Preleminary Remarks

(2’)
I will line out the methodological frame of a comparative research project which I have started about one year ago. The project is situated in the context of the graduate program „Youth Welfare in Transition“ at the universities of Bielefeld and Dortmund, funded by the German research Association.
In that context I'm organising an international conference about the modes of cooperation between school and out-of-school education agencies: Colleagues from Australia, Canada, France, Finland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, Israel, and Germany will meet in Bielefeld from the 9th to the 11th of October this year (that means in three weeks time) to compare the respective national arrangements of formal and non-formal education.
Here I will mainly present the scheme of comparison which was sent to the contributors in order to help them preparing their presentations.

The topic: Full-time school – full-time care – full-time education

(5’)
The topic of both the conference and the research project is – as the subtitle of my paper says – the role of out-of-school education institutions in the full-time systems of selected
Background
The background of the topic is the specific German ‘half-day-school’ (e.g. from 8 a.m. until 1 p.m.) – which has (again) become questioned after its poor results in the PISA-study – as well as the comparatively differentiated and specialised structure of youth work agencies in Germany, with their important social and educational functions. In contrast to Germany nearly all – at least European – countries have education systems which provide school and youth work from (early) morning until (late) afternoon. The German education system (which furthermore varies among the different states) has - along with Austria and Switzerland - just very few such institutions.
Therefore one of the main focal points in the current debate and political activities following the poor results of German pupils in the PISA-Study is the use of “Ganztagsschulen” (‘full-time schools’). In fact, with the beginning of the new school year in these days new day-formats are about to be implemented. But: Qualitatively they do not seem to be much more than “Ganztagsbetreuungen” (‘full-time care’) with lessons given by teachers until lunchtime and a meal, help with the homework and some time for playing provided by youth workers in the afternoon. In opposition to both – ‘full-time school’ and ‘full-time care’ - the debate in the German social education science prefers the term “Ganztagsbildung” (‘full-time education’) which refers to a concept of integrated formal and non-formal education.

State of Research
Besides these more or less theoretical and political debates, there is only very little comparative research about the relationship between out-of-school education agencies and schools in the education systems of other European countries. So the conference represents a first step to close an astonishing gap in research concerning the international comparative social sciences:
It is true that in the international comparative research on youth
welfare services single studies pick out the school-related youth work as a central theme, but a comparative survey about the cooperation of school education and youth welfare service does not exist at all. Analogical to that fact, international comparative studies about full-time-schools are very rarely (Neumann/Ramseger 1990). Regarding descriptions of educational systems in Europe (Anweiler 1996; Döbert 2002), the part of non-formal education of children and adolescents is totally neglected.

Nevertheless, recently a tendency in European school systems can be noticed: apart from the countries already practising full-time schooling (France, Great-Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium), even in countries with a school-system finishing at lunchtime the integration of formal and non-formal education gains in importance. Taillights of this development are still Austria, Switzerland and Germany.

But as I already said: Since the shattering results of the PISA-study about German pupils have been published and realized by the public, the full-time institutionalisation of school and out-of-school education has become a main topic in politics, both on a national level and on the level of the federal states. Despite the fact that reorganisations have already begun, concepts about how to realize a durable integration of formal and non-formal institutions do not yet have remarkable influence in Germany. The results are more or less patch-work.

Under a methodical perspective the research project and the conference follow the actual change of paradigms in the international comparative educational sciences: descriptions only regarding one country are no longer that predominant, but therefore comparisons of different educational systems focussing a special problem or topic gain in importance (Hornberg/Weber).

The research question is situated on "meso-level“ (Treptow):

- The field is – only named in Germany in that way – "full-time" education systems.
- The contexts are the PISA-studies of the OECD and the Unesco-studies about non-formal and informal learning resp. education.
The type of research is a comparison of organisations and systems.

Functions and Objectives of Comparison
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Full-time-school systems should be compared – referring to Esping-Andersen - ‘to see the wood instead of the trees’ and to point out common tendencies (and maybe furthermore to point out causalities). Furthermore it seems to be helpfull to avoid – remaining in the picture of the wood and the trees – to avoid the thicket of the internal German debates...

I use the term “system” synonymical to the term ”regime” exerted by Esping-Andersen. In my form it refers to the way in which education of children and adolescents is allocated between state, civil-society and families.

Probably, within the scope of the research project the three levels of international comparisons in the educational sciences (Schriewer 2000):

FOLIE

1. The comparatively methodised theory-building
2. The theory-based explanation of the variety of different cultural phenomena
3. The transfer of practical and political knowledge can't be considered in equal measure. This first step probably has to be restricted to unit 1 (theory-building and -critique) and unit 3 (transfer of political knowledge). That means regarding the four functions of international comparisons in the educational sciences the ideographic and the experimental units will be in the centre of interest. (The melioristic function: the counselling of politicians by „best practise“-examples cannot be provided in a serious manner. Also the evolutionistic function: the explanation of differences and shared tendencies can only pointed out as a possibility.)

At the conference systems integrating formal and non-formal education are compared in regard to three final objectives:

FOLIE

- Under a scientific point of view the development of a heuristic typology of education systems has to be

- Under an educational-conceptual point of view the comparative development of a model concerning the integration of formal and non-formal education has to be regarded.
- Under a perspective of educational policy, it is necessary to enrich the actual national discussion on full-time-systems by an out-of-school perspective.

**Units of Comparison**
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The German term „Kinder- und Jugendhilfe“ cannot easily be translated into other (academic) languages. Therefore in the research project every stately, public, private or economic form of out-of-school education is regarded as comparable to the German so-called “school-related Jugendhilfe” (e.g. Kindergarten and other child care institutions; youth clubs and centres; youth counselling, youth education centres; ambulant und statutory socio-educational provision for children with problems etc.). The central topics of German youth welfare research shall be taken as units of comparison:

- organisation
- profession
- user
- discipline/theory

**Criteria of Comparison**

Core-elements which can contribute to the named typology („Ganztagsschule“, „Ganztagsbetreuung“, „Ganztagsbildung“ – „full-time-school“, “full-time-care”, “full-time-education”) are considered as criteria of comparison.

FOLIE
Organisation
Analysing the involved organisations a mere side by side (e.g. using the same building) and just punctual cooperation shall be neglected as well as special forms of care in remideal and special fields of work.

1. the set of providers for education:
   - state (national, regional, local government)
   - public (civil-society: voluntary and third sector associations)
   - economy (leisure industry)
   - family

2. the set of finance of education:
   - stately (budgets),
   - civic (sponsoring, funding, contributions)
   - economic (charges, incomes)
   - by families (fees)

3. the set of forms of education:
   - formal (compulsory: training; certificates)
   - non-formal (voluntary: identity-building; symbolic reproduction)
   - informal (incidental: everyday-life competencies; coping)

4. the set of functions of out-of-school offers in relation to school
   - school-supporting
   - school-complementing
   - school-compensating

Profession
Characterising the staff structure in full-time-systems I'll have a look at:

1. the set of contents in the training of the professionals:
   - school education
   - social education / social work
   - leisure-time education
   - philosophy of education

2. the set of formal certificates among the professionals:
• academic (university)
• on academic basis (college)
• related to a specific field of work (vocational school)

3. the set of **professionals and volunteers**

**User**

As users are considered children and adolescents from their age of school enrolment (4 or 6 years) up to at least the end of their compulsory school time (15 or 16 years), who attend institutions of the general education system and use offers of youth welfare, as well as their parents.

The following criteria will be analysed:

1. the set of **times** (daily, weekly, annually; depending on age):
   • in school (to be differentiated by lesson and out-of-lesson times)
   • in social or leisure-time education
   • in families
   • outside educational institutions

2. the set of **legal conditions** in using full-time institutions:
   • obligation
   • voluntariness
   • legal claim
   • demand

3. the set of the **functions** of out-of-school offers in relation to families:
   • family-supporting
   • family-complementing
   • family-compensating

**Discipline and Theory**

On the disciplinary and theoretical level the comparison deals with the relationship between social and school education in the several academic systems.

1. the **formal level** of study and training programmes for the staff in full-time systems:
   • university: academic
• college: on academic basis
• vocational schools: related to a specific field of work
• outside of formal training institutions

2. the use of **leading terms**:
• education (Bildung)
• training (Ausbildung)
• care (Betreuung)
• ... work (-arbeit)
• leisure time (Freizeit)
• education (Erziehung)
• learning (Lernen)

3. the degree of **networking** between the disciplines in form of:
• research projects
• publications
• conferences

The scheduled characteristics of full-time systems serve the development and modification of the typology („Ganztagsschule“, „Ganztagsbetreuung“, „Ganztagsbildung“ – „full-time-school“, “full-time-care”, “full-time-education”). Following the conference it will be necessary to figure out some systems which are appropriate to illustrate the types. A second conference next year might be an important instrument for that objective.