THE COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN THE INTERCULTURAL CONTEXT

R. Tammaro – University of Salerno – rtammaro@unisa.it

V. Merlino – University of Salerno - zeniamerlino@libero.it

Abstract: Within the multi-ethnic society in which we live the interaction and cohabitation between different people for ethnic and cultural aspects is an important key driver to exchange and share behaviours, values and rules for mutual enrichment as well as for individual and collective growth. So the "intercultural education" is an important way to drive and strengthen the process of teaching/learning. In this context research, knowledge and experience are the main pillars that attribute to the cooperative learning the meaning of "intercultural context", allowing at the same time to validate this approach by means of criteria related to academic success, personal well-being and the quality of relationships in the classroom. The aim of the paper is to discuss about the birth, structure and development of the Cooperative Learning (CL) in order to analyze methodologies able to improve the learning outcomes of the members of a working group by using the effective teaching method.

INTRODUCTION

The multi-ethnicity wich characterize the present historical-cultural scenery, invites us to reflect on the possible bases on which to found a life in common of mutual respect and of reciprocal identity recognition.

In a multi-ethnic society as the one in which at present we actually live, the identity concept in, in fact, so strongly felt as to form a sort of blockhouse into which one can take refuge to defend one-self from the others. It seems that the identity concept refers to the protection of one own's individuality, as if in the relationship with the others, this should assure one own's survival, by representing the place where the world of values, denoting the belonging to own's place of origin, traditions and way of being, is contained this way of express.

This concept of identity, however, includes a great misunderstanding. The identity in , in fact, not a sign of isolation, but of relation. You cannot speak about identity without referring actually to something which is other in regard to which the definition of the identity of something is determined. (A. Fabbris, 2011).

It is a question of reconsider the terms with which this relation is established. In order to do that it is necessary for us to recover the sense of man's condition as constitutionally relational (A. Harendt, 1964), and to be able to found this relationality on a concept of "open identity".

This consists in the conviction that we are what we are only since, we are connected with the others. In other terms, we are not isolated and monolithic individual that only secondly relate to others, as much isolated and monolithic. Instead we are already part of a precise relational dynamics, which connects us to the others from the beginnings. Otherwise, we would be mere things, not human beings. So, we are structurally open to the other people and our identity develops through the relation with the others (A. Fabbris, 2011).

In order to acquire this awareness, one need simply to be educated. In this direction, education has had and still has a crucial role, since it is the institutional sphere incharge of granting the effectiveness of the socialization processes the future citizen's formation, the production of the official knowledge and the cultural heritage of the groups forming the society, and the construction of the cultural picture within which a peaceful way of living together must occur.

Nevertheless, the task of such education, from the point of view of a peaceful coexistence among culturally and ethnically different people, and of the consequent enlargement of knowledge horizons and of the construction of the basis for a critical reflection on one own's and others identities and life styles, needs to the develop towards the facing up of new pedagocical challenges.

The introduction of the intercultural logic into schools, is among these, since it requires:

-The curricula replanning;

-A trans-curricular pedagocical practice, particularly careful for the global aspects of single disciplines and a specific utilization of projects or extra-curricular programmes;

-Methodologies which combine emotion, thinking and doing and at the same time, balance the learning process, living the learner the status of an actor who learns and operates by beginning from processes of construction and sharing of the knowledge.

The intercultural logic must not be meant as a new chapter of pedagogy, or a branch of a special pedagogy, but must be considered an innovative perspective for general pedagogy. This as a consequence, should mean an innovative way of everybody's education, above all for that concerns the formation of personal identity and socio-cultural identity. It should be meant as qualifying in the innovative sense the general pedagogy in its entirety (Nanni, 1998).

This way of thinking of interculture, can develop only when the interculture does not take place at school or on the textbooks, but it becomes an event in the subjects cognitive system, in the subjects' cognitive experience when they carry out a synthetic experience, which re-interprets various cultures.

In this sense, "the interculture as an experience takes place when one perceives that in the other culture narration there is a divergent thought which can be accepted or refused" (Nanni, 1998, pp. 47-48).

In this sphere, the following principles are identified:
- To express recognition;
- To promote the confidence;
- To develop the communicative competence;
- The didactic principle of concreteness.

To them, one must add the aims that on the cognitive plan consist on activating the didactic paths which encourage the decentralized dimension of knowledge and on the affective-relational planrecall the ability to engage the conflict and to get over the fear of the different. In this sense, the most effective and appropriate indications of the intercultural logic need to permeate the reflection within the single disciplines (Portera, 2000).

The affirmation of an intercultural perspective implies the interpretation of the multiculture as a by now structural and distinctive fact of contemporary society and, in consequence, it aims to a rethinking of educational processes on the basis of the principles of recognition and enhancement of diversity, and aims to the construction of an educational system which favours a peaceful and democratic living together.

The concept of interculture which derives from this perspective, is not satisfied with formative results which concern only the cognitive sphere, but it refers to the entirety of the possible educational results: awareness, knowledge, empathy, attitudes and abilities.

This implies that, by the assumption of an educational principle like that, one arrives to a connotation of intercultural education which, founding its methods on reinterpreting experience of subjects different cultures, can be defined a multi-dimensional process of interaction between individual of different cultural identities, who, trough the intercultural meeting, experience something deep and complex a conflict/reception which is a precious opportunity of growth for everybody's personal culture, in tehe perspective to remove all obstacles from the construction of a new civil living together, also trough the chancing of school system (the same opportunities, remaking of textbooks, adoption of active techniques and multimedial instruments) and the requalification of the educationists.

In this terms, school, as an educational community can and must perform the task to generate a propulsion to the relationship shaped with affective and emotional languages, and the task to promote the sharing of those values which enable all the pupils to feel as members of an only and real society.

In this sense, school can be the place the task of teaching can be placed side by side with the one of teaching to be (N. Lupoli, 2010.), on the basts of the principle that every kind of education derives from the participation of the individual to the civil conscience of human species, without any distinction of culture and ethnicity, by considering the act of growing a socialization, process which begins unawares from his/her birth and goes on as a constant experience through the social life, and so, with the other individuals (J. Dewey, 1954).

A perspective like that, open to social dimension, enables to project positive effects not only into learning how to live with the others but even into learning the learning processes, into learning through the direct experience of doing, and into learning to be subjects ethically inspired (J. Delors, 1997).

From this it derives that one needs to conceive the class as a group of people, to pay attention to its relational dynamics, promoting the cooperative bonds among its members and to be able to conduct the inevitable conflicts caused by socialization.

The concept of school as a life community, by assuming the concept of intercultural education, must aim to respect of everybody's natural and active involvement, and must develop into pupils the processes of real reflection able to give foundation to the gradual achievements into the various fields of knowledge and social life; assuming the core of socio-cultural constructivism, which means the learning as an active process of knowledge construction.

According to this paradigm, pupils construct their knowledge and through this construction they learn as well as they construct, in the same time, their competences and their attitudes, that is: to know, to know how to do, to know how to be.

In this perspective, knowledge as a construction of meanings is characterized by the interaction of three polarities which refers to the context within which the relations with the learning area are formed; to the collaboration which instead concerns then relation with the other members of the community of learning; to the construction which, in the end, consist into activating the modalities of reflection and negotiations.

DISCUSSION ABOUT METHOD

The Cooperative Learning (CL) moves in this direction, since it can be defined a teaching/learning methodology which involves the structuring and restructuring of the class into cooperative groups.

After spread throughout American schools, in the sixties of last century, it has been part of the Italian school context since the end of the eighties.

In didactical terms, the CL is above all a method opposing to the traditional view of teaching to pupils and is concretely a set of techniques of conducting the class in which pupils work in small groups of learning activities and get assessment on the basis of the achieved results. Secondly, the CL express itself within a precise orientation choose in favour of the activity promoted by pupils, therefore it can be defined a strategy with a social mediation, opposed to the others aiming to the teacher's mediation (Felisatti, 2006, p. 117).

The conceptual fabric on which the CL is rooted can be traced in some guidance-ideas common to arious educational-psychology theories, which, re-examined from a socio-constructivist point of view, assert that learning is influenced in a manner that cannot be disregarded, by the context within which it takes place and by the interactions which are carried out in it.

One of the first perspective which indicates the centrality of the social interaction role in learning is linked to the Piaget's concept according to which the interaction among equals, by promoting turbulent socio-cognitive situations, simulates into the subjects the attempt to construct new interpretations of reality, able to get over the conflicts and the contrasts (Piaget 1974). As Dewey asserts " implicitly in the class and at school, as in the society, the permitted or forbidden actions, the possibility of discovery, the beliefs of who conducts or manages the context through resources and restrictions, influence the formation of mental and emotional dispositions, of attitudes such as the participation and the democracy, the creativity and the (J. Dewey, 1922).

In learning, the central role of social interaction is also present in the concept of proximate development zone proposed by Vyigotskij according to: the social interaction can have a function of which its own since a more expert subject, through an action defined "scaffolding", can be as a guide, for beginner, in facing a problem (Vyigotskij, 1974).

The concept of a guided participation to the community practices, as a privileged path for the development and the learning of the individual is present in the point of view of Rogoff, who asserts that an educational modality like that is rooted in all cultural contexts within which adults take care of children (B. Rogoff, 1990).

From a contextual point of view, the social interaction becomes a support for learning, when the context where it takes place is structured by following the condition of positive inter-dependence defined by Lewin and Deutsch's research (1948-1949).

On the base of these conceptual knots, the CL is already to be considered a context where the perspective of intercultural pedagogy are expressed.

The features which distinguish it are, in fact, already able to narrate the principles which by analogy are at the basis of the intercultural education. In this sense, the intercultural pedagogy aims to delineate the best strategies from the organizational point of view as well as the purposes, in order that the subjects who refer to different origins and cultures may learn how to communicate among them leaving language, behaviours, cultures and beliefs apart (E. Pellerani, 2007).

From this point of view it is possible to cannot the term CL as a "mantle" term used to provide a twofold meaning used for beliefs: on the one hand a pedagogical meaning, which concerns the philosophy of cooperation and the appreciation of individual differences; on the other hand a didactic one, which considers a whole of methodologies of knowledges achieved cooperatively and pluralistically constructed around the work of pupils organized in groups. These pupils, in fact, work together in sufficiently small and etherogeneus groups so that everyone can take actively part into the carring out of the tasks assigned by the teacher (E. Cohen, 2/1992, p.4).

On this subject, we'd better highlight that the CL is above all a whole of educational principles which proposes a richer complexity than a simple utilization of groups in the daily school practice, and, as we have said in advance, it is not a learning theory or a teaching theory, but a method and a theory which originates a formative pattern and a whole of working techniques.

The CL is a whole of educative perspective, define the way the students can adopt in order to learn reciprocally while working together in the carrying out of school works (Hijzen, Boekaerts, Vedder, 2006).

On the basis of these principles, the CL has carried out a whole of class organization techniques by which situations are generated in which groups of students work together as a team, in order to face a task, solve a problem or develop a common competence (Artz, Newman, 1990).

In this way, that is by inviting the students to work in group and as a group, the CL simulated a cognitive and social development. From this point of view, of reciprocal sharing of their knowledge and working for a common objective, the students benefit from the knowledge distributed in the group, where the competence of a student compensates for the deficit of the other and everyone improves his/her preparation (Hargraves,1994; Kagan, 2000).

The CL gives to the interpersonal relation a strategic function which is so intense that it becomes the fulcrum around which all other learning variables, as the motivation, cognitive processes, class organization and evaluation revolve.

In order that the CL may represent a successful experience, it's necessary that:

- The students think that the cooperation is efficacious and they feel, as a consequence, responsible of their work within the group, and aware of the competences to be used, as well as the neceddity of developing them;

- the teachers share with the students, the responsibility of development of these competences, in the learning context.

With regard to that, the teacher's role, in the CL, finds expression into four main actions such as: the activities project, the learning context management, the competences and the work group assessment, the consolidation and the individual assessment of the specific competences through opportune formative paths which have to occur in different phases of the teachers' professional lives.

In the field, the point of reference which are important in the organization of this formation refer to the cognitive apprenticeship (Collins, Brown, Newman, 1995) on the basis of which , teachers can personally experiment with modalities of CL under the supervision of expert, and then reflect on their utilization at school; and on the institution of a research community on the basis of which teachers are included to rethink of themselves as a community of researchers, oriented into the development of new patterns of CL and new techniques for the class activities organization.

Working according this modality implies a remarkable change in the way teacher operate in the class. They, in fact, do not play anymore, thanks to this methodology, the main guidance role during the lesson, insofar as the guidance carries out in various learning and self-regulated work centres corresponding to single groups where collective planning are created, derived from a multidirectional communication and mutual help forms.

In spite of all that, the teacher does not lose his7her leading role, according to Lewin (1948) or rather he is an essential point of reference for the group's objectives realization, as well as the promoter of the positive interdependence. In this sense, the author defines the teacher as a democratic and directorial leader since she/he discusses the decision referend to the activities with the groups. Encourages the communication, the members participation to the school life, and more over creates the conditions in order that the pupils' tasks may be qualitatively effective.

The conflict are regulated by the teacher her/himself, negotiated by pupils and capable to promote the development of social knowledge and abilities.

The teacher is not only ready to help, he also fixes the fundamental rules, controls and evaluates the carrying out of the task and the learning levels.

The teacher's role is therefore essential for the promotion of the individual and social dynamics and a positive learning atmosphere.

In other terms a work group can be successful not only when is members are bond together by an interdependent relationship, but even when they manifest their pleasure to work together , by knowing the others' and their own qualities and flaws, by the reciprocal appreciation and by bringing out own's abilities, encouraging one another in the moments of difficulty; these are the behaviours which promote the achievement of common aims.

Following these directions, the difference between group work and cooperative work can be identified in the modality by which the condition for activating the cooperation are constructed.

 In the most ordinary organization of group work with the class in generally associated to the behaviours of positive interaction between pupils, founded on the basis of mutual help concept, of collaboration, of respect that the teacher encourages. In the cooperative organization of the lesson, pupils are stimulated by an opportune work planning concerning the groups and in other circumstances explicitly indicated through specific formative paths.

As a consequence, in order to carry out a CL activity and not simple group works, one needs to create specific organizing condition, that have been described by Johnson and Johnson, in five planning criteria, and are still considered particularly effective in order to create a context of cooperative learning. They are:

- Positive interdependence;
- Individual and collective responsibility;
- Promotional interaction face-to-face;
- Teaching and use of social competences;
- Group assessment.

The positive interdependence is one of the main elements at the basis of the cooperative didactis.

M. Deutsch and K. Lewin define this concept as follows: the group is a dynamic whole with a structure of its own, peculiar aims and particular relations; that means that a changing in one of its parts concerns the other parts. The group interdependence is every member's consciousness to be related to the others, and to depend on them to achieve a common objective.

This relationship is positive when there is cooperation and bond connecting the individuals, become a factor which encourages everyone's development. From this point of view, the inefficacious actions promote a compensation action into the others, which reduces the negative effects and prevents their repetition.

On the other hand, the effective actions cause a positive psychological involvement and stimulate motivation and participation. The success of the single individuals becomes the success of all individuals., whereas the failure of one member contributes to the everybody's failure. That's why "the positive interdependences promotes communication, help, information exchange, acceptation, since everyone can offer one own's resources and is fully aware that his contribution is important for the common success" (M. Comoglio, A.M. Cardoso, 1996).

From this point of view, the group members predispose, create and promote the conditions which allow the individual to achieve abilities which are hard to achieve on one's own. The individual and group responsibility relates to the danger, often present in traditional groups, to take responsibility away from single members. In cooperative work, the group is responsible of the achievement of its objectives but each member must be responsible as far as he/she is concerned and for the whole group.

It would be deleterious, in fact, as well as counter- productive for the group's activity and for the individual themselves if the group dimension became the place where somebody hides her/himself or exploits other people's work to cover his/her inactivity. It is visual, in fact, that in a group-work organization, some dynamics characterized by delegation mechanisms are generate by some students.

They are usually delegation workings operated by less and motivate students in favour of other and more clever students. In this way, however, the group, exploiting the students who dedicate themselves to work and crushing the ones who are successful, is transformed from a resources to an instrument which damages both the most gifted pupils, who will commit themselves less, and the least gifted ones, that, on turns, will not catch the opportunity of learning.

 To avoid this eventuality, Kagan (1986) sets out the two principles which are to be applied to the group work organization and which correspond to the highest level of participation possible by everyone and to an equal level of participation by everyone. If the first principle insist on the importance of the highest level of commitment and involvement, and of participation of the members, to avoid undesirable phenomena such as the loss of resources, the slowness of work.

The second insist on the importance of everybody's participation with the same vigour in the common work.

The CL can foresee, therefore, a crucial variable for this accomplishment. Represented by development of students' sense of responsibility in the   carrying out of group objectives, it is realized by the individual assignment of a different and precise role. Thanks to this assignment, it is possible to promote the assumption of responsabilities facing the task. Not with standing, it is not a question of being responsible only of one own's role but also of stimulating one own's mates to assume the responsibility of their own's tasks.

It is right to tell that the choose to introduce the roles into the group can have a double value. On one hand, it allows an evaluation of the single member's work and of his responsibility, on the other hand it allows a group assessment for the work outcome and therefore the achievement of the foreseen objective.

The aim of the cooperative warning groups is, in fact, that of reinforcing the individual competence of every member too, insofar as the students learn together and then singly provide better performances.

When the sense of responsibility develops the cooperative situation turns into an experience which is an occasion for personal growing, for expressing one own's originality. A possibility to unite one own's efforts with those of the other people to achieve better result than the ones one could achieve acting on his own.

The promotional interaction face-to-face, also defined direct constructive interaction, develops "vis-à-vis" and aims to increase the reciprocal knowledge among the members of group and favour a pleasant atmosphere. One which allows everybody to feel at ease and comfortable in that group.

Since it is right that the groups work in a learning community, the creation of a pleasant class atmosphere is the first objective which a teacher must have at heart when she/he wants to introduce a cooperative learning experience with her/his students. A good atmosphere is realized by the assistance, the openness and the reciprocal knowledge, the recognition of the others' competences and qualities, the sense of confidence and dependence towards the partners and is fostered by behaviours through which the group's members express deep feeling of esteem, respect and reciprocal acceptance.

Therefore, it requires a long time for its construction, but it can be distributed with little: it is a very frail and precarious condition which can be easily altered even by the slightest reactions of defense, lacking of communication antagonism and rivalry. The atmosphere can be thought as a condition which is distributed on various organizing levels in which different levels of attention are established in order to facilitate the common commitment promoting attitudes and condition of encouragement esteem, confidence, acceptance, communication and collaboration.

We can adopt a distinction among a school atmosphere, a class atmosphere and a group atmosphere. They enjoy a certain autonomy but there are some connections among them which assure support and development.

To promote a condition of constructive direct interaction implies that the teacher aims to favour the development into students of the awareness of the importance of the mutual help for achieving the objective, trough various levels of helpfulness: to help and to be helped, to support one other, to encourage and improve one other, to accept constructive criticism, supply feedback on the procedure (Felisatti, 2006, p.131).

In this sense, we can affirm that the promotional interaction face-to-face, in the introductive phases of the CL, is to be promoted before starting the work on the objective to achieve and before introducing the utilizable structures of positive interdependence.

The teaching and the use of the social competence are fundamental for an effective and a positive interaction in groups, since they meet the working requirements of the group. In this perspective, they have been defined as an integrated system of cognitive function and vaebal and non verbal behaviours activated by an individual when the interacts with the other people (Cacciamani, 2008).

Johnson, Johnson and Holubec divide them into two groups: those aiming to conduct an effective interpersonal relationship, and the ones linked to the cooperative group work.

The first ones can be defined relational basic competences. They concern:

- The reciprocal knowledge and confidence;
- The clear and accurate communication;
- The mutual acceptance and support;
- The solution of the conflicts.

To know and to trust the other people are the basic elements which favour the emerging of the students' willingness to cooperate and avoid the ridk that the least gifted students are excluded, they are just represented by a reciprocal knowledge and by the development of a climate of confidence. To communicate clearly and accurately instead, implies the capability to express ones' own thought effectively, and to be able to listen to the other's thought is a fundamental aspect for arriving to a shared comprehension of the themes which are to be faced, and for getting ready for the adoption of new and negotiated work strategies (Cacciamani, 2008). To accept and to support one another are the crucial elements which create a good climate, a context culture at the basis of the direct constructive interaction principle. They are represent by the capacity to recognize the problematic aspects of the relation and to accept them, to ask for help without embarrassment and to help without taking the other's place. To solve the conflicts refers to the datum of group activity, since in it some conflicts of a socio-cognitive or relational nature can require opportune listening modalities, from the point of view of the other and negotiation of the solutions. The competences of group cooperation instead are divide into:

- Competences for the formation and the starting off of the group;
- Competences of functioning;
- Competences of learning;
- Competences of stimulus for the meta-cognitive reflection.

The competences for the group's formation and starting off are "necessary for the starting off of the CL group's formation, in the most effective way, as, for example, to move noiselessly to form the group or to speak softly, or to avoid waste of time" (Cacciamani, 2008, p. 40).

The competences for the functioning of the group are those which allow the organization and the carrying out of the task and the maintenance of efficacious work relations among the members, such as the recapitulation of the assigned tasks, the common strategy planning, the group work guidance, at a given point, the recording of the decision taken. The learning competences allow a shared comprehension of the contents which are the object of study, the promotion of strategies, the strengthening of content's mastery and memorization, objects of the common work.

The competences of stimulus to the meta-cognitive reflection concern the promotion of the reflection on the work strategies effectiveness used by the group, the critical discussion, the search for further solutions to problems and the transfer of strategies to new context (Cacciamani, 2008).

In the cooperative learning groups, students have to learn the contents of school subjects as well as the interpersonal abilities and those of a small group to operate profitably, everyone as part of the group.

The CL is in itself complex, since students have to look after their task, and the same time, the group work. The group's members must be able to play efficacious-a-guidance role, to make decision, to create a climate of confidence, to communicate, to control the conflicts and to be motivated in using the requested skills. These social abilities, moreover, are to be taught with the same consciousness and accuracy than school abilities.

In effect, at school, the cooperative interaction requires a specific learning training, to be united to activities of utilization of the formative contents, and cognitive strategie usefull for the organization of the knowledge which has been dealt with. For this reason , the social competences can be also defined capacities to organizing cognition and behavior in action, whose social effects are recognized on the cultural and interpersonal level.

The research in this field has identified some constitutive elements of social competences:

- A cognitive component concerning one's own knowledge and its utilization as regards to the objective to achieve;
- A verbal and non-verbal behavior component , linked to the modalities of communication;
- A motivational, pro-social component in view of the objective to achieve;
- A meta-cognitive component which is able to activate the reflection on the processes "in fieri" or those which have been achieved (Felisatti, 2006, p.133).

The CL does not suppose that the members of a cooperative group have already these competences; it starts from the idea that the group work encourages their acquisition, above all after a careful examination (Comoglio, Cardoso, 1996).

That is why the social competences are gradually acquired, and requirepositive models of reference as well as their accomplishment. In this sense, the inclusion of students who have not any social competences into a group and the request of their cooperation, is not a guarantee in itself of their ability in doing that effectively. On this purpose, the teacher not only must promote into students the development of basic relational competences and of cooperative competences aiming to an effective collaboration, but she/his must also motivate them to their utilization.

The group assessment (or evaluation) can be considered, in the field of the CL, a co-evaluation since spaces of confrontation between the student's self-assessment and the teacher's assessment are forecast.

In these terms, the cognitive responsibility of the students carries out firstly by the engagement in the development of the evaluation criteria; this is an important element, since students generally do not know the elements which characterize their performances (Cacciamani, 2008). Moreover, students take part in the decision-making process about the validity of a product or its efficacy, rather than to depend exclusively and passively from the expert adult's tudgement.

The confrontation between the assessment of the students and the assessment of the teacher is therefore fundamental since it allows the pupils to learn the more refined way for the evaluation of their product and their strategies. Thanks to the awareness of the necessity of their engagement students can use the formative role of evaluation in order to construct paths of progressive improvement of their learning. Finally, as regards to the work modality evaluation, the CL provides for spaces and modality for the revision of work, in order to allow a continue improvement of the strategie used by the group and the social competences which are put into practice.

Given the complexity of the factors which come into play in the cooperative activity, two effective modalities of group revision must be taken into account: the monitoring and the processing (Cacciamani, 2008).

The former is used in the progress of work; the latter is used at the conclusion of the process.

Monitoring is based on the collection of information through the observation which takes place during the group work. In this phase, the teacher must determine the aim of the observation and the person who will be the observer, who might be the teacher her/himself or a student from the group, or a person outside the group. Moreover, the most suitable modality of observation must be chosen, either free or structured. The free observation is orientated into the recognition of the most significant elements of the group without resorting to grids: the observer's attention is guided by elements which emerge spontaneously from the context. The structured observation, instead, provides for the utilization of observation grids which have pre-defined categories of behavior to observe.

The processing, instead, indicates the feedback, attributed to the class after a work session, therefore it indicates a revision or a work reflection assigned to a group. In order to give efficacy to this form of revision, the focus of attention must not be put on the subjects but on the concrete objects such as the behavior and the way of working.

In this phase, students and teachers must linger on the description of what has be done concretely, without judgements and interpretations.

 The objective of this phase is that of improving the work of the group's members and support their engagement; therefore the discussion must arrive at concrete decisions, shared with all the group.

It is useful to find a form of recording of the progress achieved in regard to the previous meeting. To be effective, the duration of the revision phase must be limited to short times. The processing, moreover, can develop by utilizing the observations in the monitoring, in a group discussion, or just through the group discussion (Cacciamani, 2006, p.44).

The work scheme of processing provides for three more phases:
- A feedback on the evaluation object, concerning strategies or social competences;
- A reflection on this feedback;
- The recognition of the aims for improvement which are to be pursued in the immediate future.

We think it right to remember that evaluation carried out at the end of a work-group depends notably from the quality of monitoring realized in "itinere". Moreover, the interdependence between the two forms of evaluation, the individual evaluation and the group evaluation, promotes a greater collaboration among the students and supports the helping process toward those who are most in troubles; on the whole the evaluation cannot be

exempted from the consideration of the development levels of the single individual or of the group at the synchronic and diachronic level.

In the group evaluation, the members discuss and verify their progress towards the achievement of the objectives and the efficacy of their work relationship. The groups must identify and describe what actions of the members have been positive or negative and decide what kinds a behavior must be maintained or modified. In order to improve progressively the learning process, the modalities of the collective group work and the possibility of improving its efficacy, must be carefully analyzed.

The contribution of all subjects must converge:

The pupil, the peers the teacher, who all have contributed to the learning progress; in conclusion, it is useful to remember that the realization of a CL gains efficacy through the disciplined action.

The five base-elements are not only the features of a good group of CL, they are also the principles to be applied rigorously to obtain an efficacious collaborative action.

In these terms, the CL techniques put the students of different ethnic groups into cooperative groups, in which each member is given a role on equal terms to help the group itself o achieve its aims. In this way, through the utilization of the CL the recovery of the ethical dimension of education is attained. In the cooperative work, it is easy to recognize categories which are traditionally absent from the frontal didactic process such as: the participation of the student in his learning process; the responsibility towards it own student work and also towards his mates; the reflection on his acting endowed with sense and on his student role, the sharing of his ideas, information, data, materials, his taking care of the others.

These categories tend to the reinforcement the didactic models founded on the structured work-group and on the team. Their application, in fact, strengthens the productivity of work, the student's identity and self esteem, as well as the altruism and the recognition of the other and the different. The elaboration of cognitive objectives in team produces cognitive abilities of a superior nature and, which is much more important at the beginning of the 3rd millennium, some social abilities which are more and more appreciated in social and work context.

These abilities, defined "social skills" concern; communication; problem-solving; decision; confidence; conflict resolution; leadership; group learning and inter-ethnic relations. The last skill constitutes an interesting point in favour of the cooperative group work, since it allow to lend oneself ideally to the process of acceptance and integration of the foreign pupils in the class group. With regard to that, a number of researcher, has highlighted that the students educated in cooperative learning context, have achieved not only an improvement in the strictly academic field, but they have changed their attitude towards the various ethnic groups, they have become more "pro-social".

Moreover, these researches have put in evidence another important result attainable by using the cooperative work and refer to the improvement into the proficiency of the minorities' pupils, in the cooperative classes. The researches led by john Hopkins group, in Baltimora, still unsurpassed, state the superiority of the group learning for the overcoming of racial prejudices in school setting (Chiari, 2011).

The reasons for this superiority, in particular as concerns the pupils of social disadvantaged minorities, ethnic and linguistic, are to be attributed to the differences existing in the academic task nature, in the structure of the recompense given to students, in the teacher's role, and in the cultural compatibility encouraged by the cooperative climate to which everybody contributes most of the researches which have studied the relations in the class open to the various groups as a function of the interaction and help towards the group-mates have recorded a general positive evaluation , recognizing that the CL promotes the inter-ethinc contacts.

That is made possible by a democratic management of the class based on etherogeneous and constructive work groups, on the positive interdependence of roles and on equal chances of success for everyone.

Therefore the task of school is teaching the complex art of a cooperative living together , through a monitored path able to develop everybody's talents, in the view of the group's enrichment.

The fundamental aim of the CL is therefore, the increase of cognitive processes and of social competences, in a non-competitive context, which is, moreover, responsible and collaborative.

The education towards a capacity of collaborative learning is very relevant in our complex society, where the individual work, not anymore sufficient, operates in a climate of interdependence in every social field.

The motivational, cognitive and social theories agree upon, the recognition that only in the cooperative learning structure, the efforts centred on every pupil's objective contribute to the achievement of the aims also by the mates.

Each student wishes that her/his mates do well, for the possible relapses on the common work, and adopt a "pro-social" attitude which will probably tend to spread. Therefore, the CL means working together to achieve common objectives, either didactic or social, and operating in a context where every pupil, as the one who lives a difficult condition or is member of a ethnic minority, perceives the importance of her/his contribution. The reciprocal help and the interdependence, as cohesion agents, have a remarkable role, since working together, learning through cognitive conflicts, recognizing that the to individual success corresponds the collective success, have positive aspects.

The CL must have the following effects: the recovery of the students who are not motivated and have social, affective and cognitive problems; the integration of the maladjusted and disable students, with the contemporaneous enhancement of the good pupils, thanks to the development of social skills, public spirit, respect for the others, participation, responsibility and interdependence.

MATERIALS OF METHOD

On this purpose, the CL utilizes the following models:
- The Jigsaw Model; The TGT; The STAD, The Learning Together and The Small Group Teaching Method. The first three models are defined methods of peer-tutoring, the other two are defined group-investigation (G-I) approaches. In the classification operated by S Sharan, the experimentations done with the two groups of methods are referred to their effects on:
- Academic achievements that is the cognitive and socio-relational aspects of learning, referred to the scholastic proficiency;
- Attitudes, that is the students' attitudes;
- Ethnic relations that is the ethnic relations in the desegregated classes, where the ethnic-racial segregation was abolished.
On the basis of Sharan's classification, peer-touring techniques maintain many forms of traditional education characterized by the whole class, such as:
- The emphasis on the information and basic abilities acquisition thanks to the materials presented by the teacher and the pupil review;
- The individual report by means of test or other more equalitarian means of evaluation;
- The scarce or absent open discussion about ideas, since everything is based on the content, even if the peer-tutoring tends to improve considerably the bilateral communication.
The peer-touring class can turn from the aggregation of individuals, as in the education of the whole class, into aggregation of groups (Chiari, 2011).
Nevertheless, neither the groups nor the whole class have a collective academic objective and so peer-touring methods do not apply the cooperation in the aims, and do not define the learning objectives.
The corollary of this approach is that all the groups in the class are engaged in the same task, that is to see again the same materials presented by the teacher. The groups can compete for the recompense, but they have no reason the coordinating their work. As a consequences, the class has not an emergent function as a social unit and does not produce any products apart from the one realized by a common team (Chiari, 2011).
The G-I model works differently. It is centred on the fact that the students collect information from a large spectre of sources, in collaboration with their school fellows. The learning tasks are relatively complex, including cognitive process of superior level, among which we find the selection and the critical interpretation of information, the problem solving and the production of a collective synthesis of ideas.
This model utilizes the assignment of roles into the groups and among the groups, so that the single pupil may contribute to the creation of unique products for the integration into the common group project, and in teams, can explore various aspects of one or more subjects.
The student team learning, elaborated by Robert Slavin, from John Hopkins University of Baltimora, is based, instead, on three main elements:
- The reward for everybody;
- The individual responsibility for oneself and for the others;
- The same chances of success for everybody.
On the basis of these propositions the S.T.L. differs for five techniques, applicable to each level of school: the Student Team Achievement Division (STAD), the Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), the Jigsaw, the Team Assisted Individualization (TAI) and the cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC).
The STAD model is applicable to any school content, and in its experimentations, proved efficacious both for the disciplinary contents learning and the solution of problem on a relational level, as the inclusion cultures into the class (Cacciamani, 2008).
The application of the STAD consist in the following sequences:
1) The presentation of a new subject-theme by the teacher, through a brief lesson: the STAD moves from the weekly presentation of a subject of study. After tracing together with the class the knowledge in possession of the students.
The teacher explains the new subject through a lesson. By means of causal question, the teacher evaluates the comprehension of the students as regard the presented subject-theme and makes explicit to the class the following phases of the work, which will be carried out by groups of four or five members.

2) The formation of groups for which "it is important to consider the criterion of the heterogeneity of the competence levels referred to the task, since the integration of the various levels allows the improvement of learning and encourages the sharing of the individual resources" (Cacciamani, 2008, p.47).

The duration of the group work is of one or two lessons at most and students must assimilate the contents presented and take care of whom is in trouble.

3 – the work group or mastering implies that within the group in pairs students ask questions and discuss with the help of work sheets which can require a synthesis of the subject theme the construction of a semantic map, the realization of tables or exercises. Through the reciprocal questioning, learning is checked "in itinere"; at the end of work, all the group's members must have achieved a complete mastering of the object of study.

4 – the check tests concern the individual verification which takes place through the work itself and lasts half an hour; students are not allowed to interact. In fact, in this phase, everyone must test the accuracy of this wearning and feel responsible of it. The correction of the tests can be done by the teacher or by pupils' interchanging. A score is assigned on the basis of the correct answers and the wrong answers and each pupil is evaluated according his/her improvement in comparison with a preceding evaluation, based on the same content in which a base-score has been previously established.

5 – group rewards and evaluations on the individual emprovement concern the utilization to base – scores which point out the initial level of competence of every student, as regard the object of study. That allows a group and an individual evaluation based on personal competence rather than on the confrontation with others. Every subject gets a score indicating the improvement of competence compared with one's own base-score; all the group's improvements are added up in order to get the group score, also considered according the number of the members, through conversation tables. Finally, a list of the groups is drafted on the bases of improvement score obtained and the teacher cares for bringing out the results, through the class newsletter for example.

Giving publicity to the results achieved by the groups is the rewarding element, which has a function of reinforcement. This assessment modality intends to structurate a competition among groups that, according Slavin, should stimulates a cooperative behavior among groups, orientated to encourage the competences of every member to realize an increment in the group's score.

In this CL technique, the emphasis in on the survey of the materials' taught by the teacher through the assistance of the school fellows and on the distribution of the recompenses to the group's members, through a recording system carred out by the teacher which excludes the face to face competition among students.

The teacher assigns the students to one of the various achievement divisions, based on a "equal status achievement membership", considering the results previously achieved. The important thing is the recording of the scores obtained by every pupil in the various tests repeated for a given subject-matter, in order to evaluate the improvement (or not) and construct the criterion for the assignment of improvement points.

The score of each student on weekly tests are confronted only with the ones of one's own group (division members). That increases the motivation and every one's changes of a high score. The STAD, finally, requires an highly structured card of didactic activities and relative tests and quizzes (Chiari, 2011, p. 34).

The cycle is carried out twice a week:

- brief lesson: forty minutes of reading;
- discussion: discussion teacher/student;
- mastering: forty minutes of group study on work sheets;
- testing: a twenty minutes quiz.

The model TGT is similar to the STAD. It shares with the initial explanation of the teacher, the formation of heterogeneous starting groups and a period of group work learning. The student are assigned by the teacher to 4-5 members groups. The composition of the groups intends to reflect a transversal section of the class' levels of academic ability and represents the social levels and the ethnic groups as well as both the genres (Chiari, 2011).

The function of these group is that to prepare their members, through a peer tutoring, to take part into a fair tournament – learning play, repeating the materials previously presented by the teacher.

These particular activities, the "tournament" of school plays, are based on questions about the contents of the lesson, in which a representative of each group takes part, competing with other representatives of the same level of competence. The learning groups work for six weeks in a row and their activity aims to the acquisition of the knowledge which is the object of the plays. Every week students are divided into tournament tables, composed of three participant: the assignment to the tournament tables, therefore, puts together three students of the same competence (comparable academic achievement) as it results from previous tests of the same disciplinary area (Chiari, 2011).

A tournament usually ends after 40 minutes and consists in questions with brief answers related to curricular subjects. The material used in the TGT are the same utilized in the STAD but 30 numbered cards are added.

Every 3 students each containing a question relating to the studied subject matter.

"Every tournament table has a sheet with one with the answer and thirty cards marked by a number corresponding to the written questions. Once the numbered cards are shuffled, the first player chooses one at

random and reads the question in a loud voice, trying to answer correctly. Then the player on his left gives her/his answer; if she/he thinks that her/his friend's answer is incorrect if he/she renounces the third player can express her/his opinion. At the end of this phase, the third player reads in a loud voice the answer written on the sheet of the solutions. The one who has answered correctly can keep the numbered card. In the case of no right answers, the numbered card is put again into the pack, on the table. The game goes on until all cards are finished then the students sum up the scores and write down the total of the day. During the game, the teacher's task is that of moving among the groups and give help if the procedures are not clear" (Cacciamani, 2008, p. 48).

When the game is over the three contestants are put in gerarchic order and are assigned a score (the best of them gets 6 scores, the medium 4, the lowest 2). The group scores are obtained, then, summing up the single member's scores, each for every tournament table, creating a reward interdependence in the analysis group. The more the students help one another, the more the gaining of scores in the tournament is probable. At the end of every week, the game tables are changed on the basis of the score received in the preceding performance: the player with the highest score is promoted to a table of higher competence, the second remain at the same and the third recedes to the table with an inferior levels of competences. Every week the teacher presents a report on the scores received by the grouped express appreciation for the efforts of every member, underlining the progress in comparison with the previous week and through a classroom newsletter he/she announces everyone's situation in the class with the comments on the winner of each table.

While the composition of the tournament groups of the various table changes continually (a values overturning of the players, called dumping) after each tournament, according to the results of the various contests and the scores gained by the contestants, viceversa, the composition of the learning group, the base-groups, remains constant for a period which goes from 6 to 10 weeks, in order to develop heterogeneity in the levels of competence and positive relations (Chiari, 2011). The jigsaw model has three variables, called respectively I II and III. The first Jigsaw, the original version proposed by Elliott Aronson provides for four phases of work:

1) The contest preparation: the teaches introduces the subject-matter of study, divides the theme into under-subject which assigns to the students, with the textual work materials.

2) The base groups and requires an exploratory reading to the students.

3) The experts groups formation: they are formed by the students who have read the same part of didactic materials; they discuss on the contents of the material clearing up the less simple points.

4) Socialization of the knowledge in the base-groups: once the materials have been discussed and interiorized the experts come back to the former groups and everyone presents one's own undersubject to her/his school fellows sharing the acquired knowledge.

The Jigsaw II created by Slavin, as a variable of the original Jigsaw, overcomes an important limit of the latter: each student, in the first version of the technique risks to acquire completely only the first part of the content of which he must become expert, while she/he proves to be not much prepared on the remaining materials this further version, therefore, provides for the following five phases:

1) The context preparation: the variable consists in the fact that teacher also presents the evaluation tests under the form of questionnaire or written or oral report, proposed to the students at the end of the phase of the group-work.

2) Formation of base-groups: they are formed and in every group each student is given different parts of the materials of study, with the request of examining them individually; the experts-groups will be formed only when everybody will have read one's own part of text.

3) Experts groups formation: the students discuss and develop the materials assigned and focus on the central information of their part; the experts can elaborate some question in order to verify if their base-groups fellows have well understood the explanation which they will provide to them in the following phase.

4) Socialization of the knowledge in the base-groups: each students comes back to the starting point and explains the theme he dealt with, being very careful to do a clear exposition which everyone can comprehend thoroughly. At the end of the presentation, each expert proposes the questions to control if the exposition has been effective; otherwise, she/he will offer further explanations.

5) Individual evaluation test: it is the phase in which each student undergoes some tests which must be resolved without the help of the schoolfellows, for the control of the real and personal comprehension of all the materials presented during the group discussion. At the end of the test, the recognition of group is offered.

In the Jigsaw III the procedure is the same of Jigsaw II, enriched with a further intermediate phase, which follows the number 4 of version II, where students meet in the various initial base-groups, after a few weeks, to revise the subject and help one another on the obscure points in view of the individual final test, which represents the last phase of this technique (Cacciamani, 2008).

Beyond the technical aspect of the various versions, we can affirm that the Jigsow provides an interesting alternative to the transmitting lesson by allowing the student to become the researcher in the phase of the experts and the teacher towards his/her school fellows.

In this way, the student not only learns but he even teaches helping the others to acquire information previously internalized. In the Jigsaw, every student plays an essential role, just at the piece of a puzzle (from which the name of the technique derives) for the global completion and comprehension (Cacciamni, 2008).

RESULTS

The experiment-model of the research inspected by S. Sharan on the result of the Jigsaw pattern is: pupils involved in the experiment varied from a minimum number of 120 to a maximum of 304, divided into groups of work, verification, discussion and feedback (Sharan, 1980).
All cooperative groups studied the same materials identically subdivised among the groups' members.
After receiving the information about the cards or document prepared in advance, the Jigsaw group separated temporarily to form new groups of "experts" including all the pupils which had received the same card or document. In these groups pupils helped one other to learn the materials and prepare their presentation to their group of origin. In this kind of model, pupils have a clear task to perform, defined by a number of information, and they have to teach what they have learned, which is a very effective motivational technique. "It is a good thing that also the jigsaw group are composed by a base of heterogeneity of achievement, genre, ethnic and sociometric background: anyway, neither the best friends nor the worts enemies should be together" (Sharan, 1980, p. 244).
Pupils of different ethnic/racial background (from 50/50 to 20/80) with 576 "experimental" teachers, took part into the experiment for 45 minutes a day, every day, for 2 or 3 weeks, with control-groups of classes (5/6) traditionally managed with the whole class the dependent variables were the achievement levels, obtained by a test of 37 items, including multiple-choice questions, of the kind true/false concorded by class teachers.
The results: they reported a remarkable advantage for the experimental group's pupils, belonging to the group of the ethnic minorities, but no disadvantage for the pupils of the whites' group. The 60 pupils of the minority group got 56% of correct answer (20.9 items) in the experimental group, in regard to 49.7 of percentage of correct answers (18.4) items in traditional classes.
We can concluded that the utilization of the CL can be considered efficacious not only on the level of scholastic success but even for the students personal wellbeing and the quality of their relationships.
On support of this conclusion, the effectiveness of the CL has been widely demonstrated by research, particularly by authors like David W. Johnson and Roger J. Johnson, who, working in the field of didactic method, have provided one of the most significant contributions to the development of the cooperative approach.
In their numerous publications on this technique, one of which is called emblematically "Learning together and alone: cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning", they have led a complete analysis of hundreds' of researches on cooperative, competitive and individualistic work, particularly examining three aspects: committent and motivation in working, positive interpersonal relations and psychological wellbeing.
" The research shows that cooperation, in comparison with competitive and individualistic work, usually allows the achievement of the following results:
- Students achieve better results: all the students, of various learning abilities, work more and achieve better results; memorize better and for a longer time develop a greater intrinsic motivation, reflect more on the task and develop highest levels of reasoning and critical ability;
- More positive relations among the students: a team spirit, friendship and mutual support arise, the diversity is respected and appreciated, and the group works together well.
- A greater psychological well being: the psychological adaptation of the students is better as their sense of self-effectiveness, self-esteem and self-image; students develop social competences and the ability to face stress and difficulties.
Thanks to the great impact which the CL operates on so many aspects of students' school experience, this teaching method is one of the most important instruments of didactics (Johnson, Johnson, Holubec, 1999, pp.19-20).
Therefore, the CL promotes the attainment of a number of important goals, such as:
- Raising the level of all students, whatever they school result may be; constructing positive relations among the students, essential for the construction of a learning community which accept and respect the diversity;
- Provide the students with the experiences they need for a good cognitive, psychological and social development.

CONCLUSIONS

In this terms, assuming that the primary objective of the school formative action is that of give a form to the identity of a person, supporting the full development of the subjective potentialities, and assuming that the achievement of this objective implies the involvement of three factors, which at school must be of quality, that is

teaching, context and learning, we can affirm that CL can be considered an excellent formative process, in which the educational quality is in itself transforming (E. Becchi, 2000), since it assumes the co-presence of various subjects, since they have to confront different knowledge and point of view, these subjects, through the CL, learn to interact and negotiate, in order to unite the specificity of their individual needs with the perspective of a sustained growth on the social ground, that in its variety of cultures and ethnicities, through the CL, comes belong to everybody.

REFERENCES

Arendt H. (1964). *Vita Activa*, Milano, Bompiani.

Artz A., Newman C.M. (1990). *Cooperative Learning*, in "Mathematics Teacher", 83, pp. 448-9.

Becchi E. (2000). *La qualità educativa: punti di vista e significati*, in A. Bondioli, P.O. Ghedini, *La qualità negoziata*, Bergamo, Junior.

Cacciamani S. (2008). *Imparare cooperando. Dal cooperative Learning alla comunità di ricerca*, Roma, Carrocci.

Camoglio M., Cardoso M.A. (1996). *Insegnare e apprendere in gruppo. Il Cooperative Learning,* Roma, LAS, p. 75.

Chiari G. (2011). *Educazione interculturale e apprendimento cooperativo: teoria e pratica dell'educazione tra pari*, Trento, Dipartimento di Sociologia e ricerca sociale. Quaderno n.57.

Cohen E. (1992). *Restructuring the classroom, "Issues in restructuring schools*", New York, Teachers College Press.

Collins A., Brown J.S., Newman S. (1995). *L'apprendistato cognitivo. Per insegnare a leggere, scrivere e far di conto,* in C. Pontecorvo, A.M. Ajello, C. Zucchermaglio (a cura di), *I contesti dell'apprendimento*, Milano, LED, pp.181-231.

Delors J. (1997). *Nell'educazione un tesoro*, Roma, Armando.

Deutsh M. (1949). *A Theory of Cooperation and Competition*, in "Human Relation", 2, pp.129-52.

Dewey J. (1922). *Democracy and Education,* New York, trad.it. Firenze, La nuova Italia.

Dewey J. (1954). *Il mio credo pedagogico*, Firenze, La nuova Italia.

Ellerani P. (2007). *Educare all'interculturalità,* Torino, SEI.

Fabris A. (2011). *La scelta del dialogo, Breviario filosofico per comunicare meglio*, Padova, Messaggero.

Felisatti E. (2006). *Team e didattiche cooperative,* Lecce, La Biblioteca Pensa MultiMedia.

Hargreaves A. (1994), *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age,* Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hijzen D., Boekaerts M., Vedder P. (2006). *The Relationship between the Qualityof Cooperative Learning, Students' Goal Preferences, and Perception of Contextual Factors in the Classroom,* in "Scandinavian Journal of Psychology", 47, pp. 9-21.

Johnson D.W., Johnson R.T. (1983). *Peers: The Key to Healthy Development and Socialization,* in "Character", 2, pp.1-8.

Johnson D.W., Johnson R.T., Holubec E.J. (1996). *Apprendimento cooperativo in classe. Migliorare il clima emotivo e il rendimento,* Trento, Erickson.

Kagan S. (1986). *Cooperative Learning and Sociological Factors in Schooling,* in C. Cortes (ed.), *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language-Minority Students*, Los Angeles, California State University Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, pp. 298-321.

Lewin K. (1948). *Resolving Social Conflict,* New York, Harper & Row.

Lupoli N. (a cura di) (2010). *Patrimoni identitari e dialogo interculturale*, Roma, Franco angeli.

Nanni A. (1998). *Quaderni dell'interculturalità,* n.6*, L'educazione interculturale oggi in Italia*. Panorama e prospettive, Bologna, EMI:

Piaget J. (1964). *Six études de psychologie*, Paris, Gonthier.

Portera A. (2000). *L'educazione interculturale nella teoria e nella pratica: stereotipi, pregiudizi e pedagogia interculturale nei libri di testo della scuola elementare*, Padova, CEDAM.

Rogoff B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in Thinking. Cognitive Development in Social Context,* Oxford, Oxford University Press, (trad.it. *Imparando a pensare*, Milano, 2006, Raffaello Cortina).

Sharan S. (1980). *Cooperative Learning in Small Groups: Recent Methods and Effexts on Achievement, Attitudes, and Ethnic Relations*, in "Review of Educational Research", 50, pp. 241-71.

Sharan Y., Sharan S.(1990). *Group Investigation Expands Cooperative Learning, in Educational Leadership*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp. 17-21.

Slavin R.E. (1980). *Using Student Team Learning,* Baltimora, The John Hopkins University Press.

Slavin R.E. (1985). *Cooperative Learning Applying Contact Theory in Desegregated School*, in " Journal of Social Issues", pp. 45-62.

Slavin R.E. (1990). *Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Learning*, in "Educational Leadership", Baltimora, The John Hopkins University Press.
Vygotskij L.S. (1974). *Storia dello sviluppo delle funzioni psichiche superiori*, Firenze, Giunti.