DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS WITH NONFORMAL ACTIVITIES

Alina Felicia ROMAN, Ph.D.,
Faculty of Educational Science, Psychology and Social Sciences
"Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania
romanalinafelicia@yahoo.com
Editha, COȘARBĂ, student Ph.D.,
Faculty of Educational Science, Psychology and Social Sciences
"Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania
ecosarba@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The accomplishment of common activities establishes between the members of the respective group interdependence relations in order to reach a specific goal. The personality of the students is shaped and manifests itself in interdependence with the life of the group of which he is part, with the norms and values that he develops. The interaction in the class of students produces a social organization of the class. This form of organization of the class of students, offers to those who compose it, the possibility of establishing relationships and interactions, both at school level - formal and extracurricular - nonformal. In these contexts, the student behaves differently or constantly compared to the members of the group, whom he has the opportunity to know and to formulate the elements of a possible value judgment on them. Interval can be successfully carried out in and through educational interactions. Through this study we want to capture the relationships of collegiality in the non-formal activities, identified by the teachers in the primary cycle. Thus, 67 teachers from 4 pre-university education units in the urban area completed the questionnaire consisting of 15 items. The questionnaire is its own conception, and it wants to capture the personal opinions and attitudes of the questioned teachers. The conclusions show that the teachers in the primary cycle consider non-formal activities to be relevant in developing and strengthening the relationships between students as well as between teachers and students.*

Keywords:education; communication; relationships; non-formal activities; teachers appreciation;

Introduction:

The didactic communication within the formal framework, is one of training-bearing contents, has a learning effect and aims at modifying and stabilizing the behavior. In order to establish optimal communication relationships,

the teacher must use its functions of information-training, evaluation-control, stimulating and promoting group cohesion, socio-cultural unity, to facilitate the group to become a frame of reference for the individual. Not the presence of the "personages" teacher-pupil / students gives a communication the didactic character, but the observance of the legalities supposed by a systematic act of learning. Thus, the didactic communication may occur between different other "actors", provided that the resource character exceeds the status of informant.

The communication in the non-formal activities acquires more direct and efficient valences, the actors involved in the educational act approach their standards, do not use a formal expression, but rather a conjunctural one, related to the event, to the respective non-formal activity. What is relevant is that neither teachers nor students feel the need for hierarchical communication. The teacher-student communication takes place in a relaxing environment, w **Theoretical framework**

By communication we mean the transmission of a message from the sender to the receiver through a channel or means of communication. The dictionary of pedagogical terms presents the definition of pedagogical communication as "an axiomatic principle of education that involves an educational message, elaborated by the subject (teacher), capable of provoking the formative reaction of the object of education (preschool, student, student, etc.), evaluable in terms of external and internal connection "(Ciobanu, 2003).

C. Cucoş presents the didactic communication as "a complex, multifaceted and multi-channel transfer of information between two entities (individuals or groups) that simultaneously and successively assume the roles of transmitters and receivers signifying the desirable contents in the context of the instructional-educational process" (Cucoş, 2014).

The pedagogical paradigm of didactic communication makes it necessary to approach the psychosocial paradigm (Golu, P., Slama-Cazacu, T.), which reflects the communication processes from the perspective of interaction. communication as a social fact, fulfills addressing functions, through which man communicates not only with his fellow men, but also with himself. in other words, interpersonal communication begins at the intrapersonal level. this paradigm presents arguments in favor of the fact that the communication relation initially manifests itself almost instinctively, in order to evolve towards the need for relation and integration in the group. For these reasons, A. Dragu, S. Cristea states that, in fact, communication pedagogical is social type, the teacher transmitting the pedagogical message below to the group of students form of information, presented as a set of data and indicators that modify the internal state of to the receptors, provoking a response according to the individual particularities of transmitter. The didactic information thus gains meaning through the contribution of knowledge, but and through self-regulating and self-organizing systems (9, p. 153).

The student, in the conditions of the school life, does not live in isolation, but in a social gear, his affective life, intellectual activity and no less professional activity, taking place inside and in interdependence with the socio-school

environment or under the conditions given by it (Collier, 1983). All the relational ramifications in the class of students form in the psychosocial plane a special category of inter-personal relations. In the case of the student class, the inter-personal relations have a new constitutive, ethical, moral character (Iucu, 2006).

Non-formal education represents the set of actions organized intentionally, systematically, unfolded in an insistent context, but outside the education system, in institutions that do not have an explicit educational destination. Non-formal educational activities are less formalized, but they are designed and realized by the teacher, in accordance with well-defined and delimited educational purposes, so that they generate educational and informational influences (Bocoş, M., Jucan, D., 2017).

In the specialized literature we find multiple ways of describing and defining non-formal education:

- M. Stefan in the Pedagogical Lexicon describes the non-formal education as a set of activities organized outside the school curricula, out of the compulsory nature, which allow the leisure to spend according to the wishes of the children;

- according to the authors Costea O., Cerkez M., Sarivan L., non-formal education represents any educational activity organized outside the existing formal system, which is meant to respond to the educational needs of a particular group and which pursues clear learning objectives (2009, p.10);

- Coombs, Ph. define non-formal education as an organized and systematic activity, carried out outside the formal framework of education, in order to complete and facilitate the learning of those interested in perfecting themselves in a certain field;

- UNESCO, in 1990 defined non-formal education as being composed of any organized and sustained educational activities that do not exactly correspond to what I call formal education. this can be done inside or outside the educational institutions, and is addressed to people of all ages.

- According to the law of national education, Nr. 1/2011, learning in non-formal contexts is considered as integrated learning within planned activities, with learning objectives, which do not explicitly follow a curriculum and may differ in duration. This type of learning depends on the intention of the learner and does not automatically lead to the certification of acquired knowledge and skills.

The skills and attitudes developed to students in non-formal learning include: interpersonal skills, teamwork ability, self-confidence, discipline, responsibility, planning, coordination and organization skills/project management skills, ability to solve practical problems, etc. As these skills have a high relevance in the personal development of the individual, contributing both to the active participation in the society and in the labor market, they are complementary to those acquired through formal education. The methods used are very different from the pedagogy used in formal education. In the case of non-formal education, the focus is on action learning, peer learning and volunteering.

Psycho-pedagogical implications of non-formal activities on the development of educational relationships

T. M. Lodahl and M. Keyner (1980) defined involvement in educational activity as the degree to which a person psychologically identifies with his or her activity. So the involvement would be the importance of learning activities in the self-image. In the non-formal activities, the area of involvement is not reduced to the singular, but, on the contrary, in the interaction the students can manifest an attitude of involvement, or on the contrary, of apathy, indifference, non-commitment. As a possible synonym, the term of social involvement is related to those of "participation", "socialization", but the semantic assumption is not total.

The process of educational influence is defined by the majority of specialized works as "organized and structured educational action, exercised on a person, in order to constitute, train or change behaviors, attitudes, etc." (Ullich, 1995).

Educational interaction is an aspect, a form of the multitude and variety of interpersonal relationships in the class of students. Regarding a possible classification of interpersonal relations in the class of students, the criterion used is the psychological needs and needs when they relate to each other. This results in the following types of interpersonal relationships in the class of students (Iucu, 2006):

• *Relationships of interconnection*: it derives from the need to have some information regarding the other, his way of being, his personality. The more information that a teacher has at one point about his students, and a certain student about the other colleagues are very diverse and consistent, the more dynamic the universe of the respective interactions is. the central element of this type of interpersonal relationship is the image of the partners about each other, and about themselves.

Interconnection occurs more complex through the non-formal activities. Basically, the actors of the non-formal education act live an unexpected interconnection relationship, beyond the formal space, that of the classroom. The interconnection relationship from non-formal activities brings to attention unique aspects of personality: hidden talents of teachers, students, inclinations and preferences.

• *Intercommunication relationships*: they appear as a result of what people, children, when they interact, feel the need to inform each other, to exchange information, to communicate. The class, as a universe of communication, constitutes for students an open universe of informational challenges, with exchanges of messages, with frequent and intense evaluations regarding the situation of the inter-communication process within the group.

In order to establish an authentic communication relationship, it is necessary for the interaction to work according to the principle of circularity, which means the creation of a permanent feed-back opportunity. Authors such as Hellriegel, Slocum and Woodman (1992) find it essential that in a non-formal activity, the teacher should provide students with a motivating feed-back. In this

regard, the authors draw a few guidelines, and the feedback provided by the teacher should:
- is based on the trust between the sender and the receiver;
- be rather specific than general, preferably contain recent examples;
- be offered at a time when the receiver, the student, seems to be ready to accept it;
- to include those things that the student is capable of accomplishing, not to include more than what the student can achieve during the time provided by the respective activity.

• Socio-affective relationships: they are the result of the intervention of a need for interpersonal time, which takes into account the exchange of emotions, feelings and affective-sympathetic structures. The fundamental characteristics of the affective-sympathetic relationships in the classroom are spontaneity, sincerity, disproportion between the extent of the affection and cause, the need for reciprocity in the positive affective exchanges and the overestimation of the feelings when they become aware of them. The absence of the group of students of affectivity can lead to negative effects in the plane of the interactional capacities of the students. The affective-sympathetic relationships are a condition for the development of the personality of the students.

The socio-affective relations related to the non-formal activities are defined by a complex structure, the complexity being portrayed by the realities of the social group. This relation is installed in the groups of students, being a similarity relation, strongly anchored in the syntax of the class of students. A component of the socio-affective relationship is given by consensus, that is, the way in which group members relate to the main issues of the group. The higher this consensus, the better the group works, it shows unity, efficiency. The consensus makes the group stronger, more relevant, more worthy of performing educational activity.

Another component of the socio-affective relationship is given by cohesion, the way that members of a group can coagulate around ideas, as a result of consensus. The level of cohesion of a class of students is higher the more the consensus points are. Cohesion is somewhat implicit in the evolution of the class of students, due to the fact that students spend a consistent time together, but cohesion is enhanced by the fact that students have common formal activities, similar goals, and non-formal activities unite them. Cohesion is a social indicator of the functionality and efficiency of a society.

• Influence relations: they are determined by the position each occupies in the subjective and objective hierarchies of the class group. In the school environment we meet groups of students in which cohesion has to suffer, they are dangerous and educational subgroups. In these situations, non-formal activities can be a remedial solution.

Previous perspectives

As a result of the current trends towards a global knowledge society, a significant change in the educational orientations can be observed in our country, consisting both in increasing the participation of young people in education and in

diversifying the offer of the education system, completed in parallel with that of the education system. alternative or non-formal education. Thus, the rate of inclusion in education at all levels has increased from 55% in 2001 to 61% in 2008.

As expected, another form of learning that is gaining ground among young people is non-formal education, which knows a rate. higher to more recent generations: 18% young people between 20 and 24 years old, compared to older people: only 11% young people over 25 years old (ISE, 2010). In fact, at least one third of young people (approx. 36%) recognize extracurricular forms of learning as being appropriate to their professional development needs and only 12% of young people consider them inadequate for their training requirements (Guidelines and values regarding alienations regarding career and work, ANSIT, 2008). Participation in non-formal education among young people, whose average is approx. 15% according to the surveys (ISE, 2010), is maintained at relatively high levels compared to other European countries, where the degree of participation is on average 10%, approaching Romania with countries with a tradition in this field, such as Great Britain or Denmark (European Youth Report, 2009).

From the study Implementation of the preparatory class, the Romanian educational system, in the 2012-2013 school year, carried out by the Institute of Education Sciences, shows that the cooption for the educational programs of the type after school is found in a percentage of about ten times higher among the parents from urban area than in rural area, namely 23.9% urban compared to 2.3% rural. Also, the opportunities for organizing extracurricular activities in partnership with various institutions and NGOs are greater in cities than in rural areas. Abroad, After-school programs have been working successfully for many years, with a clear development of them, from one kindergarten to another.

In the education system in Romania, starting with the 2011-2012 school year, the School otherwise works, which is a national program whose purpose is to contribute to the development of learning competence and socio-emotional skills among preschoolers / students.

The program has a duration of 5 consecutive working days during the school year and can be carried out on the basis of a schedule that remains at the decision of each school, according to the order of the minister of education and research regarding the structure of the school year, valid for the respective school year. Within this program it is facilitated the participation of all the students enrolled in a form of education in different educational activities of non-formal character.

In 2013, the Institute of Education Sciences aimed to analyze the way of carrying out the Program of extracurricular and extracurricular educational activities entitled The school otherwise. 1715 teachers were involved in data collection, of which 82.6% consider the initiative of this program useful, the share of teachers who appreciate the program decreases with the level of schooling of children (86.3% in primary education, 77, 9% in high school). Depending on the area of residence, the teachers who teach in rural schools appreciate the program more (87.6% as opposed to 77.4% in the urban area).

But, only within this program can non-formal educational activities be organized, or would their benefit be more imopact if these activities were organized staggered, throughout a school year? Are teachers in primary education willing to design and organize such activities outside the national program? Do teachers identify opportunities to implement non-formal activities in favor of relational facilitation of students? These are some of the questions that the present study is trying to find an answer to.

Study case - teachers opinion

The questionnaire, its own conception, made up of 15 items, out of which 3 questions are for the identification of the teachers in the pre-university education that complete the questionnaire, and 12 questions are specific, and ask for the objective expression of the teachers' opinions regarding the importance of the non-formal activities on the development, to strengthen the relational relationship between students, but also between teachers and students.

The questionnaire was completed by 67 teachers who work in 4 different educational units in the urban environment. From the analysis and interpretation of the data we can conclude:

- According to the form of employment of the teachers who have completed the questionnaire, we can conclude that 82% are employed for an indefinite period, 16% have concluded contracts with the educational units for a fixed period, 2% are retired teachers, but who also - extended the period of didactic activity;

- Of the total number of teachers who completed the questionnaire, 97% are female, and only 3% male;

- The age distribution of teachers is as follows: 10% are between the ages of 25-36 years, 53% between 36-45 years, 25% between 46-55 years and 12% are over 56 years old. All the teachers who completed the questionnaire graduated from higher education in the field of education sciences;

- From the analysis of the questionnaires completed by teachers, it was found that 64% of them consider that the 5-day program of the Week is otherwise sufficient for designing and conducting non-formal activities. Those 36% who stated that these non-formal activities may have a higher frequency than the one in the program, consider that these activities should be carried out periodically, but it remains to the discretion of the framework to determine their frequency and duration;

- Teachers who consider the national program sufficient for carrying out non-formal activities argue by: the agglomeration of the program of activities in which the student is involved (15.9%), the perception of this type of activity as being less important than the usual hours of the course (14.1 %), the risk of unwanted events, accidents, absenteeism, etc. 13.4%, additional request for teachers (11.3%), reduction of teaching time (9.3%), fatigue of students and teachers;

- To the question about how often they organize non-formal activities in a school year outside the national program the week otherwise, the teachers answered

as follows: 7% say they organize such activities every two weeks, 12% claim that such activities carries out monthly with the class of students, 39% confirm that outside the national program, maximum 2 times per semester they organize non-formal activities with the class of students, 16% of the teachers who completed the questionnaire did not have an objective analysis of the number of non-formal activities they proposed, and 26% consider that the additional organization of non-formal activities is not necessary;

- Regarding the communication, 58% of the teachers consider that during the non-formal activities the interpersonal relations between the students are improving, the inter-communication between them results from the action cooperation in the non-formal activities, 27% have stated in the non-formal activities the group of students remains divided into other subgroups based on previous friendships, and 15% consider that during the non-formal activities negative feelings, sometimes reciprocal, of the students, come out, possibly due to the increased competitiveness;

- Among the positive feelings identified by the teachers during the non-formal activities, they mentioned: the joy of being part of the class of students, acceptance, feeling of belonging to the group of students, attachment to colleagues, trust in their own strength, satisfaction for performing work tasks;

- Among the negative feelings of the students caught during the non-formal activities, the questioned teachers surprised: anxiety, frustration, worry, sadness, confusion.

- Asked if, in the light of non-formal activities, they feel closer to the students, 78% of the teachers answered yes, 15% consider that from the non-formal activities the teacher-student relationship does not perceive changes, and 7% said they cannot assess whether non-formal activities influence in some way the relationship between the professions-students;

- The item what asking the teachers to prioritize the skills and attitudes developed to the students in the non-formal activities, we can conclude the following: 27% of the teachers consider that, the interpersonal skills of the students will register improvements through the participation in non-formal activities, 7% appreciate that student discipline will see improvements, 22% of teachers appreciate that students 'self-confidence will increase, 13% believe that the ability to work in teams of students will be enhanced, 19% of the questioned teachers say that the students' responsibility will know improvements, and 12% express their opinion on improving the students' planning capacity, problem solving;

- Analyzing the availability of teachers about the participation of a course of management of non-formal activities, they showed their willingness to participate 82%, and 18% stated that they would not be willing to participate in such training.

Conclusions

Being a high performing teacher means being a significant presence in both the objective and subjective lives of students. In spite of the constitutive asymmetry existing in the class of students, regarding the status of superiority of the teacher, the student-teacher relationship can no longer be conceived as a relationship of

273

dependence of the student teacher, or as an abstract communication relation. The teacher's authority is not reduced to the possession of specialized knowledge, but derives from his ability to alternate the teaching start-ups, adapting their educational situations, to distribute responsibilities to the students, to mobilize the students to cooperate in a group, to use the values of the teacher-student relationship. student in the sense of a real dialogue (Iucu, 2006).

The character of the students is formed, developed and consolidated in a long process, and the school contributes decisively to the character formation, and has two possibilities to intervene constructively on the characters in training: through the prism of the curricular, formal activities, and through the non-formal activities.

The teacher-student relationship is the main method of didactic communication, it is a mutual, dynamic construction, and it is constantly adapted according to educational circumstances and purposes. The relationship with the students should not be confined to a formal, administrative aspect, regulated by deontological or normative codes, but will be personalized to the specific school group or its members. The democratic relationship favors the cooperation between teacher and student, the student is granted a certain credit, according to his degree of intellectual and spiritual maturation.

Refrences:

Bocoş, M., Chiș V. (2013). *Management curricular Vol. I, Repere teoretice şi aplicative*, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești

Ciobanu, O. (2003). *Comunicarea didactică*, ASE, București, p.47

Collier, G. (1983). *The management of peer – Group Learning, Society For Reaserch Into Higher Education*, Surrey

Coombs, Ph. (1989). *Formal and NFE: future strategies, in Titmus C J (ed), Lifelong education for adults: an international handbook*, Oxford: Pergamon: 57-60

Costea, O. (coord.), Cerkez M, Sarivan, L. (2009). *Educaţia nonformală şi informală: realităţi şi perspective în şcoala românească*, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, București

Dragu, A., Cristea, S. (2003). *Psihologie şi pedagogie şcolară, Ediţia a II-a, Revăzută şi adăugită*, Ovidius University Press, Constanța

Golu, P. (2000). *Fundamentele psihologiei sociale*, Editura Fundaţiei „România de Mâine", București

Hellriegel, D., J.W. Slocum, R. W.Woodman. (1992). *Organizational behavior*.West Publishing Company

Legea educaţiei naţionale, Nr. 1/2011

Moldovan, O., Bocoş-Binţinţan, V. (2015). *The necessity of reconsidering the concept of non-formal education* in Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol. 209, pp 337 – 343

Roman, A., (2014). *Evaluarea competenţelor. Perspective formative*, Pro Universitaria, București

Slama Cazacu, T. (1999). *Psiholingvisitca ca ştiinţă a comunicării*, Editura ALL, Bucureşti

Ştefan, M. (2006). *Lexiconul pedagogic*, Editura Aramis, Bucureşti

Ullich, D. (1995). *Pedagogische Interaktion*, Beltz Verlag, Weinheim-Basel

https://www.dalles.ro/wp-content/uploads /2010/12/ISE-CERCETAREENF 2010-RAPORT-FINAL-DE-CERCETARE.pdf, accessed in 07.04.2020

http://www.ise.ro/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Evaluare_Scoala_Altfel.pdf, accessed in 07.04.2020

https://www.edu.ro/ordinul-ministrului-educa%C5%A3iei-na%C5%A3ionale-%C5%9Fi-cercet%C4%83rii-%C5%9Ftiin%C5%A3ifice-nr-503429082016-pentru-aprobarea, accessed in 07.04.2020