The Activities Organization in Differentiated Pedagogy: Proposals of Pedagogical Models High/Scope and Portuguese Modern School Movement

Mário Henrique Gomes

Doctor in Sciences Education

CEMRI – Centre of Studies on Migrations and Intercultural Relations

Abstract

The article discusses the contribution of pedagogical proposals by the High/Scope Foundation and by Portuguese Modern School Association (M.E.M.) for the implementation of Differentiated Pedagogy. Although Portugal has, since 2001, a law that apply the flexible curriculum approach, it is urgent that schools are "effectively for all". The pedagogical models most well-known in Portugal are the High/Scope model and the M.E.M. model (Gomes, 2011).

We made an exhaustive analysis of the principles underlying the Differentiated Pedagogy and the principles and proposals of those models. Then, with the case studies made simultaneously, into the classrooms where the models are implemented, we debate the congruence with the respective theoretical lines and the principles of Differentiated Pedagogy.

Both models are according of Differentiated Pedagogy theory and can be an excellent contribution to the quality of the way we want to tread, so that "the front of the school mitigate inequalities and simultaneously so that the level of education rises" (Perrenoud, 2000, p 19).

Keywords: Differential Pedagogy; Equal opportunities; Academic Success; Curriculum Flexibility; Pedagogical Model; School For All.

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

Portugal has an educational system with humanistic values, compromised with a intentionality the guaranties a scholar education for all people, feeless tendency. During last fifty years, Portugal has followed the internationals orientations for Education for all, has signed internationals documents and created laws no apply these principles.

In 1960, Portugal subscribed the Convention against Discrimination in Education, with the principle that the non-discrimination implies the right to difference.

With the Basic Law of the Educational System, in 1986, (Law 46/1986), was reinforced the principles related with right to difference, "by virtue of respect for personalities and individual projects of existence, as well as consideration and appreciation of different knowledge and cultures" (article 3).

In 1990, was signed the World Declaration on Education for All, known as the Jomtien Agreement. Our country is also committed to Basic Education "provided for all children", emphasizing the need for a child-centred teaching strategy. In Portugal, was developed the Education for All Program (PEPT, 1990). Ten years later, the World Education Forum, evaluating the goals of the Jomtien Agreement, launches six new challenges, where we can read that it is necessary to "ensure that in 2015 all children (...) have access to good quality education" (UNESCO, 2000, p. 9) and "ensure that youth and adult education is adapted to their training needs" (idem).

The Salamanca Declaration (1994) proclaims that "every child has the fundamental right to education and should have the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning" (UNESCO, 1994, p. 1).

In 1995, through the White Paper on education and training teaching and learning: Towards the learning society and the UNESCO Report on education for the 21st century - "Education, a treasure to be discovered", the importance of school education was reaffirmed in the context of a society of information and communication.

Also in 1995, the organization Inclusion International reaffirms that the differences in the academic results of schools are systematically related to the characteristics of the educational processes, which can be modified by the teaching team to adapt to the characteristics of the students.

UNESCO published, in 2005, a report that reaffirms, once again, the urgency of "assuring access and quality of education for all students" (UNESCO, 2005, p. 4).

The 2004-2015 decade was decreed by the United Nations General Assembly to be subordinated to Education for Sustainable Development, with the aim of promoting the necessary transformations to achieve a more sustainable and fair society for all.

In 2001, in Portugal was published the National Curriculum of Basic Education, with the

definition of the essential competences that are expected to be developed through school education. Portugal also creates laws for greater autonomy of schools in terms of curriculum, opening the system to a flexible management of the curriculum.

The research in Differentiated Pedagogy (Gomes, 2001, 2011; Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002; Pinto & Gomes, 2013; Santana, 2000a, 2000b; among others), understood as adapting the school to the students, enhancing their interests, needs, rhythms and styles of learning, has been on the rise in recent decades and has gained a new meaning in this more open legislative framework. Teachers and schools have moved from curriculum executors to curriculum managers (Perrenoud, 2000; Roldão, 1999), which gives them renewed responsibility for adapting to students.

In Portugal, many proposals have been developed, namely through structured intervention models in the organization of work with students, for example the High/Scope pedagogical model and the model from the Modern School Movement.

The High/Scope model, was designed in the United States of America in the sixties of the twentieth century, asserts itself with its expression "active learning" (Brickman & Taylor, 1996; Epstein, 2012) and proposing a daily time in the class routine to «plan-do-review» (idem). According to Piaget, this model propose promoting acceleration activities (key experiences) that help children progress to the next stage of development. The moment of excellence in differentiation, in the daily routine proposed by the model, is the «plan-do-review» time, also known, among us, as the «Individual Work» time.

The Modern School Movement model, developed in Portugal since the 1960s, inspired by the movements of followers of Freinet's proposals, is based on cooperative learning and presents, as a moment of excellence for Differentiated Pedagogy, the «Autonomous Study Time».

Both models defend the existence of daily moments of differentiated work, according to the interests, needs, rhythms and learning styles of the students. High/Scope takes a more individualistic view and emphasizes the role of the teacher as a promoter of activities with students. The model of the Modern School Movement believes that the cooperative management of everything that concerns the life of the class, with the active participation of the student.

2. Method

2.1 Aims of the study.

Interested in the search for proposals for implementing the School for All, we carried out an exhaustive review of research in the scope of Curriculum Development and reflected on the contribution that the models considered of Differentiated Pedagogy can bring to the improvement of teachers' professional practices.

Understanding Curriculum Development as a gradual and continuous process, involving observation, reflection and adjustment of guidelines and practices, it is essential that teachers become reflective professionals,

Believing that Differentiated Pedagogy can be the way for "the inequalities facing the school to be attenuated and, simultaneously, for the level of education to rise" (Perrenoud, 2000, p 19), we wanted to deepen the contributions of the High/Scope models and of the Modern School Movement, namely with regard to the organization of activities, with emphasis on the Individual/Autonomous Study moments, daily moments par excellence that enable Differentiation.

2.2 Research Questions

The starting question for this study is "how can the organization of activities in the classroom, according to the approach of the models High/Scope and the Modern School Movement, contribute to the implementation of Differentiated Pedagogy and, in this way, respond to the diversity of students?"

The research questions are the following:

- How is work organized according to the High/Scope and Modern School Movement pedagogical models?

- What is the contribution of each of these models to a Differentiated Pedagogy?

- How can they contribute to a successful schooling?

2.3 Procedures

We chose for a qualitative methodology, with non-active participation in the classroom, after an exhaustive analysis of the models, confronting them with what different authors have come to define as the principles of Differentiated Pedagogy.

Thus, we proposed to conduct case studies simultaneously, with classes in which the proposals of the Differentiated Pedagogy models were implemented, by teachers with extensive training and extensive experience in implementing the High/Scope model and the Modern School Movement.

To carry out the case studies, we conducted interviews, non-participating observation, and document analysis.

3. Pedagogical Models Analysed

3.1. The High/Scope and M.E.M.

3.1.1. Theoretical Influences

The High/Scope Foundation proposes a pedagogical model influenced by constructivism, with special emphasis on Piaget's theory. The emphasis of the model is on Active Learning, conceiving it as experiences with people, objects, events, and ideas. "Children learn more when encouraged and encouraged to explore, to interact, to be creative, to follow their own interests" (Brickman & Taylor, 1996, p. 4). Action in learning is decisive, especially when there is awareness of this action. Knowledge is built through action, through the mediation of

language (Meirieu & Grangeat, 1997).

Piaget, having studied the development of children's logical thinking, influences the model in the conception that if we promote, with children, certain acceleration tasks, we can help them to pass to the next stage of development (Guerreiro, 2006). From the presentation of Piaget's theoretical influence on the High/Scope model, it is highlighted that "Piaget's work always refers to the idea of autonomy and independence of the subject in relation to things and others" (Lourenço, 2005, p. 52), the which is reflected in the approach to the model.

On the other hand, the MEM proposes a pedagogical model influenced by theories of Cooperative Learning, with special emphasis (admittedly, from the 80s) on Vygotsky (González, 2002).

Vygotsky (1995) highlights the importance of the group, the social, the collective. As the social act is fundamental in learning, it reinforces the importance of sharing, cooperation, as well as the centrality of language in the organization of verbal thought and in the regulation of actions. For Vygotsky, the construction of knowledge manifests itself in and through social interaction.

It can be seen, from the theoretical influences, that in the model of the Modern School Movement, greater emphasis is placed on the cooperative and social aspect of learning, believing that, with the help of the teacher or peers, it is possible to help the student to overcome difficulties and to develop more and new learning. In fact, "Vygotsky's perspective is oriented towards the idea of heteronomy or subordination of the individual subject to the various social structures" (Lourenço, 2005, p. 52).

This is the big difference in terms of the theoretical influences that are reflected in the principles and pedagogical proposals of the two models:

while Piaget left a work about the subject who constructs his knowledge individually and solitary, Vygotsky left a work about a subject who only develops as he participates in different forms of social interaction, using instruments (e.g., abacus, pencil, etc.) hammer and symbols (e.g., language, make-believe, mathematical formulas) both social in their very nature. Instead of individual and solitary, knowledge appears in Vygotsky as collective and doubly social (Lourenço, 2005, p. 53).

In short, there are many similarities between the two perspectives, but, however, there is "a crucial difference" (Lourenço, 2005, p. 52) that is reflected in their influences on the models under analysis in this work: in Piaget's work, one notes a preponderance "for the autonomy of the subject vis-à-vis things and others" (idem, p. 68), while Vygotsky emphasizes "a marked subordination, although not total, of the individual subject to the various social structures" (idem, p. 68).

3.1.2. Key-Concepts

The key concept of the High/Scope model is "Learning through Action" or "Active Participatory Learning" (Brickman & Taylor, 1996; Epstein, 2012; Fewson, 2008), proposing

that learning takes place through the action of the subject on the objects, people, ideas and events, and highly significant key experiences must be provided to the child (Epstein, 2012). According to this approach, "learning experiences for children should be active, that is, such experiences should make the child capable of constructing his own knowledge dealing directly with people, materials and ideas" (Brickman & Taylor, 1996, pp. 3-4).

The MEM model, in turn, is sociocentric, defending a "democratic practice of managing contents, activities, materials, time and spaces in cooperation" (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002, p. 41). The organization of the functioning of the class, according to this approach, should be based on the principle of cooperation (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002), in all phases, from planning to evaluation (Pinto & Gomes, 2013).

On the High/Scope model, the key experiences, proposed in each curricular area, support the development of learning: they guide teaching and support assessment (Fewson, 2008; Epstein, 2012), as the teacher uses the key experiences and observation of children to plan subsequent activities (Epstein, 2012; Marshall, 2009). Active and meaningful learning determines learning.

On the MEM model we do not find this vision, with the students themselves being organized as "educational learning communities" which, knowing the curriculum, plan and evaluate (self and hetero-assessment) their progressions: "because learning is an act intentionally, students must have knowledge of what they are expected to learn, so that they direct their work accordingly" (Santana, 1999).

The key concepts "active learning" and "cooperation" from the High/Scope model and the MEM model, respectively, reflect the theoretical influences that influenced the evolution of each model in a different way. Piaget's preponderance "for the autonomy of the subject in relation to things and others" (idem, p. 68) is reflected in the appreciation of "Active Participatory Learning" (Brickman & Taylor, 1996; Epstein, 2012; Fewson, 2008) of the learning subject, in key experiences proposed by the teacher. In the MEM model, influenced by Vygotsky's perspective, there is "a marked subordination, although not total, of the individual subject to the various social structures" (idem, p. 68), based on cooperation.

We cannot say with this that the teacher's role is completely emptied in the MEM model. Power, in the classroom, is shared, proposing a model that empties the teacher's conceptions of authority and superiority. However, he cannot resign from his work supervision and guidance functions. Accepting to share decisions about class life is also a way to create a true spirit of cooperation and democratic experience (Niza, 1998).

In the High/Scope approach, although it is also recommended that "adults and children share control" (Hohmann & Weikart, 2007, p. 1) it is more in the choice of activities and materials, namely at the time of «plan-to-do- review», because "learning comes from within" (idem), that the role of the teacher "is to support and guide children through the adventures and experiences that integrate learning through action" (idem). Especially in the last stages of the development of the model, "the child decisively became the central motor of the program"

(Oliveira-Formosinho, 2007, p. 59).

3.1.3. The agenda

The agenda, despite slight nuances between the two models, is a similar device, both of which should include time for individual work, project work and collective sessions.

However, in the High/Scope model, as we have been referring, it is the teacher who plans the weekly agenda, small group work and collective sessions (Fewson, 2008). Also necessarily part of the daily agenda, in this model, is the welcoming time, the «plan-do-review» moment, outdoor time and transitions (Epstein, 2012).

In the MEM model, the Weekly Agenda is defined by the class and updated weekly and daily, in the Cooperation Council, through the Weekly Plan and Daily Plan (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002; Santana, 1999). Also, as we have seen, the agenda results from the evaluation carried out by the Cooperation Council, taking into account the interests and needs of the class, in view of the explicit curriculum posted in the classroom (Santana, 1999; Gomes, 2011). Here lies a substantial difference between the two models.

3.1.4. Pedagogical Scenario

In both models, it is proposed that the pedagogical setting – the classroom – should be organized into different areas, related to the different curricular areas.

The High/Scope model advocates that "the classroom contains different areas, according to their functions" (Fewson, 2008, p. 12), called «areas of interest» related to the curricular areas and specific material resources, to be used by students in their learning experiences (Fewson, 2008). The diversity and accessibility of materials is fundamental (Guerreiro, 2006; Fewson, 2008). "In the High/Scope classroom, children have access to an abundance of meaningful materials" (Fewson, 2008, p. 11).

With a similar perspective, in this matter, the MEM model proposes that the classroom be organized in such a way that everything related to each curricular area is accessible and within reach of the students (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002). The organization of the space is relevant, bearing in mind the possibility for students to carry out different activities (idem), and the organization of the space should "structure and facilitate student access to all learning resources, as well as to the regulatory instruments of the learning processes". work" (Santana, 1999, o. 117).

Both models suggest posting students' work on the walls, whereas in the MEM model emphasis is placed on posting work management instruments in the "work organization and management area" (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002).

3.1.5. Assessment

In the High/Scope model, some instruments were created to record the evaluation of students: the COR (Child Observation Record), through which the child is evaluated through the recording of observations of key experiences; and the PIP (Program Implementation Project),

which allows observing, evaluating, and verifying the feasibility of the project's effectiveness within the classroom. The objective of the evaluation is to constantly adapt the teacher's practice and intervention to the needs and interests of the children (Guerreiro, 2006, pp. 36-37).

Recently, the model's key indicators were updated (Epstein, 2012), an auxiliary instrument in the individual assessment of students in relation to the different curricular areas. These indicators therefore support the assessment (Epstein, 2012).

In the MEM model, given the emphasis placed on cooperation, the entire evaluation process involves the students, with the teacher not being solely responsible for the evaluation (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002). In this model, assessment is more conceived as a learning regulatory instrument, helping to define the work path of students in cooperation.

We believe, therefore, that the big difference, in this regard, is that, in the High/Scope model, assessment is more conceived as a way for teachers to adapt their practice to students (Epstein, 2012), that is, very centred more on the teacher than on student self-regulation.

4. Discussion

The two models, with their similarities and differences but also their potential as pedagogical proposals for Differentiated Pedagogy, have numerous advantages in their dissemination and application.

Above all, in terms of Individual/Autonomous Work, the two models have relevant proposals in pursuing the objectives of differentiation and adaptation to individual needs, interests, rhythms and learning styles.

The High/Scope and Modern School Movement pedagogical models present suggestions for organizing activities in the classroom, which allowed us to consider them aligned with the principles of Differentiated Pedagogy.

Because we wanted to focus on the moment par excellence of differentiation – Individual Work (High/Scope) or Autonomous (MEM) –, we deepened the concepts of school time and its pedagogical implications, the principles underlying the involvement of children in their learning and, therefore, the theme of self-regulated learning.

The High/Scope and MEM models, as pedagogical models of Differentiated Pedagogy, are simultaneously close and different in their proposals for organizing activities in the classroom.

The High/Scope model is based on Piaget's theory and is based on the importance of active learning experiences (Epstein, 2012; Fewson, 2008; Hohmann and Weikart, 1995, 2007; Brickman & Taylor, 1996). In this model, the teacher is expected to promote, with the students, a set of key experiences (Epstein, 2012), considered as acceleration tasks, to support the child to evolve to the next stage (Epstein, 2012; Fewson, 2008). This key concept – active learning – comprises the subject's action on objects, people, ideas, and events and aims at

developing autonomy, responsibility, independence and planning and reflection skills (Epstein, 2012).

In this model, routines are fundamental for the student to feel safe, anticipating the day's agenda (Oliveira-Formosinho, 2007). The teacher appears to be largely responsible for guaranteeing this routine and for promoting these key experiences. Likewise, the teacher assesses the students' development, using instruments developed as a result of research on the model, in order to adapt their pedagogical action to the students' needs (Hohmann and Weikart, 2007). The role of the adult is to support the learning process (Brickman & Taylor, 1996).

In turn, the model of the Modern School Movement is much more influenced by currents that value cooperative learning and the social side of learning, much in line with Vygotsky (González, 2002). Since it is a sociocentric model, it bets on the "practice of managing contents, activities, materials, time and spaces", in cooperation (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002, p. 41). The model strives for student involvement in their learning path, trying to promote the gradual acquisition of awareness of where they are and what they need to do to advance in the curriculum (Pinto & Gomes, 2013; Santana, 1999). For this, mutual help and the development of citizenship are encouraged, through living democratic rules (Niza, 1998).

About the organization of activities, in the MEM model, great emphasis is placed on the cooperative regulation of activities, through the Cooperation Council (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002). Also, the existence of Individual Work Plans, as instruments of control and regulation of individual activities, are a form of contract that each student establishes with the class, with the activities and curricular areas where he undertakes to work, according to his needs.

The pedagogical scenario, in both models, is organized into areas of interest, making resources available to students to work in the different curricular areas.

The two models also advocate a daily moment of Individual/Autonomous Work, which constitutes a high moment of differentiation.

In the High/Scope model, the daily routine includes a moment of Individual Work ("plan-do-review"), which begins precisely by planning an activity in each area of interest and ends with the review, which is nothing more than sharing with colleagues a reflection on the activity carried out and the learning achieved.

We witnessed, in our observations, the development of the «plan-do-review» time. Effectively, the students orally planned what they intended to do and, in the end, shared the activities and learning done. It is a suggestion of the High/Scope model, proposed by Fewson (2008), that planning, and assessment be done in an individual written record document, including an increasingly in-depth reflection, with aid to the development of self-regulated learning skills.

In the model of the *Movimento da Escola Moderna*, we verified that the Autonomous Work time is used for the training and consolidation of curricular contents, according to the

Individual Plan defined for the school week, which is related to the curriculum explained and exposed in the classroom. classroom. Planning, development, and evaluation are cooperative, made by the Cooperation Council.

The differences in the proposals of the two models studied here stem from different perspectives in terms of theoretical influence. "Piaget's work refers to the idea of the subject's autonomy and independence" (Lourenço, 2005, p. 52), influencing the pedagogical approach of the High/Scope model. The MEM model, influenced by socio-constructivism, namely by the ideas of Vygotsky, which is oriented "to the idea of heteronomy or subordination of the individual subject to the various social structures (Lourenço, 2005, p. 25).

Following this difference in terms of theoretical influence, the key concepts are also different. In the High/Scope model, we see that «learning through action» about objects, people, ideas, and events is central (Epstein, 2012), with great emphasis given to daily routines, namely the time of «plan-do-review».

In the MEM model, emphasis is placed on "the democratic practice of managing content, activities, materials, time and spaces (…) in cooperation" (Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002, p. 41).

On the other hand, the content of the curriculum to be developed with the students also differs. While with the High/Scope model there is a set of pre-established key experiences that can be associated with the National Curriculum (Epstein, 2012), in the MEM model there is a cooperative management of learning that starts from the National Curriculum, translated into a perceivable language to students, which is developed according to the interests and specific needs of the group/class. Thus, it appears that in the MEM model there is a search for meaningful learning that is integrated into the filigree of knowledge of each student, in contrast to generalist proposals for all groups of a given age.

In the same sequence of ideas, we found that, in Individual Work Time, in High/Scope the emphasis is placed on individual development. The «plan-do-review» time is planned, developed, and evaluated individually. On the other hand, in the MEM model, the planning and evaluation of the activities carried out in the Autonomous Working Time is done in cooperation, in the Council meeting. In this model, this daily moment, despite being work in autonomy, is planned, developed, and evaluated in a cooperative way, with everyone being jointly responsible for its success.

5. Conclusions

We can conclude that both models have proposals like Differentiated Pedagogy, varying the approaches, but both having as a central focus the attention to the diversity of students and the concern to make all students learn, regardless of their characteristics.

Both models propose the organization of activities and the management of classroom routines according to the needs and interests of the students, defending an active role of the students in the planning, development and evaluation of the activities carried out in Individual Work

Time («planning-do-review»), in the High/Scope model, and in Autonomous Working Time, in the MEM model.

Our results demonstrate that the proposed organization of activities, according to the High/Scope and MEM models, are in line with the principles of Differentiated Pedagogy defended by several authors (Gomes, 2001; 2011; Grave-Resendes & Soares, 2002; Perrenoud, 2000; Pinto & Gomes, 2013; Pires, 2001; Przesmychi, 1991).

The two models present proposals for the selection and implementation of teaching-learning strategies and intervention at the level of regulation of individual learning processes, with the objective of making students' progress in the curriculum, through concrete proposals for strategies for organizing activities in the classroom.

In both models there is a "differentiation of learning paths" (Pires, 2001, p. 35), alternating "collective moments (note that we do not say simultaneously) with moments of individual work, group work or direct support from the teacher" (idem).

The principles of the High/Scope and MEM models reflect a concern with the organization of activities in the classroom, considering the characteristic elements of student diversity (Perrenoud, 2000): cognitive differences, sociocultural differences; the psychological differences.

We consider that the component of our study relating to the High/Scope model is not possible to compare with similar studies developed in Portugal, in addition to those carried out by us. After an exhaustive search of the bibliography, we only found works related to the High/Scope model at the level of Pre-School Education, all of them focusing more on the description of the model's proposals.

The MEM model is regularly studied in Portugal, especially at the level of the 1st Cycle of Basic Education (6-10 years), with approaches and approaches different from those carried out here. However, they all list pedagogical advantages and Pedagogical Differentiation, above all in their contribution to the development of self-regulated learning skills, skills related to reading and writing (Santana, 1999), skills related to civic training and citizenship (Niza, 1998).

In view of the results found, we can safely say that the two models advocate Differentiated Pedagogy, seeking, with their proposals for organizing activities in the classroom, to be a positive alternative for differentiating learning paths, considering the characteristics of the students.

References

Brickman, N. & Taylor, Lynn (1996). *Aprendizagem Ativa*. Lisboa: Fundação C. Gulbenkian.

Epstein, Ann S. (2012). *Approaches to Learning*. Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

Fewson, Sarah (2008). High/Scope in the Elementary School Classroom. In *ReSource*. Michigan: HSERF.

Gomes, Mário (2001). *A Escola e a Diferenciação Pedagógica – Dois Estudos de Caso no 1.º Ciclo do Ensino Básico*. University Manuscript, Instituto de Educação da Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Lisboa.

Gomes, Mário (2011). *A Pedagogia Diferenciada na Construção da Escola Para Todos. Conceitos, Estratégias e Práticas*. Porto: ECopy.

González, Pedro (2002). *O Movimento da Escola Moderna – Um Percurso Cooperativo na Construção da Profissão Docente e na Desenvolvimento da Pedagogia Escolar*. Porto: Porto Editora.

Grave-Resendes, Lídia e Soares, J. (2002). *Diferenciação Pedagógica*. Lisboa: Universidade Aberta.

Guerreiro, Margarida (2000). *Ao Encontro de uma Identidade Curricular. A Contextualização do Modelo Curricular High/Scope em três Jardins de Infância do Distrito de Évora*. Manuscript, Universidade de Évora.

Hohmann, Mary & Weikart, D. (2007). *Educar a Criança*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Lourenço, O. (2005). Piaget e Vygotsky, muitas semelhanças, uma diferença crucial. *In* Miranda, Guilhermina e Bahia, Sara (Eds.). *Psicologia da Educação – Temas de Desenvolvimento, Aprendizagem e Ensino*, pp. 141-165. Lisboa: Relógio de Água.

Marshall, Beth (2009 March/April). Scaffolding Children's Learning at Small-Group Time. In *Extensions*, vol. 23 (4).

Meirieu, P. e Grangeat, M. (1997). *La métacognition, une aide au travail des élèves*. Viewed on 16th February 2022, http://www.unige.ch/fapse/SSE/groups/life/livres/Grangeat_Meirieu_R1997_A.html

Niza, Sérgio (1998). A Organização Social do Trabalho de Aprendizagem no 1.º Ciclo do Ensino Básico. *Inovação*, *11*(1), 77-98.

Oliveira-Formosinho, Júlia (2007). A Contextualização do Modelo Curricular *High/Scope* no âmbito do Projeto da Infância. In Oliveira-Formosinho, Júlia (org.) (2007). *Modelos Curriculares para a Educação de Infância: construindo uma práxis de participação*. Porto: Porto Editora.

Perrenoud, Philippe (1997). Concevoir et Faire Progresser dês Dispositifs de Différenciation. *Educator Magazine*. Genéve, 13, 20-25.

Perrenoud, Philippe (2000a). *Pedagogia Diferenciada – Das Intenções à Ação*. Porto Alegre: Artmed Editora.

Pinto, Anabela e Gomes, Mário (2013). *O Plano Individual de Trabalho e o Estudo Autónomo*. Porto: ECopy.

Pires, J. (2001). Heterogeneidade e Diferenciação. In *Escola Moderna*, n.º 12. Lisboa: MEM, pp. 35-38.

Roldão, Maria (1999). *Os Professores e a Gestão do Currículo – Perspetivas e Práticas em Análise*. Porto: Porto Editora.

Santana, Inácia (1999). O Plano Individual de Trabalho Como Instrumento de Pilotagem das Aprendizagens no 1.º CEB. In *Escola Moderna*, 5 (5), 15-24.

UNESCO (1994). *Declaração de Salamanca*. Texto fotocopiado.

UNESCO (2000). *Educação Para Todos: O Compromisso de Dakar*. Dakar: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2005). *Orientações para a Inclusão: Garantindo o Acesso à Educação para Todos*. Paris: UNESCO.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1995). *El desarollo de los procesos psicológicos superiores*. Barcelona: Crítica.