



THEORETICAL APPROACH TO NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AS A LEARNING RESOURCE IN ATTENTION TO DIVERSITY: THE ROLE OF THE SOCIO-FAMILY CONTEXT

María Muñiz Rivas¹, Macarena Coronil Pérez²

¹*Department of Social Anthropology, University of Seville, Spain*

²*Brújula: Socio-Educational Center, El Puerto de Santa María Spain*

Abstract

This paper reflects on the relevance of non-formal education in childhood and adolescence, with particular emphasis on attention to diversity, highlighting the importance of including the social and family environment in this learning process. For this purpose, a global theoretical review of special education in Spain is presented, firstly addressing its formal historical evolution up to the birth of what is known as educational inclusion. Thus, a new educational model based on attention to diversity for students with specific educational support needs (SESN) is created to provide learning focused on optimizing students' personal and academic development. This comprehensive vision impacts socio-educational intervention from a non-formal field of education as a complementary alternative to formal education at different life cycle stages and in many contexts.

Keywords

Non-Formal Education, Attention to Diversity, Students, Citizenship, Family

INTRODUCTION

Over the decades, the definition of non-formal education has evolved to become what we currently know as systematized learning, carried out outside the scope of formal education for adults and minors (Pastor-Homs, 2001). This type of education is applied in intercultural, developmental, values, and environmental education, etc. It is adapted to the recipients and contexts, with different objectives according to the targeted area of development (Torres, 2007). Non-formal education covers a broad range of areas in which it intervenes (social, environmental, health, educational, etc.). It is implemented in many societies using a flexible and open methodology (Cabalé & Rodríguez, 2017).

Although non-formal education consists of specific objectives, principles, activities, and programs, it does not use a closed design because it is considered adaptive education, and should remain open to attend to the personal characteristics of each user (Novo, 2005; Torres, 2007). Although it presents its own theoretical frameworks, principles, and objectives, its concrete activities and programs are not pre-designed (Bonell, 2003). In addition, its multidisciplinary nature is key to understanding that it does not originate from a single science but instead is created from many different—but necessary—settings of society. Thus, non-formal education programs are aimed at the acquisition of curricular, environmental, and/or health knowledge, among others. This kind of education can be carried out by professionals from different fields and developed in various environments, administrative entities, headquarters of various non-governmental organizations, schools during extracurricular hours, day centers, leisure centers, and health and cultural centers (Gómez & Gómez, 2014).

The importance of a flexible and varied methodology, enriched by different activities, such as games, group dynamics, etc., is also noteworthy. In order to base learning on experience, non-formal education makes the person the protagonist of their learning and development process. Thus, what they have learned is significant and lasting and extends to all facets of their life (Trilla, 2009). This helps individuals to develop a series of social competences that are crucial to succeed in all areas of relationships and are also considered a basic pillar of this type of educational actions (Trilla, 1998, 2009). The context and learning environment should be enjoyable, fun,

and pleasant; it should focus on learning to develop with a dynamic and ludic nature, creating a relaxed and trusting environment in the group, making its members the protagonists of their learning (Castilla, 2007).

Non-formal education should meet all the educational needs that children and adolescents may present throughout and after their schooling, especially in the field of attention to diversity (Berneman, 2016). This type of education may be one of the best resources to facilitate the integration of children and young people with what has traditionally been known as special educational needs (SEN). Non-formal education has specific characteristics that favor interpersonal relationships and non-competitiveness because there are no preset levels or exams to overcome; it facilitates interaction, enhances socialization, and enriches experiences, favoring mutual knowledge (Romi & Schmida, 2009). Therefore, we highlight its role in the incorporation and adaptation to society of these students, mainly through ludic-educational activities.

The above reveals the interest of this work, which aims to contribute to research in the field of non-formal education, taking into account its benefit for attention to diversity and consequently for these individuals' families. The main themes for the numerous investigations carried out in recent decades range from legislative changes to variations from a socio-cultural perspective, thus showing the relationship between the use of this educational resource, the benefit of attention to diversity, and the role of families as socializing agents. However, to carry out this theoretical approach, we must first define what has been considered over time as special educational needs and how their conception has evolved.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION: FROM THE EUROPEAN TO THE SPANISH CONTEXT

The concept of special education originates in Anglo-Saxon countries, with the initial term "Science of Special Education." Special education is aimed at people who have deficiencies compared to the norm and people who are above the norm due to their exceptional characteristics (Sánchez-Manzano, 1992). Although at present, special education is understood as integrated within the field of ordinary education, it has gone through different conceptions throughout history, like the attitudes and practices of society towards vulnerable people.

Some of the first historical antecedents of special pre-education can be traced back to the Renaissance with the appearance of the first educational experiences developed by philanthropic (assistential) orders for people with disabilities, especially sensory disabilities (Zunzunegui, 2011), or by Ponce de León (1509-1584), who designed and put into practice an oral method targeting deaf children, or in the field of visual impairment by Valentín Haüy (1745-1822), who created the first center for the blind in Paris. However, it was not until the early nineteenth century that a rehabilitative trend emerged for people with disabilities. In this sense, there are works such as that of Itard (1802-1857) on the re-education of the wild child. At this time, an educational line was developed based on a healing and rehabilitative pedagogy. The movement in favor of people with disabilities reached its highest peak with the pedagogical methods of Montessori and Decroly, among others, clearing the way for the creation of educational institutions of pedagogical orientation (Espaillat, 2020; Robinson, 2015).

Throughout the nineteenth century and towards the end of the century, attention to the blind and deaf-mutes in special residences increased progressively in England, Germany, and the United States. Also, the institutionalization of the so-called mentally deficient was extended throughout much of the twentieth century. The segregation of these people was considered beneficial for them (Sánchez-Palomino & Torres-González, 2002).

In the second half of the twentieth century, the conception of a deficit as something innate and stable over time predominated. Thus, the need for an accurate diagnosis and specialized education was emphasized (Vallejos, 2009). Consequently, a segregated care and education model emerged due to the need to educate so-called deficient people. For this care model, the problem was located in the students, and the diagnosis consisted of exploring the child outside their usual context or environment (Sánchez-Manzano, 1992). A series of tests were conducted to discover the deficits and explain these children's delays (Sánchez-Palomino & Torres-González, 2002) (see Table 1).

Assistential model

- Care centered on the child, who is considered by the institutions the sole cause of their problems.
- It ignores the context: family, school, reference classroom
- Individualized intervention with a curriculum focused on the student's disabilities.
- It requires an expert for the intervention.
- It uses a different curriculum from the ordinary one.
- It is a palliative and compensating model with a rehabilitative attitude.

Table 1 Characteristics of the care model

Note. Author elaboration based on Sánchez-Palomino & Torres-González (2002).

The Warnock Report, published in 1978, represented a radical change in the understanding of special education, introducing the concept of SEN. From this new concept, the model of "integrated education" emerged, which underlines the school's responsibility to adapt to the students' individual characteristics. Authors such as Mayor

(1991) pointed out a set of factors that contributed to the change in the conception of special education, such as parents' associations, the provision of services to deficient individuals with disability, greater social awareness, and the Declaration of the Rights of the Mentally Retarded (1971) assumed by the United Nations (UN). Medina-García (2017) highlighted the interaction between personal and environmental factors, comprehensiveness, school failure in special schools, normalizing currents, and social sensitivity as factors favoring this change.

Therefore, the principles of normalization and integration of children who, due to various disabilities, could not follow ordinary education began to spread throughout Europe and the United States in the 1970s. As a result, some governments decided to introduce these principles into their laws.

Spain also joined this process of transformation and modernization of ordinary education with antecedents such as the General Education Law (LGE) of 1970, which established educational integration, or the Law on Social Integration of the Disabled (1982) (Pozo-Sánchez, 1994). But in 1985, the Royal Decree 334/1985 of March 6 on the Regulation of Special Education was proclaimed, which constitutes the starting point to begin schooling students with functional organic deficits that required special attention in ordinary schools. From that moment on, we refer to education that integrated all the students into formal education, regardless of their situation and need for support, establishing the foundations of an integrated and inclusive education (Negrín & Marrero, 2018). In the pre-democracy era, the administration recognized the right to education of all citizens but separated special education from the ordinary educational system. The approval of the above-mentioned Royal Decree was intended to promote integration and thus avoid segregation.

The concept of SEN was not formally implemented in Spain until years later, specifically with the appearance of the Organic Law of General Regulation of the Educational System of Spain (in Spanish, LOGSE) in 1990. This law allowed students with SEN to be enrolled in ordinary schools (in the stages of primary and Compulsory Secondary Education [CSE]), as long as this education was effective through the increase in human resources and didactic materials, which favored these students' positive progress in the educational system. Furthermore, the students' achievements and progress would be supervised by a specialist, the school counselor, through collaborative and close work with a new professional with whom the schools would be endowed, the therapeutic pedagogy teacher (Brennan, 1988). This was a substantial advance concerning the LGE, the first education law in Spain that contemplated education for all, without exclusion, although segregatedly (Negrín & Marrero, 2018).

At the dawn of the LOGSE, the different Spanish autonomous communities developed an entire corpus of law about the schooling of students with SEN, making important investments in the schools' human, material, and adaptive resources to universalize their education (Martín-Macías, 2010).

Undoubtedly, school integration was an important pillar on which special education relied. In fact, the origin of school integration lies in recognizing the right to education of all people (Zabalza & Cid, 2009). This vision constituted a significant change because the object of study became the need presented by a person in an educational context instead of being the person's deficit.

The conception of school integration was a process to help the person learn the behaviors accepted by society and the culture to which they belong (Dueñas, 1991). It was an essential step as it involved the whole environment. Integration was considered a process to prepare the child with SEN to exploit their potential and the opportunities presented to them, always taking into account the social and family context (Jones, 1986). (see Table 2).

School integration model

A process targeting all the students, with a social, instructive, and temporary nature.

It satisfies the learning needs of the students while respecting their individual differences.

It takes place in non-restrictive environments.

Table 2. Characteristics of school integration.

Note. Author elaboration based on Jones (1986)

Thanks to research in this area, it was possible to visibilize the ineffectiveness of segregated education and the negative consequences of classifying children with SEN (Dueñas, 1991; Martín-Macías, 2010). Furthermore, the different proclamations such as Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959), and Declaration of the Rights of the Mentally Deficient (1971) managed to mark differences, both in the social perception of children with educational needs and the evolution of the concept of deficient or disabled (Dueñas, 1991).

At the end of the twentieth century, a further step was taken, moving from integration to an inclusive school model. The problem of special education in Spain was decisively and innovatively addressed in the LOGSE. In this law, an integrative school model was assumed, proposing the need for all children to develop their abilities as much as possible with the same curricular design, which would be adapted to the group and individual characteristics of the students (Negrín & Marrero, 2018).

This law dedicated its Chapter V to special education, including important aspects such as the material and personal resources of the educational system dedicated to serving students with SEN, the assessment of their needs through specialized professionals, attention based on integration and normalization, the different modalities of schooling according to the students' individual needs, and the vital participation of families in the teaching-learning process. Subsequently, the Organic Law 10/2002, on the Quality of Education (LOCE), of short duration, dedicated its Chapter VII to the so-called specific educational needs, which, with the justification of high-quality education, included different types of students: students who, due to their socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions needed particular procedures of a differential educational intervention to achieve effective equality of opportunities in the schools, foreign students, gifted students, and students with SEN. Finally, the Organic Law of Education (LOE) (at present, partially in force) was proclaimed to improve the social inclusion of young Spaniards through education, avoiding their social exclusion through a formal—but also non-formal—educational process in which the principles of quality and equity are unwaivable and inalienable objectives.

NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AND ATTENTION TO DIVERSITY: THE CASE OF SPAIN

Following the educational policies presented above, the purposes and efforts of various organizations have been aimed at achieving objectives of inclusive coexistence that form an ethical project of society based on human rights and the recognition of all people. Establishing such a proposal has necessarily undergone a learning process based on a commitment to the community and daily practice. Therefore, the importance of all learning spaces in childhood and adolescence (families, schools, media, community, and peer coexistence) has been highlighted. In the search for experiences of real participation that fulfill an educational function, the organizations and entities responsible for developing educational policies have recognized the importance of non-formal spaces (Maiztegui-Oñate & Fonseca-Peso, 2014). Although there is no single vision, this finding is reflected in broader theoretical and policy proposals that have incorporated the field of non-formal education into diversity education (Banks & Kathryn, 2007).

From the political point of view, we note the example of the 2030 Agenda in its Youth section, identifying three major themes, each broken down into six goals for the future years: human rights and democracy, the promotion of cultural diversity, and social inclusion. The priority of working with social organizations as a vehicle for participation is highlighted. The European Union Youth in Action Program² (2007–2013) also encouraged the participation and self-organization of youth, especially those at risk of exclusion. Thus, non-formal education is not a sectoral issue but a strategy of work and intervention whose preference for dialogue guarantees diversity and respect.

In Spain, the Strategic Plan for Citizenship and Integration (2012) incorporated non-formal education into the development strategies of the first proposed goal: “Promote active citizenship with models that are capable of incorporating the diversity of the population” (p. 266). It recognizes that different types of non-formal participation are necessary to promote collaboration networks and exercise active citizenship. The Plan also considers that the schools are privileged spaces for developing coexistence and creating collaborative networks among different actors. In addition, it acknowledges that the link between various agents can facilitate the incorporation of the methodologies used by non-formal education (p. 160).

The Youth Council uses the same approach when it states that formation in non-formal education is a critical area for training in values and education among peers (Maiztegui-Oñate & Fonseca-Peso, 2014). Consequently, it is considered an ideal space for working on attitudes and learning to live together in diversity (Marín-Martínez, 2003). These statements imply the following question:

What is non-formal education? The origin of what is called non-formal education is found in the work of Philip H. Coombs (1971, p. 201), “*The world crisis of education*,” which presents a chapter entitled “Informal education: to achieve, maintain and advance.” This chapter begins with what Coombs calls “that disconcerting assortment of non-formal education and training activities that constitute—or should constitute—an important complement to formal education in the total effort of education in any country.” Subsequently, the text mentions diversity and terminological confusion when referring to this set of activities (adult education, on-the-job training, continuous education, etc.). However, these activities affect many people's lives and, when well focused, contribute very positively to the development of individuals and communities and cultural enrichment and personal fulfillment (Pastor-Homs, 2001).

Based on this approach, non-formal education is currently considered to be the educational activities promoted by civil society outside the institutional educational system, where educators are not in a hierarchical structure. Unlike informal education, it consists of an intentional and purposeful educational action applied with methodology (Kiwani, 2008). It does not propose the mere transmission of knowledge to obtain a degree but instead, the individual's awareness to achieve a perception of themselves and their environment, thereby being able to modify it (Maiztegui-Oñate, 2007). Thus, the intentionality found in the activities and the organizational and methodological structure is a key factor (Pastor-Homs, 2001). Non-formal education also contemplates incorporating other social actors (youth associations, NGOs, parishes, civic centers) in a joint educational

responsibility. However, these projects do not refer only to acquiring specific skills for action; they also explicitly allude to personal awareness, critical thinking, and commitment.

In the current legislative framework regulating the Spanish educational system, Organic Law 3/2020, which modifies the Organic Law on Education (LOE), the concept of students with SEN has been encompassed within a broader one: the student with specific educational support needs (SESN). The LOE, dedicated to these students, presents its organizational and methodological principles in Chapter I. Therein, it states that the Educational Administrations should ensure the necessary resources for people who, due to their SEN (e.g., specific learning difficulties, ADHD, giftedness, a delayed entry in the educational system, or specific physical and/or mental conditions), require different educational attention from the ordinary one (i.e., non-formal education) so these students can develop their personal abilities to the maximum and achieve the objectives established in general for all students (art.71).

To some extent, the term SESN is complex and even diffuse because it does not refer to a specific group of students and can have many interpretations. Due to its breadth, it has been proposed that, at some time of their schooling, students may temporarily have severe learning difficulties and, consequently, need educational assistance to compensate for these difficulties. Hence, attention to diversity favors a large part of the student body and contributes to personalize education, one of the basic principles that currently governs school organization. Elizondo (2017) defines the measures of attention to diversity as a set of actions in the teaching-learning scenario that equitably enhance all students' motivation, participation, and real inclusion. These actions can be of different types, depending on the coordination and intervention carried out in the school and between the various professionals. The main issue is to help the students from a purely inclusive practice (Huget, 2006).

The response to the diversity of students preferably takes place through general measures prioritizing inclusive attention and methodological and organizational flexibility to achieve the established goals and key competences of the educational stage (Trilla & Novella, 2001). Furthermore, these measures should be well known by the professionals working from non-formal education with these students. Thus, we can determine what elements are being applied to each student and whether they are effective for their learning. All this will allow a joint evaluation with the teaching staff to assess whether the measure adopted is beneficial for a particular student when it is carried out in non-formal education contexts (Maiztegui-Oñate & Fonseca-Peso, 2014).

Concerning educational attention to each student, a series of general programs of attention to diversity is considered. It is vital for the professionals who work in the non-formal field to know these programs. They need to know which areas should be reinforced or improved and, if implemented outside the school context, whether they are beneficial for the students' development (see Table 3)

General plans and programs for reinforcement and improvement

Educational reinforcement programs for the recovery of unacquired learnings.

Specific personalized plans for students who do not pass courses.

Reinforcement programs of core subjects for the first cycle of Compulsory Secondary Education (CSE).

Reinforcement programs for core subjects for the second cycle of CSE.

Programs for the improvement of learning and performance, in the stage of CSE.

Table 3 Plans and programs to reinforce and improve attention to diversity

Note. Author elaboration based on the Instructions of March 8, 2017, of the General Directorate of Participation and Equity (Ministry of Education, 2017).

In addition to the general measures mentioned above, there are specific measures of attention to diversity targeting students with SESN when the general measures are insufficient. The proposals and modifications in the curricular elements and organization of individualized treatment for students with SESN are considered specific measures of attention to diversity. The proposal to include these specific measures depends on the conclusions obtained after the psycho-pedagogical assessment, and the measures would be included in the psycho-pedagogical report. This report contains complete and valuable information on the diagnosis of the students. With this information, professionals from non-formal education organizations can design tailor-made work programs, reinforcing the areas that formal education cannot support, although it can detect them. The detected areas that the school cannot address due to circumstances such as the current high student-teacher ratio in the classrooms, the lack of human and/or material and economic resources, etc. can be addressed as complements outside of the schools and institutes of formal education (Garreta Bochata, 2011). The success or failure of attention to diversity in formal education—and especially in non-formal education—depends on providing specialized and qualified professionals and solid pedagogical bases, as well as on planning and organizing the measures and material resources to develop teaching-learning processes (Manjón, 2002).

Inclusive education is based on the right of all people to education, as proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Developed countries have shown great interest in implementing inclusive education, but this interest is often frustrated by the tendency to classify and segregate children who require different attention from that provided in ordinary education.

According to the inclusive current, students with SESN achieve optimal development of their cognitive, social, and personal skills in integrative contexts and even better academic results. Inclusive education aims to ensure that students achieve the maximum possible development of their personal, physical, mental, and social abilities.

Non-formal education shares this objective; it is mainly dedicated to early care, education, health, employment, accessibility, citizenship, communication, etc. Typically, these associations seek to improve the quality of life of students with SESN and their families. They are crucial for the inclusion of these students and to complement their formation.

Non-formal education attempts to meet all the educational needs minors may present during and after their schooling, employing measures of attention to diversity and a wide variety of personal and material resources, sharing many students' spaces and experiences.

THE FAMILY AS A BASIS FOR NON-FORMAL EDUCATION IN ATTENTION TO DIVERSITY

The family plays an essential role in the development of children and adolescents; it is the main development context during the first years of life. According to Bornstein (2002), the social environment comprises the social setting in which a student is immersed, the existing services, and the family. Therefore, any proposed educational action should consider these three variables because some needs originate in the families' situations of social disadvantage. Many learning needs emerge in social environments of scarce economic and cultural resources. Hence, an action plan from regulated and non-formal education is needed that includes conjoint and coordinated action programs to train families and provide personal and material resources.

Cantón, Cortés, and Justicia (2007) mention some critical considerations about the socio-economic level as a relevant factor that can affect families and the academic performance of children with SESN in school. Among the variables that are relevant for the family process are the level of education, professional level, marital status, income, place of residence, or type of housing. Therefore, due to the lack of economic and educational resources, a student from a disadvantaged family environment that does not provide much support to the children is more likely to achieve a low academic performance. On the other hand, children from families with a higher socio-educational level and an enriching environment are more likely to develop positively, regardless of the family structure (Martos-Sánchez, 2020).

However, coordination between the school and the family is essential to promote academic and professional performance, along with the formation of the personality of the student with SESN. Therefore, the participation of families is an essential right found in article 27 of the Spanish Constitution. Freixa (1997) points out that the role of the family and the school should be based on the excellent relationship between them, their participation, and involvement. Thus, knowledge about the socio-family reality by the professionals who intervene with students with SESN is crucial, contributing to their adequate response to the observed needs. This knowledge also allows them to develop good intervention strategies, such as work techniques shared by the school and the family, social activities with the neighborhood or locality, and the coordination of all the professionals in a shared responsibility (Martín-Bris, 2006; Parada-Gañete, 2018).

According to Comellas (2009), it is not uncommon for difficulties to arise in the relations between school and family. Therefore, it is necessary to help parents put themselves in the place of their children and think about how the children experience reality, the world, and relationships with others to develop educational and coexistence guidelines that help them understand their environment. These guidelines are reflected in the participation in educational experiences in the non-formal field. It is necessary to engage the families in the generalization of learning, ensuring that what is learned at school is applied in the children's home (Comellas, 2009; Martín-Bris, 2006).

Non-formal education should facilitate the integration of the family in the students' teaching-learning process, promoting family-student relations, considering school work as a team effort, and enhancing the parents' attitude of self-formation among its general goals. In addition, information channels must be established to meet students' educational expectations, providing the necessary resources for the interaction and participation of the families (Benso & Pereira, 2007; Martín-Bris, 2005).

Among the strategies to establish collaborative relationships between specialists and the family within the school, we note the family's temporary participation in the activities, workshops, tutorial action, evaluation, assemblies, meetings, and follow-ups at home (Martín-Bris, 2005). To achieve this collaboration, professionals must develop specific attitudes and skills that enhance family relationships. They should remember to be realistic about the students' possibilities and what can be expected of their parents (Martos-Sánchez, 2020), maintaining attitudes of respect, sincerity, and honesty. It is also important to underline the positive traits of the families and the students with SESN, ensuring confidentiality and making the collaborations as pleasant as possible by being empathetic and enthusiastic.

It must be borne in mind that the fast pace of life and the lack of time due to people's current subordination to the capitalist economic system are producing family models with a very high level of stress (Roldán, 2015). People cannot find the necessary time their children need for their balanced psychosocial development (Castro-

Zubizarreta & García-Ruiz, 2016). Therefore, families may not provide that balanced development or, on the contrary, they may produce a context that disorganizes the entire family system (Robledo-Ramón & García, 2008). Therefore, the collaboration of families in non-formal education is considered an essential element of educational quality because it contributes to improving teaching and, consequently, to more effective education.

The family is a basic pillar in the education of SESN students. The family is a safety factor that will ensure the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process due to continuous monitoring, formative evaluation, and the availability of permanent support. Hence, we see the need for the conjoint and patient educational action of teachers and family in these students' education and the benefits of the wide range of activities outside the formal context, which complement it (Castro-Zubizarreta & García-Ruiz, 2016). Besides having a beneficial impact on attention to diversity, the family's participation in their children's educational process is advantageous for the family itself because parents need to feel useful to their child, capable of coping with problems, and to consider themselves competent to provide solutions (Parada-Gañete, 2018). It is not a question of turning family and home into a new school or burdening parents with excessive tasks. On the contrary, it is a question of orienting them towards a coherent and serene collaboration that benefits their children. Thus, we point out the need to establish a close collaboration between family and non-formal education professionals because both possess essential information to optimize the intervention. The family knows the child and the context in which they grew up better than the professionals. On the other hand, the professionals have the principles, strategies, general intervention methods, and knowledge about the students' characteristics.

CONCLUSION

After this theoretical approach to non-formal education as a learning resource for attention to diversity, we highlight the critical role of the socio-family context. Education is a vital space for transmitting knowledge, abilities, values, attitudes, and skills, as well as behavioral norms that enable the person to achieve harmony between their individual and social happiness. In this sense, education is an essential process for the human being whose practice must be perfected and renewed through generations so the person can reach their goal; in the case at hand, learning to live together based on social inclusion.

Educational work can and should be carried out from the formal and non-formal spheres of education; all are essential. In the attention to diversity, non-formal education is considered a basic context due to its potential in the transmission of values and the prevention of discrimination. Naturally, in order to achieve this crucial socio-educational objective, it is necessary to carry out a deep pedagogical-educational reflection that leads to an intense formation such as education for life. We refer to a formation-education with its maximum expression in the school's provision, which must also be consolidated in extracurricular educational institutions, the world of work, and civil society.

Likewise, we know that many educational and social agents are involved in this task; for example, the family, teachers, free-time monitors, and the peer group, among others. We have focused on the family because we consider it a key piece in the organization of education in values.

Works Citation

- Banks, J., & Kathryn, A.H. (2007). *Learning in and out of school in diverse environments. Life-long, life-wide, life-deep*. Washington: The Life Center.
- Benso, C., & Pereira, C. (2007). *Familia y escuela. El reto de educar en el siglo XXI*. Vigo, Spain: Concello de Ourense.
- Berneman, J. (2016). El quehacer institucional frente a las necesidades educativas especiales (SEN) en el campo de la educación no formal. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39,2, 257-273. <http://hdl.handle.net/10908/12034>
- Bonell, L. (2003). Método: Cómo conseguimos que las personas aprendan. In R. Lamata & R. Domínguez (Coords.) *La construcción de procesos formativos en educación no formal* (pp. 163-195). Madrid: Narcea
- Bornstein, M.H. (2002): Parenting infants. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting. Vol 1. Children and parenting* (pp. 3-43). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cabalé, E., & Rodríguez, G. M. (2017). Educación no Formal: potencialidades y valor social. *Revista Cubana de Educación Superior*, 36, 69-83.
- Cantón, J., Cortés, M., & Justicia, M. (2007). *Conflictos entre los padres, divorcio y desarrollo de los hijos*. Madrid: Pirámide
- Castilla, M. T. (2007). *Las comunidades educadoras, propuestas organizativas, metodológicas y de gestión*. Madrid: CCS Editorial
- Castro-Zubizarreta, A., & García-Ruiz, R. (2016). Vínculos entre familia y escuela: visión de los maestros en formación. *Magis. Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 9(18), 193-208
- Comellas, M. J. (2009). *Educación en la comunidad y en la familia. Acompañando a las familias en el día a día*. Valencia: Nau Libres.
- Coombs, P. (1971). *La crisis mundial de la educación*. Barcelona: Península.
- Dueñas, M. L. (1991). *La integración escolar: aproximación a su teoría y a su práctica*. Madrid: UNED
- Elizondo, C. (2017). Educación inclusiva: un paradigma transformador. *Pedagogías de la inclusión. Forúm Aragón*, 22, 28-31.
- Españat, C. A. (2020). Desafíos de la Educación Especial en el desarrollo de escuelas inclusivas. *Ciencia y Educación*, 4(3), 133-143.
- Freixa, M. (1997). La integración de la escuela en la comunidad. El papel de la familia. In A. Sánchez Palomino & J. A. Torres (Coords.), *Educación especial I* (pp. 207-220). Madrid: Pirámide.
- Garreta Bochaca, J. (2011). La atención a la diversidad cultural en Cataluña: exclusión, segregación e interculturalidad. *Revista de Educación*, 355, 213-233. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-355-022>
- Gómez, N., & Gómez, M. (2014). Educación formal y no formal. Un punto de encuentro en educación musical. *Aula Abierta*, 42(1), 47-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0210-2773\(14\)70008-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0210-2773(14)70008-3)
- Huget, T. (2006). *Aprender juntos en el aula: Una propuesta inclusiva*. Barcelona: Graó
- Jones, F. C. (1986). Equity in education: Low priority in the school reform movement. *The Urban Review*, 18(1), 31-39.
- Kiwan, D. (2008). *Education for inclusive citizenship*. London: Routledge
- Maiztegui-Oñate, C. (2007). La participación como una opción transformadora en los procesos de educación ciudadana. *REICE: Revista Electrónica Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación* 5(4), 144-170. <http://hdl.handle.net/10486/661007>
- Maiztegui-Oñate, C., & Fonseca-Peso, J. (2014). Ciudadanía y participación en contextos de diversidad cultural: análisis desde la educación no formal. *Interacções*, 10(29), 37-59. <https://doi.org/10.25755/int.3921>
- Manjón, D. (2002). *Las dificultades de aprendizaje en el aula*. Madrid: Edebé
- Martín-Bris, M. (2006). Participación de los padres y madres de alumnos en ámbito municipal y de los centros escolares. *Organización y Gestión Educativa*, 14, 1, 27-28.
- Martín- Macías, E. (2010). Decisiones de escolarización en el alumnado con necesidades educativas especiales. *Pedagogía Magna*, 8, 77-84.
- Marín-Martínez, N. (2003). *La enseñanza de las ciencias en primaria*. Granada: Grupo Editorial Universitario.
- Martos-Sánchez, S. (2020). *El reto de la familia y la escuela ante la diversidad* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Jaén, Spain].
- Mayor, J. (1991). Educación especial. In J. Mayor (Dir.), *Manual de educación especial* (3rd ed.) (pp. 7-31). Madrid: Anaya.
- Medina-García, M. (2017). *La educación inclusiva como mecanismo de garantía de la igualdad de oportunidades y no discriminación de las personas con discapacidad. Una propuesta de estrategias pedagógicas inclusivas* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Jaén, Spain].

- Negrín, M. A., & Marrero, J. J. (2018). Evolución en la escolarización del alumnado con necesidades educativas especiales en el sistema educativo español: conceptualización, síntesis histórica y papel de la Inspección Educativa. *Avances en Supervisión Educativa*, 29, 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.23824/ase.v0i29.596>
- Novo, M. (2005). Educación ambiental y educación no formal: dos realidades que se realimentan. *Revista de Educación*, 338, 145-166.
- Parada-Gañete, A. (2018). *La relación familia-escuela: el caso concreto de familias del alumnado con necesidades específicas de apoyo educativo* [Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela].
- Pastor-Homs, M. I. (2001). Orígenes y evolución del concepto de educación no formal. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 220(59), 525-544. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23765896>
- Pozo-Sánchez, E. (1994). *Tratamiento educativo en el nivel de educación especial en la Comunidad Económica Europea: Reino Unido y España. Estudio Comparativo*. In Simposio Nacional Familia, Comunicación y Educación (pp. 145-150). Madrid: Kronos.
- Robinson, K. (2015). *Escuelas creativas. La revolución que está transformando la educación*. Barcelona, España: Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial.
- Robledo-Ramón, P., & García, J. N. (2008). El contexto familiar y su papel en el desarrollo socio-emocional de los niños: revisión de estudios empíricos. *International Journal of Developmental and educational psychology*, 4(1), 75-82.
- Roldan, L. M. (2015). *El sentido de la escuela media hoy: estudio comparativo entre estudiantes de distintos sectores sociales de la ciudad de Medellín (Colombia)* [Doctoral dissertation, Universidad del Salvador].
- Romi, S., & Schmida, M. (2009). Non-formal education: A major educational force in the postmodern era. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39, 257 - 273.
- Sánchez-Manzano, E. (1992). *Introducción a la educación especial*. Madrid: Editorial Complutense.
- Sánchez-Palomino, A., & Torres-González, J. A. (2002). Las necesidades educativas especiales como alternativas a la categorización. In A. Sánchez-Palomino & J. A. Torres-González (Eds.), *Educación Especial. Centros educativos y profesores con la diversidad* (pp. 63-84). Madrid: Pirámide.
- Torres, C. (2007). Conceptualización y caracterización de la educación no formal. In C. Torres & J. A. Pareja Fernandez de la Reguera (Coords), *La educación no formal y diferenciada: fundamentos didácticos y organizativos*. Madrid: CCS Editorial.
- Trilla, J. (1998). *La educación fuera de la escuela. Ámbitos no formales y educación social*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Trilla, J. (2009). *La Educación no formal. Aportes a las prácticas de educación no formal desde la investigación educativa*. Montevideo: Dirección Educativa del Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, 99.
- Trilla, J., & Novella, A. M. (2001). Educación y participación social de la infancia. *Revista Iberoamericana de educación*, 26, 137-164.
- Vallejos, I. (2009). La categoría de normalidad: una mirada sobre viejas y nuevas formas de disciplinamiento social. In A. Rosato & M. A. Angelino (Coords.), *Discapacidad e ideología de la normalidad, desnaturalizar el déficit* (pp. 95-116), Argentina: Novedades Educativas de México.
- Warnock, H. M. (1978). *Special education needs. Report of the committee of Enquiry into Education of Handicapped children and young people*. Her Majesty's Office. London.
- Zabalza, M. A., & Cid, A. (2009). Integración escolar, aspectos organizativos para la atención a los alumnos con necesidades educativas especiales en la Comunidad Autónoma de Galicia vistos por los directores de centros escolares. *Enseñanza & Teaching: Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica*, 22, 237-261.
- Zunzunegui, M. (2011). Evolución de la discapacidad y la dependencia. Una mirada internacional. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 25(2), 12-20.