

Educational Success and Social Participation of Socially and Educationally Disadvantaged Students with Migration Background in Extended Education

Haiqin Ning, Jule Schmidt, Nanine Lilla, Marianne Schüpbach

The project is funded within the “Framework Programme for Empirical Educational Research” of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research under the funding code 01JB2112 A-C. Project duration: 01.10.2021–30.09.2024. As a collaborative project, there are three partners working together:

- Team Freie Universität Berlin: Prof. Dr. Marianne Schüpbach (Coordinator of the collaborative research project), Dr. Nanine Lilla, Haiqin Ning, Jule Schmidt, Dr. Jan Willem Nieuwenboom, Hanna Lehmkuhl, Magdalena Reichenbach | Primary Education, Berlin
- Team Universität Hamburg: Prof. Dr. Ingrid Gogolin, Luise Krejcik, Tobias Potthoff | General, Intercultural and International Comparative Education, Hamburg
- Team German Children and Youth Foundation: Anna-Margarete Davis, Dr. Alexander Wedel | School Success & All-Day School as well as Research & Development, Berlin

Starting Position

Transforming half-day schools into all-day schools (i. e. a form of extended education) is often seen as a way to deal with the challenges addressed to the German education system. Recent research shows that first- and second-generation migrant children in Germany continue to be at a disadvantage throughout their educational pathway, and often in two senses: through their social background (e. g. low-income, low SES, rural areas) and their migration background (e. g. cultural and linguistic minority) (e. g. Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2020; Köller et al., 2019).

All-day schools are expected to achieve measurable improvements in the educational success and social participation of students with a migration background (KMK, 2015), who are often – if not always – also living in socially precarious circumstances. It is evident that the extra-curricular offerings of all-day schools are used by students at the primary level in Germany (Steiner, 2009; Willems et al., 2014). However, these expectations for all-day schools have not been adequately fulfilled in Germany, e. g. no direct effects on subject-related learning have been proven (StEG Consortium, 2016). Regarding the question of how all-day school settings can contribute to reducing disadvantages in respect of linguistic, cultural, and social heterogeneity, there is not much research-based knowledge available in the German context (Reinders et al., 2011; Bremm, 2018).

In other countries, however, there are comparable high-quality offerings of extended education that have been shown to be effective. Findings from studies in the US indicate that participation in high-quality afterschool programs over a longer period of time, which are comparable to all-day schools, leads to higher scores in achievement tests than non-participation (Durlak et al. 2010; Vandell et al., 2015). In their meta-analysis (based on 68 studies), Durlak et al. (2010) emphasize that programs that are *sequential, active, focused, and explicit* (SAFE) are effective both in terms of subject-related and non-academic competencies. The meta-analysis by Lauer et al. (2006) also shows that the disadvantaged students in particular benefit from participation in specific intervention programs. In South Korea, participation in afterschool programs has been shown to have a positive effect on subject-related performance – especially for socially and educationally disadvantaged students (Bae et al., 2010).

Against this background, there is assumed potential in the German all-day school settings. The question arises whether the existing offerings can be optimized by incorporating empirical findings from international contexts on such learning settings as well as conditions for their successful implementation.

Therefore, the objective of the project is to harness empirical findings and knowledge from other national contexts to better exploit the potential of all-day schools in Germany as well. Socially and educationally disadvantaged students with migration background are the target group of this project with a special focus on primary schools.

Theoretical framework

Based on research questions, several theoretical frameworks are referred to in this research project. In international contexts, there are many different forms of extended education, which can differ considerably in their design. The **characterization tool and aspects of characterization** according to Schüpbach (2018, p. 137) serve as a basis for characterizing the current offerings in Germany and in other countries. The basic points are

- (a) What is the (age) range of the participants?
- (b) What is the focus?
- (c) What form does it take?
- (d) When does it take place?
- (e) Who is the provider?
- (f) Where is it located?
- (g) Who participates?
- (h) What is the professional background of the staff?
- (i) Who pays the costs?

Based on this tool, different forms of extended education in the (inter)national fields can be described in its current basic features.

The concept of **educational quality** is based on the work of Tietze et al. (2005). In their German version of the School-Age Care Environment Rating Scale (SACERS) by Harms et al. (2013) – in German “Hort- und Ganztagsangebotskala” (HUGS) – Tietze et al. (2005) describe three levels of educational quality: The *educational process quality* is placed in the

center, which includes aspects of the offering concept, such as the spatial and material equipment, moreover all interactions that promote education and development of the students. The educational processes are framed by the *structural quality* and *orientation quality*: While the structural quality includes the conditions of the learning environment, which are mainly politically regulated (e. g. group size and composition, qualification of the pedagogical staff), the level of orientation quality refers to aspects of the educational attitude of the pedagogical staff (Tietze et al., 2005).

At the same time, the empirical, interdisciplinary, and action-oriented project follows the rationale of **co-construction of innovation** (Maasen, 2020) for the transfer of scientific findings to school practice. The German Children and Youth Foundation is a collaborative partner. Cooperation with the service agencies “Ganztägig lernen” (All-Day learning) as well as the participating federal states, in particular their education administrations, will already start at an early stage of the project. This enables a continuous review of preconditions for the implementation of the created concepts and products in school practice.

Methods

The project is designed as a qualitative study, which is divided into four phases and utilizes different methods to collect and analyze empirical data.

In the first phase, all-day primary schools in Germany are characterized with a special focus on the target group (Schüpbach, 2018). On this basis, (inter)national experts are going to be interviewed and evaluate the current implementation in Germany with regard to learning settings and necessary conditions of high-quality learning settings of the extra-curricular offerings in all-day primary schools.

In the second phase, (inter)national experts receive a summary of the assessments from all experts concerning the offerings currently implemented in the German context for a second evaluation. Then, the evaluations of the (inter)national experts are analyzed in a sequential procedure with the help of qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014).

In the third phase, the insights gained are to be discussed in focus groups consisting of German practitioners (e.g. education administrators, educational institutions and extra-curricular cooperation partners, school principals, teachers, and other educational staff) with a view to transferring them into innovative concepts, measures, and products in the German context (Morgan, 1997). The focus group discussions are also to be analyzed using qualitative content analysis.

In the fourth phase, these concepts will be developed and their suitability for the local context will be tested together with German practitioners and transfer partners at selected all-day primary schools in four federal states of Germany. A final survey with schools and their cooperation partners aims at generating assessments of whether the concepts and measures developed are practicable and purposeful.

References

- Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung. (2020). *Bildung in Deutschland 2020: Ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zu Bildung in einer digitalisierten Welt*. wbv Media.
- Bae, S., Oh, H., Kim, H., Lee, C., & Oh, B. (2010). *The impact of after-school programs on educational equality and private tutoring expenses*. Asia Pacific Education Review, 11(3), 349–361.
- Bremm, N. (2018). *Schulen mit ganztägigem Angebot. Eine empirisch ermittelte Typologie*. Weinheim München: Beltz Juventa.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). *A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents*. American Journal of Community Psychology, 45(3–4), 294–309.
- Harms, T., Jacobs, E. V., & White, D. R. (2013). *School-Age Care Environment Rating Scale, updated edition (SACERS)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Köller, O., Klieme, E., Reiss, K., & Weis, M. (2019). *PISA 2018: Grundbildung im internationalen Vergleich*. Waxmann Verlag. <https://directory.doabooks.org/handle/20.500.12854/56297> KMK.
- (2015). *Ganztagsschulen in Deutschland: Bericht der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 03.12.2015*.
- Köller, O., Klieme, E., Reiss, K. & Weis, M. (Ed.). (2019). *PISA 2018. Grundbildung im internationalen Vergleich*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.
- Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Aphthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). *Out-of-School-Time Programs: A Meta-Analysis of Effects for At-Risk Students*. Review of Educational Research, 76(2), 275–313.
- Maasen, S. (2020). *Innovation und Relevanz. Forschung im Gerangel widerstreitender Anforderungen*. In A. M. Horatschek (Ed.), *Competing knowledges – Wissen im Widerstreit* (pp. 123–140). De Gruyter.
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. SSOAR. <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd. ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Reinders, H., Gogolin, I., Gresser, A., Schnurr, S., Böhmer, J., & Bremm, N. (2011). *Ganztags-schulbesuch und Integration von Kindern mit Migrationshintergrund im Primarbereich: Erste Näherungen an empirische Befunde einer vergleichenden Untersuchung*. Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft (Sonderband 14), 163–183.
- Schüpbach, M. (2018). *Useful terms in English for the field of extended education and a characterization of the field from a Swiss perspective*. International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 6(2), 132–143.
- StEG-Konsortium. (2016). *Ganztagsschule: Bildungsqualität und Wirkungen außerunterrichtlicher Angebote. Ergebnisse der Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagsschulen 2012–2015*. DIPF.
- Steiner, C. (2009). *Mehr Chancengleichheit durch die Ganztagsschule?* Zeitschrift für Pädagogik (54. Beiheft), 81–105.
- Tietze, W., Roßbach, H.-G., Stendel, M., & Wellner, B. (2005). *Hort- und Ganztagsangebote-Skala (HUGS): Feststellung und Unterstützung pädagogischer Qualität in Horten und Außerunterrichtlichen Angeboten*. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.
- Vandell, D. L., Larson, R. W., Mahoney, J. L., & Watts, T. W. (2015). *Children's Organized Activities. Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science* (7), 1–40.
- Willems, A.S., Wendt, H., Gröhlich, C., Walzebug, A. & Bos, W. (2014). *Mehr Chancengerechtigkeit durch die Ganztagsschule?* In H.G. Holtappels et al. (Ed.), *Jahrbuch der Schulentwicklung. Band 18. Daten, Beispiele und Perspektiven* (S. 62–100). Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.