

Students' Attitudes toward Formal Education, Non-Formal and Informal Learning

Marlena Plavšić and Marina Diković
Juraj Dobrila University of Pula

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to contribute to the model of formal education, non-formal and informal learning (Coombs & Ahmed, 1974; European Commission, 2001) by exploring students' attitudes towards these three types of education and learning. 553 students of educational sciences, humanities and economics filled in a scale of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning. Data on their study year, knowledge about these three types of education/learning, monthly family income and parents' formal education were also collected. Analyses included factor analysis, ANOVA, t-test, Kruskal-Wallis, Mann-Whitney and chi-square test. More favourable attitudes were found among students of educational sciences and humanities and among students with better knowledge about these types of education and learning. Some attitudes were more favourable in the final years, and some remained stable throughout the higher education period. Students from the higher income groups had a more favourable cognitive and affective attitude component towards formal education than the students from the lowest income group. No differences in the students' attitudes were found regarding their parents' formal education. Implications regarding lifelong learning are made.

Key words: *knowledge; lifelong learning; monthly income; study group; study year.*

Introduction

An individual will not be able to meet life challenges unless he/she becomes a lifelong learner, and a society will not be sustainable unless it becomes a learning society. Lifelong learning is a combination of lifelong processes whereby the whole person – body (genetic, physical and biological development) and mind (knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses) – experiences social situations. Then he/she transforms the perceived content cognitively, emotively or practically

(or through any combination) and integrates it into the biography which results in continuous change and experience (Jarvis, 2007). Since the creation of lifelong learning, UNESCO has always been focused on education as a right and a means for upholding and fulfilling many other rights and for achieving an array of internationally agreed development goals. Lifelong learning rests upon the integration of learning and living – both horizontally in life-wide contexts across family, cultural and community settings, study, work and leisure, and vertically over an individual's whole life from birth to the old age (Yang & Valdés-Cotera, 2011). Adult education is a significant part of lifelong learning (Commission of the European Communities, 2006). That is why at the European level prolonging of the compulsory education is more discussed (European Commission, 2012).

Rajić and Lapat (2010) describe studies on lifelong learning and conducted a study among students – future teachers. More than 80% of them reported that they plan non-formal learning, more than 50% intend to continue with informal learning, and one third of them plan to continue with their formal education. They concluded that lifelong learning needs to be more researched and such research conclusions need to be implemented as quickly as possible to keep the gap between the expectations of the society and the individual features reduced to a minimum.

Croatian universities are still predominantly oriented toward their core business: teaching and researching. Therefore, “the need for rethinking the position of universities in regard to life-long learning and continuous education is of special importance to the transition countries that have to catch up in modernisation of their economies and become both compatible and competitive in global society” (Cendon et al., 2009, p. 7).

Education and Learning Models

Teachers should possess a variety of cognitive and social skills, as well as skills for the planning and implementation of teaching in order to determine learning outcomes, manage a classroom and contribute to the development of a social community. It is important to standardise the core professional competences and raise the quality of training of all the categories of prospective teachers (Government of the Republic of Croatia, 2013).

Colley et al. (2002) describe eight models of formal education, non-formal and informal learning. Authors analysed the literature that explicitly set out to differentiate between these forms of education/learning. The analysis illustrated a wide range of views and pointed to the significance of the context in influencing the form of the classification. Model of the European Commission (2001) is based on a model introduced by Coombs and Ahmed in 1974. Because of the importance of education for present as well as future generations, their study and research are particularly concerned with non-formal programmes to increase the skills and productivity of all persons in everyday life. They describe the three types of education/learning as

follows: a) formal education is the highly institutionalised, chronologically graded and hierarchically structured “education system”, spanning lower primary school and the upper reaches of the university; b) non-formal learning is any organised, systematic, educational activity carried out outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults as well as children; c) informal learning is a lifelong process by which every person acquires and accumulates knowledge, skills, attitudes and insights from daily experiences and exposure to the environment – at home, at work, at play. Generally, informal education is unorganised and often unsystematic; yet it accounts for the great bulk of any person’s total lifetime learning – including that of even a highly “schooled” person (Coombs & Ahmed, 1974).

The EU policy document model provided by the European Commission (2001) defines the three types of education/learning in the following way:

- a) Formal education: learning typically provided by an education or training institution, structured (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support) and leading to certification. Formal learning is intentional from the learner’s perspective.
- b) Non-formal learning: learning that is not provided by an education or training institution and typically does not lead to certification. It is, however, structured (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support). Non-formal learning is intentional from the learner’s perspective.
- c) Informal learning: learning resulting from daily life activities related to work, family or leisure. It is not structured (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support) and typically does not lead to certification. Informal learning may be intentional but in most cases it is non-intentional (or “incidental”/random) (European Commission, 2001).

The importance of this classification and description was also recognised by other authors (Colardyn & Bjornavold, 2004) as it addresses the European efforts to put the systems for the validation of non-formal and informal learning in place.

Starting Points for the Research on Three Types of Education/ Learning

As the learner is the first person responsible to create understanding and knowledge, it is pretty significant to know what kind of attitude he/she has towards learning (Senay Sen, 2013). Teaching is one of the essential professions for the survival of a society. Teachers’ competences are very important and the teachers must have the competence to promote the development of their students’ competences. It is expected that positive attitudes will ensure that teachers acquire lifelong learning skills (Kara, 2010). Since future teachers are future promoters of lifelong learning, it is important to explore their attitudes towards different types of education and learning. There is a long history of lifelong learning and concepts of formal education, non-formal

and informal learning and literature search shows a number of articles defining the concepts. However, attitudes and their possible connection with other variables, such as knowledge, study year, parents' formal education and household income have not been explored yet. Senay Sen (2013) conducted a research study on university students – prospective engineers and prospective technical teachers towards learning. The results pointed to positive attitudes of both groups towards learning. However, the attitude levels of the prospective technical teachers towards learning expectations and their being open to learning were found to be higher than the attitude levels of the prospective engineers.

Croatian studies related to students' motivation for and their satisfaction with studying are rare (Reić Ercegovac & Jukić, 2008). Research conducted by Potočnik (2009) about the motives for the enrollment in various study programmes shows that the main reasons for enrolling the study of economics are the continuation of high school and wish to continue the family business, while the main reasons for enrolling the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences are the failure in the field of natural sciences and a general desire for studying. Students of social sciences show a more optimistic attitude about finding a job in contrast to the students from the humanities, as expected, because in Croatia it is traditionally more difficult for individuals in humanities-related professions to get employed. Students of humanities perceived the position of their profession and high unemployment to be almost twice as bad in comparison with the students of the social professions and named that as the main reason for the expected unsuccessful employment in their profession.

Kara's (2010) study suggested that students with better understanding of the learning process were better at perceiving the nature of learning, were more open to learning and had higher expectations about what they would get from learning.

Although recent studies suggest reducing inequalities in the access to higher education among more recent generations, the association of parents' socio-economic status and success in achieving any level, including higher education, has been well established. For example, one study showed that Croatian students of a lower socioeconomic status, when they finish higher education, they do it, on average, faster than others (Matković et al., 2010). According to Raymond Boudon (in Matković et al., 2010), parental socio-economic status is reflected on school performance in two ways. Lower academic achievement of the children coming from families with a lower socioeconomic status during their compulsory education is a primary effect that limits their further educational opportunities. However, when school performance is equal, due to differences in resources and ambitions, the children of the parents of higher socio-economic status are more likely to enroll (and then finish) a higher level of education. This is what Boudon calls the secondary effect (Matković et al., 2010). Jokić and Ristić-Dedić (2010) point to the pronounced effect of parental education on the students' educational attainment. This again confirms that the education system mostly confirms the existing patterns of the social structure.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the previously described model of formal education, non-formal and informal learning (Coombs & Ahmed, 1974; European Commission, 2001) by exploring attitudes towards these three types of education and learning, and their possible connection with other variables, such as knowledge, study year, parents' formal education and household income. The objectives of the study were: (1) to explore attitudes towards formal education and non-formal and informal learning among students of humanities, educational sciences and economics; and (2) to find out if there are differences in students' attitudes considering their year of study, knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning, monthly income and parents' formal education.

The following hypothesis is related to the objective (1):

Hypothesis 1: Students of humanities and educational sciences have more favourable attitudes towards all three types of education and learning compared to the students of economics.

The following hypotheses are related to the objective (2):

Hypothesis 2: Attitudes towards the three forms of education and learning grow more favourable with the years of study.

Hypothesis 3: Students who know more about the three forms of education and learning have more favourable attitudes towards the three forms of education and learning.

Hypothesis 4: Attitudes towards the three forms of education and learning grow more favourable with the higher monthly incomes.

Hypothesis 5: Attitudes towards the three forms of education and learning grow more favourable with the increase in parents' formal education.

Method

Participants

A total of 553 students, 18-36 years old, from the Juraj Dobrila University of Pula (the Republic of Croatia), 130 males (23.5%) and 423 females (76.5%), participated in the study. The stratified sample comprised 33.3% of all students. There were 117 (21.2%) students of educational sciences (prospective primary school and preschool teachers), 144 (26%) students were from humanities (prospective history and languages teachers). As prospective teachers, they chose a set of courses for pedagogical competences that prepare them to become teachers of the subjects they are currently studying. The third group numbered 292 (52.8%) economics students. Subsample percentages resemble the percentages of the university population: educational sciences have a share of 19%, humanities 22.1%, and economics have a share of 59% of the total student population at the university. When we look at the study year, 211 (38.2%) students were enrolled in the 1st year, 113 (20.4%) in the 2nd, 128 (23.1%) in the 3rd, and 101 (18.3%) in the 4th and 5th year.

Description of the Variables

As no attitudes scales on this topic were available in the literature, three scales were developed for the purpose of this study aimed at exploring students' attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning. They consisted of a part related to the cognitive and affective component, and a part that referred to the behavioural component. The scales were constructed based on the literature scan and educational experts' suggestions: the attitudes' scale towards formal education consisted of 45 items, towards non-formal learning of 17, and the scale related to informal learning consisted of 15 items. After the application, they were revised and as a result, items with the discriminant coefficients below 0.25 were omitted. In the final version, the scale related to formal education comprised 15 items, the scale related to non-formal learning consisted of 9, and the scale related to informal learning comprised 8 items. Example of a cognitive component item is: *Non-formal learning is flexible, it responds to the interests of a learner*. Example of an affective component item is: *I feel proud of my achievements in informal learning*. The possible answers were offered on five-point Likert type scales, varying from *strongly disagree* (1) to *totally agree* (5). Higher scores relate to more favourable attitudes. Reliability coefficient for the subscale related to formal education measured with Guttman Lambda 2 was 0.83, for non-formal learning 0.71, and for informal learning 0.74. The behavioural component was examined as future intentions for formal education, non-formal and informal learning, as well as for formal, non-formal and informal teaching. The results were collected as *Yes* and *No* answers.

Construct validity for each of the three attitude scales was explored with factor analysis. For all three scales the KMO test results (0.743 for formal education, 0.741 for non-formal learning and 0.759 for informal learning) and the Bartlett test results (significant) allowed further analyses. The principal components analysis with varimax rotation was carried out. For each scale two predetermined factors with eigenvalues over 1 for each factor were described as a cognitive component and an affective component. In the scale measuring attitudes towards formal education they explained 43% of variance; in the scale of attitudes towards non-formal learning they explained 45.40%, and in the scale of attitudes towards informal learning they explained 52.86% of variance. While determining the factors, the cut-off point was considered as 0.20. There was at least 0.10 factor load difference between the factor loadings of each item in different factors. The cognitive subscale in the scale of attitudes toward formal education included 9 items (factor loadings ranged between 0.48 and 0.84), and the affective subscale included 6 items (factor loading ranged between 0.58 and 0.80). The cognitive subscale in the scale of attitudes toward non-formal learning included 6 items (factor loadings ranged between 0.46 and 0.69), and the affective component included 3 items (factor loadings ranged between 0.75 and 0.82). The cognitive subscale of attitudes toward informal learning included 5 items (factor loadings ranged between 0.34 and 0.78), and the affective component included 2 items (with factor loadings 0.80 and 0.81).

A test of knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning was also applied. It consisted of 15 items (e.g. *Formal education is performed in institutions.*) with three possible answers: True / False / Not sure. Each answer could get 1, 2 or 3 points, so total score could vary from 15 to 45. Higher results refer to better knowledge. Participants were divided into two groups according to their results in the test: those with lesser knowledge scored lower than $M - 1 SD$ ($N = 65$) and those with better knowledge scored higher than $M + 1 SD$ ($N = 78$).

General biographical data were collected with few questions related to age, gender, study year and study group. Monthly family income was explored with the usual five grades' scale (in Croatia): (a) up to 2,000 kn; (b) 2,001 – 4,000 kn; (c) 4,001 – 6,000 kn; (d) 6,001 – 10,000 kn; and (e) more than 10,000 kn. Parents' formal education, obtained separately for the father and the mother, offered four answers related to the highest level of completed education: elementary school, high school, college and university, and graduate and doctoral study.

Procedure

Data were collected in a larger survey that examined students' attitudes and knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning. Instruments were administered to university students with their oral consent and anonymously. Firstly, the test of knowledge was applied. After it was collected, students were instructed about the three forms of education/learning, so they could recognise them in the second phase when they were given, among other, the attitudes scale on formal education, non-formal and informal learning. A coding system was used for collating data from the two phases.

Results

Attitudes towards Formal Education, Non-Formal and Informal Learning between Different Study Groups

In order to examine possible differences in the attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning between students of humanities, educational sciences and economics, two analyses were performed: (1) one-way ANOVA for the cognitive and affective component of the attitudes between the three study groups, and (2) chi-square test for the behavioural component of the attitudes between them. Effect sizes were calculated as Cohen's d coefficient. Results of ANOVA are presented in Table 1.

Results in Table 1 show that the most frequent differences in the cognitive and affective components are found between the students of economics and the students of both educational sciences and humanities, who have more favourable attitudes. The effect size is medium. Table 2 presents the results of the chi-square test for the behavioural component among the three study groups. Effect sizes were calculated as Cramer's V coefficient.

Table 1

Cognitive and affective component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning among the three study groups

| Subscale | Study group | | | F df | Sheffè | Cohen's d |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------|
| | Economics (E) | Humanities (H) | Educational sciences (ES) | | | |
| | M SD n = 292 | M SD n = 144 | M SD n = 117 | | | |
| Formal education | 50.51 8.58 | 51.74 8.34 | 54.92 6.85 | 12.13** 2 | H – ES E – ES | 0.42 |
| Non-formal learning | 29.87 5.08 | 31.15 4.12 | 31.21 4.72 | 5.14* 2 | E – ES E – H | 0.27 |
| Informal learning | 26.67 4.74 | 28.95 4.52 | 28.45 5.13 | 13.13** 2 | E – ES E – H | 0.44 |

* p < .01; **p < .001

Table 2

Behavioural component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning and teaching among the three study groups

| Having plan | Number of students (percentage) | | | | df | p | Cramer's V |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----|---------|------------|
| | Economics | Humanities | Educ. sciences | X ² | | | |
| Plans for formal education | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 29 (10.0) | 38 (26.6) | 46 (39.3) | 49.36 | 4 | < 0.001 | 0.30 |
| No | 262 (90.0) | 105 (73.4) | 71 (60.7) | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal learning | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 64 (22.0) | 50 (35.0) | 39 (33.3) | 10.49 | 2 | < 0.01 | 0.14 |
| No | 228 (78.0) | 93 (65.0) | 78 (66.7) | | | | |
| Plans for informal learning | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 14 (4.8) | 46 (32.2) | 34 (29.1) | 66.12 | 2 | < 0.001 | 0.35 |
| No | 278 (95.2) | 97 (67.8) | 83 (70.9) | | | | |
| Plans for formal teaching | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 2 (0.7) | 102 (71.3) | 101 (86.3) | 359.06 | 2 | < 0.001 | 0.81 |
| No | 290 (99.3) | 41 (28.7) | 16 (13.7) | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal teaching | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 5 (1.7) | 36 (25.2) | 22 (18.8) | 60.29 | 2 | < 0.001 | 0.33 |
| No | 287 (98.3) | 107 (74.8) | 95 (81.2) | | | | |
| Plans for informal teaching | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 16 (5.5) | 59 (41.3) | 42 (35.9) | 92.78 | 2 | < 0.001 | 0.41 |
| No | 276 (94.5) | 84 (58.7) | 75 (64.1) | | | | |

Results in Table 2 show that between 60% and 90% of students in all three study groups have no plans to continue their formal education. More students of educational sciences have intentions to take part in formal education than students of humanities and economics. More than 65% percent of students have no plans for non-formal and informal learning. More students of humanities and educational sciences have these intentions than the students of economics, but the difference between them is rather small in the case of non-formal learning (0.14). When it comes to teaching intentions, results show that students of humanities and educational sciences share a similar high level of interest in formal teaching, while students of economy do not. The size of these differences is very large (0.81). Although the dominant plan in all three study groups is not to teach non-formally and informally, more students of humanities plan to undertake both types of teaching, followed by the students of educational sciences, while the same plans are least present among economics students. The differences among groups are of moderate size. Findings support the first hypothesis.

Attitudes towards Formal Education, Non-Formal and Informal Learning Regarding Study Year, Knowledge, Income and Parents' Formal Education

In order to find out if there are differences in the students' attitudes considering their year of study, knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning, monthly income and parents' formal education (objective 2), and to test the respective four hypotheses, again two analyses were done: (1) one-way ANOVA and t-test as well as Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests for the cognitive and affective component of the attitudes between the students of different study years, different levels of knowledge about formal, non-formal and informal learning, different income levels and different parents' education; and (2) chi-square test for the behavioural component of attitudes between the same groups of students. Effect sizes were calculated as Cohen's *d* and Pearson's *r*.

The first analysis tackled the attitudes related to the study year. Results of ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests are presented in Table 3.

Results in Table 3 show that senior students have a more favourable cognitive and affective component towards the informal learning compared to the students of the initial years of study, but these differences are of small to medium size. Table 4 presents the results of the chi-square test for the behavioural component between the students of different study years.

Table 3

Cognitive and affective component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning according to study year

| Subscale | Study year | | | | F df | Effect size | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th + 5 th | | | |
| | M SD n = 211 | M SD n = 113 | M SD n = 128 | M SD n = 101 | | | |
| Formal education | 51.64 7.88 | 52.28 8.68 | 51.41 8.44 | 51.88 8.85 | 0.25 3 | d | |
| Non-formal learning | 30.07 4.78 | 30.91 5.30 | 29.93 4.52 | 31.59 4.48 | 3.22* 3 | 0.26 | |
| | Mean rank | | | | X ² df | U | r |
| Informal learning | 248.79 | 286.52 | 261.57 | 344.85 | 26.51** 3 | 1 st – 2 nd 1 st – 4 th +5 th 2 nd – 4 th +5 th 3 rd – 4 th +5 th | 0.11 0.29 0.17 0.25 |

* p < .01; **p < .001

Table 4

Behavioural component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning and teaching related to study years

| Having plan | Number of students (percentage) | | | | | X ² | df | p | Cramer's V |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------|----------------|---------|------|------------|
| | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th and 5 th | | | | | |
| Plans for formal education | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 34 (16.2) | 18 (16.1) | 28 (21.9) | 33 (32.7) | 16.97 | 6 | < 0.01 | 0.18 | |
| No | 176 (83.8) | 94 (83.9) | 100 (78.1) | 68 (67.3) | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal learning | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 48 (22.9) | 26 (23.0) | 36 (28.1) | 43 (42.6) | 14.86 | 3 | < 0.01 | 0.16 | |
| No | 162 (77.1) | 87 (77.0) | 92 (71.9) | 58 (57.4) | | | | | |
| Plans for informal learning | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 25 (11.9) | 13 (11.5) | 13 (10.2) | 43 (42.6) | 57.27 | 3 | < 0.001 | 0.32 | |
| No | 185 (88.1) | 100 (88.5) | 115 (89.8) | 58 (57.4) | | | | | |
| Plans for formal teaching | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 67 (31.9) | 38 (33.6) | 42 (32.8) | 58 (57.4) | 21.59 | 3 | < 0.001 | 0.20 | |
| No | 143 (68.1) | 75 (66.4) | 86 (67.2) | 43 (42.6) | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal teaching | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 27 (12.9) | 9 (8.0) | 12 (9.3) | 15 (14.9) | 3.47 | 3 | > 0.05 | | |
| No | 183 (87.1) | 104 (92.0) | 116 (90.7) | 89 (85.1) | | | | | |
| Plans for informal teaching | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 37 (17.6) | 18 (15.9) | 24 (18.8) | 38 (37.6) | 20.26 | 3 | < 0.001 | 0.19 | |
| No | 173 (82.4) | 95 (84.1) | 104 (81.2) | 63 (62.4) | | | | | |

Results in Table 4 show that the higher the study year, the higher the intention to continue with formal education, although the differences are low. Most students express no intentions for non-formal learning, but those who do are the students of the senior study years. Students of the first three years have no or very little intention to learn informally, and the students of the final two years express more intentions for informal learning. When it comes to teaching, students of the final two years have more intentions to teach formally than the students of the first three years. Students do not differ in their plans to teach non-formally. Although less than a half of the students express the intention to teach informally, students of the final two years express significantly more intentions for that. Findings partly support the second hypothesis.

Table 5

Cognitive and affective component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning according to the level of knowledge about them

| Subscale | Level of knowledge | | t | df | p | Cohen's d |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------|-----|--------|-----------|
| | Higher M SD n = 78 | Lower M SD N = 65 | | | | |
| Formal education | 52.24 9.10 | 48.81 7.73 | 2.40 | 141 | <0.05 | 0.40 |
| Non-formal learning | 31.29 5.09 | 29.45 3.90 | 2.40 | 141 | <0.05 | 0.40 |
| Informal learning | 28.90 5.20 | 26.06 3.92 | 3.62 | 141 | <0.001 | 0.61 |

Results in Table 5 show that students with the higher level of knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning have a more favourable cognitive and affective component towards all three forms of education and learning. The differences are of medium size.

Results in Table 6 show that, although the majority of students have no plans for formal education, non-formal and informal learning, more students with a higher level of knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning express the wish to continue with all three types of education/learning, compared to students with a lower level of knowledge. When it comes to teaching, more students with a higher level of knowledge about formal education, non-formal and informal learning express the wish to teach formally and informally, compared to the students with a lower level of knowledge. No differences were found between the students of higher and lower knowledge levels when plans for non-formal teaching were compared. These findings support the third hypothesis.

Table 6

Behavioural component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning and teaching related to students' knowledge about them

| Having plan | Level of knowledge (percentage of students) | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|----------|----|---------|-----------|
| | Higher | Lower | χ^2 | df | p | Cohen's d |
| Plans for formal education | | | | | | |
| Yes | 25 (32.1) | 8 (12.5) | 8.73 | 1 | < 0.01 | 0.51 |
| No | 53 (67.9) | 56 (87.5) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 142 | | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal learning | | | | | | |
| Yes | 29 (37.2) | 13 (20.0) | 5.04 | 1 | < 0.05 | 0.38 |
| No | 49 (62.8) | 52 (80.0) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 143 | | | | | | |
| Plans for informal learning | | | | | | |
| Yes | 21 (26.9) | 8 (12.3) | 4.68 | 1 | < 0.05 | 0.37 |
| No | 57 (73.1) | 57 (87.7) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 143 | | | | | | |
| Plans for formal teaching | | | | | | |
| Yes | 44 (56.4) | 18 (27.7) | 11.91 | 1 | < 0.001 | 0.60 |
| No | 34 (43.6) | 47 (72.3) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 143 | | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal teaching | | | | | | |
| Yes | 15 (19.2) | 9 (13.8) | 0.74 | 1 | > 0.05 | |
| No | 63 (80.8) | 56 (86.2) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 143 | | | | | | |
| Plans for informal teaching | | | | | | |
| Yes | 24 (30.8) | 9 (13.8) | 5.72 | 1 | < 0.05 | 0.41 |
| No | 54 (69.2) | 56 (86.2) | | | | |
| <i>n</i> = 143 | | | | | | |

Table 7

Cognitive and affective component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning according to their monthly income

| Subscale | Monthly income (in Croatian kunas) | | | | | F df | Sheffè | Cohen's d |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | <2000 (A) <i>n</i> = 25 | 2001-4000 (B) <i>n</i> = 70 | 4001-6000 (C) <i>n</i> = 143 | 6001-10000 (D) <i>n</i> = 190 | >10000 (E) <i>n</i> = 94 | | | |
| Formal education | 46.76 9.79 | 52.76 8.49 | 52.60 8.62 | 52.35 7.61 | 50.46 8.54 | 3.68** 4 | A – B A – C A – D | 0.34 |
| Non-formal learning | 29.20 6.25 | 30.71 4.39 | 30.68 4.50 | 31.00 4.66 | 29.60 5.32 | 1.89 4 | | |
| Informal learning | 25.96 6.15 | 28.30 4.45 | 27.78 4.74 | 28.27 4.71 | 26.48 5.38 | 3.17* 4 | | |

p* < .01; *p* < .001

Results in Table 7 show that students from the higher income groups have a more favourable cognitive and affective attitude component towards formal education than the students from the lowest income group. No differences were found in the attitudes towards non-formal and informal learning.

Table 8

Behavioural component of attitudes towards formal education, non-formal and informal learning and teaching related to students' monthly income

| Having plan | Monthly income (in Croatian kunas) | | | | | χ^2 | df | p |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----|---------|
| | <2000 | 2001-4000 | 4001-6000 | 6001-10000 | >10000 | | | |
| Plans for formal education | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 9 (36.0) | 13 (18.6) | 25 (17.5) | 47 (24.9) | 16 (17.0) | 13.67 | 4 | > 0.05 |
| No | 16 (64.0) | 57 (81.4) | 118 (82.5) | 142 (75.1) | 78 (83.0) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal learning | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 8 (32.0) | 19 (27.1) | 36 (25.2) | 65 (34.4) | 22 (23.4) | 5.35 | 4 | > 0.05 |
| No | 17 (68.0) | 51 (72.9) | 107 (74.8) | 124 (65.6) | 72 (76.6) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Plans for informal learning | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 11 (44.0) | 18 (25.7) | 26 (18.2) | 19 (10.1) | 16 (17.0) | 22.97 | 4 | < 0.001 |
| No | 14 (56.0) | 52 (74.3) | 117 (81.8) | 170 (89.9) | 78 (83.0) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Plans for formal teaching | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 14 (56.0) | 27 (38.6) | 59 (41.3) | 69 (36.5) | 31 (33.0) | 5.22 | 4 | > 0.05 |
| No | 11 (44.0) | 43 (61.4) | 84 (58.7) | 120 (63.5) | 63 (67.0) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Plans for non-formal teaching | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 6 (24.0) | 7 (10.0) | 18 (12.6) | 20 (10.6) | 10 (10.6) | 4.29 | 4 | > 0.05 |
| No | 19 (76.0) | 63 (90.0) | 125 (87.4) | 169 (89.4) | 84 (89.4) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Plans for informal teaching | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 8 (32.0) | 22 (31.4) | 31 (21.7) | 36 (19.0) | 16 (17.0) | 7.46 | 4 | > 0.05 |
| No | 17 (68.0) | 48 (68.6) | 112 (78.3) | 153 (81.0) | 78 (83.0) | | | |
| <i>n = 521</i> | | | | | | | | |

Results in Table 8 show that the only difference in the behavioural component can be found regarding plans for informal learning: students with lower incomes express more intentions to learn informally compared with students with higher earnings. However, this difference is rather small (Cramer's $V=0.21$). The findings partly support the fourth hypothesis.

ANOVA and chi-square test did not reveal any differences between the students in their attitude components regarding their parents' formal education. These findings do not support the fifth hypothesis.

Discussion

Attitudes towards Formal Education, Non-Formal and Informal Learning between Different Study Groups

Differences in attitudes were found between students of different study groups. More favourable cognitive and affective components of attitudes were found between the students of educational sciences and humanities compared to the students of economics. Such findings can be ascribed to the fact that the students of educational sciences and humanities chose the teaching study programme. The results can be compared with those obtained in Senay Sen's research (2013) in which more positive attitudes towards learning were found among prospective technical teachers than among the prospective engineers.

More than 60% of the students in all three study groups have no plans to continue with formal education, non-formal and informal learning. However, more students of educational sciences and humanities have intentions to take part in all three forms of education/learning than the students of economics. Although in this research study the motives of the students belonging to different study groups were not explored, it can be assumed that motivation is a moderating variable. Namely, there are data that point to the finding that the students of economics have already been focused on economy and the study of economics is a logical continuation of the high school of economics or the family business. They also have a clearer idea of their employment opportunities than the students of humanities (Potočnik, 2009). So, it is understandable that they are more eager to start working or looking for a job and their further education is probably seen as interfering (in time and finances) with their employment plans. The same research revealed that the students of humanities had chosen their studies due to their general wish to study and they reported to be less optimistic regarding their employment chances. So these may be the reasons why these students, although not in large numbers, see additional education as a possibility to gain a better chance for employment.

When it comes to the teaching intentions, the results show that the students of humanities and educational sciences share a similar high level of interest in formal teaching, while the students of economy do not share this interest. The reason for such a finding is certainly related to the choice of the study programme. The students of economics are not expected to be teachers, so they are not offered courses designed to develop teaching competences. Although the dominant plan in all three study groups is not to teach non-formally and informally, more students of humanities have plans for both of them, followed by the students of educational sciences, while the same plans are least present among the economics students. These results reflect the previously discussed reasons for formal teaching and its relation to the choice of study. It can be assumed that the students of the teaching programmes see it as a vocation, regardless of its formal employment status. Besides, it is not unimportant to keep in mind that non-formal and informal teaching can be seen as sources of (additional) income.

Attitudes towards Formal Education, Non-Formal and Informal Learning Regarding Study Year, Knowledge, Income and Parents' Formal Education

Senior students have more favourable cognitive and affective attitude components towards the informal learning compared to the initial years of study. It was expected that the students of senior years would have more favourable attitudes towards learning and education of any type, because they have already invested more time, involvement and finances in education and learning and they already have the results, as they have the bachelor degree. However, it seems that their cognitive and affective attitude components towards formal education and non-formal learning remain stable across the study years. It can be that they see more advantages from the informal learning as they approach the end of their studies because they see it as more practical and related to the working, non-academic environment. Results further show that the higher the study year, the higher the intention to continue with formal education. One third of the students have these intentions in their final years, which is double compared to the first year of study. It may be that the students of the final years still do not feel competent for work, or they do not expect to find a job, so pursuing further formal education may seem like an advantage later at the labour market. Although most students express no intentions for non-formal and informal learning, those who do are the students of the senior study years. Students of the final years may have realised, either through their experience, or through the courses at the university, what the benefits of non-formal and informal learning are (e.g. cheaper, catered to their needs, more accessible, etc.) compared to first year students. When it comes to teaching, students of the final two years have more intentions to teach formally and informally than the students of the first three years. Students do not differ in their plans to teach non-formally. Being closer to the labour market, students of the highest years see themselves more in their vocational role (i.e. teachers providing formal education) than their colleagues at the starting years. Also, they probably feel more competent to be informal teachers than the younger students.

Students with a higher *level of knowledge* about formal education, non-formal and informal learning have a more favourable cognitive and affective attitude component towards all three forms of education and learning. Although the majority of students have no plans for formal education, non-formal and informal learning, more students with a higher level of knowledge about them express the wish to continue with all three types of education/learning, compared to the students with a lower level of knowledge. The same finding refers to the participants' plans for formal and informal teaching, but no differences were found for non-formal teaching. The rationale is that the knowledge about these types of education and learning is related to identifying the opportunities they can bring. These findings are supported by the results of Kara's (2010) study.

Students from the higher *income* groups have slightly more favourable cognitive and affective attitude component towards formal education than the students from

the lowest income group. No differences were found in the students' attitudes towards non-formal and informal learning. Financial resources can be seen as one of the important alleviating factors for the continuation of formal education. In the period when the research was conducted (January – April 2013), the average monthly paid off net earnings per person in paid employment in the legal entities in the Republic of Croatia amounted to 5,493 kn (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2013). The majority of students (54.4%) estimated their family monthly incomes as fitting into the categories higher than the country's average. Such estimation of family incomes in the students' population is in line with the previous research in Croatia (Puzić et al., 2006). So, this range of the monthly income is narrower among university students and it does not provide the possibility to examine the situation in the whole population. Students with lower incomes expressed more intentions to learn informally compared with students with higher earnings. It is possible that, due to the less favourable economical situation, students from families with lower earnings intend to learn informally because that can be cheaper than non-formal learning (e.g. courses) or formal education. Any form of postgraduate studies in Croatia (e.g. master or doctoral studies) has fees (at least an average monthly salary per semester), and unless the employer pays for it, the student has to find the resources to cover it.

No differences were found between the students in their attitude components regarding their *parents' formal education*. The most probable reason for this finding is a narrow distribution of formal education levels of both parents: 71% of fathers and 65% of mothers in this sample had high school education. Data for the whole population also show that the majority of male and female participants have high school as the highest level of finished education (60% of male and of 45.9% female participants), and fewer participants have other levels of formal education (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). It is obvious that students come from families with higher formal parental education than the general population. As mentioned in the previous section, there is evidence that the students' population is already selected by a higher socio-economical status (Bjelajac & Pilić, 2005; Puzić et al., 2006; Ilišin, 2009; Pavić & Vukelić, 2009). Since this range of the parents' formal education is narrower among university students, it does not provide the possibility to examine the situation in the whole population.

Conclusion

Although lifelong learning has many advantages, according to some research studies (e.g. McGivney, 1990) there is a relatively small number of adults who are involved in it and this is mostly because of low self-esteem, lack of confidence in the education system and the fear of failure. The study whose aim was to examine the awareness and students' attitudes on lifelong learning, including lifelong learning policy in the EU, suggests that students do not have the necessary knowledge about one of the key factors in the socio-economic development in the world today and that they have little

or no knowledge of the underlying concepts, principles, programmes, models and problems of lifelong learning (Lukenda, 2007). As some researchers describe (Cendon et al., 2009), the universities and the society should promote lifelong learning within the global community and this should contribute to a better knowledge-based society and facilitate the employment of young people.

There are some limitations in this research and some recommendations can be made for future research. Attitudes were explored only among the given three study groups, so it would be interesting to widen it to other study groups (e.g. technical, natural sciences, art-related, etc.). As it was already mentioned, monthly income and parents' formal education span was narrow, so it could not reveal the real relationship with the attitudes. Also, it would be useful to know some additional information on parents' non-formal and informal learning as this would allow more comparisons. And finally, students' motivation is a variable that probably moderates the results, so it would be worth including it into further research on the topic.

Results of this research contribute to the European Commission model (2001) based on the Coombs and Ahmed's model (1974) by showing how study group, study year, knowledge and income can be related to it, when students' attitudes are explored. In the aspect of the necessity and usefulness of lifelong learning it points to at least two implications: (1) it is necessary to raise awareness for the need of lifelong learning (among students), and (2) it is needed to offer more visible, useful and accessible lifelong learning opportunities (for young adults).

References

- Bjelajac, S., & Pilić, Š. (2005). Odnos identiteta i želje za priključenjem Europskoj Uniji studenata nastavnčkih studija u Splitu. *Revija za sociologiju*, 36 (1-2), 33–54.
- Cendon, E., Vizek Vidović, V., & Završki, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Lifelong learning in university context – Multiple Perspectives*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Colardyn, D., & Bjornavold, J. (2004). Validation of Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Learning: Policy and practices in EU Member States. *European Journal of Education*, 39(1), 69-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0141-8211.2004.00167.x>
- Colley, H., Hodkinson Ph., & Malcolm, J. (2002). *Non-formal learning: Mapping the conceptual terrain. A Consultation Report*. Leeds: University of Leeds Lifelong Learning Institute.
- Coombs, P., & Ahmed, M. (1974). *Attacking Rural Poverty. How non-formal education can help*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Commission of the European Communities (2006). *Adult learning: It is never too late to learn*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

- Croatian Bureau of Statistics (2011). *Population aged 15 and over by educational attainment and sex, 1961 – 2011 censuses*. /online/. Retrieved on 21st February 2014 from http://www.dzs.hr/default_e.htm.
- Croatian Bureau of Statistics (2013). *First release: average monthly paid off net earnings of persons in paid employment for April 2013*. L (9.1.1/4) /online/. Retrieved on 24th February 2014 from http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2013/09-01-01_04_2013.htm.
- European Commission (2001). *Communication: Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. /online/. Retrieved on 16th September 2013 from <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/education/life/index.htm>.
- European Commission (2012). *Key Data on Education in Europe 2012*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Government of the Republic of Croatia (2013). *Strategy of Education, Science and Technology*. (proposal). /online/. Retrieved on 15th October 2013 from http://www.vlada.hr/hr/dodatno/javna_rasprava_strategija_obrazovanja_znanosti_i_tehnologije.
- Ilišin, V. (2009). Skica za sociološki portret zagrebačkih studenata: uvod u istraživanje hrvatskih studenata danas. *Sociologija i prostor*, 46(3-4), 221-240.
- Jarvis, P. (2007). *Globalization, Lifelong Learning and the Learning Society: Sociological Perspectives*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Jokić, B., & Ristić-Dedić, Z. (2010). Razlike u školskom uspjehu učenika trećih i sedmih razreda osnovnih škola u Republici Hrvatskoj s obzirom na spol učenika i obrazovanje roditelja: populacijska perspektiva. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, 17 (3), 345-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3935/rsp.v17i3.954>
- Kara, A. (2010). The effect of a 'Learning theories' unit on students' attitudes toward learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (3), 100-113.
- Lukenda, A. (2007). Stavovi studenata nastavničkih studija Sveučilišta u Mostaru o cjeloživotnom obrazovanju. In V. Previšić, N. N. Šoljan, & N. Hrvatić, (Eds.), *Pedagogija – prema cjeloživotnom obrazovanju i društvu znanja*, 2, (pp. 365-380). Zagreb: Hrvatsko pedagoško društvo.
- Matković, T., Tomić, I., & Vehovec, M. (2010). Efikasnost nasuprot dostupnosti? O povezanosti troškova i ishoda studiranja u Hrvatskoj. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, 17 (2), 215-237.
- McGivney, V. (1990). *Education's for Other People. Access to education for non-participant adults*. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.
- Pavić, Ž., & Vukelić, K. (2009). Socijalno podrijetlo i obrazovne nejednakosti: istraživanje na primjeru osječkih studenata i srednjoškolaca. *Revija za sociologiju*, 40 (1-2), 53-70.
- Potočnik, D. (2009). Izbor studija: motivacijska struktura upisa i očekivani uspjeh u pronalasku željenog posla. *Sociologija i prostor*, 46 (3-4), 265-284.
- Puzić, S., Doolan, K., & Dolenc, D. (2006). Socijalna dimenzija 'Bolonjskog procesa' i (ne) jednakost šansi za visoko obrazovanje: neka hrvatska iskustva. *Sociologija sela*, 44 (2-3), 243-260.
- Rajić, V., & Lapat, G. (2010). Stavovi budućih učitelja primarnog obrazovanja o cjeloživotnom učenju i obrazovanju. *Andragoški glasnik*, 14 (1), 57-64.

- Reić Ercegovac, I., & Jukić, T. (2008). Zadovoljstvo studijem i motivi upisa na studij. *Napredak*, 149 (3), 283-295.
- Senay Sen, H. (2013). The attitudes of university students towards learning. *International Journal of Academic Research Part B*, 5 (4), 338-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7813/2075-4124.2013/5-4/B.50>
- Yang, J., & Valdés-Cotera, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Conceptual evolution and policy developments in lifelong learning*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.

Marlena Plavšić

Department of Humanities
Juraj Dobrila University of Pula
I. M. Ronjgov 1, 52100 Pula, Croatia
marlena.plavsic@unipu.hr

Marina Diković

Department of Educational Sciences
Juraj Dobrila University of Pula
I. M. Ronjgov 1, 52100 Pula, Croatia
mdikovic@unipu.hr

Stavovi studentica i studenata prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju

Sažetak

Svrha istraživanja bila je pridonijeti modelu formalnoga obrazovanja, neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja (Coombs i Ahmed, 1974; European Commission, 2001) ispitivanjem stavova studenata i studentica prema tim trima vrstama obrazovanja i učenja. Skalu stavova prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju ispunjavala su 553 studentice i studenta odgojno obrazovnih znanosti, humanističkih znanosti i ekonomije. Prikupljeni su i podaci o njihovoj godini studija, znanju o te tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja, mjesečnim prihodima u obitelji i formalnom obrazovanju roditelja. Obrada je uključivala faktorsku analizu, ANOVA-u, t-test, Kruskal-Wallis test, Mann-Whitney test i hi-kvadrat. Povoljniji stavovi pronađeni su među studenticama i studentima odgojno-obrazovnih i humanističkih znanosti i među onima s više znanja o tim vrstama obrazovanja i učenja. Neki su stavovi povoljniji na završnim godinama studija, a neki su stabilni tijekom studija. Studentice i studenti iz obitelji s višim primanjima imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava prema formalnom obrazovanju u usporedbi s onima koji imaju najniža primanja. Nisu pronađene razlike u stavovima studenata i studentica s obzirom na formalno obrazovanje njihovih roditelja. Dane su implikacije vezane uz cjeloživotno učenje.

Ključne riječi: cjeloživotno učenje; godina studija; mjesečna primanja; vrsta studija; znanje.

Uvod

Osoba neće biti u stanju ispuniti životne izazove ako ne postane cjeloživotni učenik/učenica, a društvo neće biti održivo ako ne postane društvo učenja. Cjeloživotno učenje je kombinacija procesa koje se događa tijekom života u kojemu osoba u cijelosti – tijelom (genetski, fizički i biološki razvoj) i umom (znanje, vještine, stavovi, vrijednosti, emocije, vjerovanja i osjetila) – doživljava društvene situacije. Tada ta osoba kognitivno, emocionalno ili praktično (ili u bilo kojoj kombinaciji) pretvara usvojeni

sadržaj i uključuje ga u osobnu biografiju koja rezultira kontinuiranim promjenama i iskustvom (Jarvis, 2007). Radi razvijanja cjeloživotnoga učenja, UNESCO je uvijek bio usmjeren na obrazovanje kao pravo i sredstvo za poštivanje i ispunjavanje mnogih drugih prava, kao i za postizanje niza međunarodno dogovorenih razvojnih ciljeva. Cjeloživotno učenje počiva na povezanosti učenja i življenja – vodoravno u širokom obiteljskom, kulturalnom kontekstu i u kontekstu zajednice, studija, posla, slobodnoga vremena, i vertikalno u sklopu cjelokupnoga života pojedinca, od rođenja do starosti (Yang i Valdés-Cotera, 2011). Obrazovanje odraslih važan je dio cjeloživotnoga učenja (Commission of the European Communities, 2006). Stoga se na europskoj razini sve više govori o produljenju obveznoga obrazovanja (European Commission, 2012).

Rajić i Lapat (2010) opisuju istraživanja o cjeloživotnom učenju, a proveli su istraživanje među studentima/studenticama – budućim nastavnicima/nastavnicama. Više od njih 80% planira neformalno učenje, više od 50% namjerava nastaviti s informalnim učenjem, a jedna trećina studenata/studentica planira nastaviti s formalnim obrazovanjem. Zaključili su da je potrebno više istraživanja o cjeloživotnom učenju i brzo provođenje zaključaka kako bi se jaz između očekivanja društva i individualnih obilježja sveo na minimum.

Hrvatska su sveučilišta i dalje uglavnom orijentirana na osnovnu djelatnost: nastavu i istraživanje. Dakle, „potreba za ponovnim promišljanjem o položaju sveučilišta u odnosu na cjeloživotno učenje i kontinuirano obrazovanje od posebne je važnosti za tranzicijske zemlje koje moraju uhvatiti korak s modernizacijom ekonomije te postati kompatibilne i konkurentne u globalnom društvu” (Cendon i sur., 2009, str. 7).

Obrazovanje i modeli učenja

Nastavnici i nastavnice trebali bi posjedovati različite kognitivne i socijalne vještine, kao i vještine planiranja i realizacije poučavanja da bi odredili ishode učenja, vodili razred i pridonosili razvoju društvene zajednice. Važno je standardizirati temeljne stručne kompetencije i podizati kvalitetu usavršavanja svih kategorija budućih nastavnika/nastavnica (Government of the Republic of Croatia, 2013).

Colley i suradnici (2002) opisuju osam modela formalnoga obrazovanja, neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja. Autori su analizirali literaturu koja iznosi razlike između te tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja. Analiza je pokazala širok spektar mišljenja i ukazala na značaj konteksta koji utječe na oblik klasifikacije. Model Europske komisije (European Commission, 2001) temelji se na modelu koji su uveli Coombs i Ahmed 1974. godine. Radi važnosti obrazovanja za sadašnje i buduće generacije, njihova studija i istraživanje odnosi se na neformalne programe zbog povećanja vještina i produktivnosti svih osoba u svakodnevnome životu. Oni opisuju tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja kako slijedi: a) formalno obrazovanje je visoko institucionaliziran, kronološki stupnjevan i hijerarhijski strukturiran „obrazovni sustav”, i to u rasponu od osnovne škole do sveučilišnih razina, b) neformalno učenje je bilo koja organizirana, sustavna, obrazovna aktivnost izvan okvira formalnoga sustava radi pružanja odabranih vrsta

učenja pojedinim podskupinama u populaciji, odraslima i djeci, c) informalno učenje je cjeloživotni proces u kojem svaka osoba stječe i akumulira znanja, vještine, stavove i poglede iz svakodnevnoga iskustva i izloženosti okolini – kod kuće, na poslu, u igri. Općenito, informalno učenje je neorganizirano i često nesustavno; ali ipak čini velik udio cjeloživotnoga učenja – uključujući čak i „školovane“ osobe (Coombs i Ahmed, 1974).

Dokument Europske unije, model Europske komisije (European Commission, 2001) definira tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja na sljedeći način:

- a) Formalno obrazovanje: učenje uglavnom pruža obrazovna ili stručna institucija, strukturirano je (u kontekstu ciljeva učenja, vremena učenja ili podrške učenju) i vodi do svjedodžbe. Formalno obrazovanje je namjerno iz učenikove perspektive.
- b) Neformalno učenje: učenje koje se ne daje u obrazovnoj ili stručnoj ustanovi i obično ne dovodi do svjedodžbe. Ono je, međutim, strukturirano (u smislu ciljeva učenja, vremena učenja ili podrške učenju). Neformalno učenje je namjerno iz učenikove perspektive.
- c) Informalno učenje: učenje koje proizlazi iz svakodnevnih životnih aktivnosti vezanih uz rad, obitelj i slobodno vrijeme. Nije strukturirano (u smislu ciljeva učenja, vremena učenja ili podrške učenju) i obično ne dovodi do svjedodžbe. Informalno učenje može biti namjerno, ali u većini slučajeva to je nenamjerno (ili „slučajno“) (European Commission, 2001).

Važnost te klasifikacije i opisa prepoznali su i drugi autori (Colardyni i Bjornavold, 2004) jer ta klasifikacija spominje europske napore radi uspostave sustava vrednovanja neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja.

Polazišne točke za istraživanje o trima vrstama obrazovanja i učenja

S obzirom na to da učenikova prva odgovornost jest razvijati razumijevanje i znanje, prilično je važno znati kakav stav osoba ima prema učenju (Senay Sen, 2013). Poučavanje je jedna od esencijalnih profesija za opstanak društva. Nastavničke kompetencije su vrlo važne i nastavnici/nastavnice moraju biti osposobljeni promicati razvoj kompetencija učenika/učenica. Očekuje se da će pozitivni stavovi osigurati učiteljima stjecanje vještina za cjeloživotno učenje (Kara, 2010). S obzirom na to da su budući nastavnici i nastavnice potencijalni promotori cjeloživotnoga učenja, važno je istražiti njihove stavove prema različitim oblicima obrazovanja i učenja. Opsežna je povijest cjeloživotnoga učenja i konceptata formalnoga obrazovanja, neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja, a istraživanje literature ukazuje na brojne članke koji definiraju koncept. Međutim, stavovi i njihova moguća povezanost s ostalim varijablama, kao što su: znanje, godina studija, formalno obrazovanje roditelja i prihodi u kućanstvu do danas nisu istraženi. Senay Sen (2013) je provela istraživanje među studentima/studenticama – budućim inženjerima/inženjerkama i potencijalnim nastavnicima/nastavnicama tehničkoga odgoja prema učenju. Rezultati su ukazali na pozitivne

stavove prema učenju obje grupe. Međutim, razina stava budućih nastavnika/nastavnica tehničkoga odgoja prema učenju i otvorenosti za učenje pokazala se većom od stava budućih inženjera/inženjerki.

Rijetka su istraživanja u Hrvatskoj koja se odnose na motivaciju studenata/studentica i njihovo zadovoljstvo u učenju (Reić Ercegovac i Jukić, 2008). Istraživanje koje je provela Potočnik (2009) o motivima upisa na studij pokazuje da su glavni razlozi za upis na studij ekonomije nastavak srednjoškolskoga obrazovanja i želja za nastavljanjem obiteljskoga posla, a da su glavni razlozi za upis na Filozofski fakultet neuspjeh u području prirodnih znanosti i općenito želja za studiranjem. Studenti/studentice društvenih znanosti pokazuju optimističniji stav prema pronalaženju posla za razliku od studenata/studentica humanističkih znanosti, što se i očekivalo, jer je uobičajeno da se humanističke struke u Hrvatskoj teže zapošljavaju. Studenti humanističkih studija iskazali su gotovo dvostruko lošiji položaj struke i visoku nezaposlenost u odnosu na studente društvenih zanimanja – kao glavne razloge za očekivani neuspjeh zapošljavanja u njihovoj struci.

Neka istraživanja (Kara, 2010) upućuju na to da su studenti s boljim razumijevanjem procesa učenja i oni koji su bolji u sagledavanju prirode učenja, bili otvoreniji za učenje i imali veća očekivanja o tome što bi se učenjem moglo dobiti.

Iako recentnija istraživanja navode smanjenje nejednakosti u pristupu visokom obrazovanju među novijim generacijama, utvrđena je povezanost socio-ekonomskoga statusa roditelja i uspjeha u dostizanju bilo koje razine obrazovanja, uključujući i visoko obrazovanje. Na primjer, jedno istraživanje među hrvatskim studentima nižega socio-ekonomskoga statusa pokazuje da kada studenti/studentice završe visoko obrazovanje, u prosjeku, to čine brže od ostalih (Matković i sur., 2010). Socio-ekonomski status roditelja, prema Raymondu Boudonu, utječe na školski uspjeh na dva načina. Niže akademsko postignuće kod djece nižega socio-ekonomskoga statusa u obveznom obrazovanju primarni je učinak koji ograničava njihove daljnje obrazovne mogućnosti. Međutim, kada je školski uspjeh jednak, radi razlike u resursima i ambicijama, djeca roditelja višega socio-ekonomskoga statusa imaju veću vjerojatnost da će upisati (a potom završiti) višu razinu obrazovanja, koje Boudon zove sekundarni učinak (Matković i sur., 2010). Jokić i Ristić-Dedić (2010) ukazuju na izražen učinak obrazovanja roditelja na obrazovno postignuće. To ponovno potvrđuje da obrazovni sustav uglavnom potvrđuje postojeće obrasce društvene strukture.

Svrha rada

Svrha rada je pridonijeti prethodno opisanom modelu formalnoga obrazovanja, neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja (Coombs i Ahmed, 1974; European Commission, 2001), i to istraživanjem stavova prema te tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja i moguće povezanosti s ostalim varijablama, kao što su znanje, godina studija, formalno obrazovanje roditelja i mjesečna primanja. Ciljevi istraživanja bili su: (1) ispitati stavove prema formalnom obrazovanju te neformalnom i informalnom učenju među

studenticama i studentima humanističkih znanosti, odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti i ekonomije te (2) istražiti ima li razlika u tim stavovima s obzirom na godinu studija, znanje o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju, mjesečne prihode i formalno obrazovanje roditelja.

Sljedeće hipoteze su povezane s prvim ciljem:

Hipoteza 1: Studentice i studenti humanističkih i odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti imaju povoljnije stavove prema sve tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja u usporedbi sa studenticama i studentima ekonomije.

Sljedeće su hipoteze postavljene uz drugi cilj:

Hipoteza 2: Stavovi prema tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja povoljniji su kako se povećavaju godine studija.

Hipoteza 3: Studentice i studenti koji znaju više o tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja imaju povoljnije stavove prema tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja.

Hipoteza 4: Stavovi prema tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja povoljniji su kako se povećavaju mjesečni prihodi.

Hipoteza 5: Stavovi prema tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja povoljniji su kako se povećavaju stupnjevi formalnoga obrazovanja roditelja.

Metoda

Sudionice i sudionici

U istraživanju je sudjelovalo 553 studentica i studenata Sveučilišta Jurja Dobrile u Puli (Republika Hrvatska), 130 muškoga (23,5%) i 423 ženskoga roda (76,5%). Dobni se raspon kretao od 18 do 36 godina. Stratificirani uzorak obuhvaćao je 33,3% svih studenata i studentica Sveučilišta. S Odjela za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti bilo je 117 (21,2%) studentica i studenata (smjerovi: predškolski odgoj i razredna nastava), a 144 (26%) s Odjela za humanističke znanosti (smjerovi: povijest i jezici). Studentice i studenti tih odjela biraju predmete za stjecanje pedagoških kompetencija koje ih pripremaju za nastavu iz predmeta koje studiraju. Treća je skupina uključivala 292 (52,8%) studentice i studenta s Odjela za ekonomiju i turizam. Postoci poduzoraka odražavaju postotke populacije na Sveučilištu: odgojno-obrazovne znanosti imaju udio od 19%, humanističke od 22,1%, a studenti s ekonomije 59% od ukupne populacije studentica i studenata na Sveučilištu. S obzirom na godinu studija 211 (38,2%) ih je na 1. godini, 113 (20,4%) na 2., 128 (23,1%) na 3. i 101 (18,3%) studentica i student studiraju na 4. i 5. godini.

Opis varijabli

Budući da u literaturi nije bilo dostupnih skala stavova vezanih uz tu temu, za ovo su istraživanje konstruirane tri skale za ispitivanje stavova prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju. One su se sastojale iz dijela koji se odnosio na kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava i drugoga koji se odnosio na bihevioralnu komponentu. Skale su konstruirane na temelju pregleda literature i

konzultacija sa stručnjacima i stručnjakinjama iz toga područja: skala stavova prema formalnom obrazovanju sastojala se od 45 čestica, ona prema neformalnom učenju od 17, a skala stavova koja se odnosi na informalno učenje sastojala se od 15 čestica. Nakon primjene one su revidirane i na temelju toga izbačene su čestice s koeficijentom diskriminacije manjim od 0,25. U konačnoj verziji skala koja se odnosi na formalno obrazovanje uključivala je 15 čestica, skala koja se odnosila na neformalno učenje sadržavala je 9, a skala vezana uz informalno učenje 8 čestica. Primjer čestice vezane uz kognitivnu komponentu stava: *Neformalno učenje je fleksibilno, odgovara interesima onih koji uče*. Primjer čestice vezane uz afektivnu komponentu stava: *Imam velik osjećaj ponosa zbog postignuća u informalnom učenju*. Mogući odgovori ponuđeni su na petostupanjskoj skali Likertova tipa, od *uopće se ne slažem* (1) do *u potpunosti se slažem* (5). Viši rezultati na skali odnose se na povoljnije stavove. Ukupan je rezultat na skali kognitivne i afektivne komponente za formalno obrazovanje mjeren Guttmanovom Λ^2 bio 0,83, za neformalno učenje 0,71 i za informalno učenje 0,74. Bihevioralna komponenta ispitivana je kao namjera za buduće formalno obrazovanje, neformalno i informalno učenje, za formalno, neformalno i informalno poučavanje. Rezultati su prikupljeni kao *Da* i *Ne* odgovori.

Konstruktna valjanost za svaku skalu stavova ispitana je faktorskom analizom. Za sve tri skale rezultati KMO testa (0,743 za formalno obrazovanje, 0,741 za neformalno učenje i 0,759 za informalno) i Bartlettova testa (koji je značajan) dopuštaju daljnju analizu. Provedena je analiza glavnih komponenti s varimax rotacijom. Za svaku su skalu zadana po dva faktora s eigen vrijednostima iznad 1 za svaki faktor, te su oni opisani kao kognitivna i afektivna komponenta. U skali koja mjeri stavove prema formalnom obrazovanju ti faktori objašnjavaju 43 % varijance; u skali stavova prema neformalnom učenju objašnjavaju 45,40 %, a u skali prema informalnom učenju 52,86 % varijance. U određivanju faktora uzeta je najmanja razina opterećenja od 0,20. Razlika u faktorskim opterećenjima za iste čestice između dva faktora iznosila je najmanje 0,10. Kognitivna subskala u skali stavova prema formalnom obrazovanju uključivala je 9 čestica (faktorska opterećenja variraju između 0,48 i 0,84), a afektivna 6 čestica (faktorska opterećenja variraju između 0,58 i 0,80). Kognitivna subskala u skali stavova prema neformalnom učenju uključivala je 6 čestica (faktorska opterećenja variraju između 0,46 i 0,69), a afektivna komponenta uključivala je 3 čestice (faktorska opterećenja variraju između 0,75 i 0,82). Kognitivna subskala stavova prema informalnom učenju uključivala je 5 čestica (faktorska opterećenja variraju između 0,34 i 0,78), a afektivna komponenta uključivala je 2 čestice (s faktorskim opterećenjem 0,80 i 0,81).

Za provjeru znanja o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju bio je primijenjen ispit. Sastojao se od 15 tvrdnji (pr. *Formalno obrazovanje provodi se u ustanovama.*) s tri moguća odgovora: *Točno / Netočno / Nisam siguran – Nisam sigurna*. Svaki je odgovor mogao dobiti 1, 2 ili 3 boda, pa je ukupni rezultat mogao varirati od 15 do 45. Viši rezultat odnosi se na bolje znanje. S obzirom na rezultate

ispita, studentice i studenti bili su podijeljeni u dvije skupine: oni/one sa slabijim znanjem postigli su manje od $M - 1 SD$ ($N=65$), a oni/one s boljim znanjem postigli su više od $M + 1 SD$ ($N=78$).

Opći biografski podaci bili su prikupljeni s nekoliko pitanja vezanih uz dob, spol, godinu studija i studijsku grupu. Mjesečni prihodi obitelji ispitivani su uobičajenom skalom (korištenom u hrvatskim istraživanjima) s pet stupnjeva: (a) 2.000 kn; (b) 2.001 – 4.000 kn; (c) 4.001 – 6.000 kn; (d) 6.001 – 10.000 kn; i (e) više od 10.000 kn. Formalno obrazovanje roditelja, zasebno za oca i majku, nudilo je četiri odgovora koji su se odnosili na najviši završeni stupanj obrazovanja: osnovna škola, srednja škola, viša i visoka škola, magisterij i doktorat.

Postupak

Podaci su prikupljeni u većem istraživanju u kojem su ispitivani stavovi i znanje studentica i studenata vezani uz formalno obrazovanje, neformalno i informalno učenje. Upitnici su bili primijenjeni anonimno i uz njihovu usmenu suglasnost. Najprije je bio primijenjen ispit znanja. Nakon što su prikupljeni upitnici, studentice i studenti dobili su informacije o tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja kako bi ih mogli prepoznati u sljedećem koraku u kojemu su dobili, između ostaloga, skale stavova prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju. Za spajanje upitnika iz obje faze koristio se sustav šifriranja.

Rezultati

Stavovi prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju među različitim studijskim grupama

Da bi se ispitalo postoje li razlike u stavovima prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju među studenticama i studentima humanističkih, odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti i ekonomije (prvi cilj), provedena su dva postupka: (1) *jednosmjerna ANOVA* za kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava među tri studijske grupe i (2) *hi-kvadrat test* za biheioralnu komponentu stava između njih. Efekt učinka izračunat je kao koeficijent Cohenov *d*. Rezultati ANOVE prikazani su u Tablici 1.

Tablica 1

Rezultati u Tablici 1 pokazuju da su najčešće razlike u kognitivnoj i afektivnoj komponenti pronađene između studentica i studenata ekonomije i studentica i studenata s odgojno-obrazovnih i humanističkih znanosti koji imaju povoljnije stavove. Efekt učinka je srednje vrijednosti. Tablica 2 prikazuje rezultate hi-kvadrat testa za biheioralnu komponentu između tri studijske grupe. Efekt učinka je izračunat kao koeficijent Cramerov *V*.

Tablica 2

Rezultati u Tablici 2 pokazuju da između 60 % i 90 % studentica i studenata svih grupa nema planove za nastavak formalnoga obrazovanja. Nešto više studentica i studenata odgojno obrazovnih znanosti ima namjere nastaviti s formalnim

obrazovanjem u usporedbi s onima s humanističkih znanosti i ekonomije. Više od 65% studentica i studenata ne planira nastaviti s neformalnim i informalnim učenjem, ali nešto više njih s humanističkih i odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti ima takve namjere u odnosu na studentice i studente ekonomije, ali razlika između njih je prilično mala u slučaju neformalnoga učenja (0,14). Kada je riječ o namjerama poučavanja, rezultati pokazuju da studentice i studenti humanističkih i odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti dijele podjednako visoko zanimanje za formalno poučavanje, za razliku od studenata i studentica ekonomije. Ta je razlika vrlo velika (0,81). Iako među svim ispitanima dominira nepostojanje namjere za neformalno i informalno poučavanje, najviše je onih s tom namjerom na Odjelu za humanističke znanosti, slijede oni s Odjela za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti, a najmanje namjera imaju oni s Odjela za ekonomiju. Razlike među grupama su umjerene. Nalazi potvrđuju prvu hipotezu.

Stavovi prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju s obzirom na studijsku godinu, znanje, primanja i formalno obrazovanje roditelja

Da bi se ispitale moguće razlike u studentskim stavovima s obzirom na godinu studija, znanje o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju, mjesečne prihode u obitelji te formalno obrazovanje roditelja (drugi cilj) i da bi se provjerile četiri postavljene hipoteze, ponovno su provedena dva postupka: (1) *jednosmjerna ANOVA* i *t-test*, kao i *Kruskal-Wallis* i *Mann-Whitney test* za kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava među studenticama i studentima različitih godina studija, različitih razina znanja o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju, različitih mjesečnih prihoda, zatim različitoga formalnoga obrazovanja roditelja i (2) *hi-kvadrat test* za bihevioralnu komponentu stava između istih grupa. Efekt učinka je izračunat *Cohenov d* i *Pearsonov r*.

Prva se obrada rezultata dotakla stavova vezanih uz studijsku godinu. Rezultati *ANOVA-e*, *Kruskal-Wallis* testa i *Mann-Whitney* testa predstavljani su u Tablici 3.

Tablica 3

Rezultati u Tablici 3 pokazuju da studentice i studenti viših godina imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu prema informalnom učenju u usporedbi sa studentima i studenticama s početnih godina studija, no te su razlike male do umjerene. Tablica 4 pokazuje rezultate *hi-kvadrat* testa za bihevioralnu komponentu između studentica i studenata različitih godina studija.

Tablica 4

Rezultati u Tablici 4 prikazuju da se povećanjem godine studiranja povećava i namjera za nastavkom formalnoga obrazovanja, iako su razlike male. Premda većina studentica i studenata ne izražava namjeru za neformalnim učenjem, oni koji je ipak izražavaju nalaze se na završnim godinama studija. Studentice i studenti prve tri godine imaju malo ili nimalo namjere učiti informalno, a oni sa završnih godina izražavaju nešto više takvih namjera.

Kada je riječ o poučavanju, ponovno je namjera nešto veća na završnim godinama studija i to za formalno poučavanje. Nije pronađena razlika u planovima za neformalno poučavanje među godinama studija. Premda manje od polovine studentica i studenata namjerava poučavati informalno, više je onih na završnim godinama koji to namjeravaju. Nalazi djelomično podržavaju drugu hipotezu.

Tablica 5

Rezultati u Tablici 5 pokazuju da studentice i studenti s višom razinom znanja o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu prema sve tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja. Razlike su srednjih veličina.

Tablica 6

Rezultati u Tablici 6 pokazuju da, iako većina studentica i studenata ne planira daljnje formalno obrazovanje, neformalno i informalno učenje, nešto je više onih koji planiraju sve tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja među onima s više znanja o tim vrstama obrazovanja i učenja u odnosu na one s manje takvoga znanja. Kada je riječ o poučavanju, opet je više onih s većim znanjem koji izražavaju želju za formalnim i informalnim poučavanjem u usporedbi s onima koji znaju manje. Nisu pronađene razlike u planovima za neformalno poučavanje s obzirom na znanje o tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja. Ti nalazi potvrđuju treću hipotezu.

Tablica 7

Rezultati u Tablici 7 pokazuju da studentice i studenti s višim prihodima u obitelji imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava prema formalnom obrazovanju od studenata i studentica s najnižim prihodima. Nisu pronađene razlike u stavovima prema neformalnom i informalnom učenju.

Tablica 8

Rezultati u Tablici 8 pokazuju da je jedina razlika utvrđena u bihevioralnoj komponenti ona u planovima vezanim uz informalno učenje: studentice i studenti s manjim primanjima izražavaju više namjera da uče informalno u usporedbi sa studenticama i studentima s većim primanjima. Ta je razlika, međutim, mala (Cramerov $V = 0,21$). Nalazi djelomično potvrđuju četvrtu hipotezu.

ANOVA i hi-kvadrat nisu otkrili značajne razlike među stavovima studentica i studenata s obzirom na formalno obrazovanje njihovih roditelja. Ti pokazatelji ne podržavaju petu hipotezu.

Rasprava

Stavovi prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju među različitim studijskim grupama

Pronađene su razlike u stavovima s obzirom na studijske grupe. Povoljnije kognitivne i afektivne komponente stavova pronađene su među onima koji studiraju odgojno-

obrazovne i humanističke znanosti u odnosu na one koji studiraju ekonomiju. Takvi se nalazi mogu pripisati činjenici da oni koji studiraju odgojno-obrazovne i humanističke znanosti u više od 80 % slučajeva biraju nastavnički smjer. Rezultati se mogu usporediti s onima koje je dobila Senay Sen (2013) u kojem pozitivnije stavove prema učenju imaju buduće nastavnice i nastavnici u odnosu na inženjere i inženjerke.

Više od 60 % studenata i studentica u sve tri studijske grupe ne planira nastaviti s formalnim obrazovanjem, neformalnim i informalnim učenjem. Ipak, više je onih s odgojno- obrazovnih i humanističkih znanosti koji to planiraju, u odnosu na one s ekonomije. Iako se u ovom istraživanju nije ispitala motivacija za studij, može se pretpostaviti da je motivacija moderirajuća varijabla. Naime, postoje podaci koji ukazuju na to da su se studentice i studenti ekonomije usmjerili na studij ekonomije kao logičan nastavak srednje ekonomske škole ili obiteljskoga posla. Oni također vide svoje mogućnosti zapošljavanja boljima nego studentice i studenti humanističkih znanosti (Potočnik, 2009). Razumljivo je stoga da su oni spremniji za rad ili za traženje posla i da daljnje obrazovanje više vide kao nešto što bi interferiralo (vremenski i financijski) s njihovim planovima zapošljavanja. Isto je istraživanje otkrilo da su studentice i studenti humanističkih znanosti izabrali svoj studij zbog opće želje za studiranjem i izjavili su da su manje optimistični prema mogućnostima zapošljavanja. To, dakle, mogu biti razlozi zbog kojih studentice i studenti humanističkih znanosti, iako ne u velikim brojevima, daljnje obrazovanje vide kao priliku za zapošljavanje.

Kada je riječ o namjerama poučavanja, rezultati pokazuju da studentice i studenti humanističkih i odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti dijele slično visoko zanimanje za formalno poučavanje, a studentice i studenti ekonomije ne dijele te planove. Razlog za takav nalaz svakako je povezan s izborom studija. Od onih studenata koji studiraju ekonomiju ne očekuje se da budu nastavnici i nastavnice, pa im nije ni ponuđen program pedagoških kompetencija tijekom studija. Iako u sve tri studijske grupe dominira izostajanje namjere za neformalnim i informalnim poučavanjem, nešto je više studentica i studenata humanističkih znanosti zainteresirano za oboje. Slijede ih studentice i studenti odgojno-obrazovnih znanosti, a na začelju su studentice i studenti ekonomije. Ti rezultati odražavaju razloge o kojima je prethodno u raspravi bilo riječi vezano uz formalno poučavanje i izbor studija. Može se pretpostaviti da studentice i studenti nastavničkih programa studija vide poučavanje kao svoj poziv, bez obzira na to je li riječ o formalnom zaposlenju na nastavničkom mjestu ili o poučavanju u bilo kojem kontekstu. Osim toga, nije nevažno imati na umu da se na neformalno i informalno poučavanje može gledati kao na (dodatni) izvor prihoda.

Stavovi prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju s obzirom na studijsku godinu, znanje, primanja i formalno obrazovanje roditelja

Studentice i studenti *viših godina* imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava prema informalnom učenju u usporedbi s početnim godinama studija. Moglo

se očekivati da će studentice i studenti viših godina imati povoljnije stavove prema učenju i obrazovanju bilo koje vrste jer su oni već uložili više vremena, angažmana i financija u obrazovanje i učenje, a usto iza sebe imaju i postignute rezultate jer već imaju prvostupničku diplomu. Međutim, čini se da kognitivna i afektivna komponenta stava prema neformalnom učenju ostaje stabilna za vrijeme studija. Moguće je da studentice i studenti prepoznaju više prednosti od informalnoga učenja kako se približavaju završetku studija jer ga vide kao praktičnijega te povezanoga s poslom i neakadskim okruženjem. Rezultati nadalje pokazuju da s višom godinom studija raste i namjera da se nastavi s formalnim obrazovanjem. Trećina ispitanih iskazuje takve namjere na završnim godinama studija, što je dvostruko više u odnosu na prvu godinu studija. Moguće je da se studentice i studenti završnih godina još uvijek ne osjećaju kompetentnima za rad ili ne očekuju da će pronaći posao, pa im se daljnje formalno obrazovanje može činiti kao kasnija prednost na tržištu rada. Iako većina studentica i studenata ne iskazuje zainteresiranost za neformalno i informalno učenje, među onima koji ipak pokazuju zainteresiranost više je onih s najviših godina studija. Može se pretpostaviti da su oni spoznali, bilo iskustvom, bilo zahvaljujući nastavi na sveučilištu, koje su koristi od neformalnoga i informalnoga učenja (npr. jeftinije je, oblikovano je prema njihovim potrebama, pristupačnije je itd.) u usporedbi sa studenticama i studentima prve godine studija. Kada je riječ o poučavanju, ponovno studentice i studenti završnih godina studija više namjeravaju poučavati formalno i informalno za razliku od onih s prve tri godine. Za neformalno poučavanje nisu pronađene razlike s obzirom na godinu studija. Kako su bliže tržištu rada, studentice i studenti završnih godina vjerojatno se više mogu vidjeti u svojoj profesionalnoj ulozi (tj. kao nastavnici/nastavnice u školi) nego njihove kolegice i kolege na početnim godinama studija. Oni sa završnih godina vjerojatno se osjećaju kompetentnijima za informalno poučavanje od mlađih studentica i studenata.

Studentice i studenti s višom *razinom znanja* o formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju imaju povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava prema sve tri vrste obrazovanja i učenja. Iako većina studentica i studenata ne planira nastaviti s formalnim obrazovanjem, neformalnim i informalnim učenjem, više je onih koji to planiraju među onima koji imaju višu razinu znanja. Isto se odnosi na planove za formalno i informalno poučavanje, a za neformalno nisu pronađene razlike. Razlog za tu pretpostavku je da je znanje o vrstama obrazovanja i učenja povezano s prepoznavanjem mogućnosti i prilika koje te vrste obrazovanja i učenja mogu nuditi. Takvi se nalazi mogu potkrijepiti rezultatima koje je dobio Kara (2010).

Studentice i studenti iz grupe s višim *prihodima* imaju nešto povoljniju kognitivnu i afektivnu komponentu stava prema formalnom obrazovanju u usporedbi s onima koji imaju najniža primanja. Nisu pronađene razlike u stavovima prema neformalnom i informalnom učenju. Postojanje financijskih izvora može biti prepoznato kao jedan od važnih olakšavajućih čimbenika za nastavak formalnoga obrazovanja. U razdoblju

kad je istraživanje bilo provedeno (siječanj – travanj 2013. godine) prosječna mjesečna isplaćena neto plaća po zaposlenoj osobi pravnim osobama Republike Hrvatske iznosila je 5493 kune (Croatian Bureau for Statistics, 2013). Većina studentica i studenata (54,4%) u ovom istraživanju procjenjuje mjesečne prihode svoje obitelji u kategorijama višim od državnoga prosjeka. Takva procjena obiteljskih prihoda u studentskoj populaciji u skladu je s prethodnim istraživanjima u Hrvatskoj (Puzić i sur., 2006). Dakle, raspon mjesečnih prihoda uži je među studenticama i studentima i ne omogućuje provjeru situacije koja bi se odnosila na cijelu populaciju. Studentice i studenti s manjim primanjima iskazuju više namjere da uče informalno, u usporedbi s onima koji imaju više prihode. Moguće je da, uslijed slabije ekonomske situacije, studentice i studenti iz obitelji s nižim primanjima namjeravaju učiti informalno jer im može biti jeftinije nego neformalno (npr. tečajevi) ili formalno obrazovanje. Bilo koje poslijediplomsko obrazovanje u Hrvatskoj (npr. magisterij ili doktorat) se naplaćuju (u vrijednosti od najmanje jedne prosječne mjesečne plaće po semestru), te ako poslodavac ne snosi troškove školarine, studentica i student moraju pronaći načine kako ih pokriti.

Nisu pronađene razlike u stavovima među studenticama i studentima ovisno o *formalnom obrazovanju njihovih roditelja*. Najvjerojatniji razlog za to je tijesna raspodjela formalnoga obrazovanja oba roditelja: 71% očeva i 65% majki u ovom uzorku imaju najviše završeno srednjoškolsko obrazovanje. Podaci za cijelu populaciju u Hrvatskoj također pokazuju da muškarci i žene većinom imaju završenu srednju školu (60% muškaraca i 45,9% žena), a manje je onih s drugim razinama formalnoga obrazovanja (Croatian Bureau for Statistics, 2011). Očito je da studentice i studenti potječu iz obitelji s višim formalnim obrazovanjem roditelja nego opća populacija. Kao što je spomenuto u prethodnom odlomku, ima pokazatelja da je studentska populacija već selekcionirana prema višem socio-ekonomskom statusu (Bjelajac i Pilić, 2005; Puzić i sur., 2006; Ilišin, 2009; Pavić i Vukelić, 2009). Budući da je raspon formalnoga obrazovanja roditelja uži među studentskom populacijom, on ne omogućuje ispitivanje kakva bi situacija sa stavovima bila kada bi se u obzir uzeo reprezentativan uzorak cijele populacije.

Zaključak

Iako cjeloživotno učenje, prema nekim istraživanjima (npr. McGivney, 1990), ima mnoge prednosti, relativno je malen broj odraslih koji su uključeni u cjeloživotno učenje, uglavnom zbog niskoga samopoštovanja, nedostatka povjerenja u sustav obrazovanja i straha od neuspjeha. Istraživanje s ciljem ispitivanja razine svjesnosti i stavova studenata i studentica o cjeloživotnom učenju, uključujući politike cjeloživotnoga učenja u Europskoj uniji, pokazuje da studenti nemaju potrebna znanja o jednom od ključnih čimbenika društveno-ekonomskoga razvoja u današnjem svijetu i da imaju malo ili nimalo znanja o temeljnim konceptima, načelima, programima, modelima i problemima cjeloživotnoga učenja (Lukenda, 2007). Kao što neki

znanstvenici opisuju (Cendon i sur., 2009), sveučilišta i društvo trebaju poticati cjeloživotno učenje u sklopu globalne zajednice i to bi trebalo doprinijeti boljem društvu utemeljenom na znanju te olakšati zapošljavanje mladih ljudi.

Postoje neka ograničenja u ovom istraživanju, a neke preporuke mogu biti važne za buduća istraživanja. Stavovi su se istraživali samo među tri studijske grupe, pa bi ga bilo zanimljivo proširiti na druge (npr. studijske grupe tehničkih i prirodnih znanosti, umjetnosti i sl.). Kao što je već spomenuto, raspon mjesečnih primanja i formalnoga obrazovanja roditelja bio je uzak, pa ne može otkriti pravi odnos sa stavovima. Također, dodatne informacije o neformalnom i informalnom učenju roditeljima bi bile korisne za daljnje usporedbe. I na kraju, motivacija studenata je varijabla koja vjerojatno moderira rezultate, tako da bi je bilo korisno uključiti u daljnja istraživanja na tu temu.

Rezultati ovoga istraživanja pridonose modelu Europske komisije (2001) koji se temelji na modelu Coombsa i Ahmeda (1974), i to interpretacijom kako studijska grupa, godina studija, znanje i mjesečna primanja, kada se istražuju stavovi studenata, mogu biti povezani. Unatoč pozitivnim stavovima prema formalnom obrazovanju, neformalnom i informalnom učenju, studenti u ovom istraživanju izražavaju skromne planove za daljnje učenje i obrazovanje. S aspekta potrebe i korisnosti cjeloživotno učenje ukazuje na najmanje dvije implikacije: (1) neophodno je da bi se podigla svijest o potrebi cjeloživotnoga učenja (među studentima i studenticama) i (2) potrebno je ponuditi više vidljivih, korisnih i pristupačnih mogućnosti cjeloživotnoga učenja (mladima).