Education and Citizenship between Decline of Charisma and Need of Educational Anchoring

Maddalena Colombo[*]

Author information

[*] Department of Sociology, Catholic University, Milano, Italy.

Contact author's email address

[*] maddalena.colombo@unicatt.it

HOW TO CITE

Education and Citizenship between Decline of Charisma and Need of Educational Anchoring

*Maddalena Colombo**

Abstract: This essay first discusses the meaning character education can still have in a late modern society, given the current crisis of definite educational purposes, particularly of the moral dimension of education. The author goes on to explain how such a loss of meaning could be traced back to some sort of 'loss of charisma' within the educational domain – a hard social fact that has to do both with norms and values and with teachers' authority and role. Finally, the essay argues for the need of 'anchorage' by young people, and articulates the way such a need becomes manifest in the process of identity building, particularly in the public sphere.

Keywords: charisma, education, teachers' legitimacy, anchorage

* Department of Sociology, Catholic University, Milano, Italy. E-mail: maddalena.colombo@unicatt.it

Educational charisma: an obsolete theme?

An invitation to reflect on the theme of this special issue, namely character education, leads me to revisit the meaning of two concepts (education and citizenship) fundamental for our address search in the light of two states of fact:

1) The crisis of educational charisma (teachers and tutors/educators have less moral authority compared to the past, less following/favour and power of fascination).

2) The need to anchorage for people, in particular the youngsters, that more and more feel the negative consequences of the disembedding, the disappearing of essential reference points for the design of oneself and to live in society (Giddens, 1994).

It is legitimate to ask whether the provocative title of this journal issue is not referred to something already passed, to questions of a modern declining phase. My answer is negative. Do not invoke institutional evidence, that are under the eyes of everyone, as the uncertain status of the teaching of Citizenship and Constitution in Italy (compulsory subject since L. 30/10/2009 n. 168 was promulgated) (Boda, 2009; 2012), but it is enough to recall the critical conditions of social relationships within the classroom and in the perimeter of educational institute. What we observe: lack of bilateral respect (Sennett, 2003) between adult and young people in everyday practices; abandonment of the defence of legality, as witnesses the case study of ungenerous copying (Dei, 2011; Colombo, Lomazzi, 2012); inability to properly manage the use of mobile phones in the classroom. All shows that we need to go back to talk about values, morals, civic-mindedness: the ultimate ends of educational action, without neglecting to look at the side of learning outcomes, which are essential but not exhaustive for the sociology of education today. Looking at the "other side" of education (the non-cognitive area of learning) definitely reinforces the address open by the Copernican revolution in education: the shift from *teaching for knowledge* to *teaching for skills*.

It is also true that to deal with morality or ethics today brings about a certain dose of embarrassment (Damiano, 2004), even one refuses the idea of teaching as indoctrination; if you touch the "challenge of value" (Sciolla, 2005) one comes across a phenomenology of crisis, a crisis of values that are both of professions and the systems where professionals operate

attacking the ability to build the character by those agents that in theory would be able to do it.

For character we mean a set of attitudes and behaviour that permits to predict an "invariant pattern in one's personality" (Vaillancourt Rosenau, 1993), used to infer the success of an educational process. In a holistic view of the relationship education - society, the character would be the measure of "occurred process of identization" (building a distinctive feature of oneself) and, at the same time, fitting in with the social system according an integration measure (Colombo, Santagati, 2014).

To look for the character at the end of an educational process may actually appear *démodé*, because it implies the existence of a "functional logic", a uniform principle which is above (or below) the social actions, when instead we experience them only in punctual terms, that is, as social practices placed in precise situational frames, in the *here-and-now* of the events that give meaning to the actions themselves (Giddens, 1990). If we wanted at all costs to outline this kind of "logocentric metanarrative", and maybe to submit a value judgement, that is moral in itself, we would betray the spirit of postmodern time, which suggests caution from any claim for preaching or predicting human behaviour or operational rules, because it is hard to say which would be the *telos* to which they would be oriented.

However, while recognizing the importance of "fuzzy logics" that dominate the postmodernity we try not to abandon the search of defined and explicit causalities, the measurement of the effectiveness / efficiency of our concern for social order and social cohesion. *It is here where the relevance of the character's notion is*. We need to understand what and how the education makes the character in a fragmented context as it is today.

Why? Above all to defend the moral nature of education (Goodlad, Soder, Sirotnick, 1990) as a *project by adulthood for youth* (as Damiano, 2007) that implies an a-symmetric relation and the exercise of power and authority (as Foucault, 1975); secondly to distinguish the truth from lies. This recalls the lessons coming from some of the "founding fathers" of our discipline, as F. Von Foerster who wrote about the lies at school (1907), or that of G. Simmel about ethic education, where he recommends teacher to avoid mechanic forms of content delivery, that turns the lesson into a "farce" (Simmel, 2006, p. 26)[1]. We need to distinguish a passive,

---

[1] The lesson of Simmel looks slightly unfashionable nowadays, as lies in the public life are tolerated at various levels (Barnes, 1994; Rositi, 2008).

conformist student (in learning, and also in acting every type of situation) from an active one, autonomous and not governed by blind obedience but for freedom of choice and self-control, able to act in a creative and not destructive way.

Moreover as sociologist of culture we need to test which values are currently at stake, to understand their relevance in everyday life, their translation in norms and behaviour, in reference to a renewed concept of *conformity*, which may not be absolute, as Parsons' functionalist illusion, but dropped in a contemporaneity that relativizes values. I.e. in a given circumstance the social actor must show compliance with a given set of values (it doesn't matter if consistent with the other) and at the same time he must shy away from any form of blind conformity - indeed conformity it seen as the "death of the self".

The notion of character is useful to delineate the "proper type" in those times, the good citizen tailored for the knowledge society[2]. The cues of D. Riesman seem not fit the current framework because they were created for the first stage of the mass society (Riesman, 1961). Especially the profiles of "Self-managed man", defined as "prone to work" and that of "Other-managed man", defined as "prone to people", have to be rethought because of the disappearance of work as hinge of the processes of integration and citizenship, and as outcome of training. I.e. the profiles of Yes Man and Pioneer (the Cowboy) do not fit anymore, as it is happening now, when the most important social stratification line is *to have or not to have a job*, not the level of income or the type of employment one gets.

One can then ask: what character should a citizen-consumer have today? The "wasted life" mentioned by Z. Bauman (2003)? The "competent navigator", the global citizen (Falk, 1994) or what else? I do not have the right answer, of course, but it seems there are two lessons that we can draw from "The Lonely Crowd" by Riesman, still very present:

1.   The character is defined by macro-social processes (demographics and economic cycles, as the "World Time" by A. Giddens), but each individual is allowed the opportunity to combine a sense of conformity

---

[2] This is what the OECD tried to measure with the research about "Key Competencies For All" at the base of the educational policy of the Lisbon plan 2020 (Richen Salamik, 2003; Rychen, 2004): OECD has operatively defined the citizen's profile.

"with a certain way to creativity"[3]. Briefly, building the character does not imply a mere social reproduction, rather every reproduction is also "production" (following Giddens, 1979; 1990). In fact, there is no coincidence between character and social role; in no society that occurs otherwise there would not be any social innovation: as the author says, "the disparity between the socially required behaviour and that which is compatible with the character and is one of the major drives of change" (Riesman, 1999, p. 90).

2.   The further aspiration for the contemporary character remains, without a doubt, *autonomy*. Riesman has titled "Autonomy and Utopia" the last chapter of The Lonely Crowd, taking a long-term outlook for the Other-managed profile (typical in postmodernity). Autonomy represents an aspect of character that includes on the one hand *conformation to rules*, on the other hand *freedom to choose whether or not to comply*. It must be taken into account that in a society of "Other-managed people" the conquest of autonomy is harder than in a Self-managed one. Because the requests of conformity (or the so called conformism) are less evident, more pervasive, and implicit. It is a society that takes away many inhibitions to the subject but even it reduces protection and increases the risk of anomie. At this point it is worth remembering that the position of Riesman is not nostalgic: while concerned about the mass-individual, he considers that "*the society of inter-dependence opened opportunities that were previously unthinkable for autonomy*" (Riesman, 1961, p. 346). These chances can be caught just bypassing the common obstacles and not falling in sliding traps, as (he gives as examples) the "false customizing" offered by the market, or the "forced segregation" imposed by an inhuman urbanisation (think of the places of *loisir* in which many youngsters spend their free time….separated by the rest of city).

In essence, *autonomy is placed in the middle of the active citizen's character*: it is by chance that it represents one of the three core competences outlined by the European Group Deseco (Definition And Selection Of Key Competences), alongside the ability to use technology

---

[3] The rising of creativity in social theory has been associated, in more recent times, with the "discovery" of human reflexivity. I did some field study on this point referred to the link reflexivity-creativity among school professionals. See: Colombo, 2004; 2009.

interactively and the relationship with any kind of diversity[4]. One can only agree with the frame of "Education for the 21st Century", an education that does not want to be totally refolded on "learnification" (as Biesta warns, 2013), but that remains - the words of Dewey - a "meeting between subjects" instead to become an exchange of objectives exclusively.

The crisis of educational charisma

Without drawing apocalyptic scenarios, there is no doubt we are at a critical stage for educational professions and systems without strong, clear, and shared keywords. The great "European narrative" (educational systems are the drive for growth, competitiveness and employment within the Eurozone) booms against the growth crisis, against the limits of a social model that is no longer sustainable and against the apparent disparity between the citizens condition in the member states. At the moment there is no guarantee that Europe is able to hold a future for youngsters while studying or specializing, but it only suggests that staying within European Citizenship can drive us for a global citizenship. For anyone who deals with these themes it is clear that there are currently no convincing codes and slogan to fill this "vacant space" (Giddens, 2014).

It is easy to read some of the signals coming from the current decline of public preoccupation for education in Italy; I short the list at four main indicators:

(a) slowness of reforms and confusion of perspectives (the public spending is continuously withdrawn and there are not serious investment about education);

(b) weakness of the teacher training, which is no longer embedded in a National Contract then deprived from its institutional legitimacy (and often seen as an expensive rather than a lever for reforms);

(c) faculty resistance to the demand for accountability and learning outcomes evaluation (recently made compulsory by the Invalsi standardized test, with Ministry of Education Directive n. 85 /2012);

(d) school professionals' withdrawal in coping with ITC: silent acceptance of the proposals, little involvement in new projects, scepticism

---

[4] See above, note 2.

and explicit opposition are widespread; many of them acknowledge that ITC can arouse enthusiasm within the classroom and still represent a factor of systemic innovation, and ensure the "realignment" of Italy in the global landscape (attempting to recover a digital gap that has historical roots in the country). But a deep delay has to be still recovered (Avvisati et al., 2013).

The direct consequence of these phenomena can be called "identitarian contractions" (as Kristeva, 2013) of the *teacher figure*, that takes the form of discomfort (stress, burnout, demotivation etc..), as I tried to outline in a recent research-action work (Colombo, 2014). The teacher is the only fixed point in the proceeding of reforms and counter-reforms. We can define it a "middle figure" at the matching point between past and future. In comparison to other much more blurred social roles, to carry out its function the teacher takes advantage from consolidated traditions, articulated languages, formalized knowledge and established standards at various levels. It has also the benefit to look ahead because it is aware that results of its *doing well/doing bad* will only be seen in the future.

Nevertheless at this stage teachers accuse the coup of *being in the middle*, but not as a member of a changing community nor as a lever for this change, rather they feel to be the *target of any frustration*. I.e. School professionals cannot decide autonomously whether to perform generically or specifically, punctually or transversely (how many are the systemic requests). They seem to fall back on doing it daily, not overwhelmed to this incessant change, but rather disoriented because they are excluded from the negotiating table, they lack the "voice to change". If there are symptoms of resignation, disillusionment, waiver, then we are at "the end of the re-volt" (Kristeva, 2013).

All that we said before, if related to the private sphere rather that the public role, results in a feeling of anguish and fear to teach (Blandino, 2008). Another difficulty for the teacher today seems to be giving up "self-representing", perhaps because they are no longer supported by a curiosity about themselves, by a "wanting to know about oneself", even if it is about by passing the sufferance (Gonthier-Marvin, 2012), living one's own contradictions, hassles etc… It is easy to see what negative reflections this may and will have on the demand for training and what impact on the school reforms.

I dwell only on one point that may clarify what I mean by *decline of*

educational charisma: teaching remains a profession "specimen", highly ethic (which requires gift and energy that are associated to the presence of the charisma)[5]. But I think the stability of this moral profile (what can be defined the *teacher's character)* is now at risk because of three main factors.

(i) First, the latency of the rules: those deemed valid are not applied upon in transgressive situations, and the school actors remain in a regime of uncertainty, doubts about sanctions, and doubts on who must make them respected.

(ii) Second, the "evaporation" of professional legitimacy : when the charisma is weak, it should be compensated by the rational source, by the respect for law or the technical knowledge; but now we are in a setting of "communicative socialization" (Besozzi, 1990) where the roles are flexible and situations unclear. And it is precisely the expanding inadequacy of teachers to stay ahead of the development of communication systems that erodes their traditional legitimacy : someone defined it as "legitimacy gap" (D'Agati-Molino, 2014).

(c) Third, there is a sort of lack of presidium in some educational functions : I just point out four areas where the school is often called to act in defence of educational primacy but is not very often incisive: 1) education as a justice (Reggio, 2014); 2) education as a common base to create a corporate membership and to contrast the fragmentation of identities; 3) education as an exercise of a "proper meritocracy" (Besozzi, 2010); 4) education as an antidote to the *mis*-orientation, as a means of self-testing and self-guidance.

Are we really in an age of eclipse of charisma? Must we concern about it?

If, how Weber teaches, the charisma is a "*gift given to a few that arouses in fascinating and vital energy*" (on an emotional and irrational basis) and it cannot last long, the decline of charisma doesn't have to worry because it is a sign of a normal evolution. Rather where the charisma narrows down the rational, logical and predictable basis of social actions will expand. Thought the eclipse of charisma (at least in education) brings about an objective limit to the "*differential acting in an individual form*" (as Weber in "Economy and Society", vol.11, p. 470), and it undermines

---

[5] The teacher is at the same time *moral practitioner* and *moral agent* (Campbell, 2003; 2008), then s/he acts ethically at more than one level.

the foundations of the discipline, seen as a person-devoted attitude replaced by a cause-devoted attitude which is only apparently the highest form of social behaviour.

The charisma comes from the moral qualities of the person (of a *given* person: teacher, educator, parent etc.). No discipline is effective, ultimately, if these figures are lacking ethical quality as consciousness, sense of duty, altruism and sense of justice.

My last surveys on student's perception of the relationship with teachers - which I already written about (Colombo, 2009; Colombo 2015 in press) - confirm that we are at this point there seems to be a "demand for relationship" by students that goes beyond the teachers' request for school performance. To the question: "How important is the teachers opinion about you?", only 35% of students responded affirmatively (National sample 3050 students); with a subtle distinction between those who responded: "Very important, they are people to follow" (7%) and those who responded: "Important, they are people who you can rely on" (27%). So for 2 out of 3 students the figure of the teacher is not very important. Among these students a minority thinks teachers are "Models not to be imitated". The teacher figure was tarnished as a reference model, it's knowledge is not indisputable, rather it is sifted by students and parents according to two parameters, a cognitive (as it is prepared) and a moral one (as it is reliable).

If we resign ourselves to the disappearing of charisma, like it occurs within other social institutions starting from the family, there will be a danger of *being petrified in the mechanization* (as Weber), and to collapse under the pressure of a logic of bureaucratization. It's like to be in a too rigid fortress which does not resist external attacks and slowly crumbles. Just to imagine some results of the eclipse in educational charisma, such pictures come to my mind: a classroom in which nobody feels "called to" educate or being educated and all deny responsibility towards the others; here becomes generalized a model of teaching-learning based on pure logic calculation, aseptic materialism, where means are confused with the ends. Denial of charisma means also no account for improvisation and risk, two of the more emphasized qualities of leader (according to young people's view). Finally, the inability of a "prophetic" look: teachers, parents and student will neglect (or unlearn) how to use rational and emotional resources to upset the status quo.

Need for anchors for open relationships

Many educators today can be equipped with charisma, above all in places outside of formal education, because they easily can be found in the blogsphere (Granieri, 2005). Maybe instead of disappearing, charisma has become widespread and sources of fascination are multiple and unattainable for the great mass of young people. The size of young people's dreams for example reflects a perceived need for something tangible to bet on and a destination for their orientation (Besozzi, 2012).

One of the areas where the question "anchors" is most visible is precisely that of the citizenship construction, which articulates the relationship of young people with the public sphere. On the one hand, in the youngster's eyes, it is increasingly difficult to distinguish public and private, in practice and in theory the two spheres intertwine, and it is not easy to determine which is the margin of freedom or of responsibility that every individual has in relation to its social memberships. On the other hand, it is less and less requested explicitly the consistency between personal behavior and social values. Feeling oneself as a "citizen" on the basis of a personal desire (the sphere of *Me*) is today tolerated even without counterparts in terms of social ties (the sphere of *Us*).

It's true, as Besozzi (2010, 2014) reminded, that the notion of citizenship radically changed in the span of a few years. It dropped more and more from the territorial membership, and it became more unbalanced on the axis of the rights rather than that of the duties. You have to wonder today: what we base a citizenship on, if we are at the sunset of identity, of *topos* and *etnos*? Do unchangeable and (universal) rights exist? Universal in the sense that the subject can carry with it in its relentless move, geographically and socially, along the lines of global capital, and who guarantees these rights?

Last question: any for who, for how many does the State guarantee by law these rights? And in return, what kind of counterpart can the State ask for (in terms of loyalty between citizens)?.

The difficulty of building a sense of open citizenship, as required of a similar scenario, is given by the evanescence of legitimate institutions which regulate rights and duties. Those institutions become more and more fragile and increasingly give the impression of "paper castles". The effects are evident: despite the (European) society are those with the highest school

attendance rates in the world, it cannot be assumed that a civic sense is widespread while in theory it is related to the degree of education (Assirelli, 2014). Civicness is rather irregular: it depends on the economic phases and on the differences between the legal systems of inclusion/exclusion that each notion puts in place.

Italy is a singular case regarding this (Sani, 1980). The civicness derives from a complex of skills that do not develop spontaneously, indeed it requires a precise educational work either in the areas of knowledge (cognitive), or relationships (affective) or responsibility (practical area).

On the one hand we see that there are rare occasions where you learn the citizenship at school (in Italian schools there is little "Citizenship and Constitution" subjects taught), on the other hand the opportunities for exercising it are still not frequent. With regard to this it is worth mentioning the research carried out by CNDIA (Belotti, 2010) on a vast national sample (more then 24000 subjects), that compared the negotiation skills of 11-15 years boys-girls at home, school and in sport activities.

In the representation provided by preadolescents, it emerged that no-schooling is an experience of citizenship more significant than schooling (in terms of *voice exercise* or *teens agency*). At school often there is no time for building together the operating rules, and students are not asked their opinions in the debating (as it would be requested in a public democracy). But this occurs not because school is a severe institution: instead it's the opposite, teachers often don't take care of the horizontal dimension of relationships (peer relations) in an attempt to pursue vertical control, which is often not recognized or supported by the teachers themselves.

Then when the public sphere (which are mainly represented by the school as a civic institution) is latent, you do not have to impress if the young people fall back on to private, ie, if whether, as they build their own values, their ethics "for everyday". The needs to anchor that new generation express everything, in my opinion in this search result (Colombo, 2015). To the question: "Why do you think a boy does an illegal action?", the more frequent answer was "To Need To Be Someone", "To Be Recognized By Someone" (25.8%), followed by "For play", "For fun"(18.1%) and by "To Risk", "To Test My Courage"(16.1%). This data suggests that adolescents are in search of a *social visibility*, that is well known among those who are 14-18 years today. They overlap the sense of oneself with the group

membership and they are pushed to project themselves in the public sphere without the meditation of a shared behavior code.

And still regarding the creation of a stable normativity: to the question "What drives you to respect the most important rules?", the answer that got more public plaudits among preadolescents was "My Conscience" (43.4%) followed by "Upbringing" (37.5%), by "The Habits Of Coexistence" (13.1%). The most traditional items "Law or the Constitution" (4.4%) and "My Religion" (1.6%) got very little plaudits. To comment on this I suggest that:

(a) When the large systems of value and norm (such as law and religion) are put into discussion or "sprayed" in the growth experience until they become as "absent totality", adolescents are still grasping on to educational experience as a "present totality" with its materiality and its daily relations, which serves a reference point although it remains embedded in specific situations and meetings.

(b) Nevertheless, the most significant anchor for adolescents remains *one's conscience,* that represents the size of all the choices. If realistically adolescents aged 14-18 have not already formed a mature character nor an adult moral consciousness, then it is right that "my consciousness" for them is something rooted on internal resources as a folding due to the lack of external resources. Implicitly they ask for a less unstable system of values outside.

In conclusion, until the percentages of their answers will not be inverted (i.e., until a bigger amount of youngsters will not be positioned on the items related to "upbringing" or "habit of coexistence" as sources of their normativity), the collective basis of social ties and citizenship will not be internalized by student and new generations. This means that parents, school and no-schooling agents will have until then much more work to do for building citizenship through education.

References

Avvisati, F., Hennessy, S., Kozma, R.B., Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2014). *Review of the Italian Strategy for Digital Schools*. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 90, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Assirelli, G. (2014). Studiare di più rende migliori? Analisi della relazione tra istruzione e civicness. *Scuola democratica*, 1, 29-52.

Barnes, J. A. (1994). *A Pack of Lies. Toward a Sociology of Lie*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Wasted lives. Modernity and its outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Belotti, V. (Ed.) (2010). Costruire senso, negoziare spazi. Ragazzi e ragazze nella vita quotidiana. *Quaderni e Documenti del CNDIA*, n. 50. Firenze: Istituto degli innocenti.

Besozzi, E. (1990). *Tra somiglianza e differenza*. Vita e pensiero: Milano.

Besozzi, E. (2010). *Cittadinanza/cittadinanze: vecchie e nuove questioni di politiche dell'istruzione,* paper presented at the X Congress AIS, Milan, October.

Besozzi, E. (Ed.) (2012). I giovani alla prova: agency e chances di vita, special issue of *Studi di sociologia*, 1.

Besozzi, E. (2014). Citizenship/citizenships: old and new issues for education policies, *Italian Journal of Sociology of education*, 6 (3), 184-218.

Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Boulder and London: Paradigm.

Blandino, G. (2008). *Quando insegnare non è più un piacere*. Cortina: Milano.

Boda, G. (Ed.) (2009). Legalità, responsabilità e cittadinanza, special issue of *Annali della Pubblica Istruzione*, 1-2.

Boda, G. (Ed.) (2012). Indicazioni nazionali per il curricolo della scuola dell'infanzia e del primo ciclo d'istruzione, special issue of *Annali della Pubblica Istruzione*.

Campbell, E. (2003). *The Ethical Teacher*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Campbell, E. (2008). Teaching Ethically as a Moral Condition of Professionalism. In D. Narváez, L. Nucci (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (pp. 601-617). New York: Routledge.

Caneppele, S., Mezzanotte, L., Savona, E. (2010). *Bullismo: tra realtà e rappresentazione*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.

Cavallli, A. (1981). *Il capo carismatico*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Colombo, M. (2004). The Professional Socialization of Teachers: from a Functional to a Creative approach. *Worcester Papers in Education*, 4, 41-47.

Colombo, M. (Ed.) (2008). *E-learning e cambiamenti sociali. Dal competere al comprendere*. Napoli: Liguori.

Colombo, M. (2009a). Coping with Ambivalence: Unanticipated Outcomes as Challenges for Experienced Teachers. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3, 136-150.

Colombo, M. (2009b). Insegnanti e studenti. Orientamenti valoriali, aspettative, agire di ruolo. In E. Besozzi (Ed.), *Tra sogni e realtà. Gli adolescenti e la transizione all'età adulta* (pp. 71-91). Roma: Carocci.

Colombo, M. (Ed.) (2014). Disagio degli insegnanti e interventi formativi. *Oppinformazioni*, 117.

Colombo, M. (2016). *Percezione della legalità tra gli adolescenti italiani.* Milano: Franco Angeli (in press).

Colombo, M., Lomazzi, V. (Eds.) (2012). *Costruire legalità con gli adolescenti*, Trento: Erickson.

Colombo, M., Santagati, M. (2014). *Nelle scuole plurali. Misure di integrazione degli allievi stranieri.* Milano: Franco Angeli.

Cresson, E. (2002). *Learning for active citizenship. A report to the European Commission on Education*. www.europea.eu.int/comm/education/citizen/citiz-en.html

D'Agati, M., Molino, D. (2014). Il gap di legittimità. La scuola italiana tra punti di forza, debolezze e priorità. *Scuola democratica*, 1, 155-177.

Damiano, E. (2004). *L'insegnante: identificazione di una professione*. Brescia: La Scuola.

Damiano, E. (2007). *L'insegnante etico. Saggio sull'insegnamento come professione morale*. Assisi: Cittadella.

Dei, M. (2011). *Ragazzi si copia: A lezione di imbroglio nelle scuole italiane. Bologna:* Il Mulino.

Delli Zotti, G., Urpis, O. (2012). Educational institutions in the face of multiculturalism: problems and solutions in inter-ethnic violence in Italian schools. In Z. Medaric, M. Sedmak (Eds.), *Children's voices. Inter-ethnic violence in the school environment*. Koper (SE): Universitetna Zalozba Annales.

Falk, R. (1994). The making of global citizenship. In van B. Steenbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 127-140). London: Sage.

Foerster, F. W. (1957). *Scuola e carattere. Problemi pedagogico-morali della vita scolastica.* Brescia: La Scuola.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of the sociological method.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Le conseguenze della modernità*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Giddens, A. (2014). *Turbolent and mighty continent. What future for Europe?* Cambridge: Polity press.

Gonthier-Maurin, B. (Ed.) (2012). *Rapport d'Information au nom de la commission de la culture, de l'éducation et de la communication par la mission d'information sur le métier d'enseignement.* Paris, 19.7.2012.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., Sirotnick, K. A. (Eds.) (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Granieri, G. (2005). *Blog generation*. Laterza: Bari.

Kristeva, J. (2013). *L'avvenire di una rivolta*. Genova: Il Melangolo.

Reggio, P. G. (2014). *Lo schiaffo di Don Milani.* Trento: Il Margine.

Riesman, D. (1961). *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.

Rositi, F. (2008). La tolleranza della menzogna nella scena politica. *Quaderni di scienza politica*, 1, 81-100.

Rychen, S. D., Salgamik, L. H. (2003). T*he definition and selection of key competencies. Executive summary.* Paris: DeSeCo publications, OECD.

Rychen, S. D. (2004). An overarching conceptual framework for assessing key competences in an international context. Lessons from an interdisciplinary and policy-oriented approach. In P. Descy, M. Tessaring (Eds.), *The foundations of evaluation and impact research*. Cedefop Reference series, 58.

Sani, G. (1980). The Political culture of Italy: Continuity and Change. In G. A. Almond, S. Verba (Eds.). *The Civic Culture Revisited* (pp. 273-324). Newbury Park: Sage.

Sciolla, L. (2005). *La sfida dei valori. Rispetto delle regole e rispetto dei diritti in Italia.* Bologna: Il Mulino.
Sciolla, L. (2013). Il ruolo dell'istruzione formale nella formazione dei valori e dei comportamenti di cittadinanza attiva. *Scuola democratica*, 3, 839-47.
Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect: the formation of character in an age of inequality*. Allen Lane: The Penguin Press.
Simmel, G. (2006). L'educazione in quanto vita. In M. Colombo (a cura di), *E come educazione. Autori e parole-chiave della sociologia* (pp. 20-29). Napoli: Liguori.
Vaillancourt Rosenau, P. (1993). Modern and Postmodern Conceptions of Social Order. *Social research*, 60, 2, 337-62.