conoscenze e norme, al limite anche in modo passivo, oggi essa chiede invece pensiero critico e autonomia di giudizio, quindi un "essere" e un "fare" più che un "sapere". Senza un progetto in cui le componenti di "azione" (esercitare comportamenti cooperativi, partecipativi, solidali) si associano alle relative dimensioni cognitive (conoscere e concettualizzare la realtà) e affettive (attribuire significato esistenziale e interesse alla democrazia scolastica, alla cooperazione, etc.) la cittadinanza rischia di dissolversi.

Mentre, quindi, la scuola viene accusata di svolgere ormai solo un compito di "socializzazione", trascurando di impartire gli alfabeti fondamentali, al contrario, spesso, avviene l'opposto: rischiano di perdersi proprio gli aspetti interpersonali, la rielaborazione delle emozioni e dei significati, indispensabili in una vera educazione alla cittadinanza.

Riferimenti bibliografici

Arena, G. (2006). *Cittadini attivi.* Roma-Bari: Laterza.
Audigier, F. (2006). L'éducation à la citoyenneté aux prises avec la forme scolaire. In Y. Lenoir, C. Xypas, C. Jamet, *Ecole et citoyenneté. Un défi multicultural* (pp.185-206). Paris: Armand Colin.
Bauman, Z. (1996). *Le sfide dell'etica.* Milano: Feltrinelli (Ed. or. 1993).
Calidoni, P., Manca, G., Dettori, F., Pandolfi, L. (2008). *Educazione alla cittadinanza democratica. Ricerca e autovalutazione nelle scuole.* Sassari: Progetto di Ricerca di rilevanza nazionale 2006-08, EDES.
Cogan, J.J., Derricott, R. (Ed.) (1998). *Citizenship for the 21st Century. An International Perspective on Education.* London: Kogan Page.
Conseil de l'Europe (2005). *Etude paneuropéenne des politiques d'éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique.* Strasbourg.
Council of Europe (2003). *Under Construction. Citizenship, Youth and Europe. T-kit on European Citizenship.* T-Kit N. 7. Strasbourg.
Galichet, F. (2005). *L'école, lieu de la citoyenneté.* Issy-les-Molineaux: ESF Editeur.
Hansotte, M. (2002). *Les intelligences citoyennes. Comment se prend et s'invente la parole collective.* Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.
Leleux, C. (2000). *Education à la citoyenneté. Apprendre les valeurs et les normes de 5 à 14 ans.* Bruxelles: De Boeck.
Losito, B. (2003). Civic Education in Italy: intended curriculum and students' opportunity to learn. *Journal of Social Science Education,* in http://www.jsse.org/2003-2/italy_losito.htm
Santerini, M. (2001). *Educare alla cittadinanza. La pedagogia e le sfide della globalizzazione.* Roma: Carocci.
Santerini, M. (2010a). *La scuola della cittadinanza.* Roma-Bari: Laterza.
Santerini, M. (Ed.) (2010b). *La qualità della scuola interculturale. Nuovi modelli per l'integrazione.* Trento: Erickson.
Unesco, Council of Europe (2005). *Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) in Schools.* Paris.

Towards an education for sociability

Concepción Naval

1. Introduction[1]

If we ask ourselves about some outstanding features of education, as well as of the reflection which has been undertaken about it in recent decades, we could say that there is a "star" theme, which is the necessity to promote an education which increasingly takes into account its moral and especially civic aspects.

This fact could be seen as a way of responding to the crisis of sociability in which we are immersed, and which is denounced with relative frequency. Sociability is a burning question which is in ascent, not only in the area of education, but in general in the humanities and social sciences. A problem which we are currently facing in human relations is that, in large measure, we mutually ignore each other, or to put it in another way: fragmentation and indifference (cfr. Touraine, A. *¿Podremos vivir juntos? Iguales y diferentes.* Madrid, PPC, 1997). We lament this meager social cohesion that we perceive, and which appears to us as ever more difficult. What has happened in the personal and community, psychological and sociological ambits for us to have reached to this point?

The results of a study which we carried out in distinct countries of the world a few years ago (cfr. Naval, Reparaz, 2008, pp. 31-42; Repáraz, Naval, 2007) concerning the dreams and fears which children have concerning the future, at the personal, local and global levels, corroborate what I am attempting to point out here: boys and girls from 9 to 11 years feel more fear or worry than hope about the future, be it their personal or family future, or the future of their country or the world. Some results of this research show, for example, how the children manifest that they are worried about how the cities in which they live will be affected by the increase in violence, unemployment, racism and the lack of resources in certain social sectors. But the greatest worries and desires of this childhood population are focused on human relations: friendship, kinship and company; and among these, the most appreciated, with a strong difference, is the family relationship, above friendship. Boys and girls coincide, although the latter emphasize family relations more.

---

1 I follow part of my argumentation you can find at: Naval (2008, pp. 231-249; 2009).

We could say that we are in the historical era of desired sociability. If we can define the person in terms of his or her rationality, freedom and sociability, we see how in distinct historic moments each one of these aspects has been emphasized, and how their importance has at times been exaggerated, falling into reductionisms. It is beyond doubt that the fact of putting an excessive emphasis on the intellectual aspect leads to rationalisms and also to the so-called "weak thought", or putting the emphasis on freedom leads to *laisser-faire* pedagogy, or at the other extreme, to authoritarianism. Now we could say that we are in another pendular movement, of recognition and promotion of sociability, which is necessary in order to overcome the individualism which reigns among us, and which has had so many critics in recent years, although we also ought not to lose sight of the danger of forgetting the value of individuality.

Here I propose to suggest certain bases for an education for sociability with the objective of reaching that equilibrium – which is so necessary and so often threatened – between the individual and the collective, for the achievement of an adequate social competence. Personal and social are not opposing terms. Even more, in the human being, the "personal" could be said to "disintegrate" if the social dimension is lacking.

I begin with a consideration of the current situation. I am especially interested in the world of childhood, although it is evident that this aspect of education is necessary and should be a constant throughout a person's entire life. In treating the formation of sociability, I only make occasional reference to structural questions, relevant from a sociological point of view. My interest is focused on the personal level, especially in the person being educated, although it is obvious that in speaking of it there will also arise certain reflections concerning the task of the educator.

In other occasions I have focused on citizenship education; here I have opted for a more comprehensive point of view, which required taking a step back in order to attain distance, gain perspective and energies for treating this problem which is so vital currently, and to whose resolution all of us must contribute.

The text is structured in two parts. The first ("Sociability, a burning topic increasing in importance") has a foundational character, it is the fundamental part and prepares the ground for the second ("Key aspects for the development of sociability") which is more brief. We begin with the recognition of the crisis of sociability which we are experiencing, and of the return of the thesis of the value of the community (sense of belonging), of which we are also witnesses, together with the contemporary upsurge in citizenship education. The first section concludes with a panorama of current research concerning the development of sociability, a human capacity and quality which presupposes a maturity of social identity. In the second part, I will signal in a succinct fashion the basic dimensions which in my judgment a true education for sociability should have.

Let us see, then, what the starting point is.

2. Sociability as a burning topic increasing in importance

Taylor states that in order to understand the society in which we live, we must understand how we have come to be in the situation we are in (Taylor, 1990, pp. 31-47). We will attempt, therefore, to investigate, even if only in a brief fashion, how, by what paths, the sociability deficit which we suffer from came about.

2.1. *The crisis of sociability and the return of the community*

There are two landmarks that may help in understanding this movement which – in favour of what has become known as citizenship education – is observed in countries as distinct as the United Kingdom, Poland, the United States, Australia and Spain, to cite only some, although it might be wondered what kind of education we are referring to or to what concept of citizenship we are calling upon (cfr. Naval, 2003, pp. 169-189).

The first of the occurrences to which I refer is the fall of the Berlin Wall (in 1989), with all of the antecedents which it had and the consequences which derived from it, not only in the countries of Eastern Europe, but also in the entire world. The second, which is closely related to the former, is a movement which had posterior social consequences: the critique of extreme liberalism, which from various points of view the communitarian critique, among others, has performed. Both elements have a common background: they underline the personal dimension of the human being, reclaiming freedom, but highlighting at the same time the person's social dimension.

The Year 1989 opened the door to a new stage in the history of the Western world: the coming of the third wave of democracy, as some authors have termed it. Logically, the citizens' movements in Eastern European had their antecedents: the reevaluation in the second half of the 20th century of what we could term "the space and responsibility of the citizen".

A reality emerges as a vital necessity: the necessity to learn to live in freedom in a cultural, family and social environment which had substantially deteriorated in many of the countries of Eastern Europe. The European Council speaks of "learning democracy" in a sense perhaps more reduced than that to which I am referring. In these countries, the family and social structures lacked the vitality necessary in order to regenerate communitarian life, and the citizens demonstrated a lack of enthusiasm and a slackness which prevented them from waking and getting up with the energy necessary to create a new style of life. It is not strange, then, that in this situation the school was seen at as the last resort, and concretely that it was thought that the introduction of a class on education for democratic citizenship, with the denomination that was adopted in each case, would be the key for the solution of all problems. Experience tells us that this is one measure among many others which can be used, never the only one, nor certainly the most decisive.

At the same time, there arose diverse movements which criticized extreme liberalism, among them and in a particular way communitarianism – this is the

label for the critique of liberalism of certain authors who emphasize the value of the community – which arose as an intellectual movement in the late 80's of the last century, first in the United States and Canada, and which later expanded to Europe (Naval, Sisón, 2000, pp. 589-611).

This current of thought has influenced the educational policies and especially in the promotion of a form of educating which takes into account the moral and civic plane of the person, and not only his or her intellectual dimension.

Communitarianism affirms that a subject cannot define, constitute, develop or perfect him or herself outside of the socio-cultural and historical context which inevitably surrounds him or her. The moral and linguistic communities in which we are immersed form part of our personal identity, as well as the social institutions in which we are situated.

The problem – denounces the communitarian critique – is a result of the fact that for the liberal ideology, the community appears as a residual phenomenon. In modernity, community links are broken down in favor of contractual modes of association and patterns of behavior which are rationalist or individual. Progress, reason and individual are concepts on which liberal political thought depends, but which can come to seriously harm social life. Thus, the disappearance of the community was a key topic for the founders of sociology in the 19th century.

But this critical focus of the notion of community has entered into a crisis in recent decades. This crisis has manifested itself, on the one hand in the decline of the ideology of progress, but on the other hand postmodernism has taken on the task of criticizing harshly the "omnipotence" of enlightened reason. From diverse perspectives, then, there comes a demand for a contextualization of knowledge and of moral and social norms.

In this way the concept of community is recuperated, while its return is accompanied by certain especially relevant concepts which have had a great impact amongst researchers: personal identity, pluralism, multiculturalism, intermediate groups, integration, etc. The problem that remains unresolved, at base, is how to unite unity and diversity, both in the psychological as well as in the sociological ambits; or, as stated by Ch. Mouffe: "How to attain integration and affirm identity without negating the diversity and the specificity of the diverse components" (Mouffe, 1993, p. 101).

Thus, the community can cease to be seen as something archaic and appears as a form of human association which varies according to historical epochs. This recuperation of the notion of community, of human sociability, of the relational character of the human being, which in modernity had been nearly eclipsed, and which now is experiencing a strong resurgence, leads to the reevaluation of small communities, which are the natural environment for learning this sociability. Nevertheless, the most habitual critique made against the communitarians is that they run the risk of excluding the other, the foreigner, or the person who is different.

In an interesting article published by Fendler (2006) in *Curriculum Inquiry* the track is followed to the concept of community in the educational environ-

ment in recent years, underlining the importance of *community building*. The author analyzes the distinct modes of constructing a community which appear in the educational literature.

Specifically, he analyzes how the concept of *community* is used in such didactic proposals as: a) *classroom community*; b) *teacher-learning community*; and c) *communities of practice*.

Thus this concept appears on two planes: a) with a political significance, and b) tied in with psychological notions referring to identity, as well as with other notions related to leadership and to determined aspects of taking responsibility, that is, which affect modes of participation and relationships between persons.

The author also suggests that the expression "community" currently has three different meanings:

a) Community as a third way which functions as an alternative to two unsatisfactory options (cfr. Abowitz, 2000; Furman, 1998, pp. 298-328; Redding, 2001, pp. 1-24; Wenger, 1998): state control (communitarians) and the individualist free market (liberalism).

b) Community as solidarity: solidarity is understood here as a means for *empowerment* in order to confront the problems of assimilation and homogenization: the community is a strategic weapon which permits empowerment for making effective change. In a certain way, some critical theories of education follow the same line. The feminist critique also speaks of community as empowerment (Mouffe, 1992, pp. 28-32).

c) Community as affect, emotion and care: this is the sense which makes reference to emotional bonds and which is characterized by its placing emphasis on security, on that which makes us feel accepted and at ease. But the discourse of emotional security can generate simultaneously both inclusion as well as exclusion (Tönnies, 1979; Sergiovanni, 1994) since it treats emotions as the foundation of community in schools.

From this perspective, the concept of community can be questioned, and a critical point of view thereby adopted with regards to the relationship between community and difference, *commonality* and diversity. In other words, it is suggested that a concept of community be developed which avoids assimilation and homogeneity.

In conclusion, research on the concept of community shows that the educational debates, previously approached in terms of society and democracy, now are approached in terms of community, but this does not signify that the debate is less restrictive, and on occasion is just as oppressive as the former approach.

These debates have certain direct consequences in the world of education, and are which are materialized fundamentally in the recourse to such concepts as: citizenship, autonomy, identity and sociability. Here we are interested in highlighting the latter term, although all of them are in close relation to each other.

A curious phenomenon which has come about in the international movement in favor of moral and civic education is that it has been located, in practice, nearly exclusively in the scholastic environment –. in the school community – leaving aside, at least at an initial stage, the decisive influence of other

communities, most especially family relations and society in its entirety, but it also leaves aside the influence of the communications media and modern information and communications technologies. In fact, there are many countries which in recent years have incorporated this topic in their scholastic curriculum with the hope, to a certain degree utopian, of in this way resolving the social problems which afflict their societies.

A necessary process of rectification has taken place in distinct environments which has resulted[2] in the recognition that the school is just one more ambit in the educational process, as important as one wishes to make it, but its work is preceded, supported and completed by what is done in other ambits. Among these, and principally, are family relations, which are the natural and primary ambit of education, and which demand much more attention than they are habitually given.

2.2. The rise of education for citizenship

The felt necessity of a moral and civic education, together with the experience of its insufficiency when it is reduced to the school environment, is what has prompted the search for new horizons for this aspect of education. Llano notes three indispensable elements to take into account in its configuration: a) the protagonism of human beings; b) the consideration of human communities as decisive environments for the development of the women and men that make them up, but without their becoming trapped in them; and c) the concession of a high value to the public sphere, as the ambit of deployment of social liberties and their guarantor, so as to thus avoid abusive interferences and pressures on the part of external powers (Llano, 1999, pp. 43-47).

On the one hand the gaze turns, with certain nostalgia, to family relations, and the necessity of recuperating civic virtues is commented upon (Cerezo, 2006, pp. 11-15). From another point of view the influence of globalization is spoken of, along with information and communications technologies[3] and the necessity of considering from a more ecological point of view the reality that surrounds us. Finally, there are also those who see the need for keeping very present the social dimension of higher education.

Let us look now at some ideas concerning current research on the development of sociability.

2   For example, in England, where this course has been incorporated since the late 90's in the framework of the National Curriculum, implemented in 1988 (Crick, 1998 y 1999; Delors, 1996; Kerr, 1999 a, b and c, 2003). In a report released in June of 2004, at the request of the British ministry, after a revision of the practice carried out in 100 schools which were attended by some 18,000 students, one of the suggestions for improvement was the necessity to keep clearly in mind the links with the social environment in which the school is immersed. Cf. http://www.nfer.uk/research/citizenship.asp

3   Henceforth I will use the abbreviation ICT as an abbreviation of the expression "information and communication technologies".

2.3. Current research concerning the development of sociability

It is a fact that sociability is a topic on the upswing in the human and social sciences. Now we are interested in inquiring about the recent lines of research of greatest interest for designing an adequate education for sociability, principally among children.

In the setting of theoretical reflection, those currents stand out which place the accent on the human being and his or her social dimension, while in the ambit of empirical research, we can highlight in a broad fashion three currents, for their repercussion on the study of sociability: a) the theory of *attachment psychology*; b) symbolic interactionism in social psychology; and c) social constructivism.

But let us detain ourselves a moment to consider what the contributions of empirical research (psychology and sociology) are that may help to orient an education for sociability. How can we connect that research with the theoretical reflection performed from the perspective of the theory of education? There are fruitful lines of empirical research, whose existence I would like to put on record, as well as noting the urgency of seeking points of union with them in the future. I will indicate here five lines of research, some of greater weight than others (Naval, 2005, pp. 145-162).

a) From psychology, some discoveries very useful for an education for sociability come from the theory of *attachment*, which, as is well known, emphasizes the importance for personal development of the relationships of affection which are established between parents and children – especially with the mother –. They influence affective maturity over the entire course of a person's life (Erdman, Caffery, 2001).

Attachment theory continues to be a vital line of research and has shown itself to be fruitful, within certain limits (Cassidy, Shaver, 1999).

b) Worthy also of attention is the psychological and sociological research which centers its attention on *child development*. This is empirical research concerning how children develop and what contributes to their optimal development. Studies with a more solid theoretical foundation include those concerning the *social development of children*, which thanks above all to Turiel (Turiel, 1989) have had strong repercussions in psychology. According to the latter author, social behavior cannot be understood without studying social knowledge: how does knowledge of others, of oneself and of relationships with others originate? In the same ambit we can situate, even though its approach is very different, the work of Schaffler concerning the development of sociability in children, with suggestions concerning the first years of life which are very much on the mark. Also Vigotsky insisted in the social character of human activity, as did Doise and Mugny, who formulated the theories of socio-cognitive conflict.

c) Hoffman (2002) in his study concerning moral development and *empathy*, highlights another relevant point in recent research. This has to do with how empathy can affect the relationships between parents and children, in order to foster in the children an interiorization of ethical principles. From the point of view of child and developmental psychology, Hoffman seeks to estab-

lish the behavioral, cognitive and emotional dimensions of what he calls "prosocial moral development".

Current research in the field of moral education has frequently focused, and at times has been reduced to, the study of the processes of socialization[4], the relations of social interaction, or the promotion of prosocial behavior. These are valid approaches, but in need of a more general framework which is necessary if we are speaking about the formation of sociability. In this sense, Allport (1968, pp. 1-80) stated that understanding our social nature is "the key problem of social psychology".

Therefore, I would like to emphasize here, due to its transcendence for education, a psychological current that takes a positive and optimistic stance concerning life. This is what Colby and Damon were pointing to (Colby, Damon, 1995, pp. 342-370), when they postulated the question of how to develop a "*connected sense-of-self*"[5]. We can situate in the same line the January 2000 volume of the journal *American Psychologist*, dedicated to *Positive Psychology*. This psychological current has to do with helping people to confront the inevitable negative situations that arise in their lives, knowing how to transform them into positive experiences. The questions whose answers these authors are seeking are, among others: what positive reasons are there for living together with others? Or what capacities ought to be fostered in persons and communities, not just to help them to survive, but also to develop their capacities to the maximum? Indeed, these capacities appear to be a good basis for an education for sociability (Seligman, Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, pp. 5-14).

d) One part of contemporary research in the world of education and of the social sciences, especially from the perspective of psychology, has been oriented – and it is interesting to review it here – towards the consideration of what has been termed the "*sense of community*". What does it mean to have a "sense of community"? And how does one generate it or reconstruct it?

In 1974 Sarason emphasized the importance of a "*psychological sense of community*" and proposed that it be the central concept of communitarian psychology, highlighting that it is one of the best bases for the formation of personal identity. A great quantity of theoretical and empirical studies concerning this concept arose, and it came to be fully recognized. McMillan and Chavis (McMillan, Chavis, 1986, pp. 6-23) define the sense of community as a feeling of belonging to a group which instills confidence and emotional compenetration.

On this basis Peck affirms that a community is: "a place where conflicts can be resolved without spilling of blood (neither physical nor emotional) and with

wisdom and grace at the same time. A community is a group of people that can fight with elegance" (Peck, 1987)[6].

It is almost a platitude to speak of the necessity of fostering this sense of belonging to a place, to a group, to a tradition, that is, of the necessity of rootedness, which does not mean a lack of autonomy or of a critical sense. Nevertheless, both the concepts of community, as well as that of a sense of belonging to a community, have diverse meanings according to the situation and the interests involved. In general, it is identified with the emotional connection which exists between its members, identification with the community and group cohesion. The question which goes beyond the definition is how to increase the sense of community and the commitment to it, and this is the question asked repeatedly in contemporary social and civic education.

The sense of belonging to a community develops thanks to the experience of living integrated into small communities of which we know and feel ourselves to be members. It is also important that other social forces collaborate in the promotion of this sense of community, as, for example, the new urbanism attempts to do from the perspective of architecture. According to the *New Urbanism*, the design and location of houses, streets and parks have a direct relationship to the existence or absence of community ties (Rogers, 1999). Now, although the environments, the city, the town, play an important role in fostering social links, there is no doubt that the principle forgers of these links are people. Along these lines, the theses of Simmel concerning the sociology of space are especially valuable[7].

e) The development of social competence deserves a separate mention, in the domain we are studying; this is a line of research which has arisen in recent years (López De Dicastillo, Iriarte, González Torres, 2004, pp. 143-156; López De Dicastillo, Iriarte, González Torres, 2006, pp. 127-147; López, Etxebarría, Fuentes, Ortiz, 1999).

Thus, such concepts as social skills or social competence are used frequently in order to refer to capacities whose development is fundamental for achieving a greater satisfaction and welfare, both personally and interpersonally.

Lately, social competence has become a first order object of study, especially within the school context. There has been an exponential growth in the number of articles and research projects, as well as a demand for programs of intervention and a generalized social conscience of its necessity. Among other reasons, this could be due to the news that appears in the communications media linked to the rise in school violence.

---

4   Over the course of the 20th century, we can distinguish various currents in the area of moral education (cf. Carr, 1983). In one way, perhaps excessively simple, we can say that there are three overall orientations: a) education as socialization; b) education as autonomy; and c) education as the acquisition of good positive habits, that is, of virtues.

5   Colby and Damon correctly highlight how we are all conscious of social experiences, but at the same time the necessity of individual reflection is manifest.

6   We can say that the sense of belonging to a community implies basically four elements: a) association (which presupposes the existence of frontiers, emotional security, forms of belonging and identification, of a common system of symbols and personal involvement); b) mutual influence; c) integration/interdependence; and d) emotional connection.

7   Further, when Putnam and other authors write *Better Together* they have at base the same concern which we have been speaking of: how to restore community; in the case at hand, the American community (Putnam, Feldstein, Cohen, 2003). Recently this concept has even been applied to distance learning or *on line* communities, trying to generate the sense of community in the special situation of non-presential learning modalities (Rovai, 2002).

Nevertheless, it is clear to see that the capacity for adequate coexistence does not involve only the resolution of problems, but also – and as a priority – their prevention: the promotion of positive civic behaviors, of attitudes that are cooperative, prosocial and enriching (Seligman, Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, pp. 5-14).

This interest in human sociability, united to the desire to resolve problems such as the lack of citizen participation, violence, isolation or loneliness, has given rise to a considerable volume of studies and publications concerning questions such as emotional intelligence, assertiveness, social skills and social competence, among others. This type of studies began to appear in the 60's, but in particular they began to proliferate in the decade of the 90's, due to the emphasis that psychological research places on the aspects of social and emotional development.

Until now, this first part has permitted us to verify the fact that sociability is an emerging topic in current research. Taking as our point of departure what we have discussed up to here, we enter now into a brief reflection concerning certain key elements which, nowadays ought to be kept in mind in order to bring about a genuine education for sociability.

3. Key aspects for the development of sociability

When we speak of education for sociability, there is a reality which we should always bear in mind, which is that we are speaking, above all, about education in its full sense; therefore, about the education of people. Defining elements of people are sociability, together with freedom and rationality, although we also take corporeality into account (García Amilburu, 2003, pp. 15-34).

If we lose sight of these, we will forget the whole picture to which every educational task must contribute. Harmonizing unity and diversity in distinct environments and levels is a challenge which must be confronted in every educational task. Today we live this challenge in a more intense manner, since we are acutely aware of the reality of cultural diversity.

For some years now, one has heard frequently mentioned the necessity of an intercultural education that promotes the acceptance of differences. This necessity is real, both in the individual and social domain, and becomes even more evident upon contemplating certain international conflicts. However, at times we run the risk of highlighting the things which differentiate us rather than those which unite us or make us similar. For this reason it is important to insist on the greatness of the concept of education, which includes the distinct aspects that we can distinguish in it (aesthetic, affective, moral, intellectual, civic). This is the key to the possible solution to many problems, including social problems, since all of us together have to successfully bring about the education of each individual who has an inevitable social dimension.

To educate, we might say, is in a certain manner the awakening of a person, in order to help him or her to come out of their shell. Educating sociability is also to awaken the intimacy which each one of us has (an intimacy with oneself

which makes possible closeness with others). It is not a pleasant task to wake someone up, because it causes a certain discomfort; not only for the "awakener", but also for the person coming out or waking up. This awakening is an opening of the eyes to reality, to others, it is to step out of a dream, out of a narcissistic self-involvement, out of solipsism; it is a departure which permits us to communicate with others. It is not an easy task, but neither is it that difficult, because in all of us there is a nostalgia for an encounter with a 'you' that gives meaning to one's own life. At times, perhaps due to bad experiences, or resentment, this capacity for openness has atrophied or become lethargic, but it continues to be latent.

There are many aspects which should be treated when analyzing the bases of an education for sociability, although there will not be occasion to do so here. Fundamentally, the recommendations for an adequate education for living together have at their base the cultivation of four dimensions of the person, which in turn would be the foundation for education for sociability and for the maturity of social identity: these are affectivity, memory, imagination and interest. Also worth mentioning are certain aspects related to corporeality, which are fundamental for fostering sociability.

What is needed is to relate – although this point would require a more detailed explanation – these dimensions with the principal characteristics of the person: openness with the education of the affectivity and memory, rationality with the education of the imagination, and freedom (and autonomy) with the education of interests.

One point of interest would be to see to what degree the basis of the education for sociability can be put in relation with social attitudes or virtues (Aristotle, 1970). My hypothesis is that there is a relation, in the following terms: the education of affectivity makes reference to self-control, to temperance and courage, to honor, to self-esteem, to the necessity to be valued; the education of memory connects with piety – not understood as compassion but rather as a recognition of what has been received, which is the source of identity – and also with gratitude; the education of affectivity and memory provide the affective equilibrium necessary for life in relation to others; the education of the imagination points to prudence and justice and also to truthfulness; the education of interests is based on affective education and is related also with truthfulness, the critical acceptance of authority and of norms, and with liberality; finally, education for communication and cooperation have to do with various social attitudes that would be difficult to separate: affability, cordiality, liberality, gratitude, reparation. But it will not be possible to deal here in greater depth with this topic – which is genuinely interesting – because it is time to bring things to a close.

4. Final reflections

The controversy elicited by the text of Putnam (Putnam, 2007, pp. 137-174), written for the occasion of his reception of the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize, gives

us an idea of the relevance of the topic which is treated in it. It also makes manifest the feelings and thoughts which are aroused on treating the relationship between diversity and unity, between belonging to the group and solidarity or social-identity maturity, or on analyzing phenomena such as globalization or immigration.

The thesis maintained throughout these pages is that a genuine education (which must have a social and civic dimension) can help us to rethink these concepts in harmony and collaborate in the formation of active and committed citizens. Such an education must confront a key topic in a radical manner. The development of sociability – using the terminology of current-day psychology – must seek to improve the social competence of students. Identity, belonging and maturity become axes of an education for sociability. Thus it is suggested that the idea of formation for the pacific coexistence of citizens does not seek confrontation, but rather synergy and the convergence of lines of work that identify civic development as an objective of formation, and educational systems and communities as instruments of development, identity and diversification.

Any of the basic elements for an education for sociability presupposes intellectual and character dispositions which must be cultivated, which need a space of their own. Thus, we can conclude by highlighting the relevance of a pedagogical maxim, a bit worn out for some, although there are constantly more people that recognize its relevance, which could be stated as follows: to learn one must act, for one only truly learns if decisions are taken and carried out. In the learning of sociability it is patent that "that which we must do, after learning, we learn by doing it" (Aristotle, 1970, pp. 12-18).

Thus, it is ever clearer, and with this we will close, that the true agent of education, also in its social dimension, is the one being educated: he who is learning. The educator, in his diverse modalities (parents, teachers), above all delights and suffers with "the profession that most makes one proud and [...] the most humble that exists" (Steiner, Ladjali, 2005, p. 65), since teaching is – in the words of Steiner (Steiner, 2004, p. 173) – to be an accomplice of a transcendent possibility.

Bibliographic references

Abowitz, K.K. (2000). *Making meaning of community in an American high school. A feminist-pragmatism critique of the liberal-communitarian debates.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Allport, G.W. (1968). The historical background of social psychology. In G. Lindzey, E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-80). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Aristotle (1970). *Etica a Nicómaco* (Ed. and trans. by M. Araujo, J. Marías). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Attachment* (Vol. 1). New York: Basic Books.

Cassidy, J., Shaver, P. (1999). *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research and Clinical Applications.* New York and London: Guilford Press.

Cerezo, P. (Ed.) (2006). *Democracia y virtudes cívicas.* Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.

Colby, A., Damon, W. (1995). The development of extraordinary commitment. In M. Killen, *Morality in everyday life. Developmental Perspectives* (pp. 342-370). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crick, B. (1999). The presuppositions of Citizenship Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 33* (3), 337-352.

Crick, B. (Chair) (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools.* London: QCA.

Delors, J. (coord.) (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro.* Madrid: Santillana-Unesco.

Erdman, P., Caffery, T. (2001). *Attachment and family systems.* New York: Brunner Routledge.

Fendler, L. (2006). Others and the problem of community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 36* (3), 303-326.

Furman, G.C. (1998). Postmodernism and community schools. Unraveling the paradox. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34* (3), 298-328.

García Amilburu, M. (2003). Claves y dimensiones del desarrollo de la persona. In M. Ruiz Corbella, (coord.) *Educación moral: aprender a ser, aprender a convivir* (pp. 15-34). Barcelona: Ariel Educación.

García Garrido, J.L. (1971). *Fundamentos de la educación social* (pp. 89-117). Madrid: Magisterio Español.

González Torres, M.C. (2001). Las concepciones psicológicas del yo en la postmodernidad: implicaciones para la educación moral y cívica. In C. Naval, C. Urpi (Eds.), *Una voz diferente en la educación moral* (pp. 41-78). Pamplona: Eunsa.

Häberle, P. (2005). *La ciudadanía a través de la educación como tarea europea.* Inaugural lecture of the Simposium Internacional Educación y valores de ciudadanía: experiencias y aportaciones de Europa, organized by Unesco, MEC and Universidad Carlos III, in November, 2005. Published at (accessed in January of 2005): http://www.ugr.es/%7Eredce/REDCE4/articulos/21haberle.htm

Hicks, D., Holden, C. (1995). *Visions of the Future. Why we need to teach for tomorrow.* Oakhill: Treham Books.

Hoffman, M.L. (2002). *Desarrollo moral y empatía.* Barcelona: Idea Books Universitaria.

Kerr, D. (1999). *Re-examining Citizenship Education: The Case of England-National Case Study for IEA Citizenship Education Study Phase.* Slogh: NFER.

Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship Education: An International Comparison. *International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks,* Paper 4. Londres: QCA.

Kerr, D. (1999). Changing the political culture: the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools. *Oxford Review of Education, 25* (1, 2), 275-284.

Kerr, D. (2003). Citizenship Education in England: The Making of a New Subject. *Journal of Social Science Education,* 2, (accessed: June, 2004): http://www.sowi-onlinejournal.de/2003-2/index.html

Llano, A. (1999). *Humanismo cívico.* Barcelona: Ariel.

López, F., Etxebarría, I., Fuentes, M.J., Ortiz, M.J. (Coords.) (1999). *Desarrollo afectivo y social.* Madrid: Pirámide.

López De Dicastillo, N., Iriarte, C., González Torres, M.C. (2004). Aproximación y revisión del concepto «competencia social». *Revista Española de Pedagogía,* LXII, 227, 143-156.

López De Dicastillo, N., Iriarte, C., González Torres, M.C. (2006). La competencia social y el desarrollo de comportamientos cívicos: la labor orientadora del profesor. *Estudios sobre educación,* 11, 127-147.

McMillan, D.W., Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community. A definition and theory. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14 (1), 6-23.

Mouffe, Ch. (1992). Citizenship and political identity. *October*, 61, 28-32.

Mouffe, Ch. (1993). La citoyenneté et la critique de la raison libérale. In J. Poulain, P. Vermeren (Eds.), *L'identité philosophique européenne*. París: L'Harmanttan-Association Descartes.

Naval, C. (2002). *Educar ciudadanos*. Pamplona: EUNSA.

Naval, C. (2003). Orígenes recientes y temas clave de la educación para la ciudadanía democrática actual. *Revista de Educación.* Extraordinary issue, Ciudadanía y educación, 169-189.

Naval, C. (2005). Ámbito familiar: confianza y respeto. In A. Bernal A. (Ed.), *La familia como ámbito educativo* (pp. 145-162). Madrid: Rialp-ICE.

Naval, C. (2008). Educación para la convivencia ciudadana, sentido de pertenencia y madurez socio-identitaria. In *Educación, ciudadanía y convivencia. Diversidad y sentido social de la educación* (pp. 231-249). Ediciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza.

Naval, C. (2009). *Educación de la sociabilidad*. Pamplona: EUNSA.

Naval, C., Sisón, J. (2000). Las propuestas comunitaristas en América y en Europa. *Arbor*, Monográfico "Comunidad", CLXV, 652, 589-611.

Naval, C., Reparaz, Ch. (2008). Spanish children's concerns for the future. *Citizenship, Teaching and Learning*. Special Issue: Young people's voice on civic and global issues. Guest Editor: Cathie Holden, University of Exeter, UK. 4, 2, 31-42 (Print and Online) <http://www.citized.info/pdf/eJournal/CTL No 4 (2) Dec 08 4.12.8.-pdf><http://www.citized.info/pdf/eJournal/CTL%20No%204%20%282%29%20Dec%2008%204.12.08.pdf > (accessed September 2009)

Peck, M.S. (1987). *The Different Drum. Community Making and Peace*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R., Feldstein, L., Cohen, D. (2003). *Better Together*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Putnam, R.D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2), 137-174.

Quintana, J.M. (1984). *Pedagogía social* (pp. 167-217). Madrid: Dykinson.

Redding, S. (2001). The community of the school. In S. Redding, L.G. Thomas (Eds.), *The community of the school* (pp. 1-24). Lincoln, IL: The Academic Development Office.

Reparáz, Ch., Naval, C. (2007). *Ilusiones y miedos de los niños ante el futuro*. Pamplona: Institución Futuro.

Rogers, R. (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. Urban Task Force. London: Taylor and Francis.

Rovai, A.P. (2002). Building sense of community at a distance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*. Cf.: http://www.irrodl.org/content/v3.1/-rovai.html (accessed November 2005).

Sarason, S.B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community. Prospects for a community psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seligman, M.E.P., Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive Psychology. *American Psychologist*, January, 55 (1), 5-14.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Steiner, G. (2004). *Lecciones de los maestros*. Madrid: Siruela.

Steiner, G., Ladjali, C. (2005). *Elogio de la transmisión*. Madrid: Biblioteca de ensayo Siruela.

Taylor, Ch. (1990). La filosofía y su historia. In R. Rorty, J.B. Schneewind, Q. Skinner, *La filosofía en la Historia* (pp. 31-47). Barcelona: Paidos.

Tönnies, F. (1979). *Comunidad y asociación*. Barcelona: Península.

Touraine, A. (1997). *¿Podremos vivir juntos? Iguales y diferentes*. Madrid: PPC.

Turiel, E. (1989). *El mundo social en la mente infantil*. Madrid: Alianza.

Vázquez, G. (1994). La educación social y moral. In AA.VV., *Teoría de la educación* (pp. 53-174). Madrid: Taurus.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.