

by comparing the data that emerged from the entry questionnaire and by asking for an opinion on the function of career advisors and privileged witnesses.

Question: *Do you think you know better the training, activities and skills (technical-professional and transversal) that characterize the educator?*

If in the entry questionnaire the answers were: *very much* 2%, *much* 15%, *enough* 52%, *little* 25%, *not at all* 2%; *null answers* 4%, after the meeting the percentage changed: *very much* 15%, *much* 52%, *enough* 32%, *little* 1%, *not at all* 0%, *null answers* 0%.

The change is very clear even if we compare the two different areas of study.

Disaggregating the data, we see that among the students in the social-humanistic field, 16% of the students who in the entry questionnaire claimed to know little about the profile of the educator has been reduced to 0%. The same happens for the students of classical, scientific and linguistic high schools who, if in the entry questionnaire answered 54% little, 30% enough, 3% much, 9% very much, 3% null answers, in the exit questionnaire answered 17% very much, 33% enough, 49% much.

Question: *What types of users can the educator work with?*

As for the users to whom the educator addresses, the idea that the educator cares for minors prevails in the opinion of the students, however, the responses regarding the other categories of users have increased, especially the responses of *each user* (from 28 to 50) and *each age group* (from 5 to 25).

Disaggregating the data, significant is the result recorded by the exit questionnaires of students of classical, scientific and linguistic high schools, among which the opinion that the educator can work with all types of users and all age groups increases. The responses of students in social-humanistic fields of study remain substantially unchanged.

Question: *Have Career Advisors and experts been able to involve and arouse interest?*

To this question, the total number of exit questionnaires showed that the students positively evaluated the contribution of career advisors and experts, who offered valuable information for the in-depth study of professional profiles. Specifically, 20% answered *very much*, 51%

answered *much*, 26% *enough*, while only 3% answered *little*. Even when disaggregating the data, the level of satisfaction does not change much. Students with a social-humanistic specialization answered 16% very much, 50% much, 30% enough, 4% little; while students from classical, scientific, linguistic high schools answered 15% very much, 52% much, 33% enough, 0% little and not at all.

The voice of experts

At the end of the experience, experts were also asked to give us their impressions and possibly make suggestions on the activity carried out, in order to understand if and which changes have to be made to the guidance path in order to improve its effectiveness and possibly rethink a redesign.

The suggestions made by the experts, in terms of activities to be proposed, were as follows:

- «if there are more experts, give the possibility to balance the exposure times and to make mini groups according to the profiles presented»;
- «administer a questionnaire to students in advance to better understand their level of information and motivation»;
- «select students for interest in the courses and propose workshop meetings»;
- organize «guided tours at professional facilities».

All the experts believe that the professional profile of the educator/trainer can concretely respond to specific professional needs in the territory, in particular in the following areas: «socio-educational»; «management and development of people in both public and private organisation»; «adult training in organisations»; «everyone's (children, elderly, disabled) training».

To the question to the experts: *In your opinion, how much the guidance activity was interesting in the students' eyes*, 25% responded much, 75% enough. In fact, according to some experts who took part in the seminar, even though the students were «interested and participating», the guidance proposal could be enriched with a «final debate» to make the experience even more effective, or «guided tours» could be organized because the students «need to know more about the educational field». Others have suggested involving only students who are interested in the world of education.

Finally, to the question “*Do you think this experience can help students to make more informed educational or professional choices?*”, 50% answered very much, 25% much and 25% enough.

Conclusions

The proposed intervention brought to light some critical issues linked to the scarce diffusion of information about the profile of the socio-pedagogical educator, the areas of intervention and the tasks that he/she has to carry out. This disinformation is evidently linked both to a scarce diffusion of information regarding career opportunities – even in high schools with a social-humanistic specialization – and to the complexity of this professional profile. Law 205 of 2017 states that the areas of intervention of the socio-pedagogical educator are the following: “educational and training; school; social welfare, limited to the socio-educational aspects; parenting and family; cultural; judicial; environmental; sports and motor skills; integration and international cooperation” (paragraph 594). The educator is asked, therefore, to operate on new fronts but above all to operate in complex and different contexts and to do so from a systemic point of view. These contexts require different professional skills and have to deal with a national and regional legislative apparatus that is not always coherent. Consider the educational services for children and the plurality of denominations they have assumed, the multiple educational opportunities they offer, their lack of homogeneity in the territory, the different organization of times and spaces, etc., elements that have made it difficult to understand what were the areas of action and functions of the socio-pedagogical educator (Palmieri, 2018).

Another aspect that emerged from the proposal put forward is the need to create a link with the institutions present in the territory, in order to allow students to know the areas of action of the educator and the skills both *transversal* and those more specifically required by the different contexts, but also to lay the foundations for that *mismatch* between demand and supply of work and retraining of skills through training systems and their connection with the world of work.

References

- Bonaiuti, G., Del Gobbo, G., & Torlone, F. (2020). Project design. Core contents for education and training professionals' education. *Form@re*, 20, pp. 1-15. Doi: 10.13128/form-9549.
- European Commission (2010a). *Europa 2020. Una strategia per una crescita intelligente sostenibile e inclusiva* in https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/706/1_Europe_2020_2010_IT.pdf (accessed on 10 November 2020).

- European Commission (2010b). *La Piattaforma europea contro la povertà e l'esclusione sociale: un quadro europeo per la coesione sociale e territoriale*, at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0758:FIN:IT:PDF>. (accessed on 10 November 2020).
- European Commission (2020). *European Skills Agenda for sustainable Competitiveness, Social Fairness, and resilience*, in https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/eu-policy-in-the-field-of-vocational-education-and-training-vet_en (accessed on 10 November 2020).
- Federighi, P. (2018). L'aumento della povertà educativa relativa. Una sfida pedagogica. In: S., Ulivieri (2018) (a cura di). *Le emergenze educative della società contemporanea*. Lecce.
- Istat (2018). *Istat statistics on poverty*. In: <https://www.istat.it/it/files/2019/06/La-povertà-in-Italia-2018.pdf>.
- Lo Piccolo, G., Alfano, P., & Vacheret, C. *Il METODO PHOTOLANGAGE, un dispositivo gruppale in psicoterapia e in ambito formativo*, in https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339913778_IL_METODO_PHOTOLANGAGER_un_dispositivo_gruppale_in_psicoterapia_e_in_ambito_formativo (downloaded on 20 September 2020).
- Lopez, A. G. (2007). Promozione dell'empowerment individuale e di comunità in un laboratorio di bilancio di competenze. In: Loiodice, I. (eds). *Adults at the University*. Bari: Progedit.
- MIUR (2014). *Linee guida nazionali per l'apprendimento permanente*. In: https://www.istruzione.it/archivio/web/istruzione/dg-studente/orientamento/normativa_orientamento.html.
- Palmieri, C. (2018). «Né il cavaliere inesistente né il suo scudiero»: il mondo dei servizi e la professionalità educativa. In: Iori V. (a cura di). *Educatori e pedagogisti. Senso dell'agire educativo e riconoscimento professionale*. Trento: Erickson.
- Rosati, A., & De Santis, M. (2020). Professional identity and formative choices. *Form@are*, 2, pp. 117-132. Doi: 10.13128/form-8450.
- Save the children (2016). *Ending Education and Child Poverty in Europe*. In: https://www.savethechildren.nl/sci-nl/media/Save-the-children/PDF/ending_educational_and_child_poverty_in_europe_02-12-2016.pdf.
- Zollo, I., Pace, E. M., Agrillo, F., & Sibilio, M. (2016). Il ruolo dell'orientamento per la promozione dell'inclusione educativa e sociale. *Lifelong Life wide Learning*, 27, pp. 14-28. Doi: 10.19241/lll.v12i27.2.