

Re-giving pedagogy the interdisciplinary intensity of its voice

Vincenzo Antonio Piccione¹

Abstract

In the last two decades the pedagogical cultural and scientific area has been mainly discussing about its statute, its reference subjects, its reference objectives, its reference contents; it was, perhaps, the consequence produced by interdisciplinary approaches, or, perhaps, by the need of adopting interdisciplinary approaches, or, perhaps, by the need of better defining additional directions and designs to pedagogical research. This paper does not aim at giving any contribution to this debate; it aims at stating that several effects of present changes ask pedagogical approaches to be renewed and innovated; its attention focuses on learners, on their present learning, cognitive, social, individual, communicational, expressive, lexical, emotional, affective styles; it focuses on their central position within all educational settings. This paper will shortly comment the effects of some significant changes, whose impact on all the mentioned styles is so deep that the need of re-considering the education's cores is actually realistic, in terms of a meaningful re-orientation from a pedagogy which supports didactical approaches for competences to a pedagogy which supports didactical approaches for educational objectives.

Key words: *pedagogical approaches; educational care; narrative thinking.*

¹ Vincenzo Antonio Piccione, Università Roma Tre, Italia.

For the first time in human history

The voice of pedagogy is significant when it reports the results of its observation of current phenomena, of its description of the impact of current changes on social and individual learning / communicational / expressive / linguistic / emotional styles, namely of youngsters' generations. And that voice is more intense when it is supported by the sociological, psychological, philosophical readings of those phenomena, of those changes, of those impacts; actually, according to the lessons of deep thinkers, from, at least, M. Montessori to J. Piaget and J. Bruner, pedagogy can be and must be the most interdisciplinary human science among human sciences.

Now: in the last two decades, a few factual, social phenomena have been showing their deep, important, significant, extraordinary impact which has been producing perturbing, sometimes devastating, effects within educational contexts, within educational interactions, within educational approaches.

A few very generic considerations, first: most of our pupils and students live, belong to, participate, communicate, interact within traditional educational settings, whose social, communicational, expressive, linguistic, lexical, formal, non-formal, informal messages are coherent with experts' competences and knowledge, models and lifestyles. And, at the moment, adults' and experts' teaching styles are widely traditional, i.e. transmissive, managed according to the following, rather old, procedure: as adults and experts think they are the total owners of knowledge and experience, day by day, they speak, ask full attention, have their classes and courses, deliver knowledge, make questions, evaluate without assessing. In other words, they use the same transmissive style that they have been knowing when they went to school, as pupils. Within all the other educational settings (parallel schools, according to the pedagogical lexicon), our students receive widely similar messages: adults' models and lifestyles, wisdom and experience are

undeniable, sometimes unjustifiable but undeniable. Therefore, to remain generic, we must think that there can be teachers, academics and parents who interact or listen to their students or sons and daughters, or, in other words, that there can be lucky students, sons, daughters; and that there can be unlucky students, sons, daughters who live most of their time by themselves because of their parents' job rhythms and of traditional teaching styles within traditional educational settings (Piccione, Burns & Sinfield, 2015). Now, two short considerations more profound and meaningful, on factual issues, on what is labelled "transmission of knowledge".

The former: as never before in human history, younger generations, at present, have a kind of knowledge, the technological one, about which the adult generations are not unique and total holders. Adult generations don't know and can't transfer its contents, instructions for use, usability and re-usability, meanings, cognitive strategies involved in managing it, communicational codes and channels, specific languages, potential risks, moral and ethical codes, emotional lexicon and style. On one side, the pure existence of this fact modifies, at least, the perception of educational interactions, the quality of educational interactions, the type and quality of pedagogical and didactical approaches within traditional and non-traditional educational settings, the perception of the distance between evaluation and assessment. On the other side, it modifies the learner's use and rhythm of use of cognitive strategies, the learner's perception of the interdisciplinary links between cultural areas.

The latter: younger generations, at present, have at their disposal a kind of knowledge, the technological one, which gives an additional instrumental potentiality. Its use allows, as never before in human history, the pure access to any other knowledge without the necessary physical presence of adult generations. It doesn't matter if it is a deeper or a more superficial knowledge, as its quality depends on the user's approach and

on the motivation to learn, on the personal interest and curiosity to access knowledge. The pure existence of this fact produces several extremely significant consequences, at least: the perceived usability of knowledge, the perception of its updatability, the way of memorizing, individual and social processing, giving an individual and social meaning, manipulating knowledge, making hypotheses and thinking at solutions, the way cognitive strategies are used (Maldonado, 2005; Piccione, 2013).

What I mean is: educational professions and roles cannot ignore the impact produced by the pure presence of tools that have been modifying our lifestyles and learning styles. They must have a specific competence: reading and understanding why, how, for whom the perspective of the access to knowledge and of the experimentation of critical thinking are, at present, totally different. In other words: the way we have been studying and learning, up to a few decades ago, and the way, at present, our students study and learn, are so distant that never before, in human history, the risk was so strong of reducing both the meaning of primary and academic studies and the opportunities of improving research. This does not mean that the quality of primary, secondary, academic teaching and researching is going to be lower and lower, but that the impact of primary and secondary studies, of academic studies and research can be lower and lower (Laporta, 1977; EMN, 2013). In short, in concrete, some examples. First: we have been taught that the manipulation of knowledge is the strategy that can produce significant effects on the quality of learning. What does it mean? That we were taught a learning style concentrated, at least, on deducing, inducing, making inferences, analysing, synthesizing, representing, solving problems, using logical and thematic connections, etc. Second: we have been explained subjects by the use of sequentiality. What does it mean? That our teachers and academics, wherever and whenever, from primary school to university,

explained with sequential procedures all formal contents of subjects.

In other words:

- humanities, or, better, the ‘historical’ subjects, obeyed to a red thread: history, art, literature, philosophy were ‘narrated’, explained, commented, from ancient times to present ones; and geography was narrated with a lightly different red thread: from all that is ‘close to me’ to all that is very ‘far from me’;
- logical-scientific subjects obeyed to a ‘technical’ red thread: arithmetic, maths, physics, chemistry, ..., were narrated explained, commented, from simple to complex.

At the moment, the above-mentioned cognitive strategies aren’t anymore sufficient to learn effectively: in other words, deducing, inducing, making inferences, analysing, synthesizing, representing, solving problems, using logical and thematic connections, sequentiality aren’t sufficient, anymore. In other words: a significant re-orientation from a pedagogy which supports didactical approaches for competences to a pedagogy which supports didactical approaches for educational objectives means that using interdisciplinary approaches, building and bridging intercultural and interdisciplinary nets, constantly using the critical thinking, constantly interpreting and explaining with the narrative thinking, constantly interpreting and catching meanings besides factual and concrete contents, re-giving a central role to soft skills, now, are core aims.

Now, after two considerations about factual issues, three considerations about social issues, that is, about the impact that changes produced on the social perception of the distance between adult generations and youngsters, in cultural, emotional, sentimental, educational, formative terms. The first two are very short considerations, at least from a comparative point of view.

As never before in human history, the level of abdication to an educational role by generations of parents is rather high. The representation of the deceiving figure of the

mother-friend and of the father-friend was, for example, a significant mistake within the field of the education to emotional and sentimental life. Both representations, actually, limited the importance and meaning of the role of a friend in one's life and modified the perception of the meaning of a parent. The perceptions of the meaning of a bond, of shared interests and values, of assumed equal positions, of agreed commitments, of mutual confiding personal secrets to each other were modified with a pure misunderstanding of a role.

The reduction of the lexicon of the education to emotional and sentimental life, just to make a second example, reduced the opportunity of perceiving, interpreting, differentiating, explaining, expressing moods, feelings, dispositions, intensities, reduced the opportunity of living the impact that emotions and sentiments produce on behaviours, reduced the opportunity of experiencing additional cognitive processes and mental states, reduced the opportunity of deeply distinguishing between a state and an attitude (Mortari, 2017).

As never before in human history, the level of delegation of their educational role by generations of parents is rather high. Perhaps the self-justification given by the intense rhythms of working lives, perhaps the alibi that school, teachers and professors do have an educational role have become reassuring ideas. However, on one side, the perceptions of one's educational role, presence, meaning, sense attribution, and, on the other side, the perception of different ethical and moral codes, behaviours, references, languages, positions, were modified with a pure misunderstanding of a role. Poorer meanings attributed to co-responsibility and of 'taking care of' were their effects (Mortari, 2006).

The third social consideration about a social issue is more complex and is related to a new perception of virtuality. My generation was said that virtual was something in nuce or something that could be neither tangible nor visible. Such transformation affects and amplifies educational settings. Or, better, virtual is an additional educational setting,

gives a significant contribution to individual and social developments and growths. Maldonado (1994) is here my essential scientific reference, because his voices anticipates, I think, important and meaningful issues for the pedagogical point of view. Here, materialization, globalism, consumerism, sophistication, manipulation, modelling, representation, liquidity, inaccuracy should be dealt with. Several researchers fear the gradual redefinition of the relationship between tangible and intangible, real and virtual, permanent and unstable, material and immaterial. Other researchers look at the same problem making some necessary distinctions. First, the concreteness of objects, products and tools that we all use, all days or periodically, according to conventional modalities and procedures. On the basis of our sensory perception, we recognise to them the two properties of singularity and stability, as they have specific functions and roles that make them always tangible and structured, and as they only differ in their forms and profiles; it is true, however: the obsolescence of the technological tools is so rapid and intense that it reduces the lifecycle of different kinds of objects. But we cannot deny it: technological tools are able to create even more real representations than reality itself (Skype is a very significant example, it is a tool more concrete than a letter, as it allows more realistic, deep, significant, direct interactions than letters). In other words, objects, environments, contexts are not presented, but can be re-presented on screens, they are before our eyes and can be observed from different perspectives. It is generic but unavoidable to stress the fact that with the new tools of long-distance communication we can visually contact people wherever they are, with a kind of interaction requiring new models and new procedures of communication. It seems therefore abnormal that all this can lead to a rapid process of dematerialisation of our physicality and interactions (Maldonado, 1994).

Maldonado says that, even if we have to accept the idea that high fidelity images are becoming more important than tangible and visible reality, it would be impossible to conceive a total impact of the dematerialization, because of the actions implemented by our brain: actually, it is able to analyse and produce intangible items, and, above all, it is instrument, system, player, analyser, observer of recognised / recognisable images, of iconographic languages, of symbols.

In other words, the pure fact that we cannot touch objects cannot be confused with dematerialization; actually, our body remains our body, our homes remain our homes, our desktops remain our desktops, our job will always ask actions and physical energies, games will always ask for the presence of players, the perception of self cannot be confused with a virtual self playing within virtual environments. In short: technological tools can change our working or domestic habits, even our physical approach to our work and to our domestic spaces, but the results of our actions within our homes and of our professional choices cannot be hidden or simulated.

Indeed, Tomás Maldonado says: attending virtual settings can enrich our intelligence, our experiences, competences and perceptions. According to him, it is time to stop the debate between those who argue that reality is the reality in which we move and can move, and those who argue that technologies are only producing fiction. Virtual reality asks to reconsider our relationship and our perception of physical and bodily reality, but defines the additional environments in which human experience is possible, urges the observer's analytical and synthetic skills, as well as the use of additional cognitive strategies such as, at least, denomination, classification, categorization, differentiation, representation, abstraction, symbolization (Maldonado, 1994). Of course, if we say that technology is only an encroaching videogame, there can exist no doubt. But if a doubt arises and we imagine the number of

young people using, experiencing, handling technology, recognising its use without reading the user's manuals, socialising contents and strategies, then something interesting could emerge. We could realise that virtuality has gone deep into new generations' reality, that their perception of the virtual is very different compared with the previous generations'. New generations know how to distinguish between true and false, real and fake, they are able to give virtuality a role within reality. They know that the technological games based on the cliché 'correct answers and actions = score' do not exist anymore, that all technological games allow options and choices on which scores depend. And all of us, teachers, academics and educators know that a computer-assisted teaching supports a new perception of knowledge, since manipulability, curiosity and interest reduce the gap between acting subject and knowing subject. Or, as Maldonado says, between learning by doing and learning by using (Maldonado, 1994). In other words, pedagogically important: managing writing, reading, speaking, thinking on a digital file or managing social interactions on a blog have, at least, been strengthening the use of additional competences, have even asked to the plasticity of our brains to accept new challenges (Maldonado, 1994). In concrete words, all of these changes modified the perception and the organization of knowledge, the effectiveness of knowledge and the expectations we have from it, the points of view and the narration of knowledge, the elaboration of knowledge for our own purposes. Therefore: why, in a short time, should we modify our teaching styles? There are, at least, ethical, social, cultural reasons, of course, and they all belong to our profession, or, better, to the way we perceive our profession, to the way we make researches, aim at scientific objectives, expect scientific results; in short, it belongs to our professional projects, therefore to the reasons why we study, plan researches, update our competences, have classes (Massa, 2005; Postman, 1997; Salomone,

1997; Sansone, 2003). If we all do not understand the impact of changes now, changes will however introduce themselves, clearer and clearer, in a short time. In other words, the students who, at present, attend secondary schools, could only need a couple of years to become our university students; and those who, at present, attend primary schools, will only need ten years or less to become our university students. They all are the bearers of the impact of changes. Within the above- defined context, the role of the sciences of education is extremely important; actually, they are asked to confirm their interdisciplinary scientific nature; to demonstrate to be able to read present educational problems; to give, again, significant didactical answers to the need of fostering, within all educational settings, interest, curiosity and motivation; to suggest how to avoid the risk of strengthening the perception of knowledge as a set of technical, transmissible notions (Cambi, 2005, 2006; De Kerckhove, 1991).

‘Taking care of’ as an attitude, using narrative thinking

The factual and social issues considered above are among the reasons that support my idea of re-giving pedagogy the interdisciplinary intensity of its voice. Two objectives are crucial for my proposal. The former: the transversal attitude of ‘taking care of’, which deals with the opportunity of perceiving one’s own existence, of perceiving one’s own meaningful presence within individual and social contexts, of perceiving one’s own meaningful projectual directions (Mortari, 2006) within threat-free and promising contexts (Bauman, 2006). The latter: the transversal use of narrative thinking, as a tool which observes, analyses, reads, deepens, tales, lives, breaths, interprets, defines, codifies, decodifies, selects, experiences, projects, manipulates all that belongs to one’s own life, concretely, symbolically. This is why, the two objectives are here described together, inter-linked, intertwined.

We are our thinking, we belong to our thinking, and our thinking is able to discover and re- discover our mute knowledge, our mental life, our questions and decisions; this is the reason why our metacognitive processes are so significant in all our educational actions (Mortari, 2018), within actual educational settings, according to actual pedagogical and didactical approaches. Furthermore: the contents of our lived time are defined and explained only by their unique historical connections and the sense of our decisions and of our projectual ideas are defined and explained by the reasons of our choices. According to Binswanger, this fact confirms the notion of the existence of an inner life history (Binswanger, 1955).

Value and meaning of each individual inner story can be explained by individual choices and motivations, must be considered as belonging to everyone’s original, unique, psychophysical and spiritual life plot. The author of an inner life story narrates the threads and knots of that plot, on the basis of a temporal bond linking a specific moment to a lifelong story, whose points of view depend on the simultaneous presence or absence of the author, of the storyteller, of one or more of the different characters.

This definition of narration as autobiography allows the achievement of significant objectives. On the one hand, the definition reduces the differences separating the individual from his own social group, from micro-groups and macro-groups. It states that the lived space, any lived space, is a common territory where external and internal dimensions, near and far ones, over and under the sky, exist. On the other hand, it allows the analysis of systemic relations, suggests the connection between public and private original spheres. It intends cultural growth as search for meaning and not as lack of notions and skills, because the search for meaning can’t exclude personal and collective knowledge. It solidifies the sense of belonging, giving to it a specific importance and not simple approvals. It requires participation and not education to

monadism, it chooses nomadism as a value determined by a choice and a search of self and of others, not as a simple movement from a micro-group to another, from a profession to another, from a tool or a technologically advanced one to another, from a knowledge to another. It integrates executive, iconic and symbolic representations and enhances internalisation. This idea of narration and its definition owe much to Jerome Bruner because they choose the stability of an ego who is reflexive and aware, ready to keep up to date, able to ignore all thresholds and to meet the others in the name of sharing, co-construction and of the potential value of learning circles (Bruner, 1986).

The chance of finding new and further spaces of action, the chance of conversing with individuals and groups, as well as the chance of new languages and comparisons, increase the symbolic and cultural dimensions of the “movement through” new thresholds and new entrances, new pillars of Hercules and routes, new surprises and expectations, new rites and limits, new narrations and actions, new behaviours and attitudes, new perceptions and concreteness, new obstacles and difficulties, new customs and unknowns, new negotiations and elaborations between known and unknown, familiar and stranger. However, while present adult generations often risk looking at new territories as no man’s lands, for new generations these are lands of possibilities, to be visited and to be enriched.

The problem is that, as in any other rite of passage, students have the right to be supported during difficult moments and accompanied while building their border identities, or, better, those identities who not only perceive and experience culture, knowledge, languages, vocabulary, comparisons, awareness, belonging, security that exist on both sides of a threshold, but also the chance of having additional opportunities, meanings, values, principles, curiosities, comparisons. In fact, the border is something familiar, is a place itself. Each threshold defines the dynamic co-presence

and the interaction between internal and external. That border identity is a dynamic identity that always lives close to thresholds, either geographical or metaphorical, is ready to overcome them with the fostering support of the curiosity, interest and motivation of finding out what’s beyond. In other words, the categories of permeability and of transversality define present thresholds, while the categories of availability, mediation and ductility define the border identity. Therefore, a border identity is protean, multiple, generally able to recognize the others, to identify the metaphors of a ‘beyond’ and of the ‘access’, to accept differences and distinctions, to negotiate contents and meanings, to reduce extraneousness and intransigence, to get used to crossings and returns. But, above all, a border identity doesn’t perceive the space to cross as empty, doesn’t explain space as a virtual place, as distance from the lives lived beyond the threshold, as suspension and absence, but rather as a stable and dynamic place, a place giving access to transformation because it constantly meets the new, is never a place where to get lost, either metaphorically or concretely. The border identity may be a nomad identity that chooses when, how, why to move, with whom, where, why to meet. For a nomad, the journey isn’t a movement, it is the repetition of a fundamental gesture. It means showing, giving and sharing his own mental, symbolic, cultural maps according to the crossed place.

Such considerations are essential in our discourse: our belonging is explained and affirmed because we are always involved in cultures, negotiating and mediating, according to dynamic, situated, social manners, but above all aware that each individual narration and every great narration is shared or contradicted because they always refer to the specific context of reality, to its contents, rituals, traditions, language, meanings, principles, values, to its tools and all implications, times and spaces of adoption and employment. And again: all individual and collective narrations are

coherent with the story of the mediation among individuals, social contexts and environment. It is the narration of those who aspire to change and reciprocity. It is the story of actors who contribute, explore, create, produce, desire, dream, talk, reflect. Even better: those individual and collective narration can't be seen as disconnected from the knowledge carried by cultures and which narrators always manipulate and integrate. The contributions, that each actor / narrator develops, are fostered by the new issues he finds in his social context and environment; such contributions can't be previously decided, but must be known, read, understood and manipulated, because they are part of the individual and collective narrations, most of all because the stories can strengthen and qualify meanings and values. New generations need narrations not only to tell and define dogmas or rules, traditions or customs, but also to narrate changes, their reasons, implications and resources. They need to read something not relating to fundamentalism, but to dynamics and processes. They need to be sure that reciprocity belongs to culture, to know that the definitions of 'multicultural' or 'intercultural' contradict the real meaning of culture that is necessarily, by statute, 'multi' and 'inter'. They need to confirm the importance of each personal narration, namely the meaning of humanity as first expression of a deep learning, which is built not only to solve problems, but to give answers to questions. Narrations can't surrender and give up the global representation of situations: mediation is essential to new narrations since they need to cross the distance between past and present repertoires; mediation is essential to border identities because they need to experience curiosity and relationships beyond thresholds; mediation is essential to authors and co-authors to spread together renewal, individual and collective ideas, further and future narrations. It is the same individual and social identity that needs to summarize, after analyses and reflections on the book of

previous narrations, what is constantly moving and giving new meanings back.

Individual and collective memories need to summarize processes and phenomena, to strengthen the bond with the world, to find a new language for new thoughts, new tools, new meanings, new values, new principles, new perceptions of reality. Narrations, identities, memories are the responsible actors of projectual visions and of the new horizons of meaning that students need to understand and look at. For our pedagogical point of view, the links among their social and individual identities, their social and individual memories, the narrations they know and belong to, are able to provide new suggestions for deepening.

Actually, narrations

- are fostered by cognitive processes, while elaborating and hearing them; the use of the chronological and connotative systems can't be considered the unique working cognitive processes;
- are supported by a narrative thinking which does integrate with the paradigmatic thinking (Bruner & De Kerckhove, 1991)
- organize structures, schemes, systems, models, meanings;
- are strengthened by and are understandable because of the contents of their four forms, biographies, autobiographies, psycho-biographies, socio-biographies;
- are produced by (and of course able to produce) the process of signification of events;
- are becoming collective narrations, orientation, textual processers;
- are transforming their structure in plots of movies after centuries of instant snapshots.

And, of course, narration supports our pedagogical point of view because it is able to promote primary skills:

- analytical: not only do they ask us to understand ourselves, our competences, our limits and preferences, but also our awareness of the characteris-

- tics of the context within which our designs may be effective. They correspond to: what do I know and what can I do best, what do I want, what do I prefer, what exists around me, what features does the world around me have, what are the characteristics of my specific field of interest;
- synthetic: they require the ability to find significant connections between the results of the analytical process and a kind of overview that can't be the sum of the identified details. They correspond to: what kind of compatibility exists between what I do best, the world around me and the scope of my specific interest; what the reasons for that compatibility are, what the significance of the details captured by my analyses is, what the meaning of my syntheses is, which is the meaning of the analyses and syntheses produced by individuals who have the same specific interest I have;
 - metacognitive: they require the engagement and use of cultural, mnemonic and interpretative tools. They correspond to: what concepts and cultural tools I have and can quickly get to better understand my analyses and syntheses; what technical, methodological and strategic tools I have and can quickly get to find compatibility between myself and the specific context of my project; what kind of compatibilities exist between those skills, those concepts, those tools and my preferences, my wishes, the possible directions of my project; what compatibilities exist between these aspects and the possibility that a context will approve and accept my project;
 - orientative: they require advanced skills of observation and reading of phenomena, aiming at understanding the possible direction of social and collective orientations. They correspond to: which the reasons are of preferences, decisions, individual and collective choices, what compatibility exists between my analyses, my syntheses, my meta-cognitive approach, my directions and the collective ones;
 - re-elaborative of values: they require sophisticated emotional skills in order to understand values and principles orientations that characterize micro- and macro-contexts. They correspond to: in the name of what meanings, values, individual and collective principles do the identified orientations move; what compatibility exists among men, women, students, current and future values and principles;
 - programmatic: they require skills in planning and programming a project. They correspond to: what kind of the times and spaces my project must foresee in order to guarantee consistency between what I intend to do and what effectively will be in specific times; what the crucial strengths and weaknesses are in my plans and projects;
 - reflexive: they require sophisticated logical, representative and interpretative skills. They correspond to: what reasons make my project work, what makes my plan original, in this context; what characteristics ensure that my project will be successful; what oversights, mistakes, absences will limit meaningful answers in projectual terms.
- Introspective and retrospective thinking, perspective thinking belong to the narrative thinking, all of them reflect upon the contents of the processes previously indicated from a point of view that argumentative or logical-argumentative thinking might have missed, because they are all defined by characterizing specific procedures, not from mere historical reporting. In fact, the former come from a deep reconsideration, both deconstructive and reconstructive, logical and exploratory, symbolic and hypothetical, self-critical and meta-cognitive. This reconsideration should be achieved through procedures that require research, reasoning, intent, moti-

vation, selective and distinctive skills, discernment and insight. In other words, it includes, at least, research, analogical reasoning, quasi paradigmatic logic. Narrative thinking offers the phenomenological approach the opportunity to clarify its reading and interpretation methods: the clear participation of the processing of mnemonic contents, meanings and ideas, reprocessing of issues, of meta-narration and narration, meets cognitivist, constructivist, systemic-relational, confessional, even psychoanalytic views. It also defines the participation of cerebral systems (cortical and sub-cortical areas, neuronal maps), of emotional spheres, of cognitive strategies and of the different systems of memory (semantic, episodic, procedural, declarative, ecological, autobiographic, socio-biographic, psycho-biographic, biographic, collective).

The deconstruction or reconstruction proposed by narrative thinking is therefore able to problemize and to avoid the risk of

pure psychologisation (Cambi, 2005). Narrative thinking is able to bind the tools of a deep learning, of self-conscience, bringing together processes, exchanges, projections, experiences.

For our pedagogical point of view, therefore, the narrative thinking requires the simultaneous actions of different tools, approaches, dimensions, and among them: mind and memory, reasoning and interpretation, re-evocation and recognition, association and differentiation, abstraction and symbolization, denomination and semantization, description and representation, regulation of behavioural and communication styles, discussing and exploratory styles, comparison and contextualization, organization and reorganization, access to knowledge and skills, investigative styles, curiosity and interest in one's and other's plots, motivation to read and write plots.

References

- Antonietti, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Il divenire del pensiero. Conoscenza e ragionamento*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina.
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Consuming life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2000). *I rischi della libertà*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Benasayag, M., Schmit G. (2004). *L'epoca delle passioni tristi*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Binswanger, L. (1955). *Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Bern: Francke.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (2007). *La cultura dell'educazione*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Cambi, F. (2005). *L'autobiografia come metodo formativo*. Roma: Laterza.
- Cambi, F. (2006). *Manuale di storia della pedagogia*. Roma: Laterza.
- De Kerckhove, D. (1991). *Brainframes: technology, mind and business*. Utrecht: Bosch & Keuning.
- European Migration Network, (2013). *Sixth EMN Italy Report. International students at Italian Universities: empirical survey and insights*. Roma: European Migration Network.
- Gardner, H. (2002). *Formae mentis. Saggio sulla pluralità dell'intelligenza*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Laporta, R. (1977). *Educazione e libertà in una società in progresso*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Maldonado, T. (1994). *Reale e virtuale*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Maldonado, T. (2005). *Memoria e conoscenza. Sulle sorti del sapere nella prospettiva digitale*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Massa, R. (2005). *La clinica della formazione. Un'esperienza di ricerca*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Meleddu, M., Scalas, L.F. (2003). *La molteplicità del sé. Disagio emotivo, vissuto corporeo e adolescenza*. Roma: Carocci.
- Morin, E. (1999). *La tête bien faite*. Paris: Seuil.
- Mortari, L. (2006). *La pratica dell'aver cura*. Torino: Bruno Mondadori.
- Mortari, L. (Ed.). (2010). *Dire la pratica. La cultura del fare scuola*. Torino: Bruno Mondadori.

- Mortari, L. (2016). *Cultura della ricerca e pedagogia. Prospettive epistemologiche*. Roma: Carocci.
- Mortari, L. (2017). *La sapienza del cuore. Pensare le emozioni, sentire i pensieri*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina.
- Mortari, L. (2018). *Apprendere dall'esperienza. Il pensare riflessivo nella formazione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Piccione, V.A. (2011). Present changes in learning processes of younger generations. *Revista Educação Skepsis*, 2, II, July, 544-581.
- Piccione, V.A. (Ed.). (2015). *Student's group management*. Timisoara: Editura Waldpress.
- Piccione, V.A. (2013). *The new pedagogical settings*. Roma: Aemme.
- Postman, N. (1997). *La fine dell'educazione. Ridefinire il valore della scuola*. Roma: Armando.
- Salomone, I. (1997). *Il setting pedagogico. Vincoli e possibilità per l'interazione educativa*. Roma: NIS.
- Sansone, F. (2003). *Il pensiero flessibile*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.