People with low qualification level: a critical analysis of the typologies of literacy needs profile

JÉRÔME MBIATONG
U-Pec University, Paris, France

ABSTRACT One of the most serious problems France faces today is the rise in the number of people with literacy needs since the 1990s, a problem that was declared a great national priority in 2013. Many professionals strive honestly to mend the rupture between these people and society, but it appears that the majority of strategies and programs being implemented are insufficient, inadequate or inappropriate considering the needs this population. The appropriate consideration of people with literacy needs requires a better understanding of their profiles. In this respect, a multiplicity of typologies have been designed, yet it appears that these models of typology fail to reflect the heterogeneity of people and are sometime referred to as absolute values, which is counterproductive. This paper outlines some of the shortcomings of these typologies and based on research a psychodynamic of the profiles is discussed. We argue the idea that the heterogeneity of people with literacy needs could better be handled in integrative learning settings where learning activities are combined with work or real life activities. The paper concludes by outlining some designs for a LSP training program.

JÉRÔME MBIATONG

Introduction

One of the most serious problems France faces today is the new outbreak (since the 90s) of the number of people with literacy needs. This problem was also declared a great national priority in 2013. The primary segment of the population concerned are the unemployed, most of whom are poorly educated, i.e. people with low education levels (below or equal to French GCE OL). Their chances to participate to the economic, social, political and cultural life of the community are thus reduced. Statistical analyses have established a correlation between unemployment, mastery of basic skills and the level of qualification. They show that people with low qualifications are the most expose persons regarding unemployment. In the first quarter of 2003, for example, the unemployment rate of these persons was 16%. In addition, a careful look at the job opportunities on job boards in France shows that more and more employers require post-secondary or higher qualifications. With these conditions, people who left school prematurely or without mastering the basic skills find it more difficult to integrate and remain in employment. Moreover, for the few people who do find permanent employment, incomes are relatively low.

Obviously, people with low qualifications constitute the most vulnerable segment of the population in relation to precariousness and exclusion. They mainly depend on social assistance in France and form the essential population claiming social welfare and relief services. We can say that they are victims of a system centred on social promotion through qualifications. They are excluded from social and professional life as they are snatched into the downward spiral of failure. It is thus irrefutable that society would be neither efficient nor safe, nor egalitarian, nor democratic if nothing were done to give another chance to these persons. Hence, it is relevant to bridge the gaps by promoting lifelong education and facilitating access to it for people with low qualifications. Many professionals strive honestly to mend the rupture between these people and society but it appears that the majority of strategies and programs being implemented are insufficient, inadequate or inappropriate considering the needs this population. If not, how can we justify the year on year increase of this portion of the?

One can the surmise that being neither in Education, employment nor training can also be seen as the result of collateral damage generated by the policies, programs and practices themselves. In addition, maybe, the starting point is profiling. In this paper, I try to lay out a number of theories in order to better understand NEETs. My point is based on a survey conducted among a group of people with low qualification. These persons were trainees in an integration site in north east France. Before talking about these people, I shall start by reviewing the main typologies.

A review of the main profiles—A multiplicity of typologies

The appropriate consideration of people with literacy needs requires a better understanding of their profiles. Many descriptive classifications have been made and are currently used in France. Among the popular ones, we can mention Van Grunderbeeck (1994), Vinérier (1997) and Bentolila (1996) typologies, as well as the JAD/JDC and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages typologies.

Van Grunderbeeck's model

What is interesting with Van Grunderbeeck's (1994) model is that it based on the preferred strategy of the learner in contact with writing. This author has identified four profiles of reading difficulties:

Profile	Description
The decoder	A person who in his reading strategy centres on the code. Attention is rather given to letters and syllables than to the meaning. Thus, decryption hinders comprehension.
The words seeker	A person whose reading strategy is based on lexical screening.
The guesser	His reading strategy is based on sheer guesswork. He focuses on the meaning.
The undecided	The reading strategy is ultimately centred on the code or on the meaning.

Table 1 showing profiles of reading difficulties according to Van Grunderbeeck.

Vinérier's model

Vinérier focuses her analysis on *the minimum level of knowledge and behaviour required by everyday life:* regarding social and professional inclusion (Vinérier, 1994). She suggested a different typology considering thirteen criteria. These criteria could be grouped into three categories. What is interesting in Vinérier's approach is that her criteria are tailored according to practices concerning people facing literacy difficulties. She perceived literacy difficulties as the expression of more global gaps. Thus, three profiles are identified with corresponding status regarding everyday life.

Categories	Criteria
Criteria relating to the persons past	- Familial history - Education - Social and occupational integration
Criteria relating to training	- Training process - Training project
Criteria relating to the person's living conditions at the moment he moves into training or during the training process	- Resources - Occupation - Housing - Family - Health

Table 2 showing Vinerier's criteria for assessing literacy needs

Profile	Description
Profile A	A person whose life is characterised by failure in various domains. These persons usually avoid enrolment in training processes or even in integration processes .The person's status is equivalent to *exclusion*.
Profile B	A person at the hinge line between exclusion and social integration. This person became marginalised as a result of an unfortunate event or a series of unfortunate events (in the familial or professional sphere, etc.). Contrarily to profile A, the desire for integration is present or at least latent. More often, a third party is necessary for this person to take the desired steps to enrol in training. The person's status is equivalent to *marginality*.
Profile C	A person who is socially integrated, either at the familial or at the occupational level. This person has a clear awareness of his abilities and difficulties. His motivation in undertaking training is very high. He easily transfers what he learns to day-to-day situations. This person's status is equivalent to *integration*.

Table 3 showing Vinerier's literacy profiles

Bentolila's model

To define literacy, one needs profiles. Bentolila (1996) established his typology basing on the *level and nature of the person's difficulties.* He conducted a study in 1995 with 350,000 young people. In his survey, he measured four types of performances: ability to identify and understand words; ability to understand simple sentences; ability to understand some information in a short text; and ability to understand a short text in detail. The survey resulted in the following table, distinguishing between five profiles: A, B, C, D and E.

Level	Description
A	Person whose ability lies below reading simple and isolated words (*Analphabétisme* – in French)
B	Person whose ability lies below reading simple sentences, he is only capable of identifying single words
C	Person whose ability is below reading of short texts and is only able to read simple sentences
D	Person whose ability lies below the depth reading of a short text and who is only able to extract some information
E	Person with the ability to read a short text thoroughly

Table 4 showing reading profiles according to Bentolila.

The defence and citizenship day model

The Defence and Citizenship Day was established in France in 1998 as a substitute for conscription, to raise awareness of youth about defence issues and to strengthen the link between the army and the citizens, etc. Defence and Citizenship Day lasts one day. In 2014, it took place on the 10th April. It includes an assessment tests to estimate the reading level of young people aged between 18 and 25 years old. If necessary, the person in question can request assistance and courses. The assessment profiles young people into six categories accordingly:

Profiles	Description
Profile 0	It refers to a youngster with a good level of understanding
Profile 1	It refers to a youngster who does not have an effective mechanism for dealing with written words, to the extent that they are almost so called "*analphabets*".
Profile 2	What characterises this profile is the lack of understanding, probably due to a very low lexical level similar to profile 1 but with a better/acceptable language level
Profile 3	It refers to a youngster with a lack of understanding probably due to a very low language level. Although the person may have an adequate levels of vocabulary, reading is difficult due to lack of automaticity in word processing.
Profile 4	It refers to young "weak readers" capable of reading aloud with proper language level but with a significant lack in understanding what they are reading.
Profiles 5	These profiles include effective readers whose bases are solid (5d), and those who, despite word identification difficulties (5c), low lexical level (5b) or both (5a), compensate for their gaps and at least partially succeed in complex reading tests. Some of these readers, however, remain poor in writing skills.

Table 5 showing the reading profiles for the defence and citizenship day.

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) provides language proficiency schemes and levels that are used internationally (Europe and some other parts of the world). The Council of Europe put it together in 2001 as a way of

standardising the levels of language exams in different regions. The CEFR defines six levels described below:

Levels	Description
A1	Breakthrough: this profile has the basic ability to communicate and exchange information in a simple way. For instance, he/she can ask simple questions about a menu and understand simple answers.
A2	Waystage: It refers to a level where the individual has the ability to deal with simple, straightforward information and begin to express him/herself in familiar contexts. For instance, he/she can take part in a routine conversation on simple predictable topics.
B1	Threshold: It refers to a level where the individual has the ability to express him/herself in a limited way in familiar situations and to deal in a general way with non-routine information. For example, he/she can ask to open an account at a bank, if the procedure is straightforward.
B2	Vantage: It refers to the levels where the individual has the capacity to achieve most goals and express him/herself on a range of topics. For instance, he/she can show visitors around and give a detailed description of a place.
C1	Effective Operational Proficiency: This level is used for people who have the ability to communicate with the emphasis on how well it is done, in terms of propriety, sensitivity and the capacity to deal with unfamiliar topics. Such an individual can deal with hostile questioning confidently or can get and hold onto his/her turn to speak.
C2	The mastery level: This describes the capacity to deal with material that is academic or cognitively demanding, and to use language at a level of performance which may, in certain respects, be more advanced than that of an average native speaker. The individual can read texts for relevant information, and grasp main topic of text, reading almost as quickly as a native speaker does.

Table 6 showing the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages levels

In this model, only people corresponding to profiles 1 and 2 are considered as worrying literacy cases. It is evident that there is multiplicity of models. Only some major ones encountered in literature and literacy programs in France have been described here. Each model highlights a specific aspect of literacy difficulties. However, one can ques-

tion the validity of these typologies if we keep in mind that people with LLN difficulties are sometimes very talented in hiding their literacy difficulties or needs. Usually only a few colleagues or relatives very close to the person are aware of the gap. As a result, literacy training programs mostly absorb adult migrants and the so called "analphabets" while people with literacy needs hardly benefit from it. At this point, it is important to underline how stigmatising the French vocabulary on the issue could be. Instead of focussing on people needs as the English vocabulary does - often referred to as 'literacy needs'—the French jargon uses identity defining terms like "Illiterate", which makes the issue very dramatic. It makes it sound like an insult or handicap, as if all was the fault of the person. One could then understand why people with literacy needs are inhibited and mostly refrain from claiming training, similar to revealing/claiming a social stigma. "*It is as if you were a disabled person, as if you were useless*" Yolande says. She even believed that having literacy needs was a disease and was afraid her children would suffer as she had suffered in her young ages.

Therefore, even when some people with literacy needs manage to enrol in a literacy training program, it is very common that these persons are not positioned in the appropriate level. Illiteracy or rather literacy needs are social constructs. That is, they are determined by the socio-historical context. Though we could acknowledge that the designing of typologies have been essential for advancing the cause of literacy, one can formulate the criticism that these models do not reflect the diversity of profiles concerned with literacy needs (age groups or social situations, gender, housing and professions). There lies a risk of falling in the pitfalls of what we can call an orthodoxy of profiles and typologies. Yet the diversity of individual situations and the multiplicity of causalities that underlie literacy needs make it difficult to draw generic elements of analysis. In other words, profiles should not be considered as absolute values. They may be pertinent if they are considered as means or as a provisional reference. They should be defined and used related to what is to be valued. Literacy needs can manifest themselves in several ways depending on the individual's learning model, on the level and nature of individual difficulties, on spatiotemporal factors, and thus on the minimum of knowledge and behaviour required in everyday life in a given society.

What the above-mentioned models fail to reflect is the heterogeneity of people with literacy needs and the fact that many social factors come into play. For example, literacy needs evolve with age, affecting older groups more s. In France, 4.5% 8-25 year olds are affected, but the rate jumps to 14% among the 56-65 years old. Besides age, literacy needs also vary with factors such as gender, socio-economic level, and area of residence, migration status and ethnicity. Further, some population categories such as prisoner sand migrants are disproportionately affected. In the same vein, in societies with an oral tradition, literacy needs were obviously not an indication nor a criterion of status or integration.

A final criticism that can be formulated for current typologies is that they focus only on the gaps that a person may have concerning the ability to read or write. They stigmatize the person, making him the sole responsible of his gaps. Are these gaps appropriately measured when we know that many functionalities come into play for reading and writing? Some are partially related to the person's life history, to his environment, to his personal and professional interests, to his culture, etc. Are classifications in ty-

pologies not portraying the omnipotence of the verbal-linguistic intelligence in our societies? Would it not be relevant to include profiling in a broader system taking into account the persons relationship to his environment and to knowledge itself in general?

A psycho-dynamic approach to profiles

As we pointed early, typologies may be relevant if they serve as observational elements. If not, the individuals become the objects of the transformations of the actions of the professionals (instead of being empowered as an actor of his training and integration). Instead of focussing on procedures, standards and other criteria, literacy training should focus on the needs, perspectives, and learning model of the learner. Yet, most of the time it is as if people have the same life course, the same needs are more importantly the same learning strategies.

In his book *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligence,* Howard Gardner (2011) showed that human beings have different kinds of intelligence that reflect different ways of interacting with the world. He identified nine non-exhaustive types of intelligence: linguistic intelligence, logical/mathematical intelligence, musical rhythmic intelligence, bodily/kinaesthetic intelligence, spatial intelligence, naturalist intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence and existential intelligence. Each individual has a unique combination of these different types of intelligence. No two individuals have them in the same exact configuration. Following Gardner's works, it could be observed that in school and training setting more importance is given on the first two form of intelligence: linguistic intelligence and logical/mathematical intelligence. Linguistic intelligence refers to the ability to use language to express what is you are thinking and to understand other people. Logical/mathematical intelligence refers to the ability to understand the underlying principles of some kind of causal system, the way a scientist or a logician does; or to manipulate numbers, quantities, and operations, the way a mathematician does. School examinations are based on a model that leans on these two types of intelligence. Consequently, we can consider that pupils who fail in school are those whose favourite form of intelligence does not incorporate these forms of intelligence according to the standards required by the system. The same applies to adults with literacy needs. Finally, we can say that what most students learn in school is not primarily the abilities needed to live as a useful member of society, but the ability to succeed in tests. It is as if there exists one best frame of mind, or one best model of knowledge. Those who understand the rational of the system and conform to it succeed, while those whose abilities fall outside of this model are catalogued as academic failures. And so does society fail to open to diversity and generates its own bad people. What justifies this? Why do institutions find it hard to open up to diversity?

To understand this, it is necessary to re-contextualise the issue in the frame of modern and post-modern civilisation. Among the multiple tendencies that shape our societies, we can mention *logocentrism*. Logos comes from the Greek word *legein* which refers to words, thought and discourse. By *logocentrism,* we refer to the common tendency in the Western cultures to give more value to what is proper in the sense of reasoning (rationality) and discourse (eloquence, reading, speaking, and writing). All that does not conform to rationality is usually underestimated (tacit knowledge for instance). The

outcome of this tendency is that in most teaching and learning activities materials and knowledge are abstract and decontextualized. They hardly address the needs of the individuals. However, putting learning in the context of living could be a way to guarantee people learn faster and better. Some programs like apprenticeship and integration site are built on this model. We conducted a research in 2005 in one of these programs.

The research took place in an integration site in Fumay (North-East France). Integration sites are programs that alternate employment and training. Beneficiaries are hired for 6 months on a contract for social utility jobs and at the same time the undertake courses to improve their basic skills. Beneficiaries are admitted in the program upon two criteria: being of low qualification level and having been unemployed for a certain period. Beyond these common features, there is a diversity of profiles, including degree of literacy needs, age, motivation, learning profile, cognitive disabilities, poverty, etc.. In the program, they are offered a variety of tasks that will help them gradually get used to better understanding industry requirements and also to acquire some technical skills relating to a profession, including: gardening, upkeep of green spaces, maintenance of cultural heritage, mass catering, waste disposal, little construction works, etc. The beneficiaries are trained by a supervisor who is hired, not based on his pedagogic skills, but based on his professional experience in a trade. The purpose is to introduce the beneficiaries to authentic situations as a means of constructing, developing and manipulating knowledge. The job situations also serve as an observation area for the professionals to identify the person's tacit knowledge and needs, and to adjust profiling and supply a tailor-made training. Activities and training integration are performed in small groups and individually.

Our research demonstrated that the beneficiaries, that is, people who leave school without mastering "the basic skills" are not really devoid of "basic knowledge". They structure their decryption and action strategies differently to those valued in formal education and training systems. However, little attention is given to these strategies in the school environment, and they are invisible to evaluation processes which are more likely to measure the result of learning rather than the pathways used by the person to solve problems.

Assessment biases

Upon arrival in most training programs, these persons are often confronted with sets of questions of positioning tool or skills assessment, identical to the model that defeated them in school. These tools and practices repeat traditional norms and reinforce the negative self-image they have internalised, those that previously led them to failure. The foregoing suggests that having literacy needs is not always a synonym of individual the failure, instead, it demonstrate the inappropriateness of the measurement instrument that focus more on the deficiencies than on the potentialities and learning resources of the person. This leads us to underline how assessment instruments are likely to produce the gaps they claim to measure and describe. In fact, we all acknowledge that every individual acquires informal knowledge throughout life, even before going to school. Every individual can possess different types of knowledge, such as academic knowledge, tacit knowledge, and action knowledge. Accordingly, it is always tricky to

conclude that an individual "has" or "does not have" the basic knowledge. Yet knowledge appears reliably in the presence of appropriate human and physical triggers, but may be impossible to detect in other conditions (Squire, 1986). Considering the aforementioned, we can say that the evaluation of a person's abilities, life project or career is inseparable from consideration of intimate and social recognition of his DIY knowledge. In many cases, the profiling and training processes take a more traditional form and arbitrarily assume that the trainees have no experience, nor the skills and knowledge that are the result of their life course and occupational history. People's literacy needs are too often classified in the deficient and curative model that makes them appear like sick or disabled. For people who experienced failure in school, it is somehow a second penalty, a sentence to marginalization (especially as low qualification is most often-the result of early school failure which caused the internalisation of a negative self-image). However, no matter how poor these individuals may be from the perspective of their learning, they are also social actors: they are parents, citizens, consumers. Understanding how each person uses his own strategies to control his own learning becomes extremely relevant. Therefore the question is chiefly to know how people learn before deciding what basic knowledge they master. The question of profiles, knowledge or skills typologies should be secondary in order not to reify the situation of people, i.e. confine them within a limited framework. Furthermore, knowledge as well as skills is dynamic. They are evolving faculties. Therefore, one always runs the risk of freezing them into an imperfect representation at a given moment. Knowing this, we should make sure that literacy assessment be situated, contextualized. It should serve as a benchmark to support actions that are more efficient.

Situated learning: taking advantage of error in learning

The research also demonstrated that the participants' thought was more flexible and logical vis-à-vis objects and concrete situations, leading us to conclude that they learn by better by doing (inductive learning). That is to say, they proceed from the concrete to formal learning, from particular to general thought and not the reverse. Hence the relevance of tangible situations in learning. The insertion site provides the setting to make learning concomitant to activity. This is possible for instance through peer learning (when the beneficiaries consult each other to accomplish a task) and observation. The individual constructs his representation of the world, and transforms himself in and through activity. In other words, it is a continuous and progressive approach in which action nourishes reflection and reflex guides action (Bernard, 1998).

In short, the integration site program places the beneficiaries in the position to elaborate authentic communication and expression conditions. The learning process takes place within practice. Such learning is said to be contextualised as opposed to the learning process in traditional training systems. Whatever the tasks, the beneficiaries experience diverse levels of informal learning. In fact, situated learning is not reduced to imitation; activities are also an opportunity that requests quite particularly the sensory dimensions: sight, touch, hearing, sense of smell and the memory of the subject. For example certain beneficiaries participating to our investigation were capable of feeling the imminence of a machine breakdown only by listening to the noise of the engine.

In the integration site error has a positive status in the learning process. The supervisor's role is closer to a guide's role than to that of an instructor. Thus, there is a significant room left for personal initiative and autonomy to develop. Error here is a provisional base on which to build knowledge (Bachelard, 2002). I observed that in situational problems participants to this research firstly tried to find solutions themselves through trial and error. The learning process included the following steps: a step for discovery, a step for testing assumptions, a step for understanding, a step for discrimination, a step for making adjustments, and a step for mastering the successful combination. In this process, initiation is also central to learning. The beneficiaries imitate the methods that appear to be successful. Such a process is informal because it is unstructured; data to solve the problem are not given a priori, the individual learns by trial and error and subsequent adjustments. The dramatization and recognition of the right to err prevailing here adds value to the program. It is intimately linked to the development of autonomous learning, as the individual learns by himself. It could be observed through the research that when people learn from their mistakes they gain more confidence in themselves, take more initiatives, and become a little more proactive. We can then emphasise like Bruner (1996)that: "acquired knowledge is also more useful to the learner when he discovers it by himself through his own efforts because it is then connected and used in reference to his prior knowledge and prior life experience (meaning)".

Cooperative learning

It stems from the above that integration site is a space favourable to transformative interactions. That is, interaction that led to change of individual habits, thinking or knowledge. The research also showed that an important part of the learning takes place during interaction with peers (sharing successful way of doing, sharing ideas and efforts and the mediation of the supervisor). When individual trial and error approach is unsuccessful, beneficiaries imitate each other or make use of alternative strategies based on the use of aid, requesting support from a colleague or from the supervisor. Employees of the same level learn things from each other, maybe because they understand each other despite potential language deficiencies.

Another phenomenon that the research revealed was "impregnation", which refers to the gradual change of behaviour, beliefs or practices due to the close attendance of influential individuals. For example, we noted that the admission of females in the group had a positive impact on hygiene, language and vocabulary and good manners among male beneficiaries.

Some experiences within this program are very challenging for the beneficiaries and for the supervisor too. The experience of the insertion site brings the individuals out of their cocoons, put them in touch with other people with literacy needs, with whom they can identify, consult, collaborate and exchange ideas. They have the chance to be recognised and exist by something else rather than their deficiency. Encountering others in a conducive environment is favourable to the emancipation the individuals and to the learning process. The integration site allows individuals to feel useful, get back a little in the activity and thus learn.

Conclusion

Speaking of the profiles of people with literacy needs is indirectly talking about their learning profiles and about the type of relation these individuals have with knowledge itself. And one can agree with Perrenoud (1995) that learning is a complex process, it mobilizes self-image, fantasy, trust, creativity, risk, appetite and exploration, anxiety, desire, the identity, and many fundamental aspects of the person and his culture. Most people with literacy needs are persuaded that they have no skills. So part of the task to tackle is convincing them of their tacit knowledge and their learning potentials. Profiles are not absolute values and trainers must endeavour instead to acknowledge people's prior knowledge and build on what they already know. It is necessary, so that literacy proficiency and skill assessment are not turned into "the assessment of incompetence" (Biarnès & Azoulay, 1998). The insertion site in an example of this approach: tt combines production activities and learning activities so that the individuals gain contextualised knowledge and skills. The insertion site provides a conducive atmosphere for a diverse range of learning models and more importantly for autonomous learning. In the present world there is such a variety of things to learn that no educational process or system can meet all the needs of all learners. Autonomous learning therefore becomes very important. In the near future, solving literacy needs will not be attainable without enabling people to learn by themselves, that is to learn how to learn. I say this because, the instability and volatility of working life requires the individual to make a permanent adjustment of the direction of his life. Learning to learn therefore becomes primary in the act of learning. What does that entail for LSP?

Language is perceived as an instrument of social and professional integration and progress. But it sometimes plays as an instrument of selection, discrimination and relegation. The recognition of learners' capital and building on that capital permits to take the diversity of the learners into account. The aim of education in a democracy is also to help fight against all forms of discrimination, mutual understanding, etc.

The investigation also suggests an integrative approach to literacy training programs where learning takes place in working settings may be best. It also suggests that to work with the life history of the trainees and the recognition of informal knowledge that individuals use in day to day life and their social relationships can be useful, alongside formal and external knowledge aimed by educational institution. Life history (biographical approach) plays a crucial role in how the individual invests learning, and awareness. It entails that LSP should be re-contextualised in the approach of lifelong learning (LLL). Learning takes place throughout life event at work. Considering this last point, we can imagine a three stage training process, including a pre-employment program, language for specific areas and work place language learning (on the job training). It is very crucial to implement work place training because, in reality, literacy proficiency develops from use of literacy skills. The work place is an excellent environment for the interaction necessary and here the cooperation of employer is needed.

Finally the contribution entails that in order to organise the link between knowledge and context in LSP, we should start by an inventory the domains and situations of daily life where literacy proficiency is essential for people and build training programs that are imbedded in these domains.

All the foregoing raises many questions that we also need to address: how can pedagogic engineering organise and foster autonomous learning? How can we match individual needs with the needs of society. How can we ensure quality and efficiency of such training programme.

Correspondence

Jérôme MBIATONG
U-Pec University, Paris, France
E Mail: Jerome.mbiatong@u-pec.fr
Tel.: +33 6 68 21 45 79
Fax: +33 9 55 93 18 08

Notes

1.   According to the national agency of statistics and economic studies (2011), 16% of people 18 to 65 years.
2.   Cf. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/liam/levels/levels_EN.asp
3.   Clara (a participant to the survey I conducted among people with low qualification level) admits: "*I used to tell lies in order to keep my children and be able to achieve the things I had always dreamed of. I wanted my children to be proud of their mother*"
4.   This term is used to describe people who have never been in contact with schooling.
5.   According to the Permanent group against illiteracy, the term illiteracy is used for people over the age of sixteen, having been educated but with insufficient mastery of reading and writing to meet the minimum requirements of professional, social, cultural and personal life. These people, who have been initiated to reading and writing in the context of school, came out of the school system with little or poorly acquired the basic knowledge for social, family or functional reasons. More precisely, for these men and women the use of writing is neither immediate nor spontaneous, nor easy. So they avoid and / or apprehend this means of expression and communication.
6.   The term *logocentrism* was first used by the German philosopher Ludwig Klages to refer to the tradition of Western science and philosophy that situates the logos as epistemologically superior in a system, or structure.
7.   "*I had always been told that I was useless and I thought I was useless. They put me in a class with personwith Down's syndrome and disabled. After they put me in a class to learn sewing*". Juliette says.
8.   "*It is not our fault. It is the childhood we lived that blocked us some things in our lives.*": Robert
9.   "What *I see I remember, what I touch I Understand*" This famous saying of Confucius illustrates what is meant here. We easily apprehend things that stimulate our senses: touch, hearing, smell, sight etc. "Practice makes perfect." One of the fundamental purposes of the program is to put people in an authentic work situation. Activity is used as support to learning. It takes place in a real situational context and it is expected that the participantsacquire professional skills. The scenarios performed by the supervisor, security and health instructions, participants questions, demonstrationsare favourable to cognitive growth and provide learning opportunities that are sustained by a verbal speech or written material(cf. situated learning precepts).

References

Bachelard, G. (2002). *The Formation of the Scientific Mind: A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge.* Bolton: Clinamen Press Limited.

Bentolila, A. (1996). *De l'illétrisme en général et de l'école en particulier.* Paris: Plon.

Bernard, H. (1998). Évaluer pour améliorer l'enseignement. *Mesure et évaluation en éducation, 21 (2)*, 1-3.

Biarnès, J., & Azoulay, J. (1998, novembre). Le bilan de compétences intégrées à l'acte formatif. *Les cahiers du GREC, n°2.*

Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of minds. The theory of multiple multiple intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Perrenoud, P. (1995). *La pédagogie à l'école des différences Fragments d'une sociologie de l'échec.* Paris: ESF.

Squire, L. (1986). Mechanisms of memory. *Science, 232*, 1612-1619.

Van Grunderbeeck, N. (1994). *Les difficultés de lecture, diagnostic et piste d'intervention.* Québec: Gaétan-Morin.

Vinérier, A. (1994). *Conbattre l'illettrisme : Permis de lire, permis de vivre.* Paris: L'Harmattan.