Professional Dilemmatic Spaces in Swedish School-Age Educare

Maria Hjalmarsson*, Birgitta Ljung Egeland**, Peter Carlman**

Abstract: Global interest in the field of extended education has increased over the past two decades. Extended education in the context of Swedish school-age educare has a unique position in the school system due to its voluntariness and governance as well as the free time and leisure activities it offers pupils and the lack of set learning outcomes. These features create dilemmas for teachers; thus, this study aims to generate knowledge about the complex and challenging dilemmas of school-age educare teachers in their professional work. The results are derived from a thematic analysis of two sets of data: oral and written reflections from 22 school-age educare teachers. The three themes of the teachers' dilemmas identified concern compulsory school vs. SAEC, offering pupils attractive teaching methods and content, and differing experiences and perspectives among the staff. The dilemmatic spaces that are recognised actualise positions and negotiations in everyday practices in relation to the teachers' professional identities. The findings are expected to be useful as a constructive starting point for policymakers, teacher trainers, and school-age educare teachers to understand this specific educational context and the need for professional development. This study contributes to a further understanding of the multifaceted professional identities of school-age educare teachers.

Keywords: Dilemmatic spaces, extended education, leisure, pupils, school-age educare, teachers

Introduction

During the past two decades, there has been a growing global interest in the field of extended education, "which is increasingly developing into a global culture of education" (Bae & Kanefuji, 2018, p. 27). Countries in both the East and the West are investing in developing systems to support pupils' learning outside of traditional school hours (Schuepbach & Huang, 2018). These settings offer education and/or care opportunities.

This article focuses on extended education in Sweden in terms of school-age educare (SAEC). In 1996, SAEC was integrated into compulsory schooling. Almost 20 years later, Skolverket, the Swedish National Agency for Education, revised the national curriculum to encompass SAEC. These developments have placed an increased focus on the teaching and learning outcomes of SAEC; simultaneously, several economic cuts have been made regarding the structural conditions of the settings (Lager, 2020). SAEC is most often located in school buildings, thus sharing physical space with compulsory schools. The setting holds the goals to strive for, but it does not stipulate the goals to attain. The educational programme in

* **Corresponding author**: Karlstad University, maria.hjalmarsson@kau.se
** Karlstad University

International Journal for Research on Extended Education, Vol. 11, Issue 2/2023, 34–45
https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v11i2.04

Swedish SAEC should complement preschool and primary classes by offering pupils meaningful recreational and leisure activities and stimulating their holistic development and learning (Skolverket, 2022). Approximately 85% of all young pupils in Sweden attend SAEC, which is heavily subsidised by the state. Because of the high enrolment rate, SAEC constitutes a significant part of childhood for most children. It plays a very important role, therefore, when it comes to equity for disadvantaged children (Hjalmarsson & Odenbring, 2020).

Due to the new School Act (SFS 2010:800) and revised curricula (Skolverket, 2016), SAEC teachers must balance the aspects of voluntariness, care, and learning in the processes of their planning, teaching, and evaluation (Hjalmarsson, 2019). There are several challenges to introducing teaching in this educational setting. SAEC teachers should safeguard the traditional focus of SAEC (care and common values), and the pupils' initiatives, interests, and needs should be a starting point for experience-based activities. At the same time, teachers should conduct teaching that corresponds to the core content of SAEC's curriculum and includes (1) language and communication, (2) creative and aesthetic forms of expression, (3) nature and society, and (4) games, physical activities, and outdoor excursions (Skolverket, 2022). Furthermore, because SAEC is offered to pupils 6–13 years old, who are enrolled for varying amounts of time due to their parents' work or school hours, teaching should be implemented in age-heterogeneous groups that vary in size. With no traditional classroom, the physical conditions of SAEC differ from those of compulsory school, and the educational backgrounds of the staff vary and are often insufficient (Skolverket, 2021). The staff are also obligated to teach during the regular school day in compulsory schools, and mostly they collaborate with compulsory schoolteachers in teams, working in preschool classes and in compulsory settings. Taken together, these challenges can create unique opportunities for teaching and learning in SAEC and foster the potential for pupils' identity and knowledge development. The challenges and opportunities of SAEC constitute the important framework conditions for this study, which aims to deepen the understanding of the potential dilemmas SAEC teachers face.

Research Overview: Extended Education

As interest in out-of-school time and extracurricular learning during childhood and adolescence has increased (Schuepbach, 2018), many efforts have been made to expand institutional education and use after-school hours to supplement school learning in almost every country in Europe, North America, South America, Asia, and Australia. In recent years, the term *extended education* has frequently been used internationally to define the field of education (Schuepbach & Huang, 2018). Extended education refers to non-formal education in which attendance is voluntary. It can be offered in the morning before school starts, in the afternoon and evening after school ends, during breaks within school hours, and during holidays. The focus is on children's emotional, social, and academic development and learning, and the settings are structured educationally to promote participants' learning of general or specific content (Schuepbach, 2018).

Extended education varies between countries. Bae and Kanefuji (2018) compared after-school programmes in two neighbouring Asian countries, Korea and Japan. The authors

pointed out the similarities in the values and ethics of the two Eastern countries and the long tradition of interaction between them. This comparison revealed some common features of afterschool programmes: a tool for challenging social problems, the power of governmental action in the process of implementing afterschool programmes, and the notion of school buildings as safe places for these programmes. However, there were some differences in the goals and means of cooperation between schools and communities, which the authors argued stem from the different cultural, political, and social backgrounds of the two countries (Bae & Kanefuji, 2018).

In Switzerland, almost all extended education settings have general goals and are oriented towards social competencies, academics, or recreation. The Swiss settings provide staff-guided activities as well as supervised free play. The pupils can choose from different activities, which they also impact. Switzerland and other German-speaking countries are establishing and developing all-day schools (Schuepbach, 2018b). In another study, by comparing two prototypes of extended education in Sweden and Germany, Klerfelt and Stecher (2018) found that the programmes had similar aims but faced different societal expectations. Lager (2020) claimed that although this research field is growing in Sweden, there is still a lack of knowledge about the everyday lives of pupils in SAEC.

Swedish School-Age Educare

Because of the tradition of a caring orientation in Swedish SAEC and a professional identity that strongly relates to aspects of care (Hjalmarsson, 2018), many studies still focus on pupils' well-being, security, and social learning and development (e.g. Jonsson & Lillvist, 2019). The caring orientation in SAEC is crucial to the activities it offers, but this orientation is being challenged by neoliberal tendencies (Hjalmarsson, 2018), and SAEC is struggling to find methods to measure the education it carries out because no specific goals are stipulated within SAEC (Hjalmarsson, 2019). This lack of set goals for pupils may partly explain why there is still a lack of research on the didactics in SAEC (Boström, Elvstrand, & Orwehag, 2022).

Navigating Between Governance and Voluntariness

Almost a decade ago, Hjalmarsson (2013) explored the tension between certain aspects of governance and voluntariness for pupils in SAEC, which at the time was called 'leisure-time centres'. Through interviews with teachers, a paradox emerged: on the one hand, not offering pupils organised activities could be viewed as childminding, while on the other hand, the teachers simultaneously emphasised the importance of letting pupils choose activities. Similarly, Haglund (2016) showed that teachers emphasised free play, which implies that the staff assumed a peripheral subject position through which they observed pupils' free play from a distance.

By studying the SAEC in three different settings, Holmberg (2017) noted that pupils were offered possibilities to exercise influence. Many of the pupils' wishes, however, were considered inappropriate or incomprehensible and needed to be modified by the teacher, which implies that SAEC offers pupils an environment in which abilities, such as making their own choices, taking initiative, and being flexible, can be developed. Elvstrand and Närvänen (2016) found that children in SAEC appreciated activities without teacher supervision, such as

free, unstructured play. However, Elvstrand and Lago (2019) found that the process of choosing what to do in SAEC embodied more limitations and fewer free choices for pupils. Based on interviews with pupils in SAEC, Lago and Elvstrand (2021) revealed that they viewed SAEC as a setting in which they were subjected to adult control and did not have autonomy. Furthermore, they wanted to choose their own friendships without having to take SAEC norms and rules into account. They could do this at home, but they commented on the lack of access to friends if they did not attend SAEC.

Taken together, these studies target the dilemma SAEC teachers face when designing activities that pupils will find attractive while simultaneously basing these activities on the content defined in the curriculum.

Navigating Between Professional Identities and Positions

Ackesjö, Nordänger, and Lindqvist (2016) investigated how a new group of SAEC teachers understood and negotiated their professional identities and navigated the professional landscape. The teachers positioned themselves between tradition and the intentions of the new governance, and their orientation towards a new hybrid professional identity implied a struggle in legitimating the SAEC teacher profession and efforts to equalise the power relations between different professional groups. Similarly, Ackesjö and Haglund (2021) argued that SAEC teachers navigate between two intertwined value systems representing SAEC's tradition of relationally and socially orientated activities and the goal- and results-orientated school system. These studies shed light on the challenges that occur in the transition of a professional role in which different traditions meet and are negotiated. This highlights the demand to safeguard traditions that are significant in SAEC while simultaneously being open to incorporating traditions that are prominent within the compulsory school.

Based on this research overview, we identified the tensions we understood as dilemmatic for the teachers. These tensions relate to the distinctiveness of SAEC in the school system in general, and more specifically, to the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure that SAEC teachers must manage. We strove to deepen the understanding of the potential dilemmas with which SAEC teachers cope.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis aimed to identify *dilemmatic spaces* (Fransson & Grannäs, 2013). From this perspective, a dilemma is not understood as a problem or something that needs to be resolved; compared to problems that can be solved, dilemmas do not have satisfactory solutions. Fransson and Grannäs (2013) argued that "dilemmatic spaces are social constructions and resulting from structural conditions and relational aspects in everyday practices" (p. 7). From this theoretical perspective, dilemmas and spatial dimensions, i.e. 'space', as well as aspects of positions, relations, and negotiations, are important. The concept emphasises the reciprocity and relational dynamics in negotiations, positions, and manoeuvring (Fransson, 2012, 2016) and has been used in studies of, for example, social workers (Hogget, Mayo, & Miller, 2009), teachers' work, and educational contexts (Fransson & Grannäs, 2013; Ljung Egeland, 2015). The concept of dilemmatic space does not focus on single events but rather on ever-present

dilemmas. It involves both the surrounding contexts and individuals' experiences, positions, and values. Hence, a dilemmatic space appears differently to different individuals, and there is rarely one right way of acting in a particular context (Honig, 1994). Dilemmas can be either intrapersonal (certainty vs. uncertainty) or interpersonal (individual autonomy vs. collective autonomy), and they contribute to professional learning (Pareja-Roblin & Margalef, 2013). The various ways of handling a situation can involve ambivalence and contradiction, such as emotions of guilt, failure, anxiety, and distancing alongside feelings of curiosity and the joy of realising new opportunities (Hoggett, 2006).

Dilemmatic space is a theoretical perspective for framing certain contexts, such as schools or SAEC settings, and their norms, values, and patterns of action. This conceptual framework provides opportunities to reveal and deepen the understanding of the complexities of teachers' everyday work practices. Teachers must relate to the formal laws, rules, and routines that govern educational settings. However, as professionals, they must also consider informal rules, goals, and routines. This means that teachers' work is largely about dealing with complexities and changing situations. In their daily interactions with pupils, colleagues, and parents, a variety of relationships must be maintained, and many decisions must be made quickly, with little time for reflection. In some contexts, there is more time available for reflection and consideration regarding decision making, such as which actions and positions should be taken. The professionalism of teachers is expressed in these complex situations of making decisions and taking action (Fransson, 2012). Coping with dilemmas is about dealing with choices, conflicts of interest, and tensions between sometimes incompatible goals, demands, expectations, and values. Educational settings are characterised by this complexity, and dealing with dilemmas regarding different interests and positions is a central part of teachers' everyday lives (Fransson & Grannäs, 2013).

In line with Fransson and Gannäs (2013), we argue that the conceptual framework of dilemmatic space is fruitful for several reasons. First, it can help in reflecting on the existing knowledge of SAEC teachers who are dealing with the aspects of governance, voluntariness, leisure, and free time. Second, the notion of dilemmatic space provides a theoretical framework that has not been used previously to understand teaching and teachers' work in SAEC, and it can therefore offer opportunities to understand dilemmas in this setting in a new way. Third, the use of this conceptual framework offers the potential to reveal and deepen the understanding of the complexity of this distinctive educational context, which is characterised by voluntariness and a lack of set learning outcomes while governed by the same policy document as compulsory school and tasks teachers with teaching.

Methods and Analysis

The empirical data were derived from a research project funded by Utveckling Lärande Forskning/Development Learning Research (ULF), a national pilot project commissioned by the Swedish government aimed at developing and testing sustainable collaboration models between academia and schools/school systems. The purpose of the project is to understand and develop teaching with a focus on subject-specific knowledge, including the selection and

transformation of the central content games, physical activities, and outdoor excursions defined in the revised policy documents.

This study is part of the overall project and uses two datasets. First, we conducted a case study using a model of action research comprising one school, two SAEC settings, and four teachers. The action research process included individual interviews, observations of teaching, and reflective group dialogues based on what we as researchers observed throughout the process regarding the study's aim. It became evident that the teachers had to manage several dilemmas regarding voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure in SAEC settings.

These dilemmas were then presented and discussed by the research group in a podcast that SAEC teachers in the region were given access to through a website. With a view to reconciling the preliminary results and broadening the empirical base, they were invited to participate in digital exchanges of professional development experiences based on certain themes that emerged in the research process. The teachers could choose between two sessions, each of which lasted two and a half hours. They were informed in writing that their informed consent was required to participate in the research study. They signed up in advance, and due to the restrictions of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, they were given a Zoom link for the online exchange. Four teachers registered for the first event and 14 for the second. The second dataset, comprised of recordings of the teachers' oral and written reflections, was constructed during these two events.

The data used in this study were derived from the oral and written reflections of 22 SAEC teachers. The themes focused on during the two Zoom events were (1) teaching in SAEC, (2) the teachers' tasks in SAEC, (3) the task of SAEC to complement the compulsory school, (4) collaboration between teaching in SAEC and in compulsory the school, and (5) the challenges and possibilities of teaching in SAEC. Each theme was presented separately. The teachers reflected individually and then shared their thoughts anonymously in writing using a digital bulletin board. The research group summarised what was written and asked follow-up questions before moving on to the next theme.

The researchers listened to and transcribed the individual interviews (first dataset), the reflective dialogues (first dataset), and the professional development conversations conducted over Zoom (second dataset). These transcriptions were read several times, and notes were taken. To understand the teachers' talk about their teaching and their perspectives on the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure, it was necessary to follow the transcriptions. The interviews were analysed using a joint qualitative analysis approach (cf. Boije, 2010). Through segmentation, we worked deductively with the data material and considered the interview questions and our theoretical framework of dilemmatic spaces a starting point. At the same time, we analysed the transcripts inductively to explore possible themes that emerged in the teachers' reflections.

Inspired by Braun and Clarke (2006; 2023), the process of analysis was recursive and moved between raw data, codes, and themes. Initially, all the data were coded. Thereafter, we searched for themes to guide our investigation of the relationships between other codes, and we also coded excerpts to identify patterns in the data. We were aware of the risk of taking sentences out of context and actively tried to manage that risk. When searching for patterns and links between codes, broad themes concerning the aim of the study emerged.

The themes selected focused on overall issues, which means that teachers or groups did not say the exact same things; rather, variations provided different thematic aspects. During the analysis, it became evident that the dilemmas the teachers faced about providing activities

related not only to the pupils enrolled in SAEC but also to the compulsory school and their colleagues. Each theme/dilemma was defined for clarity and consistency and named as follows: (1) compulsory school vs. SAEC, (2) offering pupils attractive teaching methods and content, and (3) differing experiences and perspectives among the staff. These themes were not mutually exclusive and partly overlapped. Data in this study were collected from a few individuals, so findings could not be generalized to a larger population. However, the findings can be transferable to other settings. To increase the trustworthiness of the study, we will present sufficient data to support this interpretation (e.g. Golafshani, 2003).

The study was conducted in accordance with the national ethical guidelines formulated by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017) and scrutinised by the university's ethical board. All participants provided informed consent in speech or writing before the data collection began.

Results

The results are presented in terms of the three dilemmatic spaces yielded through the analysis: (1) compulsory school vs. SAEC, (2) offering pupils' attractive teaching methods and content, and (3) the differing experiences and perspectives among the staff. To give voice to the teachers and substantiate the results, quotations were used. Quotes of 40 or more words are blocked, while shorter quotes are presented in single quotation marks.

Compulsory School vs. SAEC

SAEC is an educational setting on its own, but it is located in the same building as the compulsory school, and, as such, they share a physical space. It was evident that the teachers' reflections on the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure in SAEC settings were shaped with the compulsory school in mind. Indeed, SAEC teaching is planned in relation to compulsory school teaching:

> Compulsory schools are governed differently, and it is clear through the syllabi what goals to attain and so on. We also have goals, but they are not specified. We notice that when the pupils come to SAEC after school ends in the afternoon, they are exhausted; therefore, we begin with free play because that is what they need at that moment. But after the snack, we control the pupils a little bit more.

While the expressed need to offer the pupils free time after a day of limited choices in the compulsory school setting affects what the pupils are offered in SAEC, the complementary function of SAEC in relation to compulsory school is another important aspect:

> The curriculum stipulates that SAEC should complement compulsory school teaching. We do not do that so much, but sometimes we start thematic work in the compulsory school and continue working on it at SAEC. We discuss this a lot with our teacher colleagues, but it is hard to accomplish due to the time for planning and so on …

Some teachers were motivated to collaborate with compulsory schoolteachers regarding pupils working on the same project throughout the day, regardless of whether they were in the compulsory or voluntary setting. Other teachers did not have that explicit ambition, stating, 'Previously, if the teacher taught the pupils about allemansrätten (the law of Outdoor Access

Rights), I worked with them during that lesson, but we do not link compulsory teaching to SAEC teaching'. A couple of the teachers asserted the following:

We are not an extension of the school day; therefore, we make a clear division between compulsory school and the SAEC, which begins when the pupils leave school at two o'clock. It is kind of old-fashioned to view SAEC as an extension of the school day.

The fact that the pupils represent different ages and school classes also affects what the SAEC teachers organise and offer the pupils:

We welcome pupils from three different classes who have worked on different things during the day. If it is urgent for them to continue working on what they are doing in school, we do not stop them, but in that case, it should be the pupils' initiative.

The teachers claimed the importance of letting all the pupils experience the SAEC pedagogy, which focuses on creative and aesthetic forms of expression, regardless of whether they were enrolled in SAEC. Therefore, they strove to enact this pedagogy during the compulsory school day, with the aim of stimulating all pupils' holistic learning and development, regardless of whether they were in the compulsory or the voluntary setting. The teachers' views of how to navigate between the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure were clearly affected by the different tasks of compulsory school and SAEC, their own tasks in these different settings, and their ideas about what the pupils need and should be offered in SAEC.

Offering Pupils Attractive Teaching Methods and Content

Some of the teachers strongly related to the curriculum-defined tasks of SAEC, and the foremost challenge they faced related to the requirement that they stimulate pupils' holistic development and learning while at the same time conduct teaching based on the interests, needs, and initiatives of the pupils. The teachers emphasised the need to allow the pupils 'free time' while simultaneously aiming for 'a mix of the free and the teaching'.

A challenge of the SAEC teaching assignment is the difficulty of getting the pupils to be active: 'Too many pupils sit and do nothing. There are about two or three pupils who do not think it is fun to do anything'. The teachers struggled with their thoughts about whether and to what degree they should force the pupils to widen their experiences by trying activities that they did not choose themselves:

Sometimes, the SAEC setting can be very free because the pupils only want free time and reject being controlled. They think that what we have planned is boring. It is therefore difficult to know what to do and how to do it to get them interested in the planned activities.

One strategy the teachers suggested for handling the dilemma of pupils who do not want to engage in certain, or any, activities is to offer activities that are organised and led by the staff and to provide space for the pupils' initiatives and recreational needs. However, some colleagues claimed that it should be voluntary for pupils to participate in planned activities, while others regarded planned activities as mandatory for all pupils. Another suggested strategy for encouraging pupils to engage in activities planned by the staff was 'to tell [the pupils] what is in the curriculum about what to do in SAEC', which some teachers regarded as important because many pupils were not aware of the tasks of SAEC. Some teachers reflected on how to make the teaching more exciting, while others expressed curiosity about planning the activities in collaboration with the pupils. Some teachers have formalised contexts and councils in

which pupils are given the space to influence the educational setting. Sometimes, the pupils might not necessarily view the activities offered in SAEC as boring, but if they were to go home after school instead of spending time at SAEC, they would be free to do even more fun things.

I have had a problem with pupils choosing to go home when they start Grade 2 or 3 because they feel it is cool to go home after school. At home, they can sit and play online with their friends, and it has been a challenge for me to keep even those who are friends in SAEC. I say to them, 'What do you want to learn. What shall we do? It is fun to be at SAEC'. They accept that. I tell them that they can go home after snack time, at approximately half past three, and it has worked!

Obviously, the teachers are anxious to keep as many pupils as possible in SAEC, and some of them 'ask the pupils if they should call their parents and ask if they could stay longer' to participate in planned activities, such as going to the woods or the gym. They acknowledged, 'We should not really do that, but yes, we want them there because we think it is important as well'. The teachers are proud of being able to offer the pupils activities that complement compulsory school teaching, stimulate their holistic development and learning, and prevent them from spending many hours at home after school 'sitting by the computer or spending time on their cell phones'.

Differing Experiences and Perspectives of the Staff

Due to the teachers' varying educational backgrounds and work experiences, they related in different ways to the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure. Some teachers discussed different views between the teachers who only work in compulsory schools and those with responsibilities in both the compulsory and voluntary settings. For example, one participant stated, 'In the compulsory school classroom, it is strictly by the book, despite what the pupils want. In SAEC, we are free in another way'. During the discussions, differences within the group of SAEC teachers also occurred:

Where I work, there are extreme differences among the SAEC teachers regarding how they think about rules and put them into practice. Some colleagues want to control the pupils, while others prefer to offer them space to make their own choices. Of course, complexity within a group of colleagues might be positive, but it can be frustrating as well. Some SAEC teachers consider guarding the slide the most important task, while I prefer to mediate conflicts. All of us probably share a common base of values, but we have different approaches to the tasks and the pupils.

Several of the teachers had worked in SAEC for decades and had experienced several revisions in the policy documents that govern the programme. They carried out the work long before the clarified teaching commission was introduced (Skolverket, 2016), and their tasks were somewhat different. Other teachers with less work experience had not experienced significant changes in their tasks and the structural conditions. These variations might partly explain the teachers' varying views of what it means to teach in SAEC and the extent to which the pupils should influence the teaching. One participant stated, 'The teachers represent different perspectives; they know each other well, the work becomes convenient, and the teachers organise the same activities over and over'.

While complexity might be positive, it might also be challenging for colleagues: 'Several of my SAEC colleagues have extensive work experience, and they know best (laughter)'. The updated curriculum is regarded as a challenge to some teachers' colleges, and it exerts a strong

influence on the teachers' views of their task to make SAEC a learning environment while also allowing the pupils to influence and participate in the teaching.

Discussion

None of the teachers described their experiences in terms of dilemmas. However, their talk about teaching in SAEC actualised the relations, negotiations, and positioning in their everyday practices that we, supported by Fransson and Grannäs (2013), recognise as dilemmas. Our initial understanding was that the tension between the aspects of voluntariness, governance, free time, and leisure in the SAEC setting was an issue for them primarily in relation to the pupils. However, dilemmas were also shaped and emerged in relation to the two educational settings—compulsory school and SAEC—and to colleagues. This might be an example of teachers navigating two intertwined value systems (Haglund, 2016 in which they must negotiate both traditions and the tensions of the new governance (Ackesjö et al., 2016). While safeguarding the work of supporting the pupils' comfort and well-being, the teachers are also required to conduct teaching that corresponds to the core content of SAEC's curriculum.

Previous studies have shown that pupils want to choose their own friendships without having to take the SAEC norms and rules into account (Lago & Elvstrand, 2021), that the space for free choices in SAEC is limited (Elvstrand & Lago, 2019), and that although SAEC provides opportunities for pupils to exercise influence, many of the pupils' wishes are modified by the teachers (Holmberg, 2017). The teachers in our study seemed to be highly motivated to offer pupils attractive activities and content, guided by their conviction that SAEC has a positive influence on pupils' learning and development. The dilemmas they mentioned had both an intrapersonal character in the sense of actualising their feelings of (un) certainty due to conflicting formal and informal demands and goals and an interpersonal character in the sense of actualising aspects of individual vs. collective autonomy (Pareja-Roblin & Margalef, 2013) and reciprocity in the work of manoeuvring everyday practices. Still, because of the lack of goals and the less formal educational context, the teachers also expressed feelings of pride and joy when talking about their teaching in relation to the learning possibilities they offered pupils in both the SAEC and the compulsory setting. In sum, this study sheds light on the complex mission SAEC teachers have in Swedish schools.

References

Ackesjö, H., & Haglund, B. (2021). Fritidspedagogisk undervisning: En fråga om intentionalitet, situationsstyrning och inbäddning [School-age educare teaching. A question of intentionality, situational governance and embeddedness]. *Utbildning & Lärande, 15*(1), 69–87.

Ackesjö, H., Nordänger U-U., & Lindqvist, P. (2016). "Att jag kallar mig själv för lärare i fritidshem uppfattar jag skapar en viss provokation". Om de nya grundlärarna med inriktning mot fritidshem [The fact that I call myself a school-age educare teacher I perceive creates a certain provocation. About the new compulsory school teachers in school-age educare centres]. *Educare, 1*, 86–109.

Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in Qualitative Research*. SAGE.

Boström, L., Elvstrand, H., & Orwehag, M. (2022). In search of didactics in school-age educare centres: To conceptualise what exists but has not yet been found. *Nordisk tidsskrift for pedagogikk og kritikk, 8*, 1–11.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023) Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and be(com)ing a knowing researcher. *International Journal of Transgender Health, 24*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597

Elvstrand, H., & Lago, L. (2019). Do they have a choice? Pupils' choices at LTCs in the intersection between tradition, values and new demands. *Education Inquiry*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2019.1656505

Elvstrand, H., & Närvänen, A-L. (2016). Children's own perspectives on participation in leisure-time centers in Sweden. *American Journal of Educational Research, 4*(6), 496–503. http://dx.doi.org/10.12691/education-4-6-10

Fransson, G. (2012). Professionalisering eller deprofessionalisering? Positioneringar och samspel i ett dilemmatic space [Professionalization or de-professionalization? Positions and collaboration in a dilemmatic space]. In C. Gustafsson & G. Fransson. (Eds.), *Kvalificerad som lärare? Om professionell utveckling, mentorskap och bedömning med sikte på lärarlegitimation* (pp. 261–285). Gävle University Press.

Fransson, G. (2016), Manoeuvring in a digital dilemmatic space: Making sense of a digitised society. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy, 11*, 185–201, doi: 10.18261/issn.1891-943x-2016-03-04.

Fransson, G., & Grannäs, J. (2013). Dilemmatic spaces in educational contexts – towards a conceptual framework for dilemmas in teachers' work. *Teachers and Teaching. Theory and Practice, 19*(1), 4–17, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.744195

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8*(4), 597-606.

Haglund, B. (2016). Fritidshemmets vardagspraktik i ett nytt diskursivt landskap [The everyday practice of school-age centers in a new discursive landscape]. *Educare, 1*, 64–85.

Hjalmarsson, M. (2013). Governance and voluntariness for children in Swedish leisure-time centres – Leisure-time teachers interpreting their tasks and everyday practice. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 1*(1), 86–95.

Hjalmarsson, M. (2018). The presence of pedagogy and care in leisure-time centres' local documents: Leisure-time teachers' documented reflections. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood Education, 43*(4), 57–63. http://dx.doi.org/10.23965/AJEC.43.4.07

Hjalmarsson, M. (2019). Leisure-time teachers' reflections on systematic quality work: Approaches and challenges. *Early Child Development and Care*, *189*(13), 2197-2205. doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2018.1445731

Hjalmarsson, M. & Odenbring, Y. (2020). Compensating for unequal childhoods: Practitioners' reflections on social injustice in leisure-time centres. *Early Child Development and Care*, *190*(14), 2253-2263. doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2019.1570176

Hoggett, P. (2006). Pity, compassion, solidarity. In S. Clarke, P. Hoggett, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Emotion, Politics and Society* (pp. 145–161). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hoggett, P., Mayo, M., & Miller, C. (2009). *The dilemmas of development work. Ethical challenges in regeneration*. The Policy Press.

Holmberg. L. (2017). Lärande genom demokratiska önskemål – pastoral omsorg i fritidshem [Learning through democratic wishes – pastoral care in school-age educare centres]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige, 22*(1–2), 28–50.

Honig, B. (1994). Difference, dilemmas and the politics of home. *Social Research, 61*, 563–597.

Bae, S. H., & Kanefuji, F. (2018). A comparison of the afterschool programmes of Korea and Japan: From the institutional and ecological perspectives. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 6*(1), 27–48. https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v6i1.04

Jonsson, K., & Lillvist, A. (2019). Promoting social learning in the Swedish leisure time centre. *Education Inquiry, 10*(3), 243–257.

Klerfelt, A., & Steacher, L. (2018). Swedish school-age educare centres and German all-day schools – A binational comparison of two prototypes of extended education. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 6*(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v6i1.05

Lager, K. (2020). Possibilities and impossibilities for everyday life: Institutional spaces in school-age educare. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 8*(1), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v8i1.03

Lago, L., & Elvstrand, H. (2021). Children on the borders between institution, home and leisure: Space to fend for yourself when leaving the school-age educare centre. *Early Child Development and Care*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2021.1929200

Ljung Egeland, B. (2015). *Berättelser om tillhörighet - om barn med migrationsbakgrund på en mindre ort* [Narratives of belonging – On immigrant-background children in non-urban areas]. Doktorsavhandling [Dissertation]. Fakulteten for humaniora och samhällsvetenskap. Karlstad University Studies.

Pareja Roblin, N., & Margalef, L. (2013). Learning from dilemmas: Teacher professional development through collaborative action and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching, 19*(1), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.744196

Schuepbach, 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. https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v6i2.04

Schuepbach, M., & Huang, D. (2018). Comparison of extended education and research in this field in Taiwan and in Switzerland. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education, 6*(1), 8–26. https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v6i1.03

SFS 2010:800. *Skollag*. [School Act].

Skolverket. (2016). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet* [Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age educare]. Skolverket.

Skolverket. (2021). *Elever och personal i fritidshemmet läsåret 2020/21 Beskrivande statistik* [Pupils and staff in the school-age educare center for the academic year 2021/21. Descriptive statistics]. Dokumentdatum: 2021–04–15. Dnr 2021:434.

Skolverket. (2022). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet* [Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age educare]. Skolverket.

Vetenskapsrådet. (2017). *God forskningssed* [Good research practice]. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.