



ORIGINAL PAPER

**The Teaching Relation during the Period of the  
University Studies. Traditional, Modern and Postmodern  
Conceptions and Practices**

**Ecaterina Sarah Frăsineanu\***

**Abstract**

In this article we intend to highlight the specificity of the teaching interaction approach, relative to the knowledge relationships, communication, socio-emotional and influence/driving relationships between teachers-students. The hypothesis followed by us was that in academia are applied a number of conceptions and educational practices, which integrates both classical/traditional ideas on training and some trends, patterns, beliefs, behaviors that are part of the modern and postmodern pedagogical paradigms. In terms of application we presented ascertaining concrete data regarding the perceptions of a sample of students, to reveal the main features of the existing relationships in academia. The modern and postmodern perspective in training means a change to the pedagogical concepts where the relationship was dominated by focusing on the magister teacher, on the teaching or assessment activity. Nowadays, the focus on learning and students involves a concern for an optimum, professional networking with the students group and each individual, using a large range of strategies, by adapting the actions of the teacher to the needs of the learners, by addressing in an efficient manner the teaching communication and the management of the group of students. The teachers and students should address flexibly the teaching, learning assessment, and the opening and democratization of the relations are justified by the very primary mission undertaken in the university education, which is to generate and to transfer knowledge to society. As a result, in teaching networking the teacher is required to facilitate the acquiring of the autonomy and self-determination of students by studying, focusing on the capitalization of the human resources, promoting cooperation/support between teacher-students, students-students, and these goals are achieved by selecting and contextual application of some of the practices either traditional or modern/postmodern, depending on the value-utility or their demonstrated advantages in education.

**Keywords:** *relationship, influence, traditional, postmodern, flexibility*

---

\* Lecturer, PhD, University of Craiova, Department of Teachers Training, Pedagogy specialization, Phone: 0040251422567, Email: sarah.frasineanu@yahoo.com

## **Introduction/Conceptual Clarifications**

Education, as a complex activity of personality building is a product of the social relations, and training refers to the training conducted in an institutional framework, by a specialized staff, through teaching-learning-assessment. In essence, in the teaching activity we deal with a prospective process of inter-individual communication and management of interrelations and capitalization of numerous interactions and influences created. From psychological point of view, the interpersonal relationships are psychological links, conscious and direct among people (Zlate, 1997). Carl Rogers (1959) highlighted the characteristics of the human relationships: express the empathy and goodwill of the people; are authentic and congruent. From the pedagogical point of view the teaching relations, including those among teachers-students, have an ethical/moral and formative character (Iucu, 2005).

The interaction designates a reciprocal action of the educational partners and the influence – a relationship in which one's action affects other's action, “organized and structured educational action, exercised upon a person – student – aiming at the construction, formation or change of some behaviors, attitudes, etc.” (Ullich, 1995, as cited Iucu, 2005: 77). After Neculau, the influence means “sharing the authority and its reception” (1983: 104). The social perspective shifts the focus on the rankings of the statuses and roles that we encounter when setting up an educational group and during its functioning, the teacher having decisive role in stimulating the interactions. Adrian Neculau observed the fact that “the social field designates the structure and ecology of a human group, the network of the positions (statuses) occupied by actors within the organizations (institutions). Among the parties occupying positions in a field are established cooperative relationships (or adversity), are developed positive or negative interactions; «The forces» of the field are distributed in relation to the choices of the actors, their social representations, instruction level and type of the education received” (Neculau, 1997: 9).

## **The classical, modern and postmodern perspective**

In the traditional teaching or classical (seventeenth-nineteenth century approximately) it was operated with a conception in which the instruction revolved around the teaching activity as transmission of knowledge, skills, abilities, and the interventionism and dirigisme of the teacher was a priority. The fundamental ideas and most instruction practices, elaborated in Europe, first as philosophical ideas in Antiquity and then by setting, generalization of the education system in classes and lessons (Comenius, Herbart, Pestalozzi etc.), by organizing the education in universities – are part of this conception mostly, in which the pupil or the student was considered the subject of certain actions (organized) and influences (spontaneous) determined by the teacher and the teaching relationship was impersonal.

The term of modern in education must be understood by a reference to the current situation, advanced in comparison with the past, in which it was outlined prominent the concern for the improvement of the education systems and the key concept, to mark the difference with the traditional period, was the activism of the students and the concern for achieving the learning. From a philosophical point of view, the modernity (the nineteenth century and the period before 1989) attempted to legitimize, as shown by one of the

## **The Teaching Relation during the Period of the University Studies...**

theorists of the modernity and post-modernity period (Lyotard, 1997), the idea of empowerment by rationality. If most part of the history of education, as traditional period, the education was understood as transmission, the shift to the new teaching discipline was toward the regulation of the teachers-students relations, framing them in a series of formal regulations.

Going beyond the previous conception, the postmodern conception consists of bringing together and restructuring of some currents and different explanatory models, to give a post-competitive sense to inter-human relationships, to reinterpret the humanist ideas. As interactions and influences not to remain coercive, individualistic, it is required cooperation, negotiation, acceptance of the variants, diversity in relationships. In fact, the postmodernism is defined by the following characteristics (Macavei, 2001: 16-19): indeterminacy, ambivalence, originality, contextualism, decentralization, and the values promoted are: freedom, tolerance, altruism, creativity, performance, interculturalism. The most important pedagogical consequences in such a perspective are given by the interdisciplinary approach of the education contents, by change of strategies, relationship, educational communication, by the explicit concern for organizing the knowledge and learning.

Clive Beck (cited Stan, 2004: 23) stated that “the postmodernism is characterized by challenging the conventions, mixing styles (...), celebrating innovation and change, focus on the construction of reality”. Thus, one of the postulates of the postmodernism in education is the closeness of man with the real life, with all its difficulties and imbalances, to find solutions of optimal reconstruction (Joița, 2006: 27). The flexibility of way to relation means shifts from pedagogical relationships based on authority, guiding, power of teacher to relationships where is required the involvement, participation, accountability of the student while the teacher is a facilitator, relationships are open, of partnership, involving dialogue, mutual support; from the student waiting to be asked, who had to be conformist, it goes to the student who wants to be treated democratic, may negotiate, participate in decisions, can freely express, creative. The critics brought to the postmodernism must be taken into account; there is a number of paradoxes with relational impact: people manifest still much individualism in a global society, there are large blockages of interpersonal communication in a society in which we communicate more, more varied, more easily than in the past; should not be neglected the phenomenon of alienation in interpersonal relations, in a society where were removed the space and time limits in relationship.

E. Păun noted that “a large part of the subjectivity of students - how they learn, how they think, what they feel – is largely a black box for teachers” (Păun, 2002: 18). By this author, the educational relationship is an interaction with a dominant, symbolic and interpretive dimension. Also, “despite all the novelties introduced by the new education and various other contemporary psychological currents (Piaget's constructivism, strategic learning, differentiated learning, etc.) must be stated that the organizational situation that places the teacher in the heart of the action remains the dominant model of teaching” (Tardif and Lessard, cited Păun, 2002: 18).

However, identifying the three paradigms (traditional, modern, post-modern), understood as systems of pedagogical thinking accepted by the researchers (Kuhn, 1962; 2008), different from each other by the supported ideas and the way of emergence – does not imply their reciprocal exclusion; in practice, they may coexist. Thus, after an inventory of the main training systems based on communication (traditional and modern), on action, interaction or information, I. Cerghit advocated “in favor of pluralistic approach,

differentiation of the various solutions, able to bring more dynamism and flexibility to set up a possible antidote against slipping into a pedagogical conservatism, uniformity and routine in teaching activity” (Cerghit, 2002: 33).

### **The typology of interpersonal relationships**

The concerns for analyzing the teaching interactions are multiple: the field theory (Lewin, 1989), various traditional patterns that inventory especially the volume of the interactions determined by teachers (Flanders, 1952; Bellack and Davitz, 1963; Ferry, 1968; Postic, 1979; Lippit, 1967 as cited Joița, 2000: 127-134), the newer researches (Hamre and Pianta, 1999, 2001) which confirmed the importance of the support that a teacher can provide to his students, by a good relationships, by considering the personal characteristics, through exchange of information. The perspective of analysis is diverse: for example, Lippit and Fox (1967, as cited Joița, 2000: 133) showed that among actions/behaviors of the teacher there is a circular relationship, of continuous influence, certain actions being determined by the previous ones, while other studies have focused on the consequences of interpersonal relationships (Baker, Grant and Morlock, 2008 as cited in Gallagher, 2015) to show that teachers have an important role in the learning experience path of the students.

The main types of interpersonal relations are the relations of knowledge, communication, socio-emotional, influence/guiding: a) reciprocal-knowledge relations: The knowledge is the basis of some interactions with adaptive effects of the both parties. The object of perception consists of manifesting interpersonal features of the individual, situational-relevant traits and relational behaviors but this perception, and then, knowledge, based upon some methods, is selective. There are even negative effects to be kept in mind: the criticism, inertia/prejudice, stereotypes and false predictions, insufficient psycho-pedagogical knowledge; b) communication relations: The didactic communication is an exchange of information in which the roles are exchangeable and the feed-back is absolutely necessary. We note that teachers and students in higher education, by virtue of the nature of activity, benefit from increased communication skills, by openness, express orientation to questioning, debate, argumentation, explaining understanding. However, there are some blockages at the level of communication that need to be resolved: distortion, uneven involvement of teachers, students, the emergence of dissatisfactions, conflicts. Therefore, the essential conditions to meet are the accessibility intersection of repertoires, the existence of common language codes, feedback and the variation of the information flows and forms (verbal, non-verbal, trans-verbal); c) socio-emotional relations take into account the emotional involvement on the axis sympathy-antipathy, leading to closeness-eutrality or distance between teachers and students. Is known the fact that emotions have a high degree of disorganization, they could be positive or negative. Therefore, this type of relationship depends on the personality and emotional maturity level (which is not done at youth), and the normativity understood by teachers and students, the climate created or students reaction (as environment). Iucu (2005) showed that the influence process depends on a number of factors, including socio-affective relations, student`s perception by the teacher, the usage of the influence and the degree of the individualization of strategies. The same author observed an interesting aspect: the emotional reaction is independent of the professional skills of the teacher; d) the relations of influence or guiding not only depend on the ability to influence, but also on the hierarchy created by the statutes and roles stated

## **The Teaching Relation during the Period of the University Studies...**

The phenomenon of social influence contains the processes by that the individuals and groups configure, maintain, disseminate and modify their ways of thinking and acting, in the context of their social interactions direct or symbolic (Mugny, Doise, Deschamps, 1999). Also as a result of social influence, gradually can be outlined: situations/relations of accommodation in respect of habituation, mutual adjustment, assimilation relations, where works the transfer of mentalities and practices, stratification relations, according to the hierarchy of statutes held, alienation relations, in case of incompatibility. The interactions teachers-students may arise in the case of situations/relations of collaboration and cooperation: the coordination of the efforts towards a common goal; competition: the manifestation of rivalry, competition in achieving an individual target or even conflict: the existence of serious misunderstandings in relation to one indivisible purpose. The cooperation is understood as a specific application of the collaboration, as higher level of the achievement of common goals through mutual support in a smaller group. Among the members of the group must be established the necessary feedback of any training situation (in this case – of communication). The students need feedback also from a strong desire of identity` assertion, they seek to obtain this feedback from the teacher and not from colleagues. However, organizing the training collectively or individually depends on several factors: the task, the organization of teacher intervention, the learning styles, the motivation, the age, the number of students.

### **The teaching relations in a multiple-determined context**

In the initiation, operation and development of these relations, a mechanism that you should keep in mind is that “the changes are usually asynchronous. First changed is the «material culture», then the behaviors and habits of the individuals and, finally, as a consequence, the concepts, attitudes, social representations” (Neculau, 1997: 13). Some authors raise the psychosocial aspect of the teaching relationships. The relationships depend on a number of factors: the age, the number, the type of the group of students, the personalities, the followed objectives, the specific of discipline, the personality of the teacher, the teacher expectations (Brophy, Goo, 1980, as cited Diaconu, 2004). Many assessment and training tools (as is the Classroom Assessment Scoring System – CLASS: Pianta, La Paro, Hamre, 2008) have been tried to improve the training relations. The authors who analyzed the collaborative learning (Johnson, Johnson, 1999) showed that the quality of relationships includes such variables as interpersonal attraction, liking, cohesion, esprit-de-corps and social support.

There are also many studies about the impact of the relations for improving the learning outcomes, even at young ages, by action mainly on the motivational factor (e.g. Klem, Connell, 2004). Therefore, the good relation between teachers and students is important for their academic success. For an optimal relationship of teachers with their students the teaching skills are required, meaning the knowledge skills, interpersonal communication skills, management skills. The teacher plays a role in determining the mood to teaching activity, in clarifying the goals, establishing certain individual projects, making the learning accesible, providing the attitudinal support, as noted by Negreț-Dobridor and Pânișoară when presenting the humanistic perspective on the learning (Negreț-Dobridor and Pânișoară, 2005). Emil Stan shows that “the comprehensive perspective relates itself to teachers and pupils as fluid realities, able to determine each other, depending on the quality and depth of their commitment to the educational process”

(Stan, 2005: 51). In 1998, Haberman and Post (cited Solomon, Sekayi, 2007) considered that the selection of the teachers should consider their skills on self-knowledge, self acceptance, the relationship skills, the empathy, motivation for sustained effort, ability to manage the violence and the functioning in a chaotic environment.

Spencer and Schmelkin (2002) considered the qualities valued by the young students to their teachers: the care shown to students, assessing students` opinion, clarity in communication and openness to different views. Also the qualities pursued by the adult students to the teachers who instruct them (Donaldson, Flannery, Gordon, 1993 as cited Imel, 1995) are: the capacity of knowledge, the concern for the act of learning, clear presentation of the material, the ability to motivate the learners, the ability to demonstrate the relevance of the material taught and the ability to be enthusiastic in teaching. We may conclude, therefore, that those personal qualities the teacher should possess are multiple and the teaching activity involves actually the achievement of several interconnected roles: expert of teaching and learning act, motivating agent, group leader with respect to students, counselor, model, professional reflexive, manager (Woolfolk, 1990, as cited Nicola, 2003).

Management and leadership. The relationship is the basis for group leadership, to guide, to influence the attitude of students towards the success in action. "Teacher-student relationship depends largely on the real authority of the teacher in the eyes of his students. This authority is gained through competence, morality, thinking flexibility and consistent in terms of the values promoted and requirements addressed" (Diaconu, 2004: 12). Even if the democratic style and the participative management are the preferred styles of students, we must specify that the value of the styles is contextual (Potolea, 1989). As process of social influence, the leadership is the capacity to influence others to act (Zlate, 2004) and the authority considers the earned respect, the consent of the ruled ones against the decisions taken by the manager. Bochenski (1992) revealed the existence of two types of authority: epistemic – the specialist, the one who is competent in a field and ethics – the supervisor, the one who, by the position held, can give directives that must be followed.

Regarding the need for communication and negotiation, for self-improvement of the teachers and students, Neculau (1997: 10) makes an analysis of the opinions of the two educational partners (opinion surveys among students, teachers) on the desired/expected changes in the academic environment the wishes were: free and democratic elections; flow of information and people; exchanges with other universities; developing innovative spirit; renewing of the structures and curriculum. A large part of the analysis shows that the infrastructure/the material base is the aspect that has not changed for a long time, therefore, being affected the motivation and work style, even the mentalities being influenced by material conditions offered.

As a solution to improve the situations of inconsistency at the level of conceptions and practices, the negotiation is considered by Christophe Dupont "an action that puts face to face two or more partners who, faced both with divergences and interdependences, consider appropriate to find voluntarily a mutually acceptable solution that enables them to create, maintain and develop, at least temporarily, a relationship" (Dupont, 1990: 11). Several authors, including E. Stan, highlighted that the partnership and negotiation are needed not only to ensure effective control of the class, but also for the pupils` involvement in a critical exercise of the democracy: choosing and accepting the responsibility for choice made (Stan, 2004: 39).

## The Teaching Relation during the Period of the University Studies...

- The specificity of the higher education is given by the purposes, contents, methodologies and evaluation methods different from earlier stages of education. Those criteria dominating in the classic higher education, selective and elitist criteria were replaced by the participation in mass in higher education (Vlăsceanu, 2005). The personality of youth and adults, their level of training, but mostly the purposes of the curricula give a sense to the educational relations at this level.

Another important factor is the pedagogical conception. If the modernism drew the attention to the need to take into consideration the educational group, the postmodernism takes also into account the individual. A postmodern perspective on teacher-students` relationship requires a mentoring relationship. The postmodern teacher accepts the different views of the students, whether they are motivated, in order to reach the truths by consent (Siebert, 2002). Interestingly, in the socio-constructivist conception, the educated person is not only the subject of his own training, but also an agent of social influence. The dialogue and democratic attitude leads to tolerance, diversification of the relational flow so that it becomes multi-related. Moreover, the teacher-student relations affect those relations of reciprocity among students (Hughes et al., 1999, as cited Gallagher, 2015).

The learner-centered paradigm triggers changes in the roles that the teacher must assume in managing the learning: as designer, tutor, manager, organizer, manager of the training experiences, mediator, partner, facilitator of learning and self-determination, counselor in learning problems, but there should be a balance between the individualization and fostering collaboration within groups. We believe that the critical remarks should be accepted: “despite the widespread use of the term, Lea et al. (2003) argue that one of the problems with the pupil-centered learning is that many institutions and educators claim to be pupil-centered, on their learning activity in practice, but in reality they are not” (Lea et al., 2003, as cited O’Neill, Mc Mahon, 2005). We note, therefore, that by his attitude and style the teacher prints a value sense to his interrelations with the students and their interrelations in the group.

The modern and postmodern perspective, especially the constructivism focused on the role of the social context of learning, on the pursuit of it as social negotiation. Typical for the constructivist didactics is that the pupil has an active role in training; he must be treated democratically by the teacher, not to reproduce, but to demonstrate the understanding and solve real situations. The modern role of the teacher becomes one of mediator, facilitator, mentor. The ethics of the constructivist didactics profession is the source of certain requirements that consider the educational relations (Table 1):

**Table 1. The ethics of the teaching profession in constructivism**

The roles of the constructivist teacher influence the professional ethics:	Implications:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- from the perspective of the role of moderator, the constructivist teacher must demonstrate objectivity in order not to impose his own point of view;</li> <li>- at the same time, he can not criticize rough the students` achievements, but constructive, precisely because it is important to ask</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- from relational point of view, in the constructivist training the teacher-students relations, students-students, are of mutual respect, but for them to be established, it requires a good organization from the teacher.</li> <li>- motivating learners can be done by: interactivity, reasoning the links with</li> </ul>

questions, to incite them, while respecting the social equity; - the pedagogical attitude of the teacher should be centered on the mental availability for experiences, perspectives and proposals of others; - in order to enthuse the students, the teacher himself must have professional enthusiasm, thus avoiding the danger of relativization of the conceptions.	the practice, the negotiation at group level.
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Professional ethics requirements:</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Implications:</b></p>
- open mentality and availability to observe and study compared the different school systems and practices (in Europe and in the world); - favorable attitude to own professional improvement; - centering on the students' learning interests; - capacity of self-organization; - transparent communication with students or other educational factors; - participative decision-making, by negotiation; - correctness to delimit the own elements in relation to those of others; - perseverance for surpassing various obstacles in the educational activity.	- among the general requirements that any teacher must comply with in constructivism are found those characteristics that contribute to the improvement of the students` learning: to devote himself to the activity, to monitor the results and learning process, to reflect systematically on them and engage in large leveraged social education actions.
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Consequences for students` roles:</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Implications:</b></p>
- the responsibility of the students is manifested in the way which students communicate, participate actively, allow time for training/self-training, make decisions. - the way to activate the students is a challenge for the teacher who must intervene to guide them, but not directly. The delegation of tasks can be a solution to this.	- in the educational relationship is emphasized the self-esteem, but also the respect for others; these are prerequisites which will involve taking attitudes, the assertion of own values, the development of the cultural level, acceptance of multiple interpretations.

Source: Frășineanu, 2007: 65-66

### **The results of a focus group**

From the analysis of the official documents (National Education Law, 2011) we find that the teaching relationship is placed at the level of general conception on education, under the sign of the modernity, because the educational ideal of the Romanian school is: the free, integral and harmonious development of the human individuality. We present further the ascertaining results obtained in 2015 with a group of 23 students studying the Psycho-pedagogical disciplines, while being students at Geography and Foreign Languages, third year, at the University of Craiova.

The method we used was the focus group, in order to find the opinions, assessments and explanations of the young people related to the characteristics and the



## **The Teaching Relation during the Period of the University Studies...**

level of interaction teachers-students. Although the sample size does not allow us a generalization of the data obtained, we intend to find out what types of the teaching relationships operate, their level of achievement and, especially, the degree of students' satisfaction in relation to them, starting from the assumption that these relations are perceived and performed/ practiced varied, depending on the dominant pedagogical concepts in a concrete context. The participation in the focus groups was voluntary and the responses assessment scale for the closed questions was a Likert scale, with 5 levels: Very Much, Much, Average, Lesser and Very Less, At All. The focus group methodology (Krueger, Casey, 2005) consist of an informal discussion, structured and moderate, so that to cause a debate at group level. The deployment should be relaxing and safe, in order the subjects to share positive and negative feedback and comments about the proposed work.

To find out the stage of the mutual cognition, by reference to the teaching mission, two introductory questions were addressed: 1. Do you consider that in the teaching work from higher your teachers know you? 2. Do you consider that, as students, considering what the teaching activity involves, you know your teachers? The majority of the responses were for the Much and Average and the explanations on the two directions of knowledge, revealed that teachers are those who are most interested in creating or closing the channels of knowledge. It was shown that the large number of students and the different curriculum, the methodology of teaching-learning-assessment, personality and specific concerns of the teachers, of students, the different degree of personal self-disclosure and the courses frequency differentiated rates are important variables that go hand in hand and lead in academia at a level of mutual knowledge sometimes insufficient.

The students were asked to assess the satisfaction about the way of making communication with their teachers, and if at the items above, compared to the pre-university education, in the higher education, the level of the mutual knowledge is incomplete, at this item was shown that the level/relationship of communication is very good/good. The students particularly appreciate the communicative skills of teachers and believe that they have such competencies.

The socio-affective relationships were assessed whether more neutral, or more closely, without going to extremes; what is important is that the students appreciate this way. The responses to this item were correlated with those about the management style identified at teachers in most cases: the democratic style, this style being appreciated. According to students' opinion, in teaching-learning-assessment, the teachers in most cases initiate cooperative situations, but the students valorize also as positive the competition for its role activator if it is well understood and used wisely. At the question about the learning preferences for the teacher-dependent or teacher-independent style, the variants of answers were: 1) the learning depends on own conception of learning; 2) the learning depends on the instructions given by the teachers; 3) the learning depends on the instructions from the learning materials; 4) the learning depends on the information from colleagues. Most students learn cumulating these influences: teachers, colleagues, own conception; the balance of their choices leans towards independence, but this is not total. An impediment in this case is that the support application may be accompanied by problems in the social image of the student to other students.

Another item followed the assessment of the academic relations: 18 students appreciate as being Very Good, 4 – Good and 1 student – Less good. We mention that in the interview guide existed also the answer Other Assessment. Most students appreciate relations as good or very good, and the cases where relations are rated as less good were explained by the restrictive attitudes, purely authoritarian, manifested by teachers in the

classroom, by the existence of some complaints regarding the unfairness of the evaluation, the emergence of dissatisfaction relating to approach of some contents that students considered uninteresting. For the students in the sample there is a sense of belonging to the academic life: it was very much appreciated at the level Very Much and Much. We considered that these answers are in relation to the fulfillment of expectations, with the nature and success of the activities and results obtained by the interaction with teachers, but also depend on the interactions with other students, even with other than the group colleagues. A crucial question for our approach was if the teachers from the academic environment are flexible, make a differentiation of the relations, adapt to the requirements of students and the students consider that there is a mid-level flexibility, in the sense that some requirements, criteria are formulated, that must be met, but with the acceptance of the diversity, of some alternative solutions.

The last question followed to find the way of teaching relation and training, mainly used by teachers: traditional, modern, postmodern, combined. Unanimously, the responses indicated the combined mode: for the university teachers the relational foundation is given by the principles and traditional values (truth, good, beautiful, right), but there are openings, especially in knowledge tools and management – that belong to the modern trend and at the level of communication (the openness to the interactive methodology, use of media) and treating the student as partner can be considered as post-modern manifestations.

### **Conclusions**

The data obtained by the focus group have confirmed the hypothesis; the discussion was the most successful in terms of the involvement of some students, who by the specific pedagogical studies get familiar with the trends in training and design appropriate training steps deliberately. The results have an ascertaining value and correlate themselves with other aspects of research, even experimental, where the support granted by the teacher to students in teaching, the frequent relation, focused on mutual knowledge, the adequate communication, the proximity, the democratic/participative management, in order to facilitate to accomplish the self management of learning (Frăsineanu, 2012) led to increases in the performance of the students in learning. Openings: The techniques to improve the interpersonal behavior are semi recognized and accepted by the students, who are trained to be teachers. They can be: the training of the intra and interpersonal intelligence, social responsiveness through deliberate targeting for a better perception of the emotional behavior and reactions of own person and of others; by clarifying the personal values and aspirations and values and aspirations and the formation of new values and aspirations, appropriate to the democratic method of problem solving of the individual and the group of students; by encouraging practicing behavioral styles that are not characteristic (e.g., a shy person to be bolder) by empathic attitude and meta-cognitive adjustment.

Therefore, the concern of the teacher and the students` feedback forego the improvement of the teaching relations and are conditions for the selection of appropriate pedagogical conceptions and practices. From the students` proposals we note the fact that: the concern on improving the interpersonal relationships teacher-students meets some aspects: the diversity of the students` problems; the identity crisis at this age and the concern to find a job; the solving of problems related to learning demotivation; the

## The Teaching Relation during the Period of the University Studies...

adaptation to a world in continual change, fast, characterized by the advanced technology and information explosion.

### References:

- Bochenski, J. M. (1992). *Ce este autoritatea?*, Bucharest: Humanitas Publishing House.
- Cerghit, I. (2002). *Sisteme de instruire alternative și complementare. Structuri, stiluri, strategii*, Bucharest: Aramis Publishing House.
- Diaconu, M. (2004). *Sociologia educației*, Bucharest: Academy of Economic Sciences.
- Doise, W., Deschamps, J.-C., Mugny, G. (1999). *Psihologie socială experimentală*, Iași: Polirom.
- Dupont, C. (1990). *La negotiation. Conduite, theorie, application*, Paris: Les Editions d'Organisation.
- Frăsineanu, E. S. (2007). Etica profesiei didactice în constructivism. In Joița, E. (coord.). *Profesorul și alternativa constructivistă a instruirii*, Craiova: Universitaria Publishing House, pp. 65-66.
- Frăsineanu, E. S. (2012). *Învățarea și self-managementul învățării eficiente în mediul universitar*, Craiova: Universitaria Publishing House.
- Gallagher, E., (2013). *The Effects of Teacher-Student Relationships: Social and Academic Outcomes of Low-Income Middle and High School Students*. Retrieved from: [steinhardt.nyu.edu/opus/issues/2013/fall/gallagher](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/opus/issues/2013/fall/gallagher).
- Hamre, B., Pianta, R. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, (72), 625-638.
- Imel, S. (1995). *Teaching adults: Is it different? (Myths and realities)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.calpro-online.org/ERIC/docgen.asp?tbl=archiveLID=A030>.
- Ingram, J., Worrall, N. (1993). *Teacher-Child Partnerships. The negotiating classroom*, London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Iucu, R. (2005). *Managementul și gestiunea clasei de elevi*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Joița, E. (2000). *Management educațional. Profesorul manager: roluri și metodologie*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Joița, E. (2006). *Instruirea constructivistă: o alternativă*, Bucharest: Aramis Publishing House.
- Klem, A. M., Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74 (7), 262-273.
- Krueger, R. A., Casey, M. A. (2005). *Metoda Focus Grup: ghid practic pentru cercetarea aplicată*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Kuhn, T. (2008). *Structura revoluțiilor științifice*, Bucharest: Humanitas Publishing House.
- Lewin, K. (1989). *Management in Organization*, London: Free Press.
- Legea educației naționale* no. 1/2011. Published in Official Monitor, Part. I, no. 18, January the 10<sup>th</sup>.
- Lytard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Macavei, E. (2001). *Pedagogie. Teoria educației*, Bucharest: Aramis Publishing House.
- Neculau, A. (coord.), (1997). *Câmpul universitar și actorii săi*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Neculau, A. (1983). *A fi elev*, Bucharest: Albatros Publishing House.

- Negreș-Dobridor, I., Pânișoară, I. O. (2005). *Știința învățării: de la teorie la practică*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Nicola, I. (2003). *Tratat de pedagogie școlară*, Bucharest: Aramis Publishing House.
- O'Neill, G., McMahon, T. (2005). *Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers?* Retrieved from: [http://www.aishe.org/readings/2005-1/oneill-mcmahontues\\_19th\\_Oct\\_SCL.html](http://www.aishe.org/readings/2005-1/oneill-mcmahontues_19th_Oct_SCL.html).
- Păun, E. (2002). O "lectură" a educației prin grila postmodernității. In Păun, E., Potolea, D. (coord.). *Pedagogie. Fundamentări teoretice și demersuri aplicative*, Iași: Polirom Publishing House, pp. 13-24.
- Pianta, R.C., La Paro, K.M., Hamre, B.K. (2008). *Classroom assessment scoring system (CLASS) manual, pre-k*, Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Potolea, D. (1989). Profesorul și strategiile conducerii învățării. In Jinga, I., Vlăsceanu, L. (coord.), *Structuri, strategii și performanțe în învățământ*, Bucharest: Academy Publishing House.
- Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In Koch, S. (ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 3: Formulations of the person and the social context*, New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 184-256.
- Siebert, H. (2002). *Pedagogie constructivistă*, Iași: European Institute.
- Solomon, R. P., Sekayi, D. N. R. (2007). Introduction. In Solomon, R. P., Sekayi, D. N. R. (editors.), *Urban teacher education and teaching. Innovative practices for diversity and social justice*, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 1-14.
- Spencer, K. J., Skhmelkin, L. P. (2002). Perspectives on Teaching and its Evaluation. In *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 5(27), 397-409.
- Stan, E. (2005). *Managementul clasei de elevi*, Bucharest: Aramis Publishing House.
- Stan, E. (2004). *Pedagogie postmodernă*, Iași: European Institute.
- Vlăsceanu, L. (2005). *Asigurarea calității în educație. UNESCO-CEPES*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ad-astra.ro/library/papers/vlasceanu.pdf>.
- Zlate, M. (2004). *Leadership și management*, Iași: Polirom.
- Zlate, M. (1997). *Eul și Personalitatea*, Bucharest: Trei Publishing House.

---

## Article Info

*Received:* May 22 2015

*Accepted:* August 26 2015

---