

Specialised Professional Training Makes a Difference!

The Importance and Prestige of Typical Duties in All-Day Schools from the Perspective of Teachers, Leisure Educators, Principals and Coordinators of Extended Education

Olivia Fischer, James Loparics

Abstract: In Austria there is a specialised education (60 ECTS) for “leisure educators”, who are professionals working in all-day schools in the field of extended education but who are not teachers. Despite the existence of leisure educators, also teachers are often tasked with supervising extended education settings like lunchtime, extra-curricular activities and uncommitted free time in all-day schools in Austria. This paper aims to illustrate the difference of prestige that comes with different fields of duty in extended education and the implications of that difference. The paper is based on a quantitative study carried out in all-day schools in Vienna. It looks at the prestige of typical professional duties in all-day schools and at the importance attached to these duties by different professional groups. Leisure educators assign a higher importance to non-formal activities than teachers or other professional groups do. Yet, these activities represent relevant fields of duty in respect of training children and adolescents in 21st century skills. Hence the authors propose to address typical extended education duties in teacher education to enable all-day school professional teams to work on eye-level and efficiently.

Keywords: leisure education, all-day-schools, occupational prestige, specialised training

Introduction & Background

At a similar point in time Austrian and German politics declared the expansion of extended education programs in schools to improve both international assessment outcomes and the compatibility of work and family life. While German and Austrian education systems have quite similar ongoing discourses about the organisation of extended education programs there is one big difference: Austria has been having a specific education programme for leisure educators in schools for years, specifically a one-year training course (60 ECTS¹). Germany does not have such a specific education. In Germany educators and pedagogues with a more general training may choose to work in all-day schools instead of other pedagogical fields and according to Steiner (2013) there are also laypeople or professionalized laypeople working in German all-day schools. Although these lay people and professionalized laypeople work in less different fields of duty of all-day schools (like e.g. offering different extra-curricular activities or supervising homework) than pedagogical professional, Steiner (2013) found.

1 ECTS = European Credit Transfer System Points which are used for recognising academic qualifications and study periods within the European Union. For more information see: https://ec.europa.eu/education/resources-and-tools/european-credit-transfer-and-accumulation-system-ects_en

The Austrian training course on leisure education is offered by Austria's University Colleges of Teacher Education and its target group are people who want to work in schools but who have no academic background in the field of education. Leisure educators typically work in extended education settings, planning and supervising extra-curricular activities, lunch and uncommitted free time. The specialised professional training for leisure educators is unique to Austria and this paper is going to discuss differences in appraisal of various professional duties between the four main professional groups which work in extended education settings in Austrian all-day schools. These four groups are teachers, leisure educators, principals and coordinators of extended education and they vary in their basic professional education. While teachers and principals have all undergone a teacher education, leisure educators have only completed the one-year specialised training course for leisure educators. Coordinators of extended education can either have a background as teachers or a background as leisure educators but the majority comes from a teaching background. Every public Austrian school has an extended education coordinator assigned with all administrative, coordinating and planning tasks concerning extended education in schools.

Drawing from several sources the question arose if the different professional groups in Austrian schools would have different prestige and what effects this could have. “[O]ccupational roles locate individuals in social space” (Treiman, 1977) and with different occupational roles and their associated fields of duty comes different prestige. Domanski (2015) describes in his book “Prestige” that in Poland university professors have the highest occupational prestige of all occupational groups and that this is based on their specialist knowledge and qualification. Goyder (2009) argues similarly in his metastudy of occupational prestige in Canada that high level education is one of the key components for a profession with high occupational prestige. Goyder found in his Canada-wide dataset on occupational prestige that the profession high school teacher scored a rating of 80.3 (out of 100) and elementary school teacher scored 77.5 – a clearly lower rating. Social worker scored 71.4 and child-care provider in a private home 65.1 – both seem to be most comparable to the profession of leisure educators, although this is of course a wide stretch. However, it illustrates the smaller prestige of non teaching education professionals. For reference: the lowest rank Goyder found was telemarketer with 32.8 and the highest rank was physician with 90.5.

In relation to the higher prestige of teaching duties other question arose: Would professional duties ascribed to a more traditional view of school and duties ascribed to extended education settings be seen as of the same importance by all-day school staff. Would the education of a professional working in an all-day school have an influence on how they rank the importance of a field of duty? Our overall hypothesis concerning prestige and importance of duties in this pilot-study was that staff with a background as teachers (hence teachers, principals and most of the coordinators of extended education) see a higher prestige and a higher importance in all-day school duties that are closer to formal learning settings. We assumed this in relation to the previously mentioned research on occupational prestige – because working in more formal learning settings in Austrian all-day schools is related to a higher level of professional education.

A reason for not just focusing on teachers and leisure educators to answer this question but also on principals was that Börner (2015) underlines the important role of principals in all-day schools when it comes to the organisational development of schools and also to staff development. Since Austrian all-day schools additionally have a coordinator of extended education who also has a planning / organizing role, we also decided to include them.

Despite the different education programmes, leisure educators and teachers are often appointed the same duties in extended education in all-day schools in Austria, like supervising lunch or supervising self-guided / uncommitted free-time, afternoon learning sessions and extra-curricular activities. Unfortunately, there hasn't been much quantitative research on all-day-schools and their staff in Austria as Scheipl et al. (2018) state in the biannual Austrian education report and which has also been noted before by Hörl (2013). This paper presents findings of a questionnaire-based survey in 2019 where all-day school staff in Vienna were asked to participate. The staff were asked to assess the importance of fields of duty of all-day schools, in particular teaching, lunch time, time for self-study, uncommitted / self-guided free-time and extra-curricular activities (e.g. science clubs, additional sports activities, creative activities etc.). This paper focuses on three main hypotheses:

- Austrian teachers, leisure educators, principals and coordinators of extended education do not attach the same importance to the various fields of duty of all-day schools.
- The four professional groups perceive the appraisal of these fields of duty by stakeholder groups (parents, students, society) differently.
- Their professional education plays a role in how important they find a field of duty.

So why is this interesting to other countries besides Austria? Researchers like Tillmann & Rollet (2010) urge to involve teachers more in extended education settings of all-day schools and Graßhoff et al. (2019) state that extended education is often only little anchored in school culture. In this paper we will show that the type of professional education makes a difference in how important a professional group regards fields of duty that are more on the informal side of learning. Extended education settings like lunchtime or uncommitted freetime are in no way less important when it comes to the personal development of students.

Richter (2015) highlights the acquisition of social skills, life-long learning skills and democratic skills during extended education in all-day schools. He also emphasizes the importance of pedagogically designed leisure activities like sports or cultural activities. A well-functioning extended education concept needs professionals with a suitable education as well as efficient teams that can master the challenges of all-day schools on eye level. It needs professionals that value all fields of duty of all-day schools highly and who feel that their colleagues do the same. So it is necessary to put more research into professional trainings for extended education settings in all-day schools.

Method

The following hypotheses were researched using quantitative statistical methods:

1. The four professional groups – teachers, leisure educators, principals and coordinators of extended education – do not attach the same importance to the various fields of duty of all-day schools. The attached importance differs significantly.
2. The four professional groups feel significantly different about the importance of fields of duty in their respective schools.
3. All four professional groups can either be tasked with supervising lunch, supervising uncommitted freetime and supervising extra-curricular activities or they can be involved in

planning / conceptualizing these fields of duties. Nevertheless, the professional groups differ significantly in feeling prepared for working in the respective field of duty.

4. When asked to estimate how much importance stake-holder groups ascribe to the various fields of duty, the professional groups differ significantly in their estimation.
5. There is an underlying factor which we call prestige (of a field of duty). This factor can be shown in a factor analysis.
6. We can calculate a numerical value we also call prestige from variables regarding the estimated importance as mentioned in hypothesis 2 and by using the accumulated data of all four professional groups (the calculation will be explained in detail later). This prestige value can be used to rank the fields of duty in all-day schools. We assume it is higher for fields of duty that fit in a more traditional idea of schools. In particular, we postulate that that the prestige value is highest for teaching.
7. There is a significant correlation between participants feeling prepared for a field of duty by their professional education and how important they find the respective field of duty.

494 people working in extended education settings in Viennese all-day-schools took part in the online survey – 161 teachers, 261 leisure educators, 53 principals and 19 coordinators of extended education. According to our hypothesis we did not include other variables like age or gender in the survey but only focused on professional education and occupational group. The population size is an estimated 14.000 teachers, leisure educators, principals and coordinators of extended education. The questionnaire comprised items gathering data about the ascribed importance of fields of duty of all-day schools but also about cooperation between professional groups and about a few characteristics related to extended education in the respective schools. Only a part of the data is discussed in this paper.

The part of the survey focused on in this paper consisted of Likert scale items to determine the importance or the perceived importance of the following fields of duty in all-day schools: supervising lunch, supervising uncommitted / self-guided freetime, supervising self-study, supervising extra-curricular activities (like science clubs, additional sports activities, creative activities, etc.) and teaching. The study participants either had to rate these fields of duty themselves or they had to estimate the rating of different stakeholder groups. Here are some of the statements which had to be rated in the section “supervising lunch” to illustrate the items in the survey:

1. “I consider supervising the lunch in schools important.”
2. “The supervision of lunch is considered important in my school.”
3. “The supervision of lunch is considered important in society.”
4. “The supervision of lunch is considered important by parents.”
5. “The supervision of lunch is considered important by children and teenagers.”
6. “My professional education prepared my for supervising lunch.”

Participants had to rate these statements by choosing between “I fully agree.” (assigned value = 3), “I rather agree.” (assigned value = 2), “I rather disagree.” (assigned value = 1), “I fully disagree” (assigned value = 0). Analogue statements were used for the other fields of duty in all-day schools.

It seems important to mention here that the exact German phrasing which was used in most of the statements was “einen hohen Stellenwert haben” and it involves not only importance but also a high status / prestige.

The following analyses were carried out:

- **Kruskal-Wallis Test:**
Due to the gathered data being ordinal but not normally distributed, the data was analysed with a Kruskal-Wallis test to assess significant differences between the four professional groups following Lix et al. (1996) who suggest this kind of analysis for this purpose and this kind of data.
Following Tomczak & Tomczak (2015, p. 24) the effect size η^2 of the Kruskal Wallis Test was calculated: $\eta^2 = (H - k + 1) / (n - k)$
H – the value obtained in the Kruskal-Wallis test (the Kruskal-Wallis H-test statistic)
 η^2 – eta-squared estimate assumes values from 0 to 1 and multiplied by 100 % indicates the percentage of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable
k – the number of groups
n – the total number of observations
- **Factor Analysis:**
A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.827 and a significant result to Bartlett’s Test of sphericity allowed to do a factor analysis with the data sample. The measure of sampling adequacy was also checked for every variable used in the factor analysis and all were confirmed < 0,5. The factor analysis was carried out using Maximum Likelihood and Varimax rotation.
- **Calculation of the prestige value:**
Using the four items loading on the factor “prestige” a new variable was calculated by multiplying the respective load by the value of the respective variable (between 0 and 3) and then summing these numbers.
Example:
“prestige of supervising lunch” = load of L1 * value of L1 + load of L2 * value of L2 + load of L3 * value of L3 + load of L4 * value of L4
(for items L1, L2, L3 and L4 see the table in the results section)
For each prestige value of a field of duty the mean of all collected datasets was calculated and the mean values were ranked.
- **Spearman’s Rank Correlation:**
A Spearman rho rank correlation test was made to determine if there is a correlation between considering a field of duty important and having been prepared for this field of duty in one’s professional education.

Results

Differences between the Professional Groups (Hypothesis 1 to 4)

In most of the items (see Table 1) there was a significant difference between the four professional groups: teachers, leisure educators, headmasters / headmistresses and extended education coordinators. The following table displays the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test (Sig. = significance; null hypothesis = There is no significant difference between the four professional groups):

Table 1: Item-List

Item	Null hypothesis	Sig.
L1 I consider supervising the lunch in schools important.	reject	0.031
L2 The supervision of lunch is considered important in my school.	reject	0.001
L3 The supervision of lunch is considered important in society.	reject	0.001
L4 The supervision of lunch is considered important by parents.	reject	0.001
L5 The supervision of lunch is considered important by children and teenagers.	reject	0.001
L6 My professional education prepared me for supervising lunch.	reject	0.001
E1 I consider extra-curricular activities in schools important.	reject	0.001
E2 The supervision of extra-curricular activities is considered important in my school.	reject	0.005
E3 The supervision of extra-curricular activities is considered important in society.	reject	0.005
E4 The supervision of extra-curricular activities is considered important by parents.	reject	0.000
E5 The supervision of extra-curricular activities is considered important by children and teenagers.	reject	0.038
E6 My professional education prepared me for supervising extra-curricular activities.	reject	0.001
U1 I consider uncommitted free time in schools important.	reject	0.001
U2 The supervision of uncommitted free time is considered important in my school.	reject	0.001
U3 The supervision of uncommitted free time is considered important in society.	reject	0.001
U4 The supervision of uncommitted free time is considered important by parents.	reject	0.001
U5 The supervision of uncommitted free time is considered important by children and teenagers.	reject	0.001
U6 My professional education prepared me for supervising uncommitted free time.	reject	0.001
S1 I consider self-study time in schools important.	keep	0.078

Item	Null hypothesis	Sig.
S2 The supervision of self-study time is considered important in my school.	reject	0.024
S3 The supervision of self-study time is considered important in society.	keep	0.437
S4 The supervision of self-study time is considered important by parents.	keep	0.605
S5 The supervision of self-study time is considered important by children and teenagers.	keep	0.455
S6 My professional education prepared me for supervising self-study time.	reject	0.001
T1 I consider teaching in schools important.	keep	0.142
T2 Teaching is considered important in my school.	keep	0.384
T3 Teaching is considered important in society.	reject	0.001
T4 Teaching is considered important by parents.	reject	0.013
T5 Teaching is considered important by children and teenagers.	reject	0.065
T6 My professional education prepared me for teaching.	reject	0.001


The results clearly show that the four professional groups (teachers T, leisure educators LE, principals P and coordinators of extended education CEE) differ significantly in rating the importance of supervising lunch, uncommitted free-time and extra-curricular activities but not in rating teaching and supervising self-study. This is interesting because the fields where we have to reject the hypothesis are those fields of duty where teachers are in charge and which match a more traditional idea of schools.

We see the same pattern when it comes to how the professional groups feel about the importance of the fields of duty in their respective schools (hypothesis 2) but here the difference is even more striking. While all four groups on average completely agree that teaching and the supervision of self-study are considered important in their respective schools, teachers and leisure educators clearly differ concerning supervising lunch, uncommitted free time and extra-curricular activities. This is illustrated in figures 1 and 2 which contrast the boxplots and means for item T2 (“Teaching is considered important in my school.”) and item U2 (“The supervision of uncommitted free time is considered important in my school”). The mean value was calculated using the previously described assigned values for the Likert scale items with 0 meaning “I fully disagree” and 3 meaning “I fully agree.”

The boxplots and also the mean values clearly illustrate the differences between the occupational groups.


occupational group	mean	SD
leisure educators	2.923	0.281
teachers	2.941	0.330
principals	2.943	0.412
extended education coordinators	2.929	0.267
total	2.931	0.313

Figure 1: “Teaching is Considered Important in my School.” – boxplot & mean values



occupational group	mean	SD
leisure educators	2.503	0.769
teachers	2.257	0.873
principals	2.264	0.836
extended education coordinators	2.857	0.363
total	2.409	0.813


Figure 2: “The Supervision of Uncommitted Free Time is Considered Important in my School” – boxplot & mean values



Looking closer at supervising lunch, uncommitted free time and extra-curricular activities, the data shows that the professional groups (leisure educators LE, teachers T, principals P and coordinators of extended education CEE) also differ significantly in feeling prepared for these duties. In each of these fields, leisure educators show a higher mean of feeling prepared than the other professional groups involved in this field of duty. This difference between the four professional groups is also illustrated in the following boxplot-graphs and the associated means:


occupational group	mean	SD
leisure educators	1.377	1.131
teachers	0.217	0.597
principals	0.264	0.711
extended education coordinators	0.929	0.917
total	0.872	1.095

Figure 3: “My Professional Education Prepared Me for Supervising Lunch.” – boxplot & mean values




occupational group	mean	SD
leisure educators	2.523	0.788
teachers	0.658	0.957
principals	0.452	0.845
extended education coordinators	2.214	0.975
total	1.693	1.274

Figure 4: “My Professional Education Prepared Me for Supervising Uncommitted Free Time.” – boxplot & mean values



occupational group	mean	SD
leisure educators	2.242	0.908
teachers	0.750	0.985
principals	0.642	1.040
extended education coordinators	2.071	0.829
total	1.587	1.205

Figure 5: “My Professional Education Prepared Me for Supervising Extra-Curricular Activities.” – boxplot & mean values



Principals and extended education coordinators are usually only involved in supervising lunch, uncommitted freetime and extra-curricular activities from a planning perspective. Looking at the two professional groups who are directly tasked with executing these duties, it strikes the eye, how much of a difference there is between the means. On our four point Likert scale, the difference in mean for these three fields of duty is never less than 1.1 points with the leisure educators always scoring higher. Since teachers feel less prepared for these duties (hypothesis 3), it would be interesting to look at curricula of teacher education in Austria to see if these three fields of duty – to which teachers in all-day schools can very well be assigned – are addressed in lectures or seminars.

Although it has nothing to do with the original research questions and hypothesis it catches the eye and has to be noted that the mean value of all professional groups is rather low when it comes to feeling prepared for supervising lunch. Further research into this issues seems advisable to determine if changes in the curricula for Austrian leisure educators are necessary.

Regarding hypothesis 4 the four professional groups have a significantly different perception of what different stakeholder groups consider important in the very same areas as above – supervising lunch, uncommitted free time and extra-curricular activities. It is most noteworthy that the professional groups differ significantly in feeling prepared for supervising these tasks despite their involvement in those tasks. Regarding teaching and supervising self-study, the estimated importance only differs significantly for some stake-holder groups.

The effect sizes η^2 of the Kruskal Wallis Test were found out to be small for all items except for the ones involving feeling prepared for a field of duty due to the professional education of the participants (L6, E6, U6, S6, T6).

The Prestige of a Field of Duty (Hypothesis 5 & 6)

The factor analysis proved, that for each field of duty of all-day-schools, the items “xxx is considered important in my school”, “xxx is considered important in society”, “xxx is considered important by parents” and “xxx is considered important by children and teenagers”

load on the same underlying factor which we call “prestige of xxx”. Hence, we can confirm hypothesis 5. Concerning uncommitted free time, the four items could have been split into two factors according to the factor analysis, but we chose not to do this since it is not relevant for the following calculation of the prestige value. It has to be noted that the item “I consider xxx important” contributes to the same factor but it makes sense to look at it individually to be able to differentiate between an individual’s personal point of view and what they think everybody else’s view is.

For each field of duty, the prestige value was calculated as described in the methods section. As proposed in hypothesis 6 the mean of the prestige value is higher for fields of duty related to teaching and learning, or – so to say – related to a more “classical” idea of what is happening in schools. The two fields with the highest prestige are teaching, where only teachers work, and supervising self-study, where leisure educators might support but teachers are in charge. There is a clear numerical gap to the fields of duty in which teachers and leisure educators work.

Table 2: Mean Value of Prestige

Variable	Mean	SD
prestige of teaching	6,8340	0,93768
prestige of supervising self-study	6,8146	1,04698
prestige of supervising lunch	5,9238	1,74178
prestige of supervising extra-curricular activities	5,4129	1,39608
prestige of supervising uncommitted free time	4,8151	1,24634

Professional Education as a Factor (Hypothesis 7)

To see if a person’s professional education has an effect on how important they find a field of duty a Spearman Rank Correlation test was made with the items “I consider xxx in schools important.” and “My professional education prepared me for xxx.” for each field of duty of all-day schools. For every field of duty, a significant correlation between education and rating could be found which confirms hypothesis 7.

Table 3: Significant Correlations between the Feeling Prepared for a Field of Duty and Considering it Important

Field of duty	Item (importance)	Item (education)	PCC	Sig.
Lunch	L1	L6	0,103	0,023
Extra-curricular activities	E1	E6	0,117	0,009
Uncommitted free-time	U1	U6	0,182	0,000
Self-study	S1	S6	0,092	0,041
Teaching	T1	T6	0,144	0,001

Discussion and Conclusion

Prestige and Attached Importance

Looking at the different analyses carried out with the data, the four professional groups attach significantly varying importance to supervising lunch, uncommitted free time and extra-curricular activities (e. g. sports and cultural activities). These are the very same fields of duty with a clearly lower calculated prestige value and these are also areas which might not match a more traditional idea of schools. The findings match with the ones of Fischer (2016), who found that there is a linking-gap between the work of teachers and non-teaching professionals in Germany. Both groups would follow different education goals. Also Börner (2015) found that in all-day schools in Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany, professional activities which are closer related with classical teaching and education are considered of higher value by the staff. She found that professional activities which are rather untypical for traditional, non all-day schools rank lowest. So we can sum up that this study and studies from Germany with a similar (but not exactly the same) focus come to the conclusion that there is a difference in prestige and attached importance of professional duties depending on how far they are from a traditional view of teaching and learning.

Kolbe and Reh (2008) also see a correlation between quality and cooperation. While Meister (2010) argues that cooperation within schools is important, Niehoff et al. (2019) found that there is only little cooperation in all-day schools. A reason for this could be the lack of perceived importance and prestige of especially the professional duties of the leisure educator. So the question arises, if these differences in importance / prestige lead to a difference in quality of these fields of duty in all-day schools. Blackmore (2015) argues that “prestige is shaping values and priorities” (p.171). If uncommitted free time, lunch and extra-curricular activities, which are important learning environments for underprivileged students when it comes to social and communicative skills, have less prestige, will this contribute to perpetuating inequality between social groups?

The lower prestige of the typical duties of leisure educators also raises the question, if staff in all-day schools can work as efficient teams with equal members. Tillmann (2011) found in her study of German all-day schools that non-teaching staff are less involved in

strategic planning and planning of activities. She also emphasizes the findings of Fussangel and Gräsel (2010) that cooperations between teaching staff and other pedagogical staff is often little sophisticated.

Blackmore (2015) brings forward the argument that “...*the prestige that attaches to something demonstrates the advantages that accrue to institutions, groups and individuals who can develop a prestigious position. To be perceived to be prestigious is itself a resource, tending to validate everything that one does.*” (p.52). If leisure educators work in a less prestigious field will this have any influence on how others collaborate with them? Will their expertise be efficiently used in all-day school staff teams? If future studies found any influence here, Goyder’s (2009) suggestion of using public relation strategies could be taken into consideration by policy makers and governments to support the position of extended education professionals, e.g. leisure educators. Goyder suggests that occupational representation could be actively changed by public relation strategies like advertisements in mass media which stress the level of professionalism.

Professional Education and Attached Importance

Our data shows that the professional education is related to how much importance a professional sees in a field of duty. With this result a new question arises: Does it influence the quality of these constituents of extended education if teachers and principals feel less prepared for working in these fields of duty? There is need for a follow-up research project to determine if the quality of these fields of duty is related to the education of the occupational group entrusted with it. Policy makers might want to reconsider if it is a good idea to have teachers working in the less formal fields of extended education (like supervising lunch, uncommitted free-time and extra-curricular activities), if they do not feel trained for these duties. It might make more sense to entrust leisure educators alone with them.

Another way to change the current situation could be to include the less traditional fields of duty in teacher education curricula. Köpfer and Lemmer (2020) researched the cooperation between teachers and professionals of special needs education and in their conclusion, they call for including knowledge about other fields of duty into teacher education. Also Börner (2015) suggests to include fields of duty which are untypical for traditional, non all-day schools into in-service training of pedagogical staff. Likewise, she suggests in-service “tandem-training” in which all types of pedagogical staff could participate together. Also Hopmann et al. (2019) or te Poel (2019) describe in their research projects the positive effects of shared professional trainings on multi-professional teams in education. These suggested cooperative learning environments for different occupational groups in schools could also be interesting when it comes to teachers and leisure educators. On the one hand, it might help teachers feel better prepared for these duties, on the other hand it might change their attitude towards these fields when it comes to importance and prestige. Börner (2015) also argues that the less traditional fields of duty of all-day should not only be addressed in basic teacher education but also in the professional training of principals which makes sense considering the influence of principals on school culture.

Politicians and education researchers agree that all-day schools play an important role in fostering underprivileged social groups. Especially the less formal part of all-day schools might help children to acquire skills which are necessary to compete in the 21st century job

market. Moreover, these fields are not only relevant to underprivileged children and adolescents. In our fast-changing world, teaching and learning in typical school subjects like maths or languages are still changing slowly. Now it is the turn of the less formal part of all-day schools to step in and contribute in creating new learning environments and development opportunities for children and adolescents.

A professional training like Austria's training of leisure educators might be interesting to other countries in a process of expanding their range of all-day schools. It could be a part of the strategy to anchor extended education within school culture. As described earlier, an interesting approach might be to let future teachers and leisure educators work together through parts of their professional training, like several previously mentioned pilot-projects from closely related pedagogical fields show. This could have an impact on collaboration and efficiency in multi-professional teams in all-day schools. It would be interesting to research the impact of such a change in the education of all-day-school professionals in a long-term study.

References

- Blackmore, P.: *Prestige in Academic Life. Excellence and Exclusion*. London: Routledge. (2015)
- Breuer, A. (2015). *Lehrer-Erzieher-Teams an ganztägigen Grundschulen: Kooperation als Differenzierung von Zuständigkeiten*. Springer VS.
- Börner, N. (2015). Know-How, Kompetenzen und Können. Empirische Befunde zu Selbsteinschätzungen von Lehrkräften. *Lernende Schule*, 69, p.10–12.
- Bundesministerium für Unterricht, K. und K. (BMUKK). (2011). *Empfehlungen für gelungene schulische Tagesbetreuung*. Kopie vorhanden. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/16215/stb_empf.pdf
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Coelen, T. & Otto, H.-U. (Ed.) (2008): *Grundbegriffe der Ganztagsbildung*. Das Handbuch. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Domanski, H. (2015): *Prestige*; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main..
- Fischer, N. (2015). Merkmale guter Ganztagschulen. Ergebnisse der empirischen Bildungsforschung. *Lernende Schule*, 69, 6–9.
- Fischer, N. (2016). Die Verbindungslücke. *DJI Impulse*, 113(2/2016), 7–9.
- Fussangel, K., & Gräsel, C. (2010). Kooperation von Lehrkräften. In T. Bohl & W. Helsper (Ed.), *Handbuch Schulentwicklung: Theorie, Forschungsbefunde, Entwicklungsprozesse, Methodenrepertoire*. Klinkhardt.
- Goyder, J. (2009): *Prestige Squeeze: Occupational Prestige in Canada Since 1965*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Graßhoff, G., Haude, C., Idel, T.-S., Bebek, C., & Schütz, A. (2019). Die Eigenlogik des Nachmittags. Explorative Beobachtungen aus Ethnografien zu außerunterrichtlichen Angeboten. *DDS – Die Deutsche Schule*, 111(2), 205–218.
Accessed online on 2021/ 03 / 21: <https://doi.org/10.31244/dds.2019.02.07>
- Hill, L. D. & Levine F. J. (Ed.): *Global Perspectives on Education Research*. Routledge. (2018)
- Hofer, M. et al: *Schule-Freizeit-Konflikte, Wertorientierungen und motivationale Interferenz in der Freizeit. Eine kulturübergreifende Studie*. In: *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie*, 40 (2), p. 55–68. Göttingen: Hogrefe Verlag. (2008)
- Hopmann, B., Böhm-Kasper, O., & Lütje-Klose, B. (2019). Multiprofessionelle Kooperation in inklusiven Ganztagschulen in der universitären Lehre. *Entwicklung inklusions- und kooper-*

- ationsbezogener Einstellungen von angehenden Lehrkräften und sozialpädagogischen Fachkräften in einem interdisziplinären Masterseminar. *Herausforderung Lehrer_innenbildung*, 2 (3), p. 400–421
- Kamski, I., Holtappels, H. G., Schnetzer, T., & Kamski-Holtappels-Schnetzer (Hrsg.). (2009). *Qualität von Ganztagschule—Konzepte und Orientierungen für die Praxis*. Waxmann.
- Kolbe, F. U., & Reh, S. (2008). Kooperation unter Pädagogen. In T. Coelen & H.-U. Otto (Ed.), *Grundbegriffe Ganztagsbildung: Das Handbuch* (1. Aufl., p. 799–808). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften; PH Wien Fernleihe.
- Köpfer, A. & Lemmer, K. (2020). Die “perfekte” Kooperationssituation. Rekonstruktion ambivalenter Kooperationsvorstellungen angehender Lehrkräfte im Kontext schulischer Inklusion entlang von Norm und Expertise. In *Herausforderung Lehrer_innenbildung* 3 (1), p. 80–93.
- Lix, L., Keselmann, J., Keselmann, H.J. (1996): Consequences of Assumption Violations Revisited: A Quantitative Review of Alternatives to the One-Way Analysis of Variance “F” Test. In: *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 579–619. Retrieved March 2, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170654>
- Meister, G. (2010): Ganztagschule entwickeln. In T. Bohl & W. Helsper (Hrsg.), *Handbuch Schulentwicklung: Theorie, Forschungsbefunde, Entwicklungsprozesse, Methodenrepertoire* (p. 307–310). Klinkhardt.
- Niehoff, S., Fussangel, K., Lettau, W.-D., & Radisch, F. (2019). Individuelle Förderung in der Ganztagsgrundschule—Ein Anlass zur Kooperation? *DDS – Die Deutsche Schule*, 111. Jahrgang/Heft 2, 187–205.
- Richter, R.: Mehr Bildungschancen durch Ganztagschulen. In: Ganztagsschulverband GGT E.V.: die Ganztagschule. (2016) ISSN 0344-2101
- OECD: OECD Skills Strategy 2019: Skills to Shape a Better Future. Paris: OECD Publishing (2019). Accessed online on 2020 / 05 / 11 <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264313835-en>
- Scheipl, J., Leeb, J., Wetzels, K., Rollett, W., & Kielblock, S. (2019). Pädagogische Ausgestaltung und förderliche Bedingungen erfolgreicher ganztägiger Schulformen. *BIFIE (Federal Institute for Education Research, Austria)*. <https://doi.org/10.17888/nbb2018-2-6>
- STEG (2015): Ganztagschule: Bildungsqualität und Wirkungen außerunterrichtlicher Angebote. Ergebnisse der Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagschulen 2012–2015.
- Steiner, C (2015): Die Einbindung pädagogischer Laien in den Alltag von Ganztagschulen. In: Schmidt-Hertha, B., Müller, M. (Ed.): *Nicht-pädagogisches Personal in Bildungseinrichtungen*. p. 67–90, Accessed online on 2021 / 03 / 22 <https://doi.org/10.25539/bildungsforschun.vi10.162>
- Steinmann, I.: Ganztagschule in Deutschland: Effekte auf Leistungsniveau und soziale Bildungsgleichheit. (Dissertation, 2019). Accessed online on 2020 / 05 / 11 http://129.217.131.68:8080/bitstream/2003/37918/1/Dissertation_Steinmann_Februar2019.pdf
- Tan, O.S. Innovating teacher education in a complex era. *Educ Res Policy Prac* 14, 193–200 (2015).
- te Poel, K. (2019). Prozesse der Herstellung von Rollen in multiprofessionellen Teams. Sensibilisierung angehender Regelschullehrkräfte und Sonderpädagog_innen durch Fallarbeit und Rollenspiel. *Herausforderung Lehrer_innenbildung*, 2 (3), p.275–295.
- Tillmann, K. (2016). Innerschulische Kooperation und Schulprogramm. Zur Bedeutung des Schulprogramms als Schulentwicklungsinstrument. In N. Fischer, H. P. Kuhn, & C. Tillack (Ed.), *Theorie, Forschung und Praxis zur Qualität von Ganztagschulen*. Prolog-Verlag.
- Tillmann, K., & Rollett, W. (2010). Die Bedeutung personeller Ressourcen für innerschulische Kooperation an Ganztagschulen in Deutschland. In B. Schwarz, P. Nenniger, R. S. Jäger, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft (Hrsg.), *Erziehungswissenschaftliche Forschung—Nachhaltige Bildung: Beiträge zur 5. DGfE-Sektionstagung “Empirische Bildungsforschung”/AEPF-KBBB im Frühjahr 2009*. Verlag Empirische Pädagogik e.V.

- Tomczak, M. & Tomczak, E. (2015): The need to report effect size estimates revisited. An overview of some recommended measures of effect size. Accessed online on 2020 / 05 / 11 http://tss.awf.poznan.pl/files/3_Trends_Vol21_2014__no1_20.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0WjWGf7Uu3jtuuMGeUVoVGZjJTNdddcP3HH02PXBvc78mtaGBTVns0fjI
- Treimann, D.J. (1977): Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective. Accessed online on 2021 / 03 / 20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2013-0-11617-0>