The European Education Policy Network
<http://www.educationpolicy.eu/>

The European Educational Research Association (EERA)
<http://www.eera.ac.uk/web/eng/all/home/index.html>

European University Association (EUA)
<http://www.eua.be/>

Eurydice: The Information Network on Education in Europe
<http://www.eurydice.org/portal/page/portal/Eurydice>

Le Réseau Européen d'Experts en Economie de l'Education (EENEE)
<http://www.education-economics.org/>

Le réseau européen des responsables des politiques d'évaluation des systèmes éducatifs
<http://cisad.adc.education.fr/reva/france/presentation1.htm>

The Thematic Network on Teacher Education (TNTEE)
<http://tntee.umu.se/index.html>

- **INTERNATIONAL**

The Council of Europe / Education for Europe

http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA)

<http://www.iea.nl/Home/home.html>

OECD / Directorate for Education

http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_33723_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)

http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

UNESCO / Education

[http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48712&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

[URL_ID=48712&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48712&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

UNESCO / International Bureau of Education

<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/>