

School Education or the Games and Challenges of Heritage Development

NSOGA MBOM Jean-Jacques

Doctor of Educational Management, Faculty of Education (FSE), University of Yaoundé 1 (UYI)
Bertoua International Laboratory for Educational Research (LIREB)

SAAH Handson Kewihnu

Doctorate Student in Educational Management,
Faculty of Education (FSE), University of
Yaoundé 1 (UYI)

KONDO MOUNGOLE MAKAKE Freddy Maxence,

Attaché de Recherche au Centre
National de l'Éducation, Psychologue de l'éducation
(MINRESI)

Nguemfouo Tchoupou Édith Marceline

Doctorate student in Educational Management,
Faculty of Education (FSE), University of Yaoundé 1 (UYI)

5. Youmdingouotmoun Brikiessou

Doctorate student in Educational Management,
Faculty of Education (FSE), University of Yaoundé 1 (UYI)

Abstract:- When authors such as Branchesi (2007) and Barthes & Blanc-Maximin (2016) reflect on the opportunity to adapt the supranational principles set out in international conventions to the specific educational contexts of States, they consistently and insidiously highlight the need not necessarily to globalise heritage issues, but rather to consider them as a sum of their parts. This contribution focuses on primary education as a prerequisite for heritage development. Using an exploratory qualitative method, our study of history-geography and citizenship and moral education teachers seeks to identify the relevant primary education styles likely to generate, in the short, medium or long term, heritage development in the locality, i.e., a real awakening of awareness and an enhancement of the various historical and/or natural potentials and assets, graciously offered by nature or mankind. To this end, we interviewed seven teachers working in different regions, grouped together according to a number of ethnographic, contextual and situational similarities. The results of this research show that heritage development cannot be boosted unless the «educational concept of heritage» is effectively taken into account in international conventions, and unless heritage education is effectively implemented as a major tool for local development.

Keywords:- Heritage Education, Heritage Development, Heritage Education, Locality.

I. INTRODUCTION

A «reflection and expression of their evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions». This is the basis of the Faro Framework Convention (Council of Europe, 2005) on the value of heritage for communities. In fact, according to its etymology, the notion of «heritage» refers to a set of assets associated with the «father's inheritance» or at least the family fortune. It thus refers to an idea of common and community property belonging to a group of individuals linked by blood ties. Over nearly four decades (70-2010), the

heritage phenomenon has undergone a «continuous evolution» in the form of conventions: the 1972 Convention on the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO), the 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO), and the 2005 Faro Convention (Council of Europe). These UNESCO-labelled conventions also support a strong educational dimension (Barthes & Champollion, 2010), which is used by those involved in education to implement «learning territories» (Jambes, 2001). This «strong educational dimension» is revealed specifically in the Faro Convention (2005), which makes the collaboration of citizens «an ethical obligation and a political necessity» for the enhancement of resources likely to generate development.

The idea of education for development that emerges from this gives rise to several types of education (Pagoni & Tutiaux, 2012), such as heritage education, development education and even sustainable development education, all of which are not opposed to or related to the notion of local heritage development, but on the contrary are rooted in its evolutionary process and opportunely conform our sphere of investigation. The adoption of the aforementioned world heritage conventions has thus given impetus to the entry of various «educations» (Pagoni & Tutiaux, 2012) into the education systems (Musset, 2011; Barthes & Alpe, 2012) of the States with a view to the proportional promotion of a development that knows how to conform the ambient heritage to the indicated territory. The clear agenda in this article is to discuss the relationship, proven or otherwise, between education and heritage development as it demonstrates that primary education, far from being limited to a simple game, is rather identified with an issue whose consecration carries with it the sacredness of all local and sustainable development based on ancestral heritage. To this end, our analytical strategy is to start from the «educational conception of heritage» and end up with its effective «application», in order to illustrate education as a prerequisite for heritage and specifically local development.

II. FROM THE RESEARCH CONTEXT TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Context and Opening Hypothesis

➤ Contextual Background

Educating about heritage and/or heritage development in Africa, and specifically in Cameroon, is a daring initiative which, beyond the games involved (Tutiaux-Guillon, 2017), requires a number of issues (Simonneaux, 2007). Moreover, such 'education' has a definite impact on the education systems that adopt them (Richit and Champollion, 2014), at the risk of giving rise, rightly or wrongly, to controversy with regard to the reflections on territoriality (Vanier, 2009) that it engenders. What is the situation with regard to Africa and Cameroon in general, and the Dja and Lobo in particular? In this case, can heritage education be a prerequisite for becoming a major local development issue? If this is the case, what are the specific features of such an initiative?

Numerous studies reveal the indispensable nature of heritage education as a prerequisite or at least an indispensable element of local development: Herbaux, (2007), Musset, (2012). The fact remains that the main thrust of this research reveals a logic of partnership (Sauvé, 2002) and territorialisation (Mole, 2020) of education. The resulting strategic partnerships between schools and territorial development make it possible to direct the skills of territories in such a way as to generate added value likely to produce a gain and even a revival in vitality, innovation and productivity (Legardez and Simonneaux, 2011). Nevertheless, and given the prevailing education system in Cameroon and specifically the history-geography and education for citizenship and morality (HG/ECM) curricula, we have very little information on the attitudes and aptitudes of HG/ECM teachers and specifically APs, who are supposed to be the most experienced and therefore the most knowledgeable when it comes to knowing, teaching and promoting national and local heritage. Indeed, while a certain opinion tends to relativise the place of education in the promotion of heritage and its impact on local development (Herbaux, 2007; Legardez and Simonneaux, 2011), another opinion gives it primacy (Jean, 2007; Lange, 2017) for the same purpose. And what about local authorities? In fact, the literature on this subject is sparse, despite the existence of some related research, such as that mentioned above. In fact, it is one of the catalysts of this collaborative research (Desgagné, Bednarz, Couture, Poirier, and Lebuis, 2001) that consists of undertaking this research with educational facilitators (AP) and not on APs, in order to bring out the substratum of their resentment about the place of heritage education in territorial development.

➤ The Research Hypothesis

On the basis of a certain knowledge of the surrounding environment, but more so of the related literature, we put forward the hypothesis that education is a prerequisite for heritage development. What is the reality?

B. From Questions to Research Objectives

➤ The Research Questions

Our research questions can be broken down into three parts: Can education be considered a reliable and viable issue for heritage development? In other words, can training learners in the knowledge and uses of heritage contribute to the development of the local area? In more specific terms, can the «educational conception of heritage» be judiciously deployed as a premise for heritage development? If this is the case, should it not be followed by an effective «heritage education implementation» to maximise its impact?

➤ Research Objectives

Two major objectives prevail in the orientation of this research:

To identify and present the «educational conception of heritage» as perceived by educational facilitators in Cameroon and which consecrate the primacy of heritage education over local heritage development; To propose and describe the effective implementation that could be made in view of a local heritage territorial development of Cameroon and specifically of Dja and Lobo or in other words, to propose suitable strategies for an effective implementation of heritage development supported by education.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section of our research, we present a review of the literature on the issues of heritage education, education for the preservation of biodiversity and education for the conservation of ecosystems; education considered in our analysis as the essential ferment for the creation and reproduction of local heritage development, which we have made the second stage of our conceptualisation.

A. «Educations for»: a Prerequisite for all Development

«Educations for, what research, what questions». When Pagoni and Tutiaux-Guillon (2012) address this issue of education, it is inevitably in order to satisfy an unconsidered aspect of research which consists precisely in the specificity of education in heritage and/or local development. In fact, this latter concept, far from being a simple construct of the mind, as some people maintain, is more the fruit of a pedagogy (Gennaud, 1999) which, moreover, places the teacher and therefore education at the centre of the entire acquisition process (Guerin, 1997). To this end, the logic of education in heritage or any other reality likely to act as a screen for development, quite appropriately engenders a territorialisation of education (Barthes, 2020) which gives greater prominence to locality (Barthes, 2017) than to any other entity. Some authors, following the example of Girault and Barthes (2016), attribute to them an epistemological stance whose proverbial underpinnings are aimed at pervasive realities such as the environment or the territory, and whose repercussions extend to the curricular schemes of these «educations» (Barthes, Blanc-Maximin, Dorier-April, 2019). The changes (Barthes and Alpe, 2012) that emanate from this are likely to overturn the entire preconceived educational microcosm in order to

establish a specific education that provides territorial knowledge (Barthes, Blanc-Maximin, Alpe, & Floro, 2014).

Most of this research work has guided us towards the type of education that is best suited to our theme, or at least towards the approach that is best suited to involving us in it. Barthes' (2013) territorialised approach to education seemed to us to be the most appropriate for achieving our aims in this research. In fact, the territorialisation of education referred to by this author is a strategy inherent in several theorists in the field who, at the beginning of the whole process, forge a heritage education that gives pride of place not simply to heritage, but more to sustainable development (Barthes and Champollion, 2012). Such an educational approach, far from drawing on the learner's entire cognitive arsenal throughout the learning process, would undoubtedly enable them to better orient and specify their knowledge, know-how and skills to better promote and defend their tangible and intangible heritage. The survival of many communities depends on it, at the risk of succumbing to a tutorship that leads to a total or partial dilution of innate originality, or originality acquired by force of nature or the deservedness of men and civilisations.

B. From Development to Heritage Development

Whether it be tangible or intangible, human (Vernières, 2003) or other, development in our context of study, beyond being localised (Vernières, 2011, 2012), is generated by heritage. To this end, it is presented here as the consequence of a process previously carried out upstream, the consequences of which are expressed no more and no less than through specialised education (Barthes and Alpe, 2015) that is localised (Grefe, 2002) and territorialised (Barthes, 2013; Barthes, Blanc-Maximin, Alpe, & Floro, 2014).

This territorialisation of education indirectly engenders a territorialisation of development according to the logic of the part as the sum of all. Local development or local heritage development or even territorial heritage development can no longer replace or do without an educational process, which becomes a major and essential pillar of its expression and implementation (Barthes, Blanc-Maximin, 2016).

Another way of looking at this is to focus on education for sustainable development (Legardez and Simmoneaux, 2011), given that heritage education has a definite impact on both the long term and the present moment. It is here that scientific knowledge (Barthes, Zwang, & Alpe, 2013), and the flurry of curricular data (Barthes and Alpe, 2014) relating to the aforementioned education, find favourable ground for expansion through circumscribed (Bensabel and Donsimoni, 2007) or generalised (Wals, 2008) themes.

On the basis of the works cited above, heritage development as expressed in this research is geared towards strengthening locality, territoriality and, in short, the Community. The paradigmatic approaches and other conceptual frameworks relating to this theme dictate de facto the epistemological posture that contributes to making heritage development sacred as a pledge, and at the same time

a panacea, for the enhancement of man as a citizen of a country, but also as a native of a community.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Types of Research

The methodology of this research is based on a qualitative approach with an epistemological, constructivist and interpretivist stance inspired by Émilie Deschênes (2018). In fact, its epistemological character supports its vision of penetrating the word and precisely its most reliable, faithful but also conjunctural meaning in order to bring out the most faithful analysis and interpretation; the constructivist approach, for its part, stems from the option of our study to achieve the elaboration of a semantic construct of the concept of heritage development in a context that presents specificities that should not be minimised. The interpretivist approach that we use as a third posture goes beyond the simple interpretation of the opinions and other views expressed, and aims to give them a meaning and an analytical orientation that fits and conforms to the semantic logic of heritage development in all its meanings.

B. Data Collection and Analysis Tools

To this end, the semi-directed interview via telephone call and/or via WhatsApp is the tool we use in this study to collect our field data, the choice of which was made, as previously mentioned, on the basis of purposive sampling in eight of the ten regions of Cameroon. Thus, of the ten HG/ECM PAs initially chosen, only eight were finally retained on a voluntary basis, and their opinions here materialised and interpreted with strict respect for their anonymity in accordance with academic canons. As far as the processing of the data collected in the field is concerned, the transcription and categorisation of the units of meaning were carried out in accordance with the content analysis technique we opted for, while the QDA Miner software was more than helpful in carrying out each of these tasks. The coding of our data is based on a simple and precise scheme, as follows: AP to designate Teaching Assistant, AP1 or AP2 or AP5 to designate respectively Teaching Assistants no. 1 or 2 or 5. Hence AP7,5 or AP 4,16 refer respectively to educational facilitator no. 7, in his comments extracted from the fifth paragraph; and also, to educational facilitator no. 4 in his comments extracted from the sixteenth paragraph.

V. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The results of this research are twofold: firstly, they set out the decisive factors in the primacy of heritage education over local heritage development; secondly, they outline suitable strategies for the effective implementation of heritage development based on education.

A. Heritage Education: A Priority for Local Heritage Development

The justification for such a statement finds its relevance in a triptych, i.e., the appropriateness of the social environment, the appropriateness of appropriate laws and programmes as catalysts and, finally, the appropriateness of

formalising heritage education in a way that is conducive to local heritage development.

➤ *The Opportunity of the Social Environment or of the Socialisation of Heritage or Heritage Development*

Our respondents were unanimous on the fact that heritage development is merely an outgrowth of heritage education, which is itself characterised by a certain “patrimonialisation”, according to the statements made by these respondents: «Heritage is first and foremost a community asset...and it is society that disposes of it as it sees fit...To this end, it can desacralize what some might consider sacred» (AP3,4). This is corroborated by Lazzarotti & Violier (2007), who even consider heritage to be a «social construct» that can be modified according to the community's desires. This construction inevitably involves a series of interventions (Vernières, 2012), the social stakes of which only the social actor's control and hold (Sol, 2007), in accordance with this recognition: «Only the Community is capable of justifying and justifying to itself the reasons for erecting such and such a monument ... or such and such an attitude ... or such and such a song ... as heritage» (AP4,6). This is undoubtedly a «process of inverted filiation» (Davallon, 1975) that consecrates a Community as a reflection of society as a whole, or the part as a symbol of the whole (Davallon, 2000). In fact, this socialisation gives rise to a sense of belonging that is now materialised in the acquisition or appropriation of heritage, which is now considered to be a common good (Pagoni, 2009), in accordance with this statement: «social heritage gives people ... and the community a strong sense of belonging to something intimate, valuable, sacred ..., grandiose ... It further cements ... the bonds of belonging and community» (AP7,8).

➤ *The Opportunity for Appropriate and Catalytic Laws and Programmes*

This second justification for the primacy of heritage education over heritage development stems from the provision of legal standards in support of the proposed approach: "There are several laws relating to the protection and even the promotion of the heritage of States... These laws are a foundation that can be used by each State and even each Community to generate consistent development" (AP3,9). In fact, three international conventions (1972 on world heritage (UNESCO); 2003 on intangible cultural heritage (UNESCO), 2005 known as the Faro Convention (Council of Europe). «It is within the educational framework that the teacher is able to identify, cite and present to the learner the various tangible and intangible objects recognised by UNESCO as having heritage value....». (AP2,11). In fact, according to such opinions, education appears to be the foundation of the entire related process, all the more so since the Faro Convention (2005) enshrines the «ethical obligation» and «political necessity» of citizen participation in these events.

These laws undoubtedly have an impact on school curricula: «the new HG/ECM curricula now give pride of place to the notion of heritage... and especially local heritage... They now value the valuable places, objects and knowledge available in each region...». (AP4,13). This also applies to the arts (Barthes & Blanc, 2017), where learners

can put on theatrical performances that glorify or honour the history of local and/or national heroes. In some countries, this approach is even extended to primary school (M.E.N., 2008a), and even to nursery school (M.E.N., 2002), enabling very young children to identify, in short to list by name almost everything of value in their locality, and likely to generate added value as a result. One PA states: «The introduction of the concept of heritage in secondary school curricula has enabled learners... to understand that it is possible to emerge from underdevelopment through good management of this heritage...» (7,12). This seems all the truer given that a certain formalisation of heritage education is tending to boost this development.

➤ *The Opportunity to Formalise Heritage Education to Foster Development*

«In the past, heritage education was non-existent... Today it has become a formal and well-known part of school curricula, particularly in history, geography and citizenship education» (AP1,13). This is undoubtedly the result of the 14th article of the 2003 Convention on Intangible Heritage, which stipulates that «States shall develop education in favour of heritage». In the light of these statements and other opinions, it is now difficult and even more inappropriate to speculate on the pre-eminence of education in terms of heritage development, especially when the Faro Convention (2005) drives the point home by stipulating the obligatory ethical nature of such provisions. «Moreover, we can see that the inclusion of heritage education in school curricula... is generating a kind of ever-growing emotional bond between the Community and its heritage...». This assertion is also corroborated by the UNESCO World Heritage Convention (1972), which stipulates in article 27 that: «The States Parties to this Convention shall endeavour by all appropriate means, and in particular by educational and information programmes, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention». In short, education should simply be considered as a «means of developing the heritage» (2003 Convention).

B. *Strategies for the Effective Implementation of Education as a Catalyst for Heritage Development*

Our results mainly set out two strategies for the effective implementation of education as a catalyst for heritage development: firstly, decentralisation of assets and, secondly, decentralisation of powers.

➤ *Decentralisation of Assets*

The identification and enhancement of heritage by the community supports the decentralisation of assets in order to improve the organisation of enjoyment: «the decentralisation of assets... enables people to go beyond owning... and claiming to personally enjoy their possessions... to make the most of them for maximum gain» (AP 5,14). In all respects, it is a question of being able to allow the direct community to which the heritage belongs to benefit from the related added value, so as to give it a kind of «local reference» (Barthes & Alpe, 2015) that provides it with an identity. Moreover, in this context, the decentralisation of assets is consistent with the principle of preserving the environment and biodiversity (Girault & Alpe, 2001) insofar as its first and best guarantors

are potentially its rightful owners: «Decentralising assets is an appropriate strategy for developing heritage... Only the local people, who are supposed to enjoy the local heritage..., are in the best position to defend and develop this heritage in the long term, with maximum gain» (AP4,16). It is in this context that the idea of creating and procreating nature parks and/or reserves, community forests and so on is flourishing and proliferating - in short, heritage entities that know how to give local people a voice through the enhancement of local tangible and intangible wealth, a *sine qua non* for local and decentralised development (Allieu Mary & Frydman, 2003), which is not exclusive after all.

➤ *Decentralisation of Powers*

According to our survey results, the decentralisation of assets should be accompanied by the decentralisation of powers. This notion of power presupposes a commitment, a responsibility that can endorse the actions taken (Henriot, 1995). In other words, it is the capacity of actors not only to legally own their property, but also to have legal personality and therefore the power to dispose of it as they see fit and in accordance with the legal standards in force. «There is no point in pretending to have property that you can't enjoy... If you have property..., that presupposes that you can dispose of it as you wish and when you wish» (AP6,20). From then on, owning property implies the power to dispose of it in accordance with the logic of rights and duties that applies to all civic enjoyment (Audigier, 2013). Hence the relevance of history, and even more so of citizenship education and morality, which, in addition to being purely theoretical disciplines, prepare learners to take ownership of their civic and political rights and duties, and to acquire the power to influence public life and, among other things, the heritage of the city (Audigier, 2006). «Before being public or national..., property or heritage belongs first and foremost to the community from which it is extracted» (AP1,12). The related decentralisation of powers therefore reveals the possibility and/or the capacity of rights-holders to act as guardians of the heritage of which they are owners and/or beneficiaries within the community framework (Ardoino, 2004). This new situation becomes all the more imperative as (Musset, 2012) considers that “everyday objects can become elements of heritage, facilitating the transition from a state and national conception to a social and community conception”.

VI. DISCUSSION

No local heritage development can be conceived without the notion of «territorial intelligence» so dear to Girardot (2004; 2006; 2010). This is implicitly a catalyst that not only enables the beneficiaries of heritage development to be equipped wisely and effectively with sufficient psychological resources to enable them to achieve full enjoyment of their property, but also to equip them with the knowledge, skills and know-how needed to establish appropriate partnerships for all-out cooperation, opportunely reinforced by social networks (Mercklé, 2004A strategic triangulation that is sufficiently innovative to boost local development. Consequently, the obligatory loan made to the numerous and multiple parallel sciences with a view to the conception and construction of the heritage phenomenon,

annihilates any possibility of paradigmatic construction with regard to the sociology of sciences (Vinck, 1995) and especially to the numerous rivalries inferred between specialists in various fields.

Furthermore, the diktat of the illogicality of resources requires us to take a step back from the fact that «resources are not evenly distributed across space, but all spaces potentially have resources... provided that they are brought to light and put to best use» Landel and Senil (2009). To this end, we need to be cautious about quickly assimilating local areas with the whole country, or at least local and/or community heritage with national and/or state heritage. Although one is undoubtedly dependent on the other and vice versa, the fact remains that one is not at all the other, and in the light of this reality, steps must be taken to promote the development of one without obliterating the enjoyment of the other. A conflict of interest could very quickly become a highly harmful element in the satisfaction of all. From then on, heritage development (Davallon, 2006) and its corollary, appropriation, find in this environment a favourable terrain for deployment likely to generate a certain amount of added value that does not simply or necessarily take into account the heritage in question, but rather its enhancement through 'education in' (Jickling & Wals, 2008; Barthes, Zwang & Alpe, 2013). This process of heritage enhancement is becoming the path par excellence, and almost the preferred path, through which the phenomenon of appropriation remains possible, with a strong inference to local development. This patrimonialisation is all the more important because it also provides a sort of granite foundation that unites the community of beneficiaries around a common element: their heritage.

To this end, the various educations to mentioned above become the foundation of this collective appropriation (Girault & Sauvé, 2008), which is supposed to revitalise everyone around a common ideal. In fact, the way in which school curricula are put together, the way in which the heritage phenomenon is taken into account, the orientation of educational projects and, more specifically, school projects, and the education system more generally, are all elements that constitute the major and inescapable pillar for consolidating and therefore heritage-enhancing local development (Barthes, 2013; Barthes & Alpe, 2014). The appropriation that emanates from them then becomes no more and no less than the reflection of a policy that is supposed to comfort some without depriving or undermining others.

In the same way, these "educations for" become, quite opportunely, pillars of local heritage development, by including not only the notion of heritage, but also the notions of heritage preservation, biodiversity protection and ecosystem conservation (Costanza et al., 1997; Chevassus-au-Louis, Salles & Pujol, 2009). An arsenal of measures that, when all is said and done, reinforce the idea of collective appropriation and patrimonialisation (Amougou-Mballa, 2011) that follows any local development. Taking into account and, above all, respecting these measures, notions and «educating to», become the conditions thanks to which heritage development undoubtedly becomes a formality.

VII. CONCLUSION

Our results allow us to strongly support the primacy of heritage education as the foundation of local heritage development, above and beyond any conjectural or conjunctural asperity. To this end, we have based our demonstration on elements as diverse and varied as the desirability of a socialisation of the environment, the desirability of appropriate laws and programmes, but also, and more importantly, of a formalisation of heritage education. The educational leaders claim to be looking for an educational formalism that goes beyond theorising the programmes by adapting them to curricular principles, to enshrine the need to build a heritage, all the more so because «when there is a heritage, if it is a common good, everyone should benefit from it» (Davallon, 2005). In every respect, the aim is to create a generation of citizens who, although extremely «open to the world», nevertheless remain «rooted» in their own culture, from which they derive most of their added value. To this end, whether in primary or secondary school curricula, education through «heritage documents» (M.E.N., 1995c, 1997, 1998a) should become a necessity and even an obligation in citizenship education and even in history, from which all the «historical value» (Riegl, 2003) of heritage is instilled in young people and particularly in young learners. Our results also betray the situated and contextual dimension of heritage, which is again presented as a «foundation of beliefs» (Lahire, 2015) uniting a Community around a common material and/or immaterial ideal, in this case the Community of Dja et Lobo. The limited sample of our respondents can nevertheless be judiciously considered here as a limit to this research, the results of which, in our opinion, should not suffer from any possibility of generalisation. In addition, taking into account other parameters, in this case data collection tools, would certainly have added depth to this work, the scope of which is intended to be more constructivist, leading to greater maturation and involvement of the educational project in heritage development. Thus, over and above the prerogatives, skills and aptitudes of educational facilitators, the role of all educators and specifically teachers remain correlated here (Perrenoud, 2001) precisely because of their status as knowers. As Davallon (2009) rightly points out: «The final point is that we are obliged to pass it on».

REFERENCES

- [1]. Allieu Mary N. & Frydman D. (2003). L'enseignement du patrimoine et la construction identitaire des élèves. Téléchargeable sur http://www.educationprioritaire.education.fr/dossiers/histoire/articles/lenseignement_dupatrimoine-et-la-construction-identitaire-des-eleves.html
- [2]. Amougou-Mballa, E. (2011). « Les processus de "patrimonialisation" et réflexivité », Revue Internationale de l'Imaginaire, n°27 (Le patrimoine, oui, mais quel patrimoine ?), Actes Sud, Babel n°1140.
- [3]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2012). Les « éducations à » : un changement de logique éducative ?
- [4]. L'exemple de l'éducation au développement durable à l'université. Spirale, 50, p. 197-210.
- [5]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2012). Les « éducations à » : Un changement de logique éducative ? L'exemple de l'éducation au développement durable à l'université. Spirale, 50, p. 197-210.
- [6]. Barthes & Alpe, (2014). L'éducation au patrimoine dans les aires territoriales protégées, une dimension de l'éducation au développement durable ? ». In Diemer, A., Marquat, C., Education au développement durable. Enjeux et controverses. De Boeck.
- [7]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2015). L'éducation au patrimoine dans les aires territoriales protégées, une dimension de l'éducation au développement durable ? In A. Diemer & C. Marquat (dir.). Education au développement durable. Enjeux et controverses. (p.323-340). Bruxelles : de Boeck.
- [8]. Barthes A, Blanc, S. (2017, à paraître). L'éducation au patrimoine : contre la forme scolaire de l'école primaire publique française ? Revue canadienne des sciences de l'éducation.
- [9]. Barthes, A. (2013). L'éducation au patrimoine : une approche territorialisée de l'éducation en émergence ? Congrès AREF Montpellier 27-30 août 2013.
- [10]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2012). Les « éducations à » : Un changement de logique éducative ? L'exemple de l'éducation au développement durable à l'université. Spirale, 50, p. 197-210.
- [11]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2014). Le curriculum caché du développement durable, Revue Penser l'éducation, Philosophie de l'éducation et histoires des idées pédagogiques, 36.
- [12]. Barthes A. et Alpe Y. (2015). L'éducation au patrimoine dans les aires territoriales protégées, Une dimension de l'éducation au développement durable ? In A. Diemer & C. Marquat (dir.). Education au développement durable. Enjeux et controverses. p.323-340. Bruxelles : de Boeck.
- [13]. Barthes A. et Champollion P. (2012). Éducation au développement durable et territoires ruraux, Problématique, projet de territoire et réduction fonctionnelle de l'enseignement. Education relative à l'environnement, Regards. Recherches. Réflexions, 10, Québec, p. 36-51.
- [14]. Barthes A. (2013), L'éducation au patrimoine : une approche territorialisée de l'éducation en émergence ? Congrès AREF Montpellier 27-30 août 2013.
- [15]. Barthes A. (2017). Local (le local dans les éducations à). In Barthes, Lange, et Tutiaux-Guillon (dir.). Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des éducations à L'Harmattan, Paris, pp.485-491.
- [16]. Barthes A. (2017), Education au patrimoine. In Barthes, Lange, et Tutiaux-Guillon (dir.). Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des éducations à, L'Harmattan, Paris.
- [17]. Barthes A. (2020). Quelles significations politiques donner à la territorialisation de l'éducation ? In Champollion (Dir). Territorialisation de l'éducation, tendance ou nécessité. Série Education, ISTE Edition Ltd, Londres.
- [18]. Barthes A. et Blanc-Maximin S. (2016). L'éducation au patrimoine, un outil pour un développement local durable, ou une instrumentalisation de l'éducation au service de la labellisation des territoires ? Revue francophone du développement durable. n°6,32-43.

- [19]. Barthes A., Blanc-Maximin S., Dorier-April E. (2019). Quelles balises curriculaires en éducation à la prospective territoriale durable ? Valeurs d'émancipation et finalités d'implications politiques des jeunes dans les études de cas en géographie. Cahier du CERFEE, Education et socialisation n° 51. Environnements culturels et naturels : apprendre pour agir ensemble. Montpellier.
- [20]. Barthes, A., Blanc-Maximin, S., Alpe, Y. & Floro, M. (2014), L'éducation au patrimoine : pourvoyeuse de savoirs et/ou au service des territoires ? Colloque international les « éducations à », un levier de transformation du système éducatif, 17-19 Nov., Rouen.
- [21]. Barthes, A., Champollion, P. (2012). Éducation au développement durable et territoires : évolution des problématiques, modification des logiques éducatives et spécificité des contextes ? Education relative à l'environnement : Regards, recherches, réflexions, 10, Habiter : l'ancrage territorial comme support pour l'éducation à l'environnement.
- [22]. Barthes A., Zwang A. & Alpe Y. (2013). Sous la bannière du développement durable, quels rapports aux savoirs scientifiques», Revue Education Relative à l'Environnement, Regards, Recherches, Réflexions, 11 – 2013 : « Rapports aux savoirs, éducation relative à l'environnement et au développement durable, p. 81-98.
- [23]. Bensabel et Donsimoni, 2007) - Bensabel L. et Donsimoni M. (dir) (2007). Le tourisme, facteur de développement local, Presses universitaires de Grenoble, Grenoble.
- [24]. Chevassus-au-Louis B., Salles J.M. & Pujol J.L. (2009). Approche économique de la biodiversité et des services liés aux écosystèmes - Contribution à la décision publique, Paris : La Documentation Française, collection « Rapports et documents».
- [25]. Deschênes E. (2018). La confiance comme fondement essentiel du leadership des gestionnaires scolaires œuvrant au sein de communautés autochtones québécoises HEC Montréal, Québec, Canada.
- [26]. Gennaud P. (1999). « Pédagogie du patrimoine et ses actions », Bulletin de liaison des professeurs d'histoire géographie de l'académie de Rennes, n° 18.
- [27]. Girardot J-J. et al. (2006). De l'intelligence territoriale : théorie, posture, hypothèses, définition. ISDM, n° 26, Ve Colloque TIC & Territoire « Quels développements ». Université de Franche-Comté, 9-10 juin 2006.
- [28]. Girardot, J-J. (2004). Intelligence territoriale et participation. ISDM, 16, 3e Rencontres « TIC & Territoires », Lille.
- [29]. Girardot, J-J. (2010). Qu'est-ce que l'intelligence territoriale ? [En ligne] <http://www.collaboratif-info.fr/chronique/quest-ce-que-lintelligence-territoriale>.
- [30]. Girault Y. et Sauvé L. (2008). L'éducation scientifique, l'éducation à l'environnement et l'éducation au développement durable, croisements, enjeux et mouvances, Aster 46, p. 121.
- [31]. Girault, Y., Barthes, A. (2016). Postures épistémologiques et cadres théoriques des principaux courants de l'éducation aux territoires- Education Relative à l'Environnement : Regards - Recherches – Réflexions, Volume 13. pp. 25-43. Montréal.
- [32]. Greffe, X. (2002). Le développement local, La Tour d'Aigues : Éditions de l'Aube / DATAR.
- [33]. Guerin J.-C. (1997). Rôle et fonctions de l'établissement et de l'enseignant dans le développement territorial pour demain. In Actes des Assises « Education et ruralité », CERMOSEM, UJF, p. 47-60.
- [34]. Herbaux, P. (2007). Intelligence territoriale, repères théoriques. Paris : L'Harmattan, 195 p.
- [35]. Jambes, J-P. (2001), Territoires apprenants. Esquisses pour le développement local du XXIe siècle, L'Harmattan.
- [36]. Jean Y. (dir.) (2007). Géographies de l'école rurale. Acteurs, réseaux et territoires. Ophrys Géographie, Collection « Essais géographiques ».
- [37]. Jickling B. et Wals A. E. J. (2008). « Globalization and environmental education: looking beyond sustainable development ». Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40, 1, p. 1-21.
- [38]. Landel P-A. et Senil N. (2009). Patrimoine et territoire, les nouvelles ressources du développement, Dossier 12 | 2009 : Identités, patrimoines collectifs et développement soutenable, <http://developpementdurable.revues.org/7563>.
- [39]. Lange J.M. (2017). Développement durable in Dictionnaire des « éducations à ». Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des éducations à, L'Harmattan, Paris, pp.485-491.
- [40]. Legardez, A. et Simmoneaux L. (coord.) (2011). Développement durable et autres questions d'actualité, Questions socialement vives dans l'enseignement et la formation. Educagri.
- [41]. Merckle P. (2004). Sociologie des réseaux sociaux, La Découverte.
- [42]. Mole F. (2020). « Une école pour les territoires ruraux ? Négociations et accommodements au Congrès de l'école rurale (1925) ». In Champollion, P. (dir.). Territorialisation de l'éducation. Tendance ou nécessité. Londres : ISTE.
- [43]. Musset, M. (2012). Education au patrimoine, mémoire, histoire et culture commune, Dossier d'actualité Veille et analyse, 72.
- [44]. Pagoni M. et Tutiaux-Guillon N. (2012). Les éducations à, Quelles recherches, quels Questionnements, Spirale, Revue de recherches en éducation, 50, Lille : Université Lille 3.
- [45]. Perrenoud P. (2001). Développer la pratique réflexive dans le métier d'enseignant. ESF, 3^{ème} édition.
- [46]. Richit N. et Champollion P. (2014). L'orientation, une « éducation à » ? Colloque « les éducations à : un (des) levier(s) du système éducatif ? ». Université de Rouen, 17-19 novembre 2014.
- [47]. Sauvé L. (2002). Le partenariat en éducation relative à l'environnement : pertinence et défis. Education relative à l'environnement : Regards – Recherches - Réflexions, 3, 21-35. Simonneaux, 2007.

- [48]. Tutiaux-Guillon N. (2017). Education au patrimoine. In Barthes, Lange, et Tutiaux-Guillon (dir.). Dictionnaire critique des enjeux et concepts des éducations à, L'Harmattan, Paris.
- [49]. Vanier, M., (2009). Territoires, territorialité, territorialisation. Controverses et perspectives. Rennes : PUR.
- [50]. Vernières M. (dir) (2011). Patrimoine et développement. Etudes pluridisciplinaires. Karthala Gemdev, Paris.
- [51]. Vernières M. (2012). « La contribution du patrimoine au développement local : enjeux et limites de sa mesure », Colloque La mesure du développement, Paris 1-2-3 février.
- [52]. Vinck, D. (1995). Sociologie des sciences, A. Colin.
- [53]. Wals, A. E. J. (2008). « Globalization and environmental education: looking beyond sustainable development ». Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40, 1, p. 1-21.
- [54]. Jambes, J-P. (2001), Territoires apprenants. Esquisses pour le développement local du XXI^e siècle, L'Harmattan.