

**EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING AND EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL POVERTY. INCLUSIVE
TEACHERS AND SCHOOL LEADERS AS "AGENTS OF CHANGE" IN THEIR PEDAGOGICAL AND
PROFESSIONAL ACTIONS**

**LA DISPERSIONE SCOLASTICA E LA POVERTÀ EDUCATIVA. L'AGIRE EDUCATIVO E
PROFESSIONALE DEGLI INSEGNANTI INCLUSIVI E DEI DIRIGENTI SCOLASTICI COME
'AGENTI DI CAMBIAMENTO'**

Paolina Mulè
Department of Education Sciences, University of Catania
pamule@unict.it



Double Blind Peer Review

Citazione

Mulè P., (2023) Early school leaving and educational and cultural poverty. Inclusive teachers and school leaders as "agents of change" in their pedagogical and professional actions, *Giornale Italiano di Educazione alla Salute, Sport e Didattica Inclusiva - Italian Journal of Health Education, Sports and Inclusive Didactics*. Anno 7, V 2. Supplemento Edizioni Universitarie Romane

Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.32043/gsd.v7i2.939>

Copyright notice:

© 2023 this is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Open Journal System and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

gsdjournal.it

ISSN: 2532-3296

ISBN: 978-88-6022-479-8

ABSTRACT

In this essay, the Author intends to examine the issue of early school living and educational and cultural poverty, starting from the analysis of the two phenomena, taking into account the most recent statistical data presenting their causes, and the reflecting on the importance of the educational and professional actions of inclusive teachers and school directors as "main agents of change" to promote Welfare Communities.

In questo saggio l'Autore intende investigare il tema della dispersione scolastica e della povertà educativa e culturale, partendo dall'analisi dei due fenomeni, considerando gli ultimi dati statistici che presentano le cause, per poi riflettere sull'importanza dell'agire educativo e professionale dei docenti inclusivi e dei dirigenti scolastici come 'agenti principali del cambiamento' per promuovere Welfare Community.

KEYWORDS

Scholastic dropout, educational poverty, school, community pacts, inclusive teacher, school leaders

Dispersione Scolastica, povertà educativa, scuola, patti di comunità, docente inclusivo, dirigenti scolastici

Received 19/08/2023

Accepted 19/09/2023

Published 26/09/2023

Introduction

The theme that we wish to touch upon briefly in this paper, without claiming to be exhaustive, is currently an urgent issue on the national panorama, given the latest data on the two phenomena of early school leaving and educational poverty. It is an issue that has been the subject of pedagogical and other debates for several years now, both from a theoretical and practical point of view. In this essay, the subject is examined from the point of view of the analysis of the two phenomena, taking into account the most recent statistical data on their causes. It, then, reflects on the importance of the pedagogical and professional actions of inclusive teachers and school leaders as "main agents of change" in order to promote welfare communities. The attempt is made to analyse the educational and training processes through theories, teaching methods and practical actions that give meaning and significance to the change of the subject of the *educandus* in the school and, by extension, in society. In this historical period, the data show us a high rate of early school leaving, so that today we need to reflect on the ways in which it is possible to counter this phenomenon, but also to intervene preventively in cases at risk of early school leaving (Invalsi Report, 2022; OEDC, 2022; Miur, 2021, Report of the Guarantor of Childhood. Early school leaving, 2022). It follows that it is necessary to start from the constructs of *Ex-ducere* and *Bildung*, which lead us to analyse the problematic and unpredictable nature of the educational process, which is measured by the lives of people who, within historical and social contingencies, give shape to their complex and problematic life experiences. After this theoretical analysis of the constructs, the aim is to focus on the pedagogical implicitness of the concepts of school dropout and educational and cultural poverty, which must be confronted at school with courage and confidence on the part of teachers, transforming archaic and exclusionary practices into more dignified and humane actions, This must be addressed to all subjects - individuals in their specific uniqueness and unrepeatability, but also to the various institutional and social subjects involved in teaching, education and training, such as the family, the school, out-of-school places, and in this school context, school leaders must be the guarantors of this change.

1. Early school leaving and poverty in terms of education and culture: two phenomena that are becoming more and more widespread in our time

Before reflecting on the constructs of early school leaving and educational and cultural poverty, it is good to focus on the concepts of *Ex-ducere* (to draw

out the potential of students in order to guide them in the process of growing and developing their personal and social identity) and *Bildung* (a romantic term meaning to acquire form). The pedagogical debate presents the concept of formation, which, due to its complexity, refers to the dimensions of education, conceiving the latter as a set of practical and poetic actions (A. Granese, 1990; 1993; Spadafora, 2010; Mulè, 2014), in which the theoretical and practical assumptions of human action are developed in specific situations (M. Pellerrey, 1999).

Given that the two categories in question, education and training, now appear to be closely linked within the training process itself, it is good to reconstruct their evolution in a synthetic way. Such an analysis leads us to present the two classical categories: *Paideia* and *Bildung*, to which the concepts of education and formation are closely linked. If *Paideia* conceived of the development of man as man, that is, in the pre-modern tradition, it represented an education that was the expression of the transmission of customs, models and values proper to a particular social class; whereas in Greek antiquity, *Paideia* was a pedagogical model that was different, authentically human, far removed from the social processes of enculturation and learning that actually constitute educational processes. In this sense, "to educate was, and still is, to conform: to produce subjects who, though enculturated, are functional to the social and cultural (often also political) order that structures society. Education is constitutively conservative. It is organised precisely in function of a conformation based on the principle of authority" (Cambi, 2006, p. 58).

Instead, *Bildung*, a concept from the Romantic period, is the expression of the idea that education is a process by which the subject transcends itself in forms derived from cultural, ethical, political and aesthetic heritage. *Bildung*, therefore, is no longer intended for the ruling classes, the power elite (Plato, 1979), as it was in the ancient Western world, but for all human beings, with no one excluded. Education [is] based on the subject as self-knowledge, the process of personal appropriation of culture, indispensable to participate in the social reality of human experience" (Burza, 2008, p. 67; Gennari, 1992). It is therefore a matter of training, the main object that orients the pedagogical discipline towards a reflexive activity, destined to measure itself against the reality of educational practice, with its historical and social contingency, but also communicative and intersubjective. On the one hand, it becomes the knot to be unraveled in order to interpret the processes of growth, learning, development, socialization, caring for oneself, for others and for the things of the world; On the other hand, it becomes the main pivot around which the many interpretative logics, the many disciplinary

perspectives and the many methodological procedures that have passed through it are analysed (Spadafora, 2001).

In short, educators have clarified the polysemy of the concept of training and its interchangeability with that of education through a series of in-depth studies based on philosophical analysis. This has highlighted the transition from a philosophical-anthropological meaning to a more technical-engineering one. In this respect, we refer to the reflections made by Riccardo Massa in 1997 in the text *Institutions of Pedagogy and Educational Sciences*, when he specifically addresses the issue of training in relation to the dualism and reductionism that persist in the concepts of education and instruction, specifying that if education develops the process of global structuring of the personality, instruction, on the other hand, activates the series of events that develop the acquisition of concepts and behavioural, cognitive and affective traits, it is in the concept of training that the two aforementioned concepts come together: Education and Instruction. (Massa, 1997, pp. 564-569) It is a polymorphous and polysemic term, depending on the context of reference and use.

So, from Romantic education we have moved on to the emergence of subjectivity, which highlights a rupture, a crisis, in the vision of awareness that has prevailed in Europe since Descartes, Kant, Fichte and Hegel, all the more so since the subject was assigned the role of founding truth and knowledge (Cambi, ed., 2007). Such a crisis has led scholars to understand the subject no longer as an abstract category marked by its characteristics of fixity and otherness, but as a corporeal subject immersed in historical and social contingency, as Marx revealed when he pointed to the poetic character of education with his historical materialism. Marx's philosophy is, in fact, a philosophy of the emancipation of man.

The emancipation of man is rooted in material, social and historical reality. From this brief epistemological analysis emerges the cultural matrix present in the pedagogical debate. The constructs of *Ex-ducere* and *Bildung* lead us to analyse the problematic and unpredictable nature of the educational process. This process is measured against the lives of those who live and work within the historical and social contingencies that shape their complex and problematic lived experiences.

Following this theoretical analysis of the constructs, the pedagogical implications of the concepts of early school leaving and educational and

cultural poverty will be considered. If early school leaving can be defined as "the omitted, incomplete or irregular use of education and training services by young people of school age" (Italian Authority for Childhood and Adolescence, 2022) and represents "an obstacle to economic growth and employment, hampering productivity and competitiveness and aggravating poverty and social exclusion" (European Commission, 2017), educational and cultural poverty represents the "humus" in which early school leaving develops.

When the family, which has the role of educating (transmitting values) does not fulfil this role and pushes its children to work and does not adequately stimulate their growth and development processes, supporting the processes of self-esteem and self-confidence, it denies them the opportunity to educate themselves and acquire all the skills necessary to face the problems of future life, as well as not supporting them to play a role in our society, on the contrary, it contributes to producing a future citizen living in vulnerable social, economic and social conditions.

With regard to the phenomenon of early school leaving, it is interesting to recall that INVALSI has only recently begun to emphasise the concept of "implicit school leaving". This refers to the failure to achieve the learning and skills expected throughout the process up to the end of secondary education. Ultimately, early school leaving is represented by taking into account: 1) formalised drop-outs before completing compulsory education or before obtaining a diploma or qualification; 2) formalised drop-outs (mainly measured ex-post in terms of qualifications obtained/not obtained); 3) irregular attendance; 4) not attending school; 5) avoiding compulsory education; 6) repeating school; 7) attending school and obtaining a qualification without achieving. In order to avoid generalising the various manifestations of early school leaving, this is something that should give us pause for thought.!

The phenomenon of early school leaving has undoubtedly been studied in many different fields from the twentieth century to the present day. Today, this phenomenon is compounded by that of educational and cultural poverty, which has grown in Italy and also affects the ability of students to imagine their future. This is confirmed by the Invalsi data; the second "Research on Educational Deprivation in Italy", carried out by the Fondazione L'Albero della Vita Onlus (Fadv) under the scientific supervision of the University of Palermo; the Garante dell'Infanzia, in a report published in June

2022, according to which Sardinia is the region with the highest dropout rate in Italy for lower secondary school students, while for upper secondary school students the dropout rate is over 5% in Sardinia

The results seem to correlate with the presence of child labour in our country, which mainly concerns young males in the 14-15 age group in the southern regions (Zuilkowski et al., 2016).

In this context, it is worth noting that the rate of early school leavers will already be 27.9% in the year 2020. It is well known that the likelihood of dropping out is linked to the difficulties encountered at school, which in turn is linked to the socio-economic conditions of the family environment in which the child is growing up. If you do well at school, it is difficult to drop out, even if there are elements of poverty. It is true that where there is poverty, including educational poverty, there is a greater risk of poor school performance. In the South, the incidence of early school leaving among young people whose parents have completed at most lower secondary education is 25.5 per cent, compared with 18.9 per cent in the North.

It is possible to try to make a more uniform assessment throughout the country with the INVALSI surveys. In this respect, the data of the 2019 INVALSI report already indicate that students have "difficulties" at the end of the third year of secondary school, i.e. the third grade. The latter is measured on the basis of the number of students who, at the end of the third grade, have an insufficient level of competence in all three subjects examined by INVALSI: Italian, mathematics and English. For Italy, the average is estimated to be close to 15%, which means that one student in six is in difficulty. In Calabria the figure is 30%, in Sicily 28%, in Campania 25% and in Sardinia 22%. Moving downwards, we find that 18% Puglia 12-13% of Piemonte and Liguria, Toscana and Lazio, 8% of Lombardia, Veneto and Marche and 6.5% of Trento and Friuli are in difficulty. All in all, if we add up the explicit and implicit numbers of missing students, we can estimate that the total number of missing students in Italy is more than 20%. This is a problem that affects one student in five. But what are the causes? It is known that there are exogenous and endogenous causes of this phenomenon. The exogenous causes are related to the economic and social conditions of vulnerability, but also to the political, psychological, sociological and educational ones, while the endogenous causes are related to the way in which the school implements the educational project and to the growth of future generations.

It is necessary to reflect on the ways in which the phenomenon is tackled. This will help to identify the causes of early school leaving and the main

needs. There is undoubtedly a pedagogical and a political and cultural approach. On the one hand, reflection shows that schools must intervene to promote an educational culture which, together with families and public and private institutions, gives meaning and significance to the education and training of human beings. On the other hand, educational policies are needed to compensate for disadvantages and deficiencies of a personal nature: psychological, economic, cultural and health-related.

In terms of the epistemological debate on the subject, it is clear that the phenomenon has been studied from a variety of perspectives. We can think of the anthropological perspective, which studies early school leaving by tracing it to a specific age and city, in relation to lifestyles and cultural transmission linked to orality and writing, but also to the persistence of various forms of illiteracy and new means of communication. It can be linked to emigration and the development of mass media, but also to multiple lifestyles, plurality and diversity in transmitting information and culture. From a sociological and educational point of view, there was already talk in the 1980s of school mortality and then of school drop-outs the individual who dropped out and the system that produced the dropouts.

The phenomenon is also associated with specific discomfort, maladjustment, deviance and risk. From a psychological and personal point of view, the adolescent phase is undoubtedly a sensitive period in the life of a young person, because it is not uncommon for a young person to leave school, or to be at risk of leaving school, to experience a state of unease, frustration, fear, apathy, suspicion, a sense of closure with the world around him or her, and a refusal to engage in dialogue.

2.The didactics of inclusive teachers' pedagogical and professional actions

On the basis of the above considerations, it is clear that the school, with its teachers and school leaders, has a central role to play in the process of growth and education of future generations. They must become significant "agents of change". Teachers should base their pedagogical action on the reference contexts and the family, personal and educational needs of the students who are dispersed: family, as they experience situations that are not calm emotionally and in the family unit's transactional relationships, which adequately stabilize affectivity and aggression. Personally, in that the student is generally demotivated and dissatisfied in relation to the object (people, institutions) with which he or she interacts, internalises a negative perception of himself or herself and experiences his or her situation in a guilt-

ridden way. Scholastic, because they experience difficulties in their interpersonal relationship with the teacher because of what and how he proposes. This educational and professional action on the part of teachers and school directors is based on an ecosystemic assumption. This allows the phenomenon of early school leaving to be analysed, tackled and monitored, given that it is closely linked to the educational poverty of students who are at risk of dropping out of school because they lack authentic values and parental support in the educational process.

However, it must be remembered that the family educates and the school educates by educating, so that in the subject *educandus*, the educational intervention of the family is essential, which very often in these cases is not able to manage the education of its children, who consequently grow up with a series of problems of a psychological nature and social behaviour, which cause a degree of suffering in the subjects, and which in some cases even lead them to manifest themselves in behaviour that goes beyond the norms and generates deviance. It is well known that suffering leads to deviance, but not in a mechanistic way.

It is certain that no phenomenon can be isolated. Understanding the problematic and complex relationships between interventions and the contexts in which they take place is therefore crucial. This is why systematic observation, which is never hasty and judgmental, is needed to combat the phenomena of early school leaving and educational poverty. According to the eco-systemic approach, the context defines the operator-learner relationship but also the learner as a problem and the characteristics of the problem, only in context.

It is clear from the analysis that a consumerist and alienating society produces altered processes in relational dynamics that unbalance the basic structures of the personality of the *educandus* subjects, without the significant educational contribution of the family to give them a sense of meaning and purpose. Individual factors favouring early school leaving include psychological characteristics, learning difficulties, disability, resistance to schooling, disengagement, perceived inadequacy and previous failure (Dalton et al., 2009), and learning difficulties and special educational needs determine a greater likelihood of dropping out (OECD, 2012). Conversely, students are more motivated to study and less likely to drop out (Alivernini & Lucidi, 2011; Batini, 2014) if they have a better perception of their abilities and higher self-efficacy.

It follows that of particular interest are the factors within the school that have been highlighted in studies and research as capable of influencing dropout: the way in which teaching and didactics are organised and developed, the interpersonal relationships that are established in the school, aspects related to the organisation and general functioning of the school (Batini & Bartolucci, 2016). This is why the role of school leaders is important. They must truly be guarantors of "change", supporting and guiding their teachers to be "agents of change" in the classroom and in the communities of educational practices located within the various classroom councils. This means that teachers have to adapt their pedagogical and professional actions in order to combat and prevent early school leaving at two levels:

1. systemic level: personal system

2. intersystem level: relations with others, social meaning

The first level implies a special attention to the life experiences and contexts of those who are dispersed or at risk of being dispersed, while the second level concerns the interpersonal relationships that these subjects establish with others, with themselves and with the surrounding reality.

To this end, educational co-design between teachers and students, between teachers and families, and between teachers and practitioners is fundamental. In school, it is necessary to change the approach between students and learners, which must be linked not only to a transmissive didactics, but also to a didactics of doing, of exploration, of continuous research, and therefore to a workshop didactics, active of the Deweyan memory. In short, what is needed is an innovative didactic in which students become active, not passive, subjects in their own learning process and thus learn not to manifest attitudes that indicate a disaffection for learning and an emotional detachment from school itself. The relational approach between teacher and learner must be based on listening, on dialogue, which can take place in school thanks to cognitive and emotional empathy, to assertive communication, but also to the teacher's ability to apply his or her knowledge didactically through technology, the digital.

It is essential to take these levels into account in order to develop targeted training projects. These projects should focus on listening practices and the active participation of students who are demotivated and have little interest in educational success. There is no doubt that the school alone cannot activate effective actions. Community pacts are needed through the creation

of a network of services and resources that must be activated in the territories, in which the various actors involved play a fundamental role.

There is a need for the involvement of the territory and of the other actors who are involved in various ways in the fight against early school leaving or, even better, in the protection of minors.

In order to fight these important problems, schools must therefore become permanent educational garrisons for testing a social, didactic and educational strategy based on the involvement of the territory in all its parts. This strategy must act as a stimulus for finding forms of active involvement and promoting a sense of belonging and participation among citizens, with the aim of becoming an educational and training community. It is a question of promoting the culture of a welfare community, according to which the social community must be able to profoundly change the relations between institutions and civil society.

It is therefore based on the concept of social solidarity, understood as active cohesion aimed at the common good, in which every single subject (individual, institutional and associative) is responsible for creating a network of activities aimed at protecting minors and meeting their educational needs. The intervention provides for an integrated approach involving all the actors involved in the phenomenon: students, teachers and families, social partners, institutions. To this end, it is necessary to develop training projects with a series of interconnected actions.

The objectives are as follows:

- to promote the school integration of students in vulnerable situations in order to avoid the risk of isolating and marginalising them in order to return to "normality" as regards their behaviour or opposition to peers;
- prevent young people at risk of social deviance;
- encourage social and educational integration, with a view to cooperation between the various actors working in the field in different capacities;
- support and help the learner in the cognitive and emotional processing of situations that cause him or her a feeling of unease, inner tension or explicit aggression;

- support motivation for school work, which is often a source of aggression and an expression of feelings of inadequacy;
- guide and accompany an educational path outside school in order to promote healthy and positive territorial integration;
- create places of psychological hearing, guidance and support for parents and teachers;
- encourage individual educational guidance;
- support for parental education.

The Welfare Community approach is therefore based on the idea of promoting the protection of children and the active involvement of families on the road to school reintegration, thanks to a school that, with its headteacher, is the guarantor of change. But are today's teachers sufficiently well trained to bring about this change? And are headteachers really the supporters of change?

Certainly not yet. However, it is years since the initial and in-service training of teachers as reflective and generative agents to change and transform their pedagogical and professional actions. In this regard, over the last 30 years, teacher training has been studied from the point of view of teacher professionalism (Delors, 1997; Mulè, 2005) and the main competences to be possessed, in order to identify the educational and training needs, gaps, potentials, students' talents and, in the school of autonomy, also the competence objectives (Perrenoud, 2005; 2006; Mulè, 2011); it has been involved in the analysis of the interdependence between the pedagogical models and the changes in the school systems by means of legislation (Bertagna, 1999; 2008). Nevertheless, the scientific literature has never dealt with the training of the teacher as an expert in the management and organisation of the joint construction of networks with the family, with public and private institutions and with the third sector, fundamental interlocutors in the definition of change, as happens today.

Certainly, the attempt to culturally construct a teacher figure capable of managing the complexity of relationships present in the different systems and differentiated social organisations of our time seems laborious, but it is certainly a necessary attempt if we want to imagine a new school and a new education, with innovative teaching methods, in a society that is increasingly dynamic, but also disoriented - as Brezinka would say -, fluid - as Bauman would say -, or of sad passions - as Benasayag and Schmit would say. It is

therefore necessary to start from the assumption that, as Pati argues, participating in schooling does not pass only through the family, but also through teachers (Donati, 2005; Pati, 2019). Teachers must be prepared and receive appropriate training.

3. The educational and professional actions of school leaders: what governance

The school head, as an educational leader as well as a manager (Mulè, 2015), has the mission of guiding his or her teaching staff to become "agents of change" in order to address and counteract educational emergencies. Therefore, as far as school drop-outs are concerned, he or she can be the guarantor of change if he or she is committed to the creation of community pacts in the territory where the school is located in order to activate networks and services. This is possible today with the autonomy school, applying the principle of horizontal subsidiarity. The school, as the first educational community, must promote a welfare community, understood as cohesion and activity, with the aim of recovering the dissatisfaction with systematic school attendance by means of educational co-design.

This is essential today in order to intervene in the real risk that poor performance, as well as family and social difficulties, can lead to more widespread and irreversible negative attitudes and behaviours, and to reduce the school failure rate of students in difficult circumstances. It is therefore necessary to rethink the role of the school, in its educational and training dimension, in relation to integration and social inclusion and to the future insertion of students into the world of work. This will create a link between the school and training systems and the employment system. From the point of view of a global approach, it is impossible to think of interventions aimed at young people without considering the "territory" system as a whole. That is to say, the context of resources, relations and actors that move around young people's nuclei. In this sense, families, institutional and associative actors, teachers and the whole wealth of vital resources in the territory, which will intervene from the inside in the development of actions for overall improvement, will also be considered as recipients of initiatives.

As far as educational and cultural poverty is concerned, the school manager has the task of activating intervention measures aimed at families, not only in terms of parenting education, with targeted training courses (D'Addelfio

et alii, 2022). The aim is to make families identified as being at risk of educational poverty more independent as parents, and to strengthen their role as the first social source of education, through tailor-made interventions.

Therefore, one of the main objectives of the school is to design, within the network, accompanying services and to strengthen the activation measures with targeted interventions, with the aim of improving the well-being of minors. This will bring about a change not only in the school-family relationship, but also in the parent-child relationship and in the relationship with the other subjects of the community, making them aware of being active and participating citizens in order to build democratic, supportive communities.

School leaders are aware that, in the absence of family incentives and because of the family's difficulty in understanding the value of school, many families of dispersed students have serious difficulties in fulfilling their educational role. For this reason, educational policies in this case must take into account and activate all those services to the family that are transversal to all school support activities: from reception and information, to individual interviews, to the initiation of parental support pathways, as well as all those measures necessary to support the educational and social planning required in the territories to counteract the two phenomena studied.

Conclusions

The reflection today on the pedagogical and professional action of teachers and school directors, as agents of change in the fight against early school leaving and educational and cultural poverty is necessary and, in my opinion, the only way to promote a community welfare in which all subjects are called upon to intervene through educational co-planning with the school. It is a question of guaranteeing the social development of the context in which the young person lives, from a programme and structural point of view, in order to promote a real process of cultural change, through: a broad involvement of the territory (institutions, families, mass media, etc.); a listening desk for families and students on problems and difficulties at school (integration, bullying, etc.), also through the provision of effective guidance and counselling.

A "listening desk" for families and students on problems and difficulties in school (integration, bullying, etc.), also providing effective support

counselling from psychologists; parental meetings offering nutrition for thought and space for discussion on issues related to teenagers' problems, accompanying them in the acquisition of skills and tools to recognise and deal with them, in coordination with local services; use of parents for "peer-to-peer" interventions to raise awareness among other families of common problems; support and assistance to unaccompanied foreign minors; promotion of self-employment and entrepreneurship.

From the reflections presented it emerges, in brief, that pedagogy must guide the family, the school, the university and society to regain a sense of community in order to build a democratic society, called upon to achieve the integration and full formative and social inclusion of all the subjects-persons to be educated and trained through didactic practices and the educational and professional action of teachers and school leaders, in close collaboration with the family, public and private institutions and the third sector. It emerges once again that the school has the task, today more than ever, of taking care of those who have abandoned school (*Il care*, borrowing the term from Don Milani) to promote new community pacts and a new *paideia*, a new education for democracy open to relationships, to encounter, to reciprocity, to dialogue, to valorised difference, to a new civism, which takes into account the specificities of each and every one, in particular of those *educandus* at risk of dropping out of school and/or of those who have already dropped out, thanks to educational teaching practice.

References Abuya, B., Oketch, M., & Musyoka, P. (2013). Why do pupils dropout when education is 'free'?

academic achievement, and intention to drop out of high school: A longitudinal study. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104(4), 241-252.

Adelman, M., & Székely, M. (2016). School Dropout in Central America: An Overview of Trends, Causes, Consequences, and Promising Interventions. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 7561*.

Alivernini, F., & Lucidi, F. (2011). Relationship between social context, self-efficacy, motivation, and *International Education*, 43(6), 740-762.

Asquini, G. (a cura di) (2018). *La ricerca formazione. Temi, esperienze e prospettive*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Batini, F., & Bartolucci, M. (2016). *Dispersione scolastica. Ascoltare i protagonisti per comprenderla e prevenirla*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Bertagna G., (2008). *Autonomia. Storia, bilancio e rilancio di un'idea*. Brescia: Editrice La Scuola.

Burza V.,(2008). *Formazione e società globale. Riflessioni pedagogiche*. Roma: Anicia.

Cambi F. (2007), (edited by). *Soggetto come persona. Statuto formativo e modelli attuali*. Roma: Carocci.

Cambi F., (2006). "Formazione e comunicazione: un rapporto integrato e dialettico", in F. Cambi, L. Toschi, *La comunicazione formativa, Strutture, percorsi, frontiere*,. Milano: Apogeo.

D'Addelfio et alli, Vissuti di insegnanti e genitori al tempo della pandemia: note sulla corresponsabilità educativa scuola e famiglia, in Mulè P., (2022), (by edited). *La corresponsabilità educativa scuola-famiglie nella promozione di una cittadinanza democratica e inclusiva nelle regioni italiane in ritardo di sviluppo*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

Dalton, B., Glennie, E., & Ingels, S. J. (2009). Late High School Dropouts: Characteristics, Experiences and Changes across Cohorts (NCES 2009-307). Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. <http://nces.ed.gov/Pubsearch/Pubsinfo.Asp?Pubid=2009307>

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

Donati P., (2005). *Famiglia e sussidiarietà: nuove politiche sociali che generano benessere comunitario*, in S. Belardinelli, (by edited), *Welfare Comunity e sussidiarietà*. Milano: Egea.

Gennari M. (1995). *Storia della Bildung*. Brescia: La Scuola.

Granese A. (1993). *Il labirinto della porta stretta. Saggio di pedagogia critica*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Granese A., (1990). Presentazione generale dei "Quaderni di pedagogia critica", in A. Granese (a cura di), *La condizione teorica. Materiali per la formazione del pedagista*. Milano: Unicopli.

INVALSI (2021). Risultati delle PROVE INVALSI 2021. Retrieved from: <https://www.invalsiopen.it/>

INVALSI (2022). Risultati delle PROVE INVALSI 2022. Retrieved from: <https://www.invalsiopen.it/Journal of Educational Development>, 50, 100 - 107

Massa R.,(1997). Istituzioni di pedagogia e scienze dell'educazione. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Ministero dell'Istruzione (2021). La dispersione scolastica aa.ss. 2017/2018 - 2018/2019 aa.ss.

Mulè P., (2005). *Il docente in Italia tra pedagogia, scuola e società*. Roma: Anicia.

Mulè P., (2011). *La formazione del docente in Spagna dal 1945 ad oggi. Un'analisi critica della formazione docente tra normative, modelli e applicazioni*. Roma: Anicia.

Mulè P.,(2014). *I processi formativi, le nuove frontiere dell'educazione e la democrazia. Questioni pedagogiche*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

Mulè P., (2015), (edited by). *Il dirigente per le scuole Manager e leader educativo*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

OECD (2022). Education at a Glance 2022: OECD Indicators, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Pandolfi, L. (2017). Dispersione scolastica e povertà educativa: quali strategie di intervento? *Lifelong, Lifewide Learning*, 13 (30), 52-64.

Pati L. (2019), *Scuola e famiglia. Relazione e corresponsabilità educativa*. Brescia: Scholè.

Pellerey M. (1999), *Educare. Manuale di pedagogia come scienza pratico-progettuale*, Roma:LAS

Perrenoud Ph, (2002). *Dieci nuove competenze per insegnare*. Roma: Anicia

Platone(1979). *La Repubblica*, in *Opere complete*, VI, Roma- Bari:Laterza.

Spadafora G.(2010), (edited by). *Verso l'emancipazione. Una pedagogia critica per la democrazia*. Roma: Carocci.

Spadafora G., "La pedagogia tra filosofia, scienza e politica nel Novecento", in F. Cambi et al., (2001). *Pedagogia generale. Identità, modelli, problemi*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

Ufficio - Gestione Patrimonio informativo e Statistica, 2021. Retrieved from: Federico Batini / RicercheRicercazione / Vol. 15, n. 1 / Giugno 2023 Six-monthly Journal on Learning, Research and Innovation in Education 19 <https://www.miur.gov.it/web/guest/-/la-dispersione-scolastica-aa-ss-2017-2018-2018-2019-aass-2018-2019-2019-2020>

Zuilkowski, S., Jukes, M., & Dubeck, M. (2016). "I failed, no matter how hard I tried": A mixed methods study of the role of achievement in primary school dropout in rural Kenya. 50, *International Journal of Educational Development*, pp.100-107-