

# THE COMMUNICATIVE AND SOCIO-AFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIP: MODELS, STRATEGIES AND TOOLS FOR A MEANINGFUL TEACHING

## LA RELAZIONE COMUNICATIVA E SOCIO-AFFETTIVA: MODELLI , STRATEGIE E STRUMENTI PER UNA DIDATTICA SIGNIFICATIVA

Pompilio Cusano  
Pegaso University

[pompilio.cusano@unipegaso.it](mailto:pompilio.cusano@unipegaso.it)



### Double Blind Peer Review

Cusano P.,(2024) The communicative and socio-affective relationship: models, strategies and tools for a meaningful teaching ; Giornale Italiano di Educazione alla Salute, Sport e Didattica Inclusiva - Italian Journal of Health Education, Sports and Inclusive Didactics. Anno 8, V 1. Edizioni Universitarie Romane

### Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.32043/gsd.v8i1.1006>

### 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](http://gsdjournal.it)

ISSN: 2532-3296

ISBN: 978-88-6022-486-6

### ABSTRACT

At the center of this paper is the theme of relational and communication skills, a crucial theme in the educational relationship and in the teaching-learning processes. The relational and communicative dimension is part of the range of transversal knowledge that is increasingly central in teacher training as it forms the fabric of school community life and is an essential dimension of educational and training relationships. Communication and relational skills are therefore the basis of all human formation and for this reason they need to be pedagogically oriented in order to achieve teaching that is truly meaningful.

Al centro del presente contributo vi è il tema delle competenze relazionali e comunicative, tema cruciale nella relazione educativa e nei processi di insegnamento-apprendimento. La dimensione relazionale e comunicativa fa parte del ventaglio delle conoscenze trasversali sempre più centrali nella formazione degli insegnanti in quanto esse formano il tessuto della vita comunitaria scolastica e sono una dimensione imprescindibile delle relazioni educative e formative. Le abilità comunicative e relazionali si pongono pertanto alla base di ogni formazione umana e proprio per questo necessitano di essere pedagogicamente orientate affinché si possa realizzare una didattica che sia realmente significativa.

### KEYWORDS

Learning; School; Educational contexts.

Apprendimento; Scuola; Contesti educativi.

Received 24/10/2023

Accepted 12/03/2024

Published 15/03/2024

## Introduction

It is no coincidence that the binomial educational relationship is used, since at the base of every pedagogical process there is, first of all, a relationship, a bond between two people that becomes educational when both subjects involved in it draw lessons functional to their individual and social growth. From this point of view, no educational relationship should be understood as a one-way process, but rather as a path based on reciprocity. Talking about the educational relationship does not mean simply analyzing an aspect of education, but addressing the heart of education itself as a human experience that happens between people and, therefore, is an encounter that takes place in the interpersonal relationship of the subjects involved who are subjected to the biological, social, and cultural conditioning of the environment of which they are a part. Through the educational relationship, the process of socialization takes place, of transfer of knowledge and transformation of knowledge into skills. It is characterized by affective (affiliation, adoption, dependence, acceptance, rejection) and social (asymmetry, authority or authoritativeness, reciprocity or unidirectionality) components, commensurate with the needs, the characteristics of the individual, the objectives of the educational intervention, flexible to the circumstances and changes that the relationship itself produces. The relationship with the educator follows a dynamic path and translates into possibilities that are perpetually open to an infinite multiplicity of other relationships: with people, cultural, social, and political products, the whole world.

The traditional model of transmissive teaching places the learner in a position of inferiority compared to the teacher, influencing the quality of the relationship which generally becomes marked by authoritarianism, generating dependence and passivity in the learner and hindering his effective participation, his capacity for self-determination. It is necessary to move away from an approach centered exclusively on the teacher and to promote an approach centered on the learner and on the relationship, aimed at achieving a positive relational climate, based on empathy, and based substantially on good communication as a fundamental function that guarantees effective teaching and learning.

Teaching is almost a universal practice, but the notion that it is enough to teach for there to be learning is not of the same universal value. The fundamental variable that makes teaching effective is the quality of the relationship. Effective teaching is therefore based on building a quality relationship.

Everything that happens in teaching is necessarily confronted with the dimensions of being-in-relationship. One of the most common definitions of the discipline designates it, in fact, as the science of the educational relationship,

emphasizing that the centrality of the didactic discourse is not organized only around the construction of a theoretical-strategic corpus, but also and above all in the comparison between this corpus and the concreteness of human relationships.

In order for a teaching strategy to be considered effective, it is necessary, therefore, that the relationship between those who teach and those who learn can be considered clear, authentic, regulated by deep awareness and management skills. On the educational level, it is essential that the relationship between teacher and learner is a quality relationship, where the expression of this quality is a precise professional duty of the teacher: knowing how to manage the relationship is a fundamental competence of teaching action.

However, creating a good relationship is not an easy task, due to the presence of an extremely wide range of subtle and changing variables that are an integral part of being in relationship and that, unknowingly, condition its quality, very often, even regardless of the will of the interacted. A wide sequence of actions, comparisons, roles, mediations, fictions constitute both the essence of the didactic relationship and at the same time its most elusive and irreducible dimension. This dimension involves communicative, symbolic, and negotiation variables that are mainly responsible for the impossibility of reducing and decoding the teaching environment through predictive and prescriptive criteria. However, this does not imply that it cannot be analyzed and managed as a complex subject through the definition and exercise of a precise competence. This competence is substantiated by the ability to take a critical look at the set of processes that govern interpersonal dynamics.

Managing the unexpected that arises from being in relationship is, therefore, possible. It is, indeed, a central aspect of teaching competence in general, understanding the latter as the ability to regulate and adapt choices and behaviors in situations.

In essence, what makes a relationship effective or not refers to the set of interpretations of the other's ways of communicating, which, invariably, generate judgments and beliefs that, in turn, move our way of interacting. What is worth asking, then, is what are the mechanisms through which such judgments and beliefs emerge. The answer is to be found in the substantially implicit nature of the cognitive, social, cultural, and emotional filters that each of us uses in the experience of relationships. They determine the direction in which we make sense of what happens to us, directing our interpretations and actions towards others. In other words, the reasons, the drives, the drives that are the basis of our ways of entering into relationships and communicating are mostly hidden from our eyes and it is precisely this condition of theirs that makes them particularly influential in determining the direction of the relationship towards outcomes that are

beyond our control.

A possible way to build a relationship management capacity is represented, then, by the possibility of revealing the implicit nature of the processes that guide our ways of entering relationships with others, making them visible to our consciousness. In other words, it is a matter of becoming able to critically observe the series of dynamics that, generally, underlie a dimension of unawareness, which places the reasons behind our ways of entering relationships in a condition of invisibility.

The critical management of one's choices and actions towards others therefore requires the ability to look at ourselves as we enter into relationships, being well aware of why and how we are operating certain interpretations and acting through certain behaviors.

Reflection on a theory of interpersonal relationships becomes an unavoidable need in the construction of didactic skills that are adequate to the complexity of the educational field, skills that are specifically defined as reflective, since they concern the ability to systematically reflect on the variables that guide communication and relationships. The construction of skills in relationship management is expressed, that is, through the exercise of critical-reflective thinking, capable of explaining and analyzing the hidden variables that influence our behavior.

## **1. The role of Communication in the Teaching-Learning Process**

The growing importance that the quality of communication is increasingly assuming in educational contexts, currently characterized by increasingly complex and elusive emergencies and criticalities, requires a deep knowledge of the constitutive aspects of communication itself and its dynamics. Knowing how to communicate effectively in different contexts, with different people and perhaps covering different roles is an indispensable skill of educational action. In the didactic field, communication is a determining condition that represents a fundamental object of analysis for the construction of a theory of being in relationship. Communication is first and foremost the way in which social relationships are established, structured and developed, and it is also the main tool for affirming the "self" in the world as an individual and/or collective actor. In other words, it is only thanks to the ability to communicate those human beings, beings with a social character by nature, enter into a contract with each other and are able to share a set of agreements and rules that sanction common living. In

the same way, it is thanks to communication that each of us is able to declare and perceive our existence in the world as a social existence.

There are many models that attempt to describe the elements and variables of communication. In this case, since we are referring to the specific field of interpersonal communication, we will refer to a basic model defined as "circular" for which communication is a system that basically includes six elements or variables: the sender, the message, the channel, the code, the recipient, the feedback.

The sender is the source of transmission; that is, it is the subject from which the communication is generated. Obviously, the broadcaster has specific characteristics: its own culture, its own interests and inclinations, its own languages, resources and tools. The broadcaster is the "communicator". The message is represented by the content that the broadcaster transmits. In other words, the message refers to the meanings that a subject expresses by communicating. The message is the "what is being communicated". The channel is the medium through which the message is conveyed. The channel is the "what you communicate with". The code is the set of symbols and rules through which a message is expressed. The code is the "how to communicate". The recipient is the subject to whom the message is sent; he, as well as the sender, is obviously characterized by his own culture, languages, experiences and tools that relate to those of the sender. The recipient is "to whom it is communicated". Feedback is the response message that the recipient sends back to the issuer; starting from the type of response received, the recipient communicates, in turn, a further message in the direction of the issuer; feedback also constitutes the confirmation or disconfirmation of a correct reception and interpretation of a meaning.

Finally, a seventh must be added to the six variables described: the context, i.e. the place or environment in which communication takes place (the place where it is communicated), which plays a decisive role with respect to the results of communication, since it expresses an important influence on all the other variables. Communicating in a classroom or on the street, the physical connotations of the spaces in which communication takes place, the presence or absence of noises, objects and any other type of environmental variable, all represent contextual elements, which can facilitate or interfere with communication, acting directly on all the elements that compose it.

Communication is defined, therefore, as a circular system that occurs through extremely subtle and elusive processes. However, within daily interactions, each of us tends to be convinced that communication represents one of the simplest and most immediate prerogatives of life. Going beyond this simplification, for which communication is essentially a common and, therefore, taken for granted activity of the human species, requires entering deeply into its mechanisms and

the dynamics that act within it.

One of the misunderstandings given by the spontaneity of communication can be expressed in the affirmation of common sense that: it is enough to communicate to understand each other; the problematic knot of communication in general and of didactic communication in particular is, on the other hand, constituted precisely by misunderstanding, by the risk of misunderstanding, by misunderstanding which, as we will see, is paradoxically inherent in the very process of communicating: That is, communication includes in itself, by the nature of the dynamics that characterize it, the probable effect of misunderstanding. Let's overturn, therefore, our initial statement by clarifying that it is not enough to communicate in order to understand each other, on the contrary, that in communication it is easier not to understand each other than to understand each other, even if this does not happen most of the time unconsciously.

A message produced by a sender always corresponds to a response message from the receiver who, in turn, will send a further message in response, and so on. We will say, therefore, that communication is a system. Moreover, the continuous emission of messages in the presence of an interlocutor is a process that occurs not only voluntarily, but most of the time it takes place in a totally involuntary way. In other words, each of us communicates even in the absence of a precise intention to communicate. In fact, for a communication to take place, it is sufficient that two people are placed in a space of proximity, that is, that they are sensorially perceptible to each other. A look, a body attitude, a silence are all ways of communicating, which reach our interlocutor regardless of our will, inducing him to react to our message with a response, which can be, in the same way, a behavior, a body attitude, a way of looking or a verbal affirmation. Interpersonal communication is, therefore, a process of exchange and feedback, a circular and recursive process, which always has effects on behavior (pragmatic effect).

Therefore, communication is expressed through a plurality of dimensions; these are the verbal, para-verbal and non-verbal dimensions . Verbal communication is made up of language, the code of thought, that is, the fundamental tool that human beings use to translate what they think into known and shared words and concepts; this makes it possible to translate what happens in our mind to the outside, to others, thus feeding both the interpersonal and, therefore, social process, and intra-personal dialogue (the ways in which we explain and give meaning to experience to ourselves). Para-verbal communication consists of all the elements that accompany verbal communication in terms of the emission of the message. These elements are tone, volume, time, timbre. Non-verbal communication, on the other hand, consists of all those generally

involuntary communication phenomena that emerge in interaction with others; they are, for example, the way of gesticulating, facial expressions, looks, etc. This particular dimension represents the communicative events to which the meanings of a message are decisively linked; In other words, each of us gives meaning to the messages that come to us from an interlocutor more in reference to the ways in which they are expressed (the how it is said), than in reference to the content (the thing is said).

Schematically, the elements that define non-verbal communication are: posture, proxemics, facial expressions, body movements and gestures, mimicry. Posture represents the way of arranging the parts of the body in space and allows us to distinguish the communicative function from the expressive one. In other words, it corresponds to the so-called "attitude" that we unconsciously assume in managing our body. Proxemics indicates two aspects of the way we present ourselves socially and physically relate to other people: the first concerns the use of space in terms of proximity to the other (proximity/distance), the other, the position of the body that we assume in relation to an interlocutor (e.g., from the side, in front of us, etc.). Facial expressions are a set of extremely powerful generally involuntary signals that deserve, in the context of these descriptions, more widespread and particular attention. The movements and gestures of the body act as an "accompaniment" with respect to the other levels of communication we have talked about; they emphasize the messages through a sort of gestural punctuation that has the function of highlighting, underlining, clarifying or minimizing what we say. Mimicry represents the whole range of gestures and movements that have a symbolic value and are therefore shared and recognizable. That is, these gestures determine linguistic acts because they are emblematic and have a common meaning (for example, raising the hand to ask for a word or moving a caress to show affection).

The aspect that leads to highlight the set of these levels of non-verbal communication as fundamental, concerns the fact that they play a decisive role in the construction of meaning, directing and consequently influencing the outcomes of any relationship and, in particular, of the didactic relationship. In fact, one of the fundamental aspects that distinguishes the non-verbal dimension and that makes it particularly significant with respect to the understanding of communicative dynamics in general is the fact that it is not produced intentionally, accompanying the interaction between people at an unconscious level: our ways of looking, of moving, of assuming attitudes, in most cases, that is, they are not under our control; They simply happen, regardless of our will. In the subtle folds of non-verbal communication, therefore, the most authentic and hidden aspects of our feelings, our intentions, our emotions, find expression,



regardless of whether we want it or not. The common expression: "your gaze has betrayed you", for example, indicates precisely this possibility; That is, the possibility that an expression that is inconsistent with the content reveals that a person is lying and that, therefore, the true meaning present in the communication has emerged involuntarily and above all starting not from what we have been told, precisely, but from the way in which we have been told (a facial expression or a body attitude). All interpersonal communication requires the maturation of a reflective competence focused in particular on "communicating". Competence that allows you to critically interpret messages, to coherently regulate actions, to reflexively govern interpersonal dynamics, controlling their effects and taking note of the "unconscious" messages that underlie the communication itself.

During a communication, the interpretation of messages is directed starting from perceptual, cognitive, cultural, and emotional filters. Perceptual filters are related to the subjective and selective perception of the experienced event, to the familiarity or novelty of the elements that constitute it, to the perception of oneself within the situation. Cognitive filters are related to linguistic codes, the hierarchies according to which knowledge is sorted. Every human being builds knowledge starting from them, that is, from the schemes of representation of reality that during experience act as tools for ordering and decoding reality itself. Socio-cultural filters are related to social and cultural images that are shared and recognized as one's own. They depend on belonging to groups (family, peer group, cultural associations, political associations, scientific communities) and, moreover, often refer to prejudiced positions related to these memberships (social categories). The way we communicate and the way we interpret the communication of others are, therefore, generally guided by social and cultural points of view and knowledge. Emotional filters derive from inner conditions, from moods, which heavily interfere with communicative interpretation. Feelings of vulnerability, self-esteem, devaluation or overvaluation, belonging or estrangement play a powerful role in implicitly directing communication.

Building effective relationships depends, therefore, on the ability to consciously choose precise communication models that appear coherent with the contexts, and, above all, that are constantly subjected to a critical verification of the outcomes that their use determines with respect to the quality of the relationship. As we have described, every time we communicate with someone, we use filters through which we observe, evaluate, and interpret their behaviors. The encounter between people is an encounter between "visions of the world", knowledge, cultures, emotions, feelings. They all represent elements that have their own origin, and it is precisely based on the validity and legitimacy of this origin that a reflective and systematic process must be articulated.



Communication then becomes effective when feedback is properly managed, i.e. when it overcomes communication barriers, through an in-depth analysis of the variables that generated it. Pursuing the precise communicative objective of the quality of the relationship implies, that is, a critical and constant dialogue with oneself, with the situation and with the people who delimit it, to be able to move a wise and regulated readjustment of the modes and styles of communication. The improvement of the quality of communication and, consequently, of the relationship essentially stems from the ability to think of oneself in communication, exercising conscious control of one's own way of communicating with respect to precise educational objectives, investing it with reflection and criticality.

The activation of a self-reflective capacity on the fundamental processes of communication is, therefore, one of the central paths for transformative and self-directed learning, which supports competence in relationship management. The reconstruction and analysis of the origins of communicative acts reveals the role and influence of the processes and variables that influence their possible interpretations, making them conscious rather than instinctive, justified rather than arbitrary, intentional rather than random and, above all, making them governable and finalized.

## **2. The Role of Emotions in the Teaching-Learning Process**

A lot of research has shown that emotions largely determine our actions, representing a basic component of the motivational picture of each of us. According to Goleman (2009), they are essentially impulses to act according to action plans with which evolution has endowed us to manage life's emergencies in real time. Impulses that derive from deep states and conditions of the self that concern the biological organism (neuro-physiological level), knowledge (psychological, sensory-motor and evaluative level) and relationships (level of interpersonal exchanges).

In the Western scientific and philosophical tradition, a precise distinction has been made between emotions and knowledge, for which the former are associated with the meanings of fragility, inability to control, instability, while the latter is superimposed on the principles of rationality, control, and rule. In this sense, the Western tradition lives in the conviction that knowledge, knowledge, and learning concern exclusively the conscious dimension of the psyche. Teachers who, inside and outside the school, have the professional task of transmitting knowledge are convinced that the success or failure of their work, as far as pupils are concerned, is a matter of intelligence (predisposition) and will, intentionally

neglecting the soul in favor of a functionalist conception of representing, learning, and teaching.

This separation between the knowledge of thinking and the knowledge of feeling has represented an important interpretative error that has conditioned for a long time the reflection and understanding of the processes of construction of knowledge, which in fact are achieved through a deep and indissoluble intertwining of emotions and rationality. In other words, it is not possible to consider learning as a purely rational process, since it is always imbued with emotionality. The deep stimuli represented by emotions are in fact a key aspect of the entire process of knowledge. It is not possible to produce rational experiences by neutralizing the emotional dimension underlying them, since knowledge is realized through a dynamic of constant and indissoluble interweaving between thinking and feeling. However, there is still a common sense in our culture that emotions are the expression of the weaker side of human experience. In everyday life, they are generally and implicitly considered as something to be controlled, not to be revealed, to be kept in some way "aside", because they are an expression of weakness, inefficiency, inadequacy. Therefore, on many occasions and experiences we tend to underestimate the presence and pervasiveness of emotions, underestimating in the same way their strength and the decisive effect they can have in the relationship with others. For these reasons, this way of representing and experiencing emotions, one's own and those of others, has generated a sort of latent inability to manage the emotions themselves. In other words, if my prevailing conduct causes me to control and deny the emotional level, the result will be a kind of inability to govern that level. It is not possible to govern, direct, manage what we do not know and do not understand. This implies a weakening of the very capacity to know, since it conditions the way in which we enter a relationship with reality.

The separation between feeling and thinking is, therefore, an artifice, an interpretative error of Western culture, which, although it has represented the foundation of rational thought that has fueled the technical and material growth of our society, has at the same time precluded the possibility of expression and liberation of cognitive potential according to complex and multidimensional trajectories, forgetting that the volatile and multifaceted experience of feeling has always nourished the rigorous and decoded experience of thinking and vice versa: emotions guide cognitive processes, as well as social and relational processes. This aspect represents the flaw of rational thought which, by placing emotions in the second place, has denied itself the possibility of adequately decoding them and, therefore, of directing them, of managing them, generating a sort of "emotional illiteracy".

Emotions, even if they are controlled by the individual, by the culture to which

he belongs or by the contexts in which he lives, in any case, act. Denying them or attempting to control them, attributing to them a secondary value in the face of reason, implies, therefore, that they have a negative impact on people's lives. Faced with the pressure of external and internal stimuli produced by experience, human beings tend to produce emotional responses that are mostly ignored through control, at least if such containment is possible. Emotions are impulses that, in fact, cannot really be controlled. They therefore burst into our lives in a sudden and often harmful way regardless of our will, unless we give up the illusion of control, trying instead to learn to know them, decode them, place them, recognize them, direct them, through the mediation of a consciousness that gives them a meaning, a reason, a purpose.

The ability to manage oneself within the relationship with others is, therefore, closely related to the ability to open a space for reflection and knowledge on the domain of feeling. More than ever, in order to deal with the complexity expressed by the symbolic-negotiated dimension of being in relationship, it seems necessary to become capable of knowing, recognizing and managing one's emotions: the challenge that faces us is aimed at the ability to use emotions and feelings to build valid behaviors to face the unexpected that emerges in the spaces of interpersonal exchange.

Knowing one's emotions and growing through the relationship with the dimension of feelings can allow one to manage one's choices and behaviors, recognizing the substantial role of influence that this dimension, implicitly and profoundly, imprints on it. Without this awareness, emotions remain essentially impulses to act according to implicit and ungovernable patterns of action, which prevent the exercise of a critically oriented will.

Reflecting on one's emotions means, therefore, creating the fundamental relationship between one's thinking and feeling and, therefore, determining behaviors and choices, which are the result of a substantial mediation between the rational and emotional dimensions. The former cannot be a source of motivation, interest, trust without intertwining with the latter. In the absence of such connections, individual biographies are defined through "gestures that are so disconnected from each other that they are not even perceived as one's own. And this is because the heart is not in tune with thought and thought with behavior, because emotional communication has failed, and therefore the formation of the heart as an organ that, before reasoning, makes us feel what is right and what is not right, who I am and what I am doing in the world." It is necessary, therefore, to make the educational relationship an active education in emotions and feelings. Entering into a relationship with one's emotions, dialoguing with them in a critical and reflective way, constitutes the possibility of attributing meaning to what one feels; This translates into the ability to recognize

emotions: they burst into our existence, altering our perceptions and intervening in our way of relating to others; Being able to make sense of what we feel means avoiding being overwhelmed by it and producing actions and choices mediated by a critical evaluation of the events, conditions and circumstances that induce a certain emotional state in us. Recognizing emotions implies, therefore, the ability to manage them: not allowing the dimension of feeling to intervene in an uncontrolled way in the conduct of the experience contains the possibility of getting in touch with reality, using the emotional side of being as an additional interpretative resource for understanding oneself and experience, rather than as a confusing obstacle. This possibility inaugurates the further ability to direct emotions to a goal: to use one's emotions and feelings as an interpretative key to reality, on which to operate a critical reflection of the meaning they express and of the profound indications they suggest about ourselves, our way of being, our needs, leads to the opportunity to use emotions consciously, as a knowledge base and a tool through which to explore one's authentic goals, moving in their direction. All this translates, in the end, into the ability to listen to the emotions of others: the work on one's own emotions through the levels of recognition, management and use of the same emotional dimension, opens up to a sensitivity to the subtle interpersonal signals present in the other, which constitutes a further and important skill for the understanding of reality and for the critical management of one's own behavior and choices.

The use of these different skills intervenes on the quality of interpersonal exchange and therefore contributes to configuring an emotional competence, which constitutes a determining personal factor in the conduct of the relationship in teaching. The symbolic-negotiation dimension of teaching is realized in the encounter between people and, therefore, in the continuous confrontation and clash, as well as between languages, codes, points of view, versions of the world, also between emotions and feelings. Emotional competence is then necessary to manage this complexity. This does not imply, of course, that it is possible to intervene in educational contexts in an emotionally perfect way, since this escapes concrete possibilities (only a standardization and a reduction of contexts could determine this certainty), but it certainly allows us to act in non-random behaviors, continuously making emotional evaluations of ourselves and of the other through the critical analysis of the reasons on which the same emotions originate. Emotions are related to the body's evaluations of itself in its environment. An educator can, therefore, learn to manage the disruptive power of emotions by giving himself space and time to understand their nature, understanding their meaning, reflecting on the emotional experience and using it to understand the experience of others and finally reshaping the interaction through self-regulation processes consistent with the relationship itself. This

translates into the construction of a competence to listen to one's own emotions and those of others that profoundly affects one's communication and relational style, directing it towards quality and effectiveness. Learning to manage emotions is therefore equivalent to building a model of understanding emotions that creates an alphabet to communicate about and with emotions.

An emotional competence becomes, in this sense, the content of an intentional training, matured in the first instance in educators, often first extraneous to the emotional dimension of experience and learning and transferred, as a learning strategy, to the learners. That is, emotions can be used as a resource in teaching, since these, when they become known and manageable, constitute a source of energy and motivation that moves knowledge, orients relationships and rebalances the experience of being; A harmonization between the dimension of feeling and that of thinking supports self-awareness, autonomy, self-reflection, qualities that are the basis of growth paths oriented to the ability to enter into a relationship with the other in a constructive dynamic.

## **Conclusions**

Affirming the priority of the educational relationship over teaching is a constant trend in pedagogy: it is necessary first to create a good educational relationship and only then is it possible to teach, facilitate learning and take care of each student's educational path.

The educational relationship is based on encounter, to learn together, to grow together, an encounter that changes and transforms, so that the didactic and educational relationship can be considered as an event of authentic contact and the school as the privileged place of cultural, human, and social exchange and encounter.

According to this perspective, the teacher will not only have to accompany the student towards the acquisition of the alphabets that will be indispensable for understanding and interpreting reality, but also promote those alphabets that will allow him to interpret and make sense of his or her affective and emotional experience within society.

## **References**

Albanese O., Lafortune L., Marie-France D., Doupin P. A., Pons F. (2006). *Competenza emotiva tra psicologia ed educazione*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

- Amerio P, (1996). *Fondamenti teorici di psicologia sociale*, il Mulino, Bologna.
- Bertolini P. (1988). *L'esistere pedagogico. Ragioni e limiti di una pedagogia come scienza fenomeno logicamente fondata*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze.
- Bruner J. (2001). *La cultura dell'educazione. Nuovi orizzonti per la scuola*, Feltrinelli, Milano. Calvani A. (2013). *Fondamenti di didattica. Teoria e prassi dei dispositivi formativi*, Carocci,
- Cambi F, Orefice P. (1996), *Fondamenti teorici del processo formativo. Contributi per una interpretazione*, Liguori, Napoli.
- Contini M.G. (1992). *Per un pedagogia delle emozioni*, La nuova Italia, Firenze.
- Curby, T. W., Zinsser, K. M., Gordon, R. A., Ponce, E., Syed, G., & Peng, F. (2022). Emotion-focused teaching practices and preschool children's social and learning behaviors. *Emotion*, 22(8), 1869.
- Dallari M. (2000). *I saperi dell'identità. Costruzione delle conoscenze e della conoscenza di sé*, Guerini e associati, Milano.
- Dallari M. (2000). *I saperi dell'identità. Costruzione delle conoscenze e della conoscenza di sé*, Guerini, Milano.
- Damasio A.R. (2000). *Emozione e coscienza*, Adelphi, Milano.
- de Mennato P. (2011). *La scienza divide. Un itinerario di epistemologia pedagogica*, CUEM- Demetrio D. (1996). *Educazione degli adulti. Gli eventi e i simboli*, Cuem, Milano.
- Fletcher, T., & Hordvik, M. M. (2023). Emotions and pedagogical change in Physical Education teacher education: a collaborative self-study. *Sport, Education and Society*, 28(4), 381-394.
- FrancoAngeli, Milano.
- Gaburri E. (1997). *Emozione e Interpretazione*, Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- Galimberti U. (2008). *L'ospite inquietante. Il nichilismo e i giovani*, Feltrinelli, Milano. Giannelli M.T. (2006) *Comunicare in modo etico. Un manuale per costruire relazioni efficaci*,
- Goleman D. (2009). *La natura dell'intelligenza emotiva*, Rizzoli, Milano.

Gong, Y. F., Lai, C., & Gao, X. A. (2022). Language teachers' identity in teaching intercultural communicative competence. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 35(2), 134-150.

Gordon T. (1974). *T.E.T. Teacher Effectiveness Training*, Wyden, New York, NY, 1974. Hall E.T. (2001). *La dimensione nascosta*, Milano, Bompiani.

Gordon T. (2005). *Good relationships. What makes them, what breaks them*, Solana Beach, CA, Gordon, Training International, 2002.

Hardiansyah, F., & Zainuddin, Z. (2022). The influence of principal's motivation, communication, and parental participation on elementary school teachers' performance. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, 9(2), 319-334.

Iavarone M.L., Lo Presti F. (2015). *Apprendere la didattica*, PensaMultimedia, Lecce.

*Il corsivo è nostro.*

Lo Presti F. (2005). *Il senso del sé. Percorsi autoriflessivi nella formazione*, Pensa Multimedia, Lecce.

Lo Presti F. (2009) *Educare alle scelte. L'orientamento formativo per la costruzione di identità critiche*, Carocci, Roma.

Massa R., Cerioli L. (1999). *Sottobanco. Le dimensioni nascoste della vita scolastica*, Milano, FrancoAngeli.

Milano, Raffaello Cortina.

Morelli U. (2006). *Conflitto. Identità, interessi, culture*, Meltemi, Roma.

Morelli U., Weber C. (1996). *Passione e apprendimento*, Raffaello Cortina, Milano. Moscovici S. (1989). *Il fenomeno delle rappresentazioni sociali*, in Moscovici S., Farr R. M.,

Orefice P. (2003). *La formazione di specie. Per la liberazione del potenziale di conoscenza del sentire e del pensare*, Guerini, Milano.

*Rappresentazioni sociali*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Ricci Bitti P.E., Zani B. (1983). *La comunicazione come processo sociale*, Bologna, il Mulino. Turner J. C. (1997). *Verso una ridefinizione cognitivista del gruppo sociale*, in Ugazio V. (a cura di), *La costruzione della conoscenza. L'approccio europeo alla cognizione del sociale*,



Roma.

Sabirjanovna, P. Z. (2022). A model for developing students' communicative competence by teaching them intercultural communication. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(11), 680-683.

Saputra, E. B. (2022). The effect of teacher communication ability and learning motivation on student learning outcomes in Economic lessons for Class XI IPS SMA Ekasakti in Padang academic year 2015/2016. *Journal International on Global Education*, 1(1), 1-10.

Watzlawick P. (1971). *La pragmatica della comunicazione umana*, Roma, Astrolabio.

Watzlawick P. (1988). *Il codice del barone di Münchhausen*, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1988, p. 109.

Yusufovich, A. A., & Alisher o'g'li, E. O. (2022). Psychological and pedagogical opportunities for the formation of communicative competence in future teachers. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(6), 1157-1161.

Yusufovich, A. A. (2022). Developing the communicative competence of future teachers is an effective measurement for self-organization. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(1), 302-304.

Zinsser, K. M., Curby, T. W., Gordon, R. A., & Moberg, S. (2023). A unidimensional model of emotion-focused teaching in early childhood. *Learning Environments Research*, 1-17.