"Peer" learning. An exercise in democracy

Patrizia Magnoler

Riassunto: *Da diversi decenni gli insegnanti vivono una dimensione di ricerca sulla propria pratica per alimentare sia una cultura partecipativa all'interno della comunità professionale, sia le conoscenze specifiche sulle problematiche connesse all'insegnamento, in particolare alla trasposizione e mediazione didattica. Lo stato di "insegnante ricerca-tore" è stato diversamente interpretato e curvato nei modelli formativi che si ispirano alla collaborazione tra "pari", identificabili non solo nei colleghi, ma anche i ricercatori uni-versitari e non. La postura necessaria alla realizzazione di esperienze di co-formazione è individuabile nella disponibilità a condividere i saperi (teorici e della pratica) al fine di affrontare efficacemente i problemi che si presentano, disponibilità che si accompagna alla responsabilità, all'ascolto reciproco, all'attenzione verso una complessità sistemica. Vivere esperienze di ricerca-formazione permette di alimentare la conoscenza profes-sionale ma consente altresì di fare esperienza consapevole di democrazia.*

Abstract: *For several decades teachers have been living a research dimension on their own practice to nurture both a participatory culture within the professional community, and the specific knowledge about problems connected to teaching, specifically to the trans-position and to the educational mediation. The status of "research teacher" was differently interpreted in the training models founded on collaboration among "peers", meant not only as the colleagues, but also as the academic and non academic researchers. The attitude which is necessary to create experiences of co-training is to be found in the availability in sharing knowledge (thereotical and practical) in order to face the problems that occur in an effective way. This availability is accompanied by responsibility, reciprocal listen-ing, and the attention towards a systemic complexity. Living experiences of co-training makes you able to nurture the professional knowledge, but also to make a conscious expe-rience of democracy.*

Keywords: *training, research, democratic participation, collaborative models.*

The idea of a teacher who develops among peers through research on personal training and for personal training has permeated the educational landscape for more than forty years, from the first definitions developed by Stenhouse (1977) to the current interpretations which also envisage a

collaborative approach between experts and teachers. But how have these research models carried out among equals changed over time and what reasons have led to these changes? How are research groups set up each time, which parties are involved? Which topics does research focus on?

The answer to these questions requires a systemic vision connected to the times, to social and cultural needs, to the concept of the teaching profession and the organisational operation within the school. Relationships with teacher associations and aggregations beyond the borders of any individual school come into play, as do those with other organisations and individuals dedicated to research, which bring important changes in the design and management of field surveys, through a dialogue which is built up between theoretical and practical knowledge.

One aspect in the different dimensions of research experienced by teachers within the different models remains constant in any case, namely that research is born and develops around an actual problem which is experienced as such by the school. The recursive relationship between problem and research on the one hand focuses attention on the real context, whilst on the other it requires a continuous processing and verification of hypothesis and a significant collection of data. Finally, the data must always be able to offer a broad and articulated picture through quantitative and qualitative collecting methods, the latter must be able to give visibility to the richness of reality, as explained by Stenhouse himself.

A second important aspect, intrinsic to doing research or being a researcher (Beillerot, 1991) is the elaboration of hypothesis, the process that manifests the culture which is being built up at the individual school. Every hypothesis is directly connected to the data collected, to the interpretative categories of those who process it, to sustainability which may be defined in relation to the context.

A third aspect that occurs recurrently is the interpretation of a democratic participation to the research and therefore the presence of forms of dialogue and mutual appreciation between the actors involved, which increases or decreases in relation to the social and professional context, according to how the different models vary.

Three different models (to innovate school culture and indirectly that of society, to address specific problems valuing various methods, to find mutually beneficial intervention strategies based on the procedures in use) which teachers have been facing since the 50s, will be addressed by this presentation. The purpose of this paper is not to historically reconstruct

the models, but to focus solely on how the investigation manner of the teaching methods was interpreted, highlighting in particular the extent of sharing with other peers or with experts who have become specific "peers" in their turn.

The research teacher in legislation

Before describing the three models we should retrace how research in schools, and therefore teacher training, has been interpreted in ministerial terms.

If research practices, intended as design-experiment-analysis-assessment, were already present in Italy since after the last war, it is in the seventies that we find the definition of research teacher. Despite the process applying models developed "out of school for the school," which required teachers to be "executive staff", it is at this time that participation in research and teaching and pedagogical innovation take shape as a fundamental right-duty for the upgrade of inspection, management and teaching staff (Presidential Decree 31st May 1974 n. 419). The idea of experimenting in order to innovate, to explore new teaching and organisation strategies in order to adapt the educational system to a social culture thereby entered into the school, which became both the cause and the recipient of the change itself. The decree had regulated and legitimated educational research in Italian schools, helping to fuel a favourable attitude to the search for improvement. In particular, art 3 defined the experimentation extent which could be carried out when struggling with an issue, specifying the reason, the working hypothesis, identifying the organisational needs, the cost estimate, the description of the methodological procedures, the means of verification and evaluation. Research and experimentation were connected because they were linked by a common goal: to change the existing, considered no longer suitable for responding to the problems posed by the incoming generations. Experimenting also meant inducing changes to the organisational formats of the school, not just dealing with educational problems which could be solved within the class.

Precisely in relation to change and experimentation, it is interesting to recall what Stenhouse said concerning the curriculum elaboration: he states that when it is produced from above (the ministry) it is unequivocal and tends to propose solutions; when it is elaborated within the individual

schools, it is based on problem-solving and proceeds through continuous phases of adaptation to reality, in order to pursue a progressive improvement of the procedures and work methods. It is in this latter case that the idea of a research teacher, which Stenhouse processed beginning from the Humanities Curriculum Project (1970), created with the aim of "developing an understanding of social situations and human actions, as well as of the controversial evaluation versions which they give rise to" (Stenhouse, 1975, 158), develops. The proposals for implementing such a research method required the observation of the procedure carried out between peers and an observation made by the academic class researcher who attempted, where possible, to remain neutral. However, the objectives appeared not to converge at all times; the researcher developed an interest in elaborating an educational theory rather than giving teachers a detailed view of the analysed action.

The different experiences at that time allow us to identify three different lines of research:

- Academic, uninterested in solving practical problems, oriented towards the discovery of process operations and the development of conceptualisations and methods;
- Political and administrative, mainly geared towards ensuring that changes in the school system should be implemented;
- By the professional communities and educational institutions which offer methodological support and training in order to improve methods.

Returning to the subject of national legislation, the autonomy law (Presidential Decree 275/99) and subsequently M. Decree 100/2002 which heralded the educational reform of 2003 (Law 53), already gave rise to a progressive transformation of the spirit of educational research as identified by Presidential Decree 419/74, towards "giving shape" to what had been previously decided at a ministerial level. Examples are given by the proposals made to schools to develop Learning Units, to develop itineraries inspired by an educational orientation. We agree with Calidoni that the latter fieldwork constitutes a means to facilitate the implementation of certain proposals with the aim of spreading and sharing a proposal born outside the classroom. This process makes use of some teachers (experts inter pares) who in turn become its promoters. Research institutes (IRRE, INDIRE), have often played a key role on behalf of the Ministry in promoting and sharing this process. Such research is configured as the space which combines

school with ministerial intentions through a process of "directed renewal".

But how is the research teacher trained? The analysis of the initial training and whilst working allows us to discover in particular the absence of specific trajectories.

Educational research seems to occupy a marginal niche even in a teacher's training structure which is based on an approach where the link between research and teach-ers/ings appears to be predominantly of a linear-application type or of mutual independence/juxtaposition, with a lack of recognition of the research by/with the teachers, to the point of not being included in a professional training profile (Calidoni, 2004, 45-46).

Not even M. Decree 249/2010, which established the new five-year course for teacher training, envisages the development of teaching research skills; the evidenced objectives show a convergence regarding didactic transposition and classroom management and the participation to an institutional view of school life. The image of a teacher who does research is recalled within the National Guidelines (2012) which suggest a devolution by the teacher to rethink teaching according to the development of pupils' skills. This is completed by the Accompanying Measures (2013) which represents the Action-Research (hereafter AR) combination, which is consistently used in ministerial and school language. In this case AR is functional to developing effective methods to implement normative objectives.

The research dimension inherent to the idea of professionalism is present instead in some professional profiles (MEQ, French Référentiel) and is connected to a reflection concerning development and continuous self-training. Research which takes on ethical connotations as the investigation is functional to the teacher's improvement and to the educational project. Even the choice of the object to be investigated is an ethical aspect as it highlights the importance given to certain topics rather than others. Research, as part of a vocational service, is also seen as a form of exercise of educational responsibility which must materialise in itineraries able to intervene on the present, but with a social planning perspective which pays attention to the need to form citizens able to participate in democratic life.

The research for innovating school and society

The teacher's figure, historically assigned to forming citizens, according to a well-defined political-cultural project, has often been implemented

ever are not independent from purposes (Ciari, 1961), they are the reification of a pedagogical vision which identified "cooperation as the dimension required in order to substantially transform education" (Pettini, 1980, p.20). The relevance and validity of the educational proposals was always discussed among teachers, referring on the one hand to the culture and methods spread by the Institut Coopératif de l'École Moderne (ICEM), and on the other to the children themselves who supplied directions and guidance contextually according to how their school work was carried out.

A similar need to re-establish a democratic school participation, but also to rethink educational culture, was shared by a part of the world of higher education and research (Codignola, Borghi, De Bartolomeis, Visalberghi and later Laporta, Tornatore, Santoni Rugiu who were all members of CTS). A fruitful cultural exchange between researchers and teachers who do not want to be identified as "empirical", but rather as school technicians, able to give visibility to pedagogical activism, was born from this synergy between different subjects who shared the same social and value-related vision. Rugiu recognises that cooperating for educational renewal is the real strength of these associations between teachers, which do not fall into line with ideologies and pedagogical theories, trying to maintain impetus towards the formation of the student. It is this vitality, due to the idea of having to meet the educational needs determined historically, psychologically and experimentally, which materialises in the idea of publishing the "bulletin", a true space for collecting and disseminating experiences in order to then discuss and compare them, a liaison and critical body of enhancement. The bulletin is also a communication continuity instrument between teachers which must also be implemented through regular contacts, meetings and trips in order to meet Italian and foreign colleagues, and a very active correspondence.

The participation and liveliness of that period have been traced by Pettini (1980) through the reports of various conferences, from 1951 to 1957[2] from which the amplitude of research which had been accomplished transpires. University researchers and teachers worked jointly in order to experience and rethink the effect of Freinet's techniques (prints, live calculation, self-correcting files, etc.) both from the point of view of teaching effectiveness (teaching disciplinary rules, but in a participatory way), and from the point of view of the educational-pedagogical value of these work methods. An examples is given by the Visalberghi report at the conference of 1957 in which he revisits the importance of the printing technique for

developing social functions, and Ciari's report, oriented towards building a "survey technique" to be developed together with the students in order to build up systematic knowledge, although with indirect influence on the teacher's mode of investigation. The latter is trained by designing, testing, sharing his documentation on the various paths, he analyses their practical validity and reconstructs their theoretical justification, harnessing all the positive elements.

The tendency of this innovative movement is to develop a path of continuity in improvement and research starting from a mutual base, i.e. techniques. The role assumed by the researchers is to act as "peers" who make their own knowledge available in order to co-design, brainstorm, present different views, as occurs, for example, when the need arises to build up observation tools to be used in class.

The equal relationship was achieved through a mutual control between researchers and teachers, both engaged in the construction of practical knowledge in a rigorous, reliable and publicly verifiable manner. This type of research and relationship produced research reports in which the narrative reconstruction, detection, documentation and systematic reflection and critical examination were developed cooperatively: everyone worked and discussed the various issues addressed as equals. The organisation of the CTS meetings is a demonstration of this, for example: the main speeches were given both by scholars and teachers, offering different viewpoints which therefore became the occasion for a generative and multi-prospective comparison and which often became texts to be subsequently divulged.

The writings produced both by school staff (Ciari, Pettini, Tamagnini), and by scholars (Laporta, Rugiu, Visalberghi) gave rise to a wealth of strongly connected meanings, which are still useful to interpret that research period.

Educational innovation functional to democratic participation had a different impact on systemic and political aspects. The world of the school inspectorate looked at these changes sometimes with interest, sometimes with suspicion, only partially adopting the thought of an active student in the '55 Curricula. The issues that were raised mainly concerned learning evaluation which led to setting learning objectives already in these curricula. The political world was initially opposed (investigations by the police on the work of major activists were frequent), then Dewey and Freinet's lines of thought were taken on and partially engulfed by members of the Italian Communist Party.

Research for a didactic embetterment

During the 70s and 80s, the reforms carried out at a political and social level allowed the creation of a more democratic society which was attentive to the civil development of students. In schools, research increasingly seeks to assume a "scientific" role by adopting procedures and data processing methods allowing a possible source of mutual control on the achievements reached.

It is during this period that the Action-Research model, applied to schools (Elliott, Scurati, 1993), becomes visible in teacher training methods.

Lewin's model presented particular features: it was connected to organisational aspects (a client and a contract) and had a structure which imposed the respect of stages in order to ensure scientificy (Cunningham 1976, Kemmis, 1990). It also puts in the foreground the role of the researcher, who was also the guarantor of the different regulatory actions of the AR (planning, action, observation and reflection). If the initial objective was the resolution of a problem through a process led by the researcher, over time and with the development of different AR models, a trajectory towards an ever-increasing democratisation of research becomes evident. Knowledge of problems was contextualised, linked to the life of each participant, to his acts and for this reason the collection, analysis and decision-making processes could only be shared with those who actually worked in that situation. The subjects participating in the research were not the recipients of thoughts and ideas of others, but were directly involved in order to contribute to the increase of knowledge on the issue which was being investigated, and through this devolution of the problem an enhancement of human potential, with particular attention to reflection, to learning and change was achieved.

A re-reading a posteriori, in the face of an accurate analysis of the context and of the times during which Lewin (1946) developed his own model, led Trombetta and Rosiello to stating that AR had placed "the problem of democratic collaboration, participation and cooperation seen from a perspective of change [...] which can only take place within a democratic self-improving spirit considered positive for the psychological life of the individual, the group and the community", (2000, 93). This theory has not only shaped an epistemology, a way to affect the social fabric, but above all the utopia of transforming society by using a collaboration which

manifests itself in dialogue methods which characterise the relationship between teachers and researchers. According to Pourtois (1986), it requires an intersubjective agreement which the research actors can reach through conversation. "It is to the dialogues which follow and precede acts that we entrust the intersubjective negotiation of what the group will consider as "truth". Truth that is always given in a linguistic landscape which cannot be identified tout court with facts. Baldacci invokes the need to apply the dialogue principle of Morin (1989) between an epistemological position and a hermeneutic[3] one, to be balanced, on a case-by-case basis, on the study in progress.

This process involves several steps:

1) The construction of the discourse on the problem that presents itself as a dialogue between "different languages". Pourtois evidences well how the "data", i.e. what is reported by the actors, is the result of a reality construction, filtered by beliefs,

2) The construction of the datum based on the procedures, but also on the confidence that the other may find interesting information concerning the problem,

3) Sharing data and a process of interpretation,

4) The development of a common language capable of recounting "the fact" according to a shared interpretation.

Mastromarino considers AR as "a type of applied social research, which differs from the others because of the active participation in the process of intervention both by the researchers and by the operators in the field and aims to change some conditions experienced by the community as unsatisfactory" (Mastromarino, 1989, 91). AR emphasises the connection between the cognitive and the pragmatic moment, in an effort to "assemble from the very beginning the need to know with that of action, the progress and the organisation of knowledge together with the improvement of the studied situations and phenomena and with the effectiveness of interventions "(Pellerey, 1980, 450). It is not just a question of understanding, but also of searching in order to act, of acquiring the ability to do. The expansion of knowledge is combined with modifying the existing situation through a constant reciprocity.

Dialogue and action become an essential combination in order to identify the process to be followed for an improvement in critical situations.

Action is the "raw material" of research as it is from this that problems and their related factors are drawn, changes to it are designed and it is to

this that one returns in order to analyse processes and possible changes. But action is conceived and experienced by a practical person who becomes its first cognoscente, he who has access to information not available to others. This type of knowledge takes on increasing power within the relationship with the researcher who increasingly takes on the role of accompaniment to a process of clarification of the implicit and of what relates to action.

The evolutionary path outlined by Barbier (1996) enables seeing a process of emancipation of the practical person, who increasingly becomes the protagonist not only of the action, but also of thought about the action.

The researcher, as an advisor, stands as one who facilitates the intelligibility of the problem and of thought concerning a possible change. He works to bring out needs and potential from the people involved in research in an effort to help them achieve what they wish to change, he favours a social process of learning by not avoiding the typical processes of confrontation and conflict. He does not stand as the one who knows and learns together with others.

One can feel the passage of concentration towards the group, as a dynamic field in which favourable or hindering relationships and dynamics for the development of the other are woven, towards subjective experience which becomes the basis for the interpretation and implementation of subjective and collective awareness paths.

The paradigm of reflectivity is part of a trajectory which also wants to connect the training aspect to the elements characterising AR. Learning, acting, thinking, changing, analysing and evaluating are all interconnected processes which help to fuel professional competence and the ability to be more effective in critical situations.

AR often envisages a continual process of self-assessment followed by an assessment of the results. Precisely in relation to the outcome, an evaluation of the operation and its redesign may be traced, thereby implementing a cyclical process of planning-action-observation-reflection; this is the dimension that puts the researcher into research and not in carrying out research. Calidoni[4] defines the main feature of AR thus: collaborative / participatory, innovative / transformative, evaluative / self-correcting. When applied to the school, this is a methodology which is particularly full of potential for support and help in educational activities and for innovation and therefore can be the subject of a specific in-service training and of the initial training when intended as a "systematic reflection on practice" to be carried out through laboratory-training.

Castoldi (1991) sees the possibility of reconnecting AR to the organisational dimension, as it could be considered as one of the possible and effective processes in order to activate an institute self-analysis, useful to bring out issues and immediately place them within a change perspective.

At the same time as these thoughts within the national context, an integration of the AR definition with the adjective "participatory" (Selener, 1992) is particularly recognised in the United States, highlighting a convergence between researchers and other subjects, both also engaged in verifying the results of research within specific educational contexts (Mantovani, 1998), in order to understand if and how the shared experience actually bore new knowledge for action.

Other factors relating to joint participation in research emerge from these reflections: the need to verify the validity of the results for all interested parties, the increased perception of a co-generative process (M. Lewin, 1993) and, in the case of applying AR to schools, the connection which becomes established between innovating and taking on professionalism as a fundamental variable in order to respond to problems which arise.

The expert is increasingly a "peer" able to present a distanced vision, characterised by the use of other conceptual tools designed to enhance intelligibility.

Democratic methods for a double knowledge

If AR applied to schools had gradually lost sight of its organisational and social aspects and the continuous link with school policies, the renewed conceptualisation regarding the learning and skills development of students gave rise to a new proposal, the Collaborative Research (hereafter CR)[5], a model which is in keeping, but also out of keeping, with AR (Lenoir, 1996 Desgagné, 1997). Thanks to this model, a strong connection with the instructional-educational mandate drafted at a ministerial level is re-established, which takes on the educational potential of the process of joint research. In recent years, the analysis of education processes, in Quebec as in Italy[6], has led the process of didactic transposition to become the focus of the teaching reflection, there is a particular attention to the methodologies and epistemological choices made by teachers who must adapt to new cultural challenges. But what should actually change and how? The

answer can only be the result of a co-generation between those who study the problem and those who act by recognising and addressing the problem itself, sometimes without having the time to understand and examine in depth its profound reasons. Therefore the object of the research connects to the object of the training, taking on, as an analysis mode, the relationship between pedagogy and didactics, two dimensions which are profoundly connected to each other in teachers' practice[7] (Bednarz et Proulx, 2009).

The choice of guiding professional development through joint research processes depends on two basic factors: the respect and recognition of the knowledge gained from teaching while working (Shulman 1987 Tochon, 2000), and the knowledge that improved methods depend on a fruitful interaction between theoretical and practical knowledge. The objective is not to create breaks with what is actually done at school, but to take it on board in order to see how Learning sciences can orient the work of teachers more effectively. The journey of accompaniment which a researcher may carry out is implemented through reflective activity (Desgagné, Bednarz, Couture, Poirier, Lebuis, 2001) adopted in order to share mutual expertise.

A democratic dimension can also be found in CR, which manifests itself:

- In respecting everyone's opportunities of being productive in research in relation to the personal professional role, not adding further tasks and skills which would require a duplication of time commitment, but enhancing and optimising the real action. There is therefore a symmetrical position in relation to the creation of knowledge, even though the researcher plays a specific role in setting the path (Morissette et Desgagné, 2009; Bednarz & al., 2012),
- In assigning equal importance to the teacher as to the researcher. If the latter can offer a review of the educational process and in particular on issues related to learning obstacles tied in with disciplinary tangles, he does so through a negotiation in which the teacher determines, at least at a 50% level, the possibility of an actual double verisimilitude of the end result,
- In determining the adequacy of a response to the problem which cannot be exact, but is relevant both to the negotiation process between varying theoretical and practical knowledge, and to the subjective methods of each teacher. There are routines, concepts, pedagogical and methodological choices which are a source of stability for teachers,

just as there are multiple views present in theoretical studies that allow glimpsing a range of "possible actions". With this in mind, the researcher suggests different strategies to the teacher from those experienced, backs up design and reflection based on the collected data, helps to dig deep in students' answers and productions. As described by Couture (2013), the researcher becomes the one that follows, fully collaborating with the teacher, classroom experimentation, data collection and the rethinking of the teacher's professional self, helping him discover several potentials and problems, his own and his students,

- In the double verisimilitude. This concept summarises the democratic perspective of CR. The double verisimilitude refers to a) the way in which each CR phase includes the focus on ensuring that the decisions taken in view of the action and research are negotiated and understood by both parties; b) producing a final research result that is valid for the scientific community and for the teaching community. The product can be prepared with different languages and focuses, but in any case the findings which the research team has reached can only be due to negotiation.

The dimensions of research and discovery are accompanied by a training dimension which shows a synergy between practical didactics and critical-theoretical / legislative didactics. The ongoing confrontation does not only change the teacher's professionalism, but also that of the researcher: «une sorte d'exercice démocratique exigeant et dont il est probable que le chercheur ne sort pas totalement indemne» (Dubet, 2007, 45). In an effort to be the interpreter of teachers' voices in order to reach a common construction, he is at the same time involved in it, to the point of even changing his way of looking at problems. As teachers find themselves rethinking the action with a researcher's conceptual tools, similarly he enters the world of everyday life, of the methods of intuitive, immediate investigation, which often provide the ability to deal in real time with unusual situations. Desgagné et al. (2001) believes that the researcher has to exercise a double sensitivity in such a way that the reflective process should be a formal process of investigation, but also a "questionnement pratique" for teachers, which can make them advance professionally. Respect, listening, the common goal of progress towards greater understanding drawn from the respective worlds characterise a strongly democratic research-training environment, best capable of stimulating the chances of each participant.

Conclusion

Although laid down in their simplicity, the three models presented thus far allow reconsidering democratic sharing processes which connect innovation, change and professionalization.

The objective of a community which dialogues and faces off may be ascribed to understanding in order to change for the good of the community and of all those who are recipients of the action carried out by its members. Teachers have an institutional role which cannot avoid taking on an ethical dimension (Damiano, 2007), of responsibility towards the current generations for a possible future. If a teacher passes on his relationship with knowledge within the educational mediation, rather than his knowledge, his students will also experience their relationship with an actual, tested democratic dimension.

In this sense, it is believed that the participation forms which enhance the perception of being able to contribute to the collective good are discernible in certain practices:

a) An upstream determination of knowledge equality on which to build together: for the practical person it may be having a wider knowledge of the problem and its context and for the theorist an expertise in formalising , but they are both involved in giving meaning to research and results;

b Taking on equal responsibility in defining new possible actions for the improvement of knowledge and of procedures related to specific problems, but in a negotiated way;

c) Also accepting a dimension of mutual analysis, which can sometimes be difficult, even from a personal perspective, as the research community constantly goes deeper as regards the reasons for the action, coming to identify deep patterns generated by individual experiences and putting in place the necessary condition for a change of perspective;

d) Designing possible objectives to be extended to the system, which do not isolate single dualities (researchers-teachers or ministry-teachers, or yet again school-ministry) because the possibility of a real collective participation must be set within a continuous dialogue with the variables existing in the system.

All this in order to reach what may be considered the highest goal of education, i.e. to allow freeing the "total intelligence" of students, encouraging their participation in social activities at school and outside, allowing

each to acquire skills which will enable walking their own path, at their own pace, although together with others.

Notes

[1] Tamagnini, a training teacher in Fano, with a great academic knowledge given the fact also that he had been a student of Lombardo Radice, and Pettini, a teacher, educator and director of studies.

[2] In 1957 CTS was transformed into MCE at the congress held in Fano on 1st November.

[3] The epistemological position "means assuming that all contributions to a discourse may be measured through rules which indicate how a rational agreement can be reached". The hermeneutic position "battles against this assumption, which is replaced by the hypothesis of a conversation which does not rest on common origins, but which can hopefully lead to an agreement" (Baldacci, 2009, p.33)

[4] Chronicle of the results of the international seminar "Action- Research for Educational Development" held in Erice from 1 to 5 February 1992.

[5] Collaborative Research, born in the specific field of teacher training, sets itself up as a model of joint participation at all stages: teachers and researchers are engaged in co-research situations (defining the problem), in co-operation (agreeing methodologies and the investigation process), in co-production (which must be valid for both cultures of belonging of the different players.

[6] See New National Guidelines.

[7] « L'objet de recherche rejoint ainsi l'objet de formation, puisqu'il concerne les pratiques en développement, avec, comme angle d'analyse, l'articulation entre la pédagogie et la didactique, deux dimensions profondément imbriquées dans la pratique des enseignants ».

Author's Presentation: Patrizia Magnoler is Assistant Professor - with qualification awarded to associate professor - of Didactics in the Department of Education, cultural heritage and tourism at the University of Macerata. Scientific director for the training activities of the Degree in Primary Teacher. Member of the Executive Board of the Italian Society of Educational Research.

References

Accompagnare le Indicazioni, Misure di accompagnamento delle Indicazioni nazionali per il curricolo della scuola dell'infanzia e del primo ciclo d'istruzione, http://www.indicazioninazionali.it/documenti_Indicazioni_nazionali/Documento_CSN_26_08_2013_pdf.

Baldacci, M. (2009), "La ricerca pedagogica e la logica della complessità", *Encyclopaideia*, XIII, 26, 29-36.

Barbier, R. (2007), *La ricerca azione*, Roma, Armando.

Bednarz, N., Proulx, J. (2009), Spécificité du travail mathématique de l'enseignant : un ancrage pour la formation continue, Colloque international INRP, 16, 17 et 18 mars 2011 Le travail enseignant au XXIe siècle Perspectives croisées: didactiques et didactique professionnelle, http://www.inrp.fr/archives/colloques/travail-enseignant/contrib/25.pdf.

Beillerot, J. (1991), « La "recherche", essai d'analyse », *Recherche et formation*, IX, 9, 17-29.

Bednarz, N. (2012), *Recherche collaborative et pratique enseignante. Regarder ensemble autrement*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

Bini, G. (1971), *La pedagogia attivistica in Italia*, Roma, Editori Riuniti.

Bini, G. (1980), "Prefazione" in A. Pettini, *Origini e sviluppo della Cooperazione Educativa in Italia*, Milano, Emme Edizioni, IX.

Calidoni, P. (2004), "Insegnanti e ricerca", *Pedagogia e Vita*, III, 27-51.

Calidoni, P. (1992), "La Ricerca-Azione sotto i riflettori", *Dirigenti Scuola*, III, 59-61.

Calvani, A. (2012), *Per un'istruzione evidence based*, Trento, Erickson.

Castoldi, M. (1991), "La prospettiva della ricerca/azione", *Dirigenti Scuola*, II, 24-30.

Ciari, B. (1961), Le nuove tecniche didattiche, Roma, Editori Riuniti.

Couture, C. (2013), Travailler ensemble au développement des pratiques: un projet commun, in N. Bednarz (dir.), *Recherche collaborative et pratique enseignante: regarder ensemble autrement*, Paris, France, L'Harmattan, 97-108.

Cunningham, B. (1976), "Action Research: Toward a procedural model", *Human Relation, III,* 215-238.

Damiano, E. (2007), L'insegnante etico, Assisi, La Cittadella.

— (2013), *La mediazione didattica*, Milano, FrancoAngeli.

Decereto Ministeriale 249/201, Regolamento concernente: «Definizione della disciplina dei requisiti e delle modalità della formazione iniziale degli insegnanti della scuola dell'infanzia, della scuola primaria e della scuola secondaria di primo e secondo grado, ai sensi dell'articolo 2, comma 416, della legge 24 dicembre 2007, n. 244», http://www.miur.it/Documenti/universita/Offerta_formativa/Formazione_iniziale_insegnanti_corsi_uni/DM_10_092010_n.249.pdf.

Desgagne, S. (1997), « Le concept de recherche collaborative : l'idée d'un rapprochement entre chercheurs universitaires et praticiens enseignants », Revue des sciences de l'éducation, XXIII, II, 371-393, http://www.erudit.org/revue/rse/1997/v23/n2/031921ar.pdf.

Desgagne, S., Bednarz, N., Lebuis, P., Poirier L, Couture, C. (2001), « L'approche collaborative de recherche en éducation : un rapport nouveau à établir entre recherche et formation », *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, XXVII, I, 33-64, https://www.erudit.org/revue/rse/2001/v27/n1/000305ar.pdf.

Dubet, F. (2007), *L'expérience sociologique*, Paris, La Découverte.

Elliott, J., Giordan, A., Scurati, C. (1993), *La ricerca-azione. Metodiche, strumenti, casi*, Torino, Bollati Boringhieri.

Freinet, C. (1973), *Les techniques Freinet de l'école moderne*, Paris, Armand Colin.

Hubermann, A.M. (2002), "Moving towards the Inevitable: the sharing of research", *Education in Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, III, 2002.

Kemmis S., Taggert, R., (1990), *The action planner*, Geelong, Deakin University Press.

Lenoir, Y. (2012), « La recherche collaborative entre recherche-action et recherche partenariale: spécificités et implications pour la recherche en éducation », *Travaille et apprentissage*, IX, 13-39.

Lewin, K., (1946), "Action research and Minority Problems", Journal of Social Issues, II, http://bscw.wineme.fb5.uni-siegen.de/pub/nj_bscw.cgi/d759359/5_1_ActionResearchandMinortyProblems.pdf .

Lewin, M. (1993), "Creating networks for rural economic development in Norway", *Journal of Social Issues*, XLVIII, II, 15-29.

Mantovani, S. (1998), *La ricerca sul campo in educazione: i metodi qualitativi*, Milano, Bruno Mondadori.

Mastromarino, R. (1986), "Il metodo della ricerca-azione", *Studi di psicologia dell'educazione*, V, II, 88-104.

Morin, E. (1989), *Il metodo. Ordine, disordine, organizzazione*, Milano: Feltrinelli.

Morrissette, J., Desgagné, S. (2009), « Le jeu des positions de savoir en recherche collaborative : une analyse », *Recherches qualitatives*, XXVIII, II, 118-144. En ligne, http://www.recherche-qualitative.qc.ca/revue/edition_reguliere/numero28(2)/morrissette(28)2.pdf.

Pellerey, M. (1980), "Il metodo della ricerca-azione di K. Lewin nei suoi più recenti sviluppi e applicazioni", *Orientamenti pedagogici*, XXVII, III, 449-463.

Pettini, A. (1980), *Origini e sviluppo della Cooperazione Educativa in Italia*, Milano, Emme Edizioni.

Pourtois, J.P. (1986), "La ricerca-azione in pedagogia", in E.Becchi & B. Vertecchi (Eds.), *Manuale critico della sperimentazione e della ricerca-educativa*, , Milano, FrancoAngeli, 134-155.

Pourtois, J.P. (1992), "La pratica interagita della ricerca e dell'azione nelle scienze umane", *Dirigenti Scuola*, II,5-7.

Reigeluth, C.M. (1999), *Instructional-Design Theories and Models*, Londra, LEA.

Santoni Rugiu, A. (1979), *Storia sociale dell'educazione*, Milano, Principato.

Selener, D. (1992), *Participatory action research and social change*, Paperback – 1997.

Stenhouse, L. (1977), *Dalla scuola del programma alla scuola del curricolo*, Roma, Armando.

Tochon, F., (2000), « Recherche sur la pensée des enseignants : un paradigme à maturité », *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, CXXXIII, 129-157.

Trombetta, C. (1987), "Psicologia dell'educazione e metodo della ricerca-azione*", Studi di Psicologia dell'educazione*, VI, II, 5-13.

Trombetta, C., Rosiello, L. (2000), *La ricerca-azione. Il modello di Kurt Lewin e le sue applicazioni*, Trento, Erickson.