International Journal for Research on Extended Education



International Journal for Research on Extended Education, Volume 3/2015

Editors' Preface	3
<i>Fernando Hernández-Hernández & Juana María Sancho-Gil</i> Introduction to the Main Topic: Blurring Educational Boundaries to Visualise Young People's Agency in Learning Practices	5
ARTICLES Main Topic: Blurring Educational Boundaries to Visualise Young People's Agency in Learning Practices	
<i>Ola Erstad</i> Learning Lives Across Educational Boundaries: Continuity and Discontinuity in Learning Trajectories	9
Rachel Fendler & Raquel Miño Puigcercós New Learning Imaginaries: Youth Perspectives on Learning In and Outside School	23
Imanol Aguirre Learning and Attitudes Towards the Knowledge of the Young Producers of Visual Culture	36
Kristiina Kumpulainen & Anna Mikkola Researching Formal and Informal Learning: From Dichotomies to a Dialogic Notion of Learning	50
FREE CONTRIBUTIONS	
Anna Liisa Närvänen & Helene Elvstrand What is Participation? Pedagogues' Interpretative Repertoires and Ideological Dilemmas Regarding Children's Participation in Swedish Leisure-time Centres	61
Stephan Kielblock Program Implementation and Effectiveness of Extracurricular Activities: An Investigation of Different Student Perceptions in Two German All-Day Schools	79

Content

2	International Journal for Research on Extended Education, Volume 3	8/2015
<i>Sang Hoor</i> Influential Korean Co	<i>Bae, Sue Bin Jeon & Song Ie Han</i> Factors in the Out-of-class Activities of llege Students	99
DEVELOP	MENTS in the Field of Extended Education	
<i>Amina Fra</i> Research o A Brief Ex	<i>ij & Stephan Kielblock</i> on Extended Education Around the Globe? amination of the First Five Issues of the IJREE	123
AUTHOR	NFORMATION	
Authors		127

Editors' Preface

The last issue of the International Journal for Research on Extended Education (1/2015) contained seven contributions from different fields of extended education. Like the first three issues, this issue again has a main topic. Fernando Hernández-Hernández and Juana María Sancho-Gil are the guest editors of this main topic concerned with blurring educational boundaries. It contains four papers: "Learning Lives Across Educational Boundaries: Continuity and Discontinuity in Learning Trajectories" (Ola Erstad), "New Learning Imaginaries: Youth Perspectives on Learning In and Outside School" (Rachel Fendler & Raquel Miño Puigcercós), "Learning and Attitudes Towards the Knowledge of the Young Producers of Visual Culture" (Imanol Aguirre), and "Researching Formal and Informal Learning: From Dichotomies to a Dialogic Notion of Learning" (Kristiina Kumpulainen & Anna Mikkola).

In addition there are also three free contributions: "What is Participation? Pedagogues' Interpretative Repertoires and Ideological Dilemmas Regarding Children's Participation in Swedish Leisure-time Centres" (Anna Liisa Närvänen & Helene Elvstrand), "Program Implementation and Effectiveness of Extracurricular Activities: An Investigation of Different Student Perceptions in Two German All-Day Schools" (Stephan Kielblock), and "Influential Factors in the Out-of-class Activities of Korean College Students" (Sang Hoon Bae, Sue Bin Jeon & Song Ie Han).

In issue 2/2014 the section "Developments in the Field of Extended Education" has been introduced, which contains short research reports (e.g. on new research methods, or developments in research networking). In this issue, Amina Fraij and Stephan Kielblock present a brief examination of the coverage of countries that are involved and have published in the IJREE in the first five issues.

Though there is a high number of submissions we would like to encourage researchers within the field of extended education to submit papers, and also suggestions for book reviews and proposals for short research reports for the section Developments in the Field of Extended Education.

Sabine Maschke, Ludwig Stecher and Stephan Kielblock

Blurring Educational Boundaries to Visualise Young People's Agency in Learning Practices

Fernando Hernández-Hernández & Juana María Sancho-Gil

Expanding learning scenarios

Learning takes place beyond the classroom and school. Notions such as lifelong or life-wide and life-deep learning reflect its ubiquity in the knowledge society (Banks et al., 2007). However, in the educational discourse learning remains closely linked to scholastic concepts related to student assessment or curriculum objectives. In these pervasive settings, young people's learning often seems to be ambiguous. On the one hand, the literature offers a picture of a body of connected youth who use digital technologies to engage in learning activities tailored to their personal interests. On the other, there is an increasing criticism around the notion of life-long learning as a key competence, as educational policies seem to respond more to market demands than to a holistic approach once promoted by progressive educators. Therefore, a tension exists between research into learning experiences that contributes to the pedagogisation of young people's lives, and the studies that attempt to articulate and recognize more personal and social ways of engagement that, for some young people, are allusive in a formal school context.

Taking into account this complexity and tensions, the RTD project Living and learning with new literacies in and outside secondary school: contributions to reducing drop-out, exclusion and disaffection among youth (MINECO. EDU2011-24122), developed by the research group ESBRINA-Subjectivities, Visualities and Contemporary Educational Environments¹ of the University of Barcelona, hosted in November 6th and 7th, 2014, the international symposium "Blurring educational boundaries" dedicated to explore young people's agency in their learning practices, both in formal and/or informal educational contexts.

The symposium aimed to problematize and interrogate the participant's understanding of the role of learning in young people's lives and looked critically at re-

¹ http://esbrina.eu

search objectives and methods. We specifically sought to address the following issues:

- 1. The expanded notion of learning, and how it relates to how we understand and discuss the boundary between inside and outside school;
- 2. The relationship between learning and young people's use of digital technologies;
- 3. The methodological and ethical issues that arise when studying learning in informal and/or virtual contexts;
- 4. Advocate for doing research collaboratively (with young people), taking into account the advantages and limits of using 'with' as a methodological stance.

These topics were addressed in 21 papers submitted by researchers from England, Finland, Argentina, United States, France, Germany, Switzerland, Spain, Norway and Brazil. A selection of these papers, those closer to the aims of the journal, were selected to be published in the International Journal for Research on Extended Education (IJREE).

The paper presented by Ola Erstad (Norway), based on the 'learning lives project' (2009–2013) in a community in Oslo, explores the link between learning and identity formation as interrelated practices connected to the capacity to adapt to changing roles within different contexts. In this case, members of the research group have investigated changes and transitions in and between youth and children institutional and everyday lives. An important aim of the project was to analyse how identities are shaped and developed in different settings over time. To meet this objective notions, such as "Participation trajectories" (Edwards & Mackenzie, 2008) and "Learning lives" (Edwards, Biesta, & Thorpe, 2009), appear as fundamental. As a conclusion, the analysis shows that learning activities, as experienced by young people, are connected and expanded across different settings. And there is a diversity in the ways boundary crossings develop.

The second paper, by Rachel Fendler and Raquel Miño Puigcercós (USA and Spain) approaches issues arising from blurred boundaries between school and nonschool, virtual and physical sites, or formal, non-formal and informal education. Drawing on the contributions of 34 secondary school students, they consider ways in which young people's learning practices suggest the need to rethink educational boundaries. The key notions were "situated learning" and "communities of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Situated learning looks at the environment in which learning occurs, as manifested in the social terrain of communities of practice, and points out the way for seeing learning as a spatial practice. In the ethnographic cases performed *with* young people, students began to reflect on learning in different spaces (at school, with sport, or with other activities), on how they moved from one to another, and how these different spaces overlapped. As young people were asked to play the role of researchers rather than students, the project was an interruption in their everyday school lives, displacing them both physically and in terms of their identity.

The paper by Imanol Aguirre (Spain) shows an investigation on young people's practices as producers of visual culture, that deviate from traditional master-appren-

tice and expert-novice relationships and that take place at the margins of formal education in the realm of what Trend (1992) designates as "cultural pedagogies". The focus of this research is how and where young people acquire the knowledge they apply in their productions, the types of competencies associated to these types of knowledge and what are their attitudes and interactions in the learning processes. The research, based on interviews and a questionnaire, evidences that visual culture produced in this conditions gives young people the opportunity and the occasion to feel free for experimentation, being part of a community or an audience that dispenses recognition, trust and complicity and the opportunity to access to many unexpected resources.

Finally, the contribution made by Kristiina Kumpulainen and Anna Mikkola (Finland) offers an alternative conceptual framework to the disjuncture between "formal" and "informal" education by re-framing this traditional divisive distinction between the two. From the authors approach, formal and informal learning are not conceptualised as discrete categories, but rather "formality" and "informality" are conceived as attributes inherent to all circumstances of learning. To exemplify this argument they analyse empirical data from a case study on elementary school students' engagement in technology-mediated creative-learning activities. In their analysis, they demonstrate how attributes of formality and informality intersect in the students' social activity and consider how this is related to their engagement, learning, and identity building. They conclude by considering the wider implications of a hybrid notion of learning as the interplay of formality and informality in social activities.

The four papers have in common two assumptions: (1) formal education does not take into account how young people are using knowledge in their outside-of-school activities; and (2) young people's learning goes beyond traditional institutional limits, particularly when they use virtual environments and participate in different communities of practices.

These contributions could help educators and policy-makers to rethink the roles of learning in the transitions and mobilities of young people in today's societies. All these papers locate learning beyond the limits of schooling, in spaces of affection and intensities that cannot be measured and represented by external or internal school standards. These learning environments contain activities that escape classification and coding strategies of analysis. This issue is articulated by Dennis Atkinson (2011, p. 13), who argues that "within teaching and learning contexts it is quite possible for there to be learners whose ontological status of learners is not recognized so their potential for becoming is constrained and therefore they have no (or marginal) existence within the pedagogical space."

References

Atkinson, D. (2011). Art, Equality and Learning: Pedagogies Against the State. Rotterdam: Sense.

- Banks, J. A., Au, K. H., Ball, A. F., Bell, P., Gordon, E. W., Gutiérrez, K. D., ... Zhou, M. (2007). Learning in and out of School in Diverse Environments: Lifelong, Life-wide, Life-deep.
- Edwards, A., & Mackenzie, L. (2008). Identity Shifts in Informal Learning Trajectories. In B. van Oers, W. Wardekker, E. Elbers, & R. van der Veer (Eds.), *The Transformation of Learning. Advances in Cultural-historical Activity Theory* (pp. 163–181). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, R., Biesta, G., & Thorpe, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Rethinking Contexts for Learning and Teaching: Communities, Activities and Networks*. New York: Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trend, D. (1992). *Cultural Pedagogy: Art/Education/Politics*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Articles: Main Topic: Blurring Educational Boundaries to Visualise Young People's Agency in Learning Practices

Learning Lives Across Educational Boundaries: Continuity and Discontinuity in Learning Trajectories

Ola Erstad

Abstract: In this article, I discuss educational boundaries as experienced by the learner across different contexts, activities and interests. Learning is understood as a trajectory beyond situated contexts. The analytical focus is how learning trajectories are experienced as continuity or discontinuity by students across in-school and out-of-school settings. The analysis draws on findings from a longitudinal project in one multicultural community of Oslo, using mainly observational and interview methodologies. The findings show that educational boundaries are often blurred and represent different learning trajectories beyond simple dichotomies of continuation or discontinuation in learning.

Keywords: learning lives, (dis)continuity, trajectories, boundaries, education

Introduction

The 20th century was characterised by a global explosion in mass formal education, in which a schooled society has come to be accepted as a universal common good. Over the last decade, however, both the relevance of mass formal education to a changed socio-technical and socio-economic environment, and its moral purpose as an instrument of social justice, have been subject to increasing critique (Egan, 2008; Claxton, 2008). In order to remedy the perceived deficiencies of mass 'industrial education', there have been calls to look to models of informal learning, especially within the new socio-technical spaces of the Internet, as a source of alternative educational strategies (Gee, 2007).

Some also argue that the resources, identities and experiences students develop in settings other than school are not properly recognised or used as an anchor for developing their skills and knowledge in school (Heath, 1983; Wortham, 2006). In the same vein, scholars have started to question the relevance of educational practices for the future workplace and for civil society, that is, students are not sufficiently able to re-contextualise the curriculum and make it relevant to manage problems and challenges in practices outside of educational institutions (Guile, 2010). For educational institutions and curriculum development, it is also a challenge how stakeholders in the labour market impose pressure on the educational system, trying to make it adjust to societal needs and developments.

This article focuses on educational boundaries as experienced by the learner, especially how we explore experiences and knowledge building between and across different contexts, activities and interests. By using the term 'learning lives' (Erstad & Sefton-Green, 2013), the objective is to explore learning as a trajectory beyond situated contexts, such as classrooms. The analytical focus for this article is continuity and discontinuity between educational boundaries of learning experiences in school and outside of school. The research question is: How are learning trajectories across in-school and out-of-school contexts experienced as continuity or discontinuity by students?

To shed light on this research question, I will report on findings from a project in one community of Oslo, Norway. The project called 'Local literacies and community spaces. Investigating transitions and transfers in the "learning lives" of Groruddalen' (2009–2013) was a longitudinal ethnographic study following 60 students and their families over a period of about two years, in school settings and as part of activities within the community. In this article, I will present observational and interview data to explore the research question.

Review – Educational boundaries as (dis-)continuities

Within educational research, it is well documented how learning activities are taking place in classrooms (Hattie, 2008). Ways of informal learning outside of schools are more vaguely defined in the research literature, yet at the same time, are proclaimed to be of major importance for the future of education (Sefton-Green, 2012; Facer, 2011). Educational scholars have started to question how participation in multiple contexts like school, home, peer groups and leisure settings affects ongoing learning processes (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström, 2003).

Several efforts have been made in trying to define what constitutes a learning context or learning environment beyond just classroom settings, and also how this changes over time (Jonassen & Land, 2000; OECD, 2013). On a conceptual level, van Oers (1998) presented an approach to context, inspired by the ideal of developing a non-dualistic theory of human activity, arguing for using the concept of contextualising rather than context, as an ongoing interactional process of meaning making and creating conditions for learning. If we merely point out that learning is situated in context, we miss the point, because we are ignoring how people themselves actively establish contexts of meaningful action (ibid.). Sometimes there can be connections, other times tensions, and yet at other times, they might not be related at all (Silseth & Arnseth, 2011). How these connections or tensions are established has consequences for the person's learning trajectories, understood as ways of participating and engaging in learning processes over time.

Some have also tried to identify more clearly what constitutes educational boundaries and boundary crossing (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Boundaries can be understood as something defined by the system of schooling as in the physical boundaries of the school with fences and buildings, and the often decontextualised nature of subject content that you learn about in school, but do not use elsewhere. However, boundaries can also be understood as created by individuals or groups themselves as personal conceptions of who you are, and boundaries about 'us' and 'them'. Ways of conceptualising boundaries also raise issues of ways of crossing or overcoming boundaries. Bronkhorst and Akkerman (2015) write about boundary crossing as 'a process of (re)establishing continuity in action and interaction across different social cultural practices. In contrast to discontinuities, *continuities* in learning across contexts testify to prolonged efforts and activities related to particular content or participation' (2015, p. 4). Crossing boundaries, as defined by the system or the person, is about ways of defining continuities.

Another approach towards issues of educational boundaries is represented by the term 'learning lives'. 'Learning lives' (Edwards, Biesta, & Thorpe, 2010; Erstad & Sefton-Green, 2013) refers to the coherence between learning, identity and agency as personal histories and future orientations central to productive learning. Several empirical approaches have been influential in the way they open up ways of studying young learners across contexts, such as 'literacy and learning as part of after-school programs' (Cole et al., 2006; Hull & Schultz, 2002), 'funds of knowledge' (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), 'biographical studies of youth' (McLeod & Yates, 2006; Thomson, 2009), and 'connected learning' (Ito et al., 2013). This research often targets students that drop out of, or are disengaged within, the regular school system. Also, to better understand 'what they do not learn in school' (Mahiri, 2004), researchers have become more aware of the developmental processes in different trajectories of participation (Dreier, 2003; Ludvigsen et al., 2011).

The notion of trajectory provides analytical means for understanding learning activities across time and space. Learning and participation trajectories are closely linked to identity as a 'capacity for particular forms of action and hence a capacity to interpret and use environmental affordances to support action' (Edwards & Mackenzie, 2008, p. 165). We should, then, explore how participants are not merely situated in space and time, but also actively networking learning resources across space-time in the course of their activity (Leander, Phillips, & Taylor, 2010, p. 8).

Context and methodology

Leander et al. (2010) point out that 'following' learners across and between sites is complex. Within 'multisite ethnography' researchers like Marcus (1995) and Falzon (2012) argue that the study of social phenomena cannot be accounted for by focusing on one particular site. However, the ways that different settings and contexts are interrelated as experienced by young people themselves, as the unit of analysis, have not been present in many educational studies (Leander et al., 2010).

The data presented here is part of a large-scale ethnographic study conducted in a multiethnic community, the Grorud Valley in Oslo, Norway, with about 130,000 inhabitants. Some neighborhoods consist of more than 35% immigrants, while others have up to 90%. In our study we involved three kindergartens, two lower secondary schools and two upper secondary schools in five different neighborhoods in this community.

As a pilot study we collected diaries from 28 students during a whole week. The aim was to get a sense of how students in different neighborhoods spent their regular days, from the time they woke up in the morning, until they went to bed at night, with a special focus on their media use.

The research design for the main study started in the classroom, where we spent about eight months conducting observations and interviews following whole classes in different subject domains and study programs. The sample included three cohorts; pre-schoolers (5 and 6 year old students, who I will not report on in this article), 10th graders (15 and 16 year old students, last year of lower secondary school), and students at the end of upper secondary school (18 and 19 year old students). Within each cohort we then sampled 20 students for more in-depth study and following them into their neighbourhood, at home and as part of different activities. These students were sampled after spending several months in their class, choosing academically strong and weak students according to their teachers and grades, and an equal number of boys and girls. In this article I report on data from the cohorts of 15 and 18 year olds since they are more expressive and reflective concerning their learning trajectories.

Methods used in this study were: survey on background data; semi-structured interviews; field notes; still and video image and artefact collection; and co-production with young people or their parents. Some methods were modified to suit the ages of the cohorts. In order to answer the research question for this article I will primarily include data from the interviews with some supplementary data from field notes of students in different settings. The interviews were done systematically with all informants three times during a period of one and a half year, and each interview lasted about one hour. First set of interviews were done in November and December 2010, during the first phase of the project. The next set of interviews was done in April 2011 just before the final exams, and just after they had decided what to do during their next school year entering a new level of schooling. The last set of interviews was done from December 2011 until March 2012, at home, in their community or by phone. In addition we had several informal conversations with students both in and out of school that were written in field notes or audio taped.

The qualitative research interview is a way to understand and get access to the life world from the point of view of the research participants (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). In this study each interview was structured as dealing with past, present and future orientations of activities and interests in school and outside of school. Also, the interviews were dealing with conceptions of learning in the sense that we wanted the students to talk about their different activities; what they were about, degrees of engagement and what they got out of these activities. Our experience was that the interviews triggered the informants to reflect on what these different activities meant for them on a personal level and as learning trajectories over time (ibid.). The students gave positive feedback about the issues covered in the interviews, and that this was the first time anyone had asked them on a personal level about other aspects of learning than just school.

All interviews and field notes were transcribed and entered into Nvivo 10. In total this consisted of about 400 pages of transcribed data. We used a coding scheme

with two main categories; of places and activities the informants were involved in. This was further specified with sub-categories and nodes on their personal engagement and ways of learning, either as defined by others or self-initiated.

When working on the coding of data we decided to create narratives of the learning lives of the individuals in order to develop a coherent presentation of data on a personal level (Goodson, Biesta, Tedder, & Adair, 2010, Thomson, 2009). These are structured as stories about people's lives as told by themselves (Goodson & Gill, 2011). As Polkinghorne (1995) explains: "Narrative descriptions exhibit human activity as purposeful engagement in the world. Narrative is the type of discourse composition that draws together diverse events, happenings, and actions of human lives into thematically unified goal-directed purposes." (1995, p. 5). In this study the term 'learning lives' is used to approach similar issues of learning and development, as a lens that brings together vertical (over time) and horizontal (across contexts) axes of experience. In the following I will present extracts from several of the narratives in the study to discuss issues of continuity and discontinuity of learning trajectories.

Presentation of data

In the analysis, learning trajectories are related to three main issues of continuity and discontinuity. First, it concerns content and what students were oriented towards in school and out-of-school. Second, it concerns the activities they were involved in and how they are structured and goal oriented such as improving their skills and knowledge. Third, it concerns the ways in which the students position themselves, i.e. their learning identities, in different settings.

Continuities

Activities in school are of course diverse. There are varieties between subject domains and working methods, from whole class instruction by the teacher, to project work where students move out of school to collect information. However, my focus in this article is on the boundary between activities in and out of school, so I will not analyse school activities per se.

An obvious example of how school activities continue into everyday activities as learning trajectories is homework, which is a learning trajectory concerning knowledge production. A few of the girls mentioned that they were aware that doing homework was important in order to succeed at school, while a few of the boys emphasised that they often did not do homework because they had a lot of other things to do, like sports. There were also differences in where the students did their homework. Most of them did their homework at home, while some of the students reported that they preferred to do their homework either at school right after the school hours had finished, or at the local library. The reason for this was noise at home. Many of the students in this community lived in apartment blocks and had several siblings living at home and sharing bedrooms, so the conditions for concentrating on doing homework were difficult.

A more surprising finding was that for some students their activities in everyday life directly influenced their ways of positioning themselves as learners at school. This was especially linked to participation in sports. There is strong evidence regarding how, for many students, sports has a positive impact on school performance (Rasberry et al., 2011). One girl in her last year at upper secondary school, for example, explained that she made training programs for herself to become better in cross country skiing, with clear performance goals aimed for specific competitions. At school, she did the same. She showed how for each subject, she made a program for herself to better perform. She called doing homework her training, and her exams were the aim for each subject. She was a high performing student with the best grade in all subjects. Her days, both with activities at school and after school, were very structured.

Another surprising finding in our data concerning learning trajectories within this multicultural community was the role of ethnic community centres. These centres were set up for cultural purposes of shared language and cultural activities. However, many of these ethnic community centres also provided school activities. In the interviews, many of the students explained that they had been active at these centres, almost every weekend, from the time they were preschoolers until they entered upper secondary school. Most often, these centres were situated in warehouse storage buildings in the community and had been rebuilt with regular classrooms with a teacher's desk and rows for students. The teachers were former students who now studied at the university in high-status fields, such as engineering, medicine, biology and the like. They did this on a voluntary basis during weekends due to social consciousness of giving something back to their own community. For several of the students in the study, these community centres functioned to encourage students to better perform within the formal education system, in the core subjects of math, physics and science.

Ugur, a 15-year-old boy, born in Norway, but with parents from Turkey, regularly went to the out-of-school Turkish centre to work with mathematics and Lego robotics. He ranked the teachers there as very good.

You have clever people, engineering students, technology students. You are one of two or three young people getting help from one student in a very small classroom. Very good! Very good! I joined the math class to become as good as my older brother in math (interview, 2011).

During participant observation in the math class at his lower secondary school, Ugur played iPhone games during class activities, while commenting to the researcher sitting next to him:

The math level here is basic. Really basic! I cannot be bothered working with math in school any more. That's why I play computer games, you know? (whispers while looking at the teacher). I practice at the centre. (fieldnote, 2011).

Ugur joined the technology courses at the Turkish centre because he remembered having fun building a steam engine with Lego Technics, a present from his mother in his childhood. Simultaneously, he developed a competence in using computers, both

software and hardware. In primary school, friends and teachers started to ask him for help, since he developed a role as a computer 'wiz' in his social network.

One interesting finding from the analysis of continuity concerns data from the pilot study using the student's one-week diaries. The pilot study included 28 students (15-year-olds) that lived in different neighbourhoods in Oslo, but who were not part of the sample for the main study. For the students in this pilot study, it is obvious that school is a place and an institution that occupies most of their time during week-days. They also described it as a place consisting of different spaces, such as the classroom, science lab, schoolyard and online web sites used for school purposes. Activity patterns at school varied during the week, being a mix of formal and informal activities. Their descriptions of their communities, schools and activity patterns during leisure time were different. How much they used different technologies also differed quite a bit. In the following extract, I picked one day for one girl called Anita as an example. The point here is just to give a sense of the learning trajectories using digital media through a regular week or day.

Extract from Anita's diary on media use in everyday life

Monday: I got up around 6.30. I was awakened by the terrible sound from my mobile. The first thing I did was to get dressed and make breakfast before I sat down with the breakfast in front of the PC. I then checked Facebook, even though I know that very few updates came during the night or that early in the morning, but it has become a habit. A bad habit! I went into my blog to update it.

At school today, we visited the "Clinic for Health and Sexuality Education" with the class. At the clinic, I took a number of photos of my friends with my camera that I later might use for my blog or just as nice and funny memories. When I came back to school after the main recess at noon, I sat in the computer lab to find some information about the Cuba crisis for a test in social sciences tomorrow.

When I arrived home from school, I uploaded the photos I took during the school day to my PC and edited some of them with Photoshop. Since I have problems to leave things aside that I think are fun, I continued making some web designs in Photoshop, because it is one of my hobbies. In addition, I am a bit upset because my MSN does not work after a crash with Windows Vista and the newest MSN. Ahh, I should pull myself together... It is just an awful small luxury problem! Later on, I sat down and read in the social science book and wrote notes on the computer because of a test tomorrow. When I finished the notes, I printed them out in order to read them again. At 18:00, I have extra math. At this teacher's, I get help with assignments I believe are difficult and to understand the connection between different themes better. Before I went home after extra math, I bought Costume, a magazine I read every month. This magazine I read in bed before I lie down to sleep. When I came home, I put on a TV series that I like a lot. It runs on MTV and is called *The Hills*, but I have several season packages (DVDs) at home, which I put on when I am tired or do not have anything special to do. I have also downloaded some music to my iPod and it is charged now, tonight, because I like to listen to my iPod when I am going to sleep. Now I have some new music! Goodnight©

The two main places she moves between are home and school. It is clear that she combines physical interaction at home or at school with being online, as a space for connecting with friends, especially using Facebook, but also following up on more interest-driven expertise using Photoshop. She is advanced in her interest in technology and the way she uses this interest for different activities. Her use of technology also moves across different contexts, combining these activities; for example, working on images she takes at school and reworks at home. We also see how formal and

informal activities are blended both at school and at home, in visiting clinics, taking photos at school that are then uploaded to Facebook, doing homework, and so forth. These kinds of diaries illustrate how activities using different media blend between different contexts for young people in different ways.

Discontinuities

It is well documented how subcultures of young people develop interests that can be in direct opposition to school (Sefton-Green, 2012). This is documented in research on how boys, in particular, are engaged in communities of playing computer games has also shown how such activities are positioned as in opposition to school, and that these students often get lower school grades (Gee, 2007; Stevens, Satwicz, & McCarthy, 2008).

In this article, I am not exploring such conceptions of opposition or discontinuities per se, but rather how discontinuities between activities and interests might have educational implications for students. The study makes it possible to study how interests that might be in opposition to school learning at one point, may provide young people with resources that might have an impact on their educational trajectories later on.

During interviews with Andreas towards the end of upper secondary school, he explained his interest in games and game design, an interest that started in grade eight, when he got his own computer. At that age, he was content with academic subjects and was happy to do animation and editing of images and videos in his leisure time. Even though his interest was in creating animation and videos on his computer in lower secondary school, he did not choose to study media and communication because, according to him, he wanted to have other options after upper secondary school. Finishing upper secondary school opened up new opportunities for Andreas, as he gradually realised that it was possible to study his out-of-school 'hobbies' in what is called folk high school, which is a system of independent schools distributed around Norway with one year programs based on young people's interests without any exams. Many students take this as a 'gap year' before entering higher education:

I:But when did you decide really?

A:That was maybe last year, when I discovered the education and game design and stuff.

For him, it became important to join one specific folk high school that had a media and design programme. When talking with him after the first semester at that school, he explained that he enjoyed a wide variety of different practices and could take advantage of former experiences and knowledge about design. When comparing it to his experiences with academic programmes in upper secondary, Andreas emphasised how much he worked in front of the screen at this school:

We have been taught to create 3D figures using a software program, using key-frames to move them around, creating short animations and short films. We have also used like a 'competition' software program that allows us to integrate our 3D models into a video clip from reality, like put them together. My intention is to use this to create computer games (Interview, 2012).

Andreas saw himself as a game designer in the future, and hoped to test this out during his year in the folk high school. The school offered him a safe environment, and to test out whether gaming and game design were interests he wanted to pursue.

Another finding from our data analysis concerning discontinuities was the way family histories for some of the students had a direct impact on their interests and ultimately on their choices for educational trajectories. One example is Hanne, a 15-year-old girl who moved in with her grandmother when her mother died a couple of years before. She had no contact with her father. After her mother died, Hanne started to gain an interest in horseback riding and photography. In the interviews, Hanne described how visits to the photography shop, where her mother was working, and examination of her mother's photos and interest in horses were important to her learning trajectory. Her out-of-school interests in photography and horses had also led her to create an online blog about horses, which worked as an online networking space connecting Hanne to others interested in horses. Throughout lower secondary school, she has been blogging daily and commenting on other blogs. Her blog contains images and video clips of horses, horseback riding and her personal horse diary. She was aware that 'a good blog cannot contain misspelling and poor writing because it is read and commented on by others' (interview, 2011). However, this literacy practice and interest was developed, not in opposition to school, but as a self-initiated activity with no specific connection to her school activities as she saw it herself.

At the end of lower secondary school, her interests made Hanne think more about future ambitions within the formal education system, in the sense that she wanted to enter the media and communication program at upper secondary school. As a consequence, her academic motivation changed. Her strong incentive was to become a skilled photographer. She managed to enter this program, which is very competitive. She experienced a closer connection between her in-school and out-of-school interests and activities. This connection helped her in further developing expertise within her field of interest. In our data we saw similar cases, especially among girls, where students had strong interests that they spent a lot of time on outside of school, and that from a longitudinal perspective, had an impact on their educational trajectories. For example, one girl who became interested in Korean K-pop at the end of lower secondary school, decided to study Korean language at upper secondary school.

Among the students in our study, there were also examples of students that consciously stopped focusing on specific interests and expertise they had developed outside of school in order to pursue and concentrate on educational futures. One example is Mathias. He was 18 at the time and in his final year of upper secondary school as part of the media and communication program. His two main interests outside of school were rap music and physical training. In the interviews, he talks passionately about how he discovered Eminem when he was 12 years old, and how it struck him on a personal level as something he connected to. Mathias' interest in rap music soon turned into a more active role as a rapper himself, writing lyrics and creating beats. He performed at youth clubs in his community and became well known among others his age. He also became part of a larger network of rappers in this part of the city and appropriated an identity as a rapper. In one of the interviews he explains: I was probably not the smartest at school, but what I did with music, that was what I could do, and there was no one that could do that better than me at that time. I felt like, this is my thing. I feel like I manage school, and in addition I have trained a lot. I feel that I still am good in music, but I know many musicians that are very good, but it is not enough to be good. Everything has to connect. (interview, 2012)

Obviously, for Mathias, rapping meant a way to be a person, to create a learning identity based on confidence that he was good at something. It also meant he developed literacy practices of writing lyrics and creating beats as interest-driven skills. He also built up experience in performing on a stage with a large crowd of several hundred people. All this seems to strengthen a certain kind of learning identity for Mathias, building self-confidence and ways to be sociable.

Mathias' other main interest was physical training. After he stopped creating music, because he saw no future possibilities in it, his passion outside of school became Thai boxing. He explains:

I: Do you do a lot of training on the side?

M: Yes, every day. Boxing. Thai boxing.

I: Why did you start with that?

M: I guess it has taken over from the music. I have school and then I have always had the music. But then I feel I am moving nowhere with the music. And then I have always had an interest in training and using my body. And then I have always liked boxing and I went to wrestling a couple of years ago, and then I went to one training and got hooked, and train there all the time. (interview, 2012)

What became obvious was that when leaving his interest in performing as a rapper behind, his ambition was directed towards military service. How he links this to being involved in Thai boxing becomes evident when he explains that:

I: It seems demanding this Thai boxing, kind of rough.

M: Yes, I have injuries all the time, my nose is hurting and in the legs. However, if I am planning military service after school, then it is incredibly good, and you get very good physically. Not only physically really, but also mentally. To be able to stand in front of strangers and hit each other, that makes you stronger mentally. (interview, 2012)

His rational considerations have made him position himself in a certain way as a learner for the future. He refers to his experiences with Thai boxing, where he learned how to push himself to better perform. Mathias is a student that more or less consciously makes connections between his out-of-school activities and interests and being a learner in school.

Discussion and prospects

The narratives from different students mentioned above, either at the end of lower or upper secondary school, show different learning trajectories that students relate to over time. The focus has been on how these learning trajectories represent continuities or discontinuities between knowledge production, activities or ways of posi-

18

tioning themselves as learners, both in school and out of school. It has not been so much about exploring these contexts themselves, but rather to study ways of defining educational boundaries.

Boundaries are important in an educational sense because they influence the way young people engage themselves in learning and succeed in the school system, or build their own learning trajectories as alternatives to succeeding in schools. What is important as ways of (re)establishing continuity is the important role played by brokers, boundary objects and boundary interactions or activities and the value of institutionalising these in some way for sustainability (Bronkhorst & Akkerman, 2015).

One of the main findings from the presentation in this article about continuities and discontinuities of learning trajectories is that these processes are blurred as defined from the position of the learner, and there is a diversity in the ways such boundary crossings and learning trajectories are developed. This can be seen in activities that are expressed as continuities and is in line with knowledge production at school, such as in doing homework. We also saw an example of how students use activities like sports outside of school to position themselves and succeed in school. Due to the multicultural community in which the data collection was collected, it also became apparent that other settings in the community played an important role in connecting knowledge production, activities and ways of positioning across institutional boundaries. The data about Ugur shows that there is continuity for him in learning math, but with an opposite direction than what is normally thought about for the subject in school, since he learns more advanced math and is challenged more as a learner at the ethnic community centre.

Further, this blurring about continuities and discontinuities of learning trajectories is supported in the section on discontinuities when studying this over time. What might seem like clear boundaries between interests and activities at one point, may change over time. Like for Andreas, this started as an alternative to school, since game playing and creating game design was something he pursued entirely outside of school. Over time, however, this learning trajectory took over as his main ambition for the future. Completing school within the social science program was something he did to pass his certification, and then his main interest took over in the way he made educational choices. In a similar way, Hanne started an interest in photography and horses, building on a strong trajectory from her mother that became important in her choice of educational program upon entering upper secondary school. She could combine her expertise and interest from outside school with subjects and learning within school. For Mathias, however, it was about leaving his interest and expertise in creating and performing rap music behind to become more focused on school performance and his educational future.

All of these different cases and narratives show that learning trajectories across contexts are blurred, and that clear-cut divisions between continuities and discontinuities are not very helpful in understanding learning trajectories. Educational boundaries fluctuate in different ways for learners, and they change over time. In our data, this is also supported by the way digital and mobile technologies support learning trajectories in everyday life. This is most explicitly shown in the data from the diaries. The diary extract from one day in Anita's life, presented continuity between in-school activities and out-of-school activities and also showed how this is mixed together. For example, she takes photos with her mobile phone during activities at school and then continues that activity again in the evening at home working with Photoshop, which is not available at school, and uploading them to the Internet. It is also reflected in how working with school-related topics after school is connected to upcoming tests at school. For her, technologies play an important role in the way these activities are mixed together.

Even though connections between in- and out-of-school activities are not new in educational research, the challenge is still to develop conceptual understandings and methodological approaches in order to study such trajectories of participation across contexts of learning. My point is that learning activities as experienced by young people today are much more connected and expanded across different settings than ever before.

References

- Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 132–169.
- Bronkhorst, L. H., & Akkerman, S. F. (2015). At the boundary of school: Continuity and discontinuity in learning across contexts. Paper at the EARLI conference 2015.
- Claxton, G. (2008). *What's the point of school? Rediscovering the heart of education*. Oxford, England: OneWorld.
- Cole, M., & The Distributed Literacy Consortium. (2006). *The fifth dimension. An after-school program built on diversity*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dreier, O. (2003). Psychotherapy in everyday life. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, R., Biesta, G., & Thorpe, M. (Eds.). (2009). Rethinking contexts for learning and teaching. Communities, activities and networks. London, England: Routledge.
- Edwards, A., & Mackenzie, L. (2008). Identity shifts in informal learning trajectories. In B. van Oers, W. Wardekker, E. Elbers, & R. van der Veer (Eds.), *The transformation of learning* (pp. 163–181). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Egan, K. (2008). *The future of education. Reimagining our schools from the ground up.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Erstad, O., & Sefton-Green, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Identity, community, and learning lives in the digital age*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Facer, K. (2011). Learning futures: Education, technology and social change. London, England: Routledge.
- Falzon, M. A. (2012). *Multi-sited ethnography: Theory, praxis and locality in contemporary research*. London, England: Ashgate Publishing.
- Gee, J. P. (2007). Good video games and good learning. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). Funds of knowledge. Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodson, I. F., Biesta, G. J. J., Tedder, M., & Adair, N. (2010). *Narrative learning*. London, England: Routledge.
- Goodson, I. F., & Gill, S. R. (2011). *Narrative Pedagogy. Life history and learning*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Guile, D. J. (2010). Learning to work in the creative and cultural sector: New spaces, pedagogies and expertise. *Journal of Education Policy*, *25*(4), 465–484.
- Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. London, England: Routledge.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2002). *School's out. Bridging out-of-school literacies* with classroom practices. New York, NY: Teachers College.
- Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J., Salen, K., Schor, J. Sefton-Green, J., Craig Watkins, S. (2013). *Connected learning: An agenda for research and design*. Irvine, CA: Digital Media and Learning Research Hub.
- Jonassen, D. H., & Land, S. M. (Eds.). (2000). *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative re*search interviewing. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage.
- Leander, K., Phillips, N. C., & Taylor, K. H. (2010). The changing social spaces of learning: Mapping new mobilities. *Review of Research in Education*, *34*, 329–394.
- Ludvigsen, S., Rasmussen, I., Krange, I., Moen, A., & Middleton, D. (2011). Intersecting trajectories of participation: Temporality and learning. In S. Ludvigsen, A. Lund, I. Rasmussen, & R. Säljö (Eds.), *Learning across sites. New tools, infrastructures and practices*. Oxford, England: Routledge. 105–121.
- Mahiri, J. (2004). *What they don't learn in school. Literacy in the lives of urban youth.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Marcus, G. E. (1995). Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 95–117.
- McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives. Subjectivity, schooling and social change*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- OECD. (2013). *Innovative learning environments*. The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI): OECD Publishing.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. A. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (Eds.) *Life History and Narrative* (pp. 5–25). London: Falmer.
- Rasberry, C. N., Lee, S. M., Robin, L., Laris, B. A., Russel, L. A., Coyle, K. K., & Nihiser, A. J. (2011). The association between school-based physical activity, including physical education, and academic performance. A systematic review of the literature. *Preventive Medicine*, 52, S10–S20.
- Sefton-Green, J. (2012). *Learning at not-school: A review of study, theory, and advocacy for education in non-formal settings*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Silseth, K., & Arnseth, H. C. (2011). Learning and identity construction across sites: A dialogical approach to analysing the construction of learning selves. *Culture & Psychology*, 17(1), 65–80.
- Stevens, R., Satwicz, T., & McCarthy, L. (2008). In-game, in-room, in-world: Reconnecting video game play to the rest of kids' lives. In K. Salen (Ed.), *The ecology of games: Connecting youth, games, and learning* (pp. 41–66). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Thomson, R. (2009). *Unfolding lives. Youth, gender and change*. Bristol, England: The Policy Press.
- Tuomi-Grohn, T., & Engeström, Y. (Eds.). (2003). *Between work and school: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing*. London, England: Pergamon.
- van Oers, B. (1998). From context to contextualizing. *Learning and Instruction*, 8(6), 473–488.
- Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Boston, MA: Cambridge University Press.

New Learning Imaginaries: Youth Perspectives on Learning In and Outside School

Rachel Fendler & Raquel Miño Puigcercós

Abstract: This paper draws on the results of an ethnographic project carried out with five groups of secondary students. During one academic year, our research team accompanied youth in an inquiry into learning practices in and outside school. Here their observations and contributions are brought together to problematize the relationship between formal and informal learning, learning and schooling, and the role of students versus researchers. In an attempt to understand the impact of learning as a practice (rather than a result), a mobilities perspective is introduced. The authors use metaphors such as multi-directionality, flow, border crossing and displacements to reimagine learning practices in relation to the personal trajectories of learners, rather than the fixed location of the school.

Keywords: school disaffection, learning mobilities, participatory ethnography, youth voice, secondary school

Changing the conversation on school disaffection¹

How and where young people learn are two pressing questions in educational research, and today they seem irrevocably intertwined. The blurred boundaries between school and non-school, virtual and physical sites, or formal, non-formal and informal education contribute to a rise in studies looking at the way learning is linked to our understanding of social space (Leander, Phillips, & Headrick Taylor, 2010; Brooks, Fuller, & Waters, 2012; Vadeboncoeur, Hady-Rachid, & Moghtader, 2013). However, while educational research has diversified and ventured outside the classroom, it still struggles with finding ways for discussing learning without falling back on normative assessment frameworks used to evaluate school effectiveness (Sefton-Green, 2012). This paper approaches this tension by addressing the representation of learning practices, drawing on the contributions of 39 secondary school students who participated in a study researching how they learn in and outside school.

Gathering students' reflections on their own learning practices is a particularly relevant exercise today. In spite of the perceived multiplication of learning opportunities available to young people, researchers have identified an increase in school

¹ This article contributes to the national project *Living and learning with new literacies in and outside secondary school: contributions to reducing dropout, exclusion and disaffection among youth* (MINECO. EDU2011-24122) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness.

disaffection in Western industrialized nations (Smyth & McInerney, 2012). In Spain, where this research was carried out, 24.9% of students leave school early, which is twice the European average (Eurostat, 2012). In acknowledgement of this problem, reducing the rate of early school leaving is a high priority in the European strategic initiative Horizon 2020 (Europe, 2020).

In findings published by the European Parliament, early school leaving in Europe is linked to school disaffection: it is "typically caused by a cumulative process of disengagement" (Nevala, Hawley, *et al.*, 2011, p. 3). While a student's socio-economic conditions are a factor, it is now believed that:

a significant part of the problem can be attributed to lack of support and guidance, disengagement from schooling and to secondary-level curricula which too often do not offer enough options for varied courses, alternative teaching pedagogies, experiential and other hands-on learning opportunities or sufficient flexibility. (Ibid.)

It is clear that young people are sensitive to their role and sense of belonging in their schools (Watkins, 2005), and their decision to leave should not be treated as a casual chain of events. Instead, John Smyth (2005) has found that the decision to not to continue in school is "made consciously and often amounts to the perceived cultural irrelevance of the school and an absence of respect by the schools for the lives, experiences and aspirations of young people" (p. 121).

In light of the consistent findings that young people are active agents in their learning processes (see Smyth & McInerney, 2012) this project follows a research tradition that chooses not to address school disaffection in terms of a failure, or lack, on behalf of schools, students, or teachers (Hernández-Hernández & Padilla-Petry, 2013). Instead, it focuses on how to change the conversation by working with young people, studying the learning practices they identify as meaningful to them. In this way, the study does not describe what young people learn, or where, but rather explores learning according to the representations provided by young learners. As a result, the project shifts from focusing on physical sites of learning (i.e., in and outside school) and takes into consideration the multiple, heterogeneous learning practices that young people engage in.

Learning mobilities: an emerging paradigm for studying learning across contexts

By focusing on learning *in and outside* school the project initially set up a comparative approach between formal and informal leaning. However, as our work with the young people progressed, the notion of a fixed in/out binary became hard to maintain; neither school nor 'the outside' are categories that stay put in young people's lives. To better capture the entanglement of the transitions, trajectories, and socio-spatial practices that produce learning, we turn to the "mobilities paradigm" (Urry, 2007) to better interpret our results.

The study of mobilities brings together research from sociology, geography and anthropology, among other fields, to focus on:

"a wide array of economic, social and political practices, infrastructures and ideologies, that all involve, entail or curtail various kinds of movement of people, or ideas, or information or objects" (Ibid, p. 43).

Within this paradigm, a subfield that specifically addresses learning mobilities is consolidating. Leander, Phillips and Headrick Taylor (2010) describe the learning mobilities perspective as a product of the "new geographies of education" (p. 332), one that revives Lefebvre's critical analysis of the "nexus of in and out conduits" (1991, p. 93) that condition the production of social space. By tracing the influence and evolution of sociocultural perspectives of learning, Leander *et al.* (2010) argue that today, "processes of thinking and learning [are] not contained within individual minds, but rather distributed across persons, tools, and learning environments" (p. 330). This shift towards thinking in terms "learning across contexts", is echoed in Vadeboncoeur, Hady-Rachid and Moghtader (2013), who advocate

against equating education and schooling, instead noting that education occurs in and out of schools, and that school and non-school contexts are neither homogeneous nor opposites in a binary. (p. 341)

We find that a mobile approach to learning deconstructs what Leander et al. (2010) identify as the "classroom-as-container" discourse (p. 329). It allows us to shift from focusing on learning as a result to considering it as a series of emergent processes – reconfiguring educational research as an "investigation of (re)assemblages" (Landri & Neumann, 2013, p. 5).

A mobilities perspective does not set out to privilege movement, acting instead as a descriptive framework that allows scholars to track "the power of discourses and practices of mobility in creating effects of both movement and stasis, and uneven distribution of network capital" (Sheller, 2011, p. 3). Of particular interest to this project is Cresswell's (2012) work on the politics of mobilities:

By politics I mean social relations that involve the production and distribution of power. By a politics of mobility I mean the ways in which mobilities are both productive of such social relations and produced by them. Social relations... include relations between classes, genders, ethnicities, nationalities and religious groups... Mobility, as with other geographical phenomena, lies at the heart of all of these. (p. 162)

Following Cresswell's analysis, we may ask to what extent disaffection is itself a form of mobility, performed as a veritable pushing-out of young people from formal education. If that is the case, approaching learning from a mobilities perspective invites us to think about how young people are navigating between sites of learning, and what effects of movement and stasis are in play.

Developing a participatory ethnography

The national project was developed around a participatory ethnography, where 11 university researched *with* young people, in an effort to study learning in and outside school (Sharpe, Beethan, & de Freitas, 2010; Hernández, 2011; Heath, Brooks, Cleaver, & Ireland, 2009). Through collaboration, we sought a type of en-

gagement where "students whose voices may have been silenced or devalued within traditional schooling systems can be heard" (Bland & Atweh, 2007, p. 339). As the young people became more articulate throughout the project, we were able to move past an adult-centred mode of understanding and discuss how their social worlds are moulded and influenced by learning practices.

The research was carried out in five different secondary schools in the metropolitan area of Barcelona. In each school, two members of our research team worked with between 4–11 students in their last year of compulsory education (aged 15–16 years old). Schools either selected students to participate or recruited volunteers, but in each group youth members represented students who both did and did not meet school expectations. Three schools formally recognised student participation and allowed it to take the place of, or contribute to, the research project students are required to complete.² One school informally recognised student participation, but did not grade the results, and one school invited students to participate in the project as an extracurricular activity. In each case, the presence of the teacher and the degree of control the school maintained over the project was different. In three of the five groups, a teacher participated directly in the process and formed part of the core research group, while in two schools the teachers' presence was more perfunctory, following the project's progress through informal meetings with the university researchers.

Over the course of an academic year, the youth participants learned to interview their peers, perform observations in and outside school, take field notes, analyse and theme field journals, write a research report, and develop presentations through which they could share their results. Each group presented these results in their respective schools and in a final assembly at the university that brought all the participants together. During the fieldwork, the greatest obstacle was our struggle to maintain an approach to inquiry that was open-ended and exploratory, rather than proscriptive. This position was unsettling for some of the young people who sought clear guidelines; however, as the project progressed the participants gained a critical distance from their identities as students and become more confident as participant observers within the research framework.

Navigating learning mobilities

Not only was learning to research together a challenge, but the notion of learning practices was also a foreign concept. During the collaborative project we worked towards the topic of learning in and outside school while developing a new repertoire of ideas and concepts that allowed us to think critically about learning and its impli-

² This project is defined in regional curriculum guidelines as "a series of activities of discovery by the pupils regarding a subject chosen and marked out, partly by themselves, with the guidance of the teaching staff" (Department of Education, 2010, p. 251. Authors' translation.). Effectively, the university team wanted a selection of students from each school to earn their research credit by participating in the project. We hoped that linking the project with the curriculum would provide a strong incentive for the young people, as well as make more resources available to them (namely, in the form of time and space during school hours).

cations. To a certain extent, our move towards mobilities is a result of the non-linear progress we made in our group ethnographies. A mobilities perspective focuses on how learning emerges in an assemblage – a network of relations, sites and practices – which is coherent with the research experience. By adopting this approach, we are interested in considering learning as an *actant* (Latour, 1992) rather than an outcome.³ To this end, the following section introduces four mobilities, using them as framing devices to study how the young people's contributions expound on issues related to learning in and outside school.⁴

Multi-directional relationships. Learning activities that take place on-line, beyond school walls, are characterized by horizontal (peer-to-peer) pedagogical relationships. The literature on this new culture of learning provided an important starting point when designing the national project (see Thomas & Seely Brown, 2011; Ito, et al., 2010; Patel Stevens, 2005; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000) and the young people confirmed, in many instances, their experiences related to "connected learning" (Ito, et al., 2013).

One youth participant, Yassine, stands out in this regard. In many ways he resisted the academic demands of formal education, claiming that some of the school subjects were not interesting or relevant to him, and reported on feeling uninvolved in his classes. However, he was highly engaged when working on topics he considered to be significant for his own life, and he spent a lot of his free time improving his skills in video production and photography.

Yassine (Els Alfacs): I have friends on the Internet who know how to make videos. We share fields – because to apply an effect you need money – and so we share fields, sometimes. ... They show me their videos, I show them mine. They tell me what I should improve and I tell them what they should improve. Also, I end up helping out my classmates, because sometimes they have to do a project but don't know how.

I also take photographs. I've taken an online course on Photoshop, to learn more. I'm really interested in computers, especially how to fix them and how to problem solve when they're not working. I'm pretty good at it. I started doing this after watching some videos about it on YouTube, and learning from other people, and I think I'll keep doing it so I get better at it.

The meaningful learning experiences that Yassine identifies lead him to build a relational network, using sources from the Internet, advice from forums, and the help of a few of his teachers. What is interesting in Yassine's case is that his high level of engagement outside school does not replace his affiliation with school, leading to a greater sense of disaffection. Instead, his independently acquired skill base provides a path for staying connected with the school community. By positioning himself as the resident expert in technical matters, Yassine was frequently called upon to help both students and teachers on projects, or by troubleshooting technical problems.

Many young people in the project questioned the authoritarian roles implied by the teacher-student relationship, and Yassine is no exception. However, a mobilities

³ *Actant* is a term from Actor Network Theory that refers to "entities that do things" (Latour, 1992, p. 241) or that bring about action.

⁴ All project participants were given the option of using their own name or a pseudonym and the names cited in the text reflect each student's decision, we also include the school the participant attended at to avoid confusion when names repeat. The young people's contributions are citations of either oral statements that were recorded during the project sessions or written contributions made by the students over the course of the project. These statements have been translated from their original version in either Catalan or Spanish.

perspective encourages us to pay attention to the multi-directional character of the pedagogical relationship. We can observe that by developing his competencies with computers and digital media Yassine creates a different space for himself in school, one that allows him to participate in the school community not only as a student, but also as a teacher or collaborator.

While not all the students involved in this project were highly engaged in a learning community outside of school, the idea that the role of 'student' is not the only way to understand their relationship to learning was an important point for most youth participants. The young people highlighted their acute interest in cultivating learning experiences where they are not only students, but also experts and teachers; where the pedagogical relationship is not unidirectional but allows for different modes of participation.

Conduits. As we have seen, networks are a central structure within the mobilities paradigm, representing the social space of a connected, mobile society. Within networks the default mobility is "flow" (Castells, 1996/2010), which is frequently, and incorrectly, conflated with movement liberated from the confines of ideological space. Flow is better understood as the state wherein sites and subjects are constantly on the move, even when that movement is directed or forced. Cresswell (2012) reminds us that:

mobility is 'channelled' into acceptable conduits. Smooth space is a field without conduits or channels. Producing order and predictability is not simply a matter of fixing in space but of channelling motion – of producing correct mobilities through the designation of routes. (p. 165)

Schooling is a so-called 'correct mobility' for youth learning, and provides a template for how young people should progress. It is common to link the project of education to the concept of 'upward' mobility, and it can be a gateway for improving young people's social opportunities.

One participant's experience was particularly emblematic for thinking about the modality of flow and the processes of channelling. Before we met him, teachers identified Joan as at risk for school disaffection and during the project he frequently commented on his struggle to meet school expectations. He disliked being at school and did not identify any redeeming factors about his experience there.

Joan (La Mallola): It's like we're locked up in here [in school]. It's like a prison. When I leave here, I go home, eat lunch, and then get out of the house. I'm always just, you know, out. Then I won't go home until 9:00 pm.

As the project developed, Joan represented himself as someone who spends all his time on the street – which he associates with independence and leisure, and perhaps community – while continuing to criticize the disciplinary tactics of the school. This criticism stands out because Joan so clearly articulates a space that is alternative to the school, one that resists the conduit of classes and formal assessment. In fact, as the project advanced and became more technical, we observed that Joan was a master at cultivating smooth spaces – by tuning out, looking at his cell phone or starting conversations, he successfully redirected the flow of the group.

The group working at the school Els Alfacs also considered the conduits supported by the school when the young people took an interest in the tracking system that was in place. In their final report, the students concluded that:

It would be better if schools erased the rule about organizing students by level, because the groups who get better grades advance, while those who are at a lower level get stuck and fall further behind than they already were.

The observation by the students from Els Alfacs illustrates how the channelling that takes place in school is not the same for every student; schools facilitate certain mobilities inside their walls, while also introducing obstacles. Coupled with Joan's description, we are reminded that the act of learning inside school is not just one thing that we can compare to out of school learning. Rather, it is an umbrella concept containing diverse experiences.

Cresswell's emphasis on *acceptable conduits* confirms the idea that no mobility is carried out in an ideologically void space. With the examples given here, we see that disaffection is a complex mobility – the result of getting both pushed and pulled in a different direction. By paying attention to the directionality of mobilities, it is our aim to better understand the negotiations that young people engage in while learning across contexts and become more aware of the contradictory currents that young people are attempting to navigate.

Border crossings. This inquiry began with the assumption that there is a difference between learning inside and learning outside school. However, the young people did not take this division for granted and the separation became increasingly problematic as the project progressed. In the group working at the school La Mallola, when we asked students where they wanted to carry out their observations on learning outside school, there was confusion about what that meant.

Rachel (university researcher): So, let's go over where you're going to do the outside observations.

Jordi: Outside... So, like, outside of class? In the hallway?

Adrià (laughing): No! Outside, like in the street...

Xavi (university researcher): It could be anywhere you associate with learning that's outside school.

Adrià: Yeah, maybe at practice, or with friends, or while you're at home...

Rachel: Laura, you were thinking about writing about the dance?

Laura: Yeah but... what is that? Is it in or out?

[The dance was a choreography that Laura and her friends were organizing on their own time, to be performed at a school assembly.]

Roser: It's in AND out!

Everyone laughs.

While Jordi and Laura's questions are met with amusement, Roser's concession that an experience can be at once in *and* out reveals an unresolved tension regarding the term *inside school*. We see in this conversation that the term inside refers to both the concept of formal learning and the physical site of the school. Laura's question provides an example of an instance when informal learning takes place *in* school, while still remaining outside the curriculum. Jordi senses this ambiguity, and implicit in his question is the acknowledgement that surely what goes on in the hallway is different than what goes on in the classroom. Jordi's peers laugh at his suggestion that the hallway would count as "outside," reinforcing the idea that "inside" clearly refers to a physical location. However, the slippage regarding the definition of inside occurs in other groups, and it is not as straightforward as it appears.

Sonia (El Palau): We learn a lot of things at school, but I think they could teach us more about stuff that isn't strictly academic. ... We also learn from our classmates, from the relationships we have with our friends and with adults, even if some of the teachers are more distant than others.

Sonia registers a complaint about the relevance of the school curriculum and in the same paragraph of her narrative, recognizes that other types of learning take place at school (in this case, the development of interpersonal relationships). Once again the school is recognized as a social space and a curricular space, both of which entail learning.

Conversations about *where* learning takes place often overlapped with discussions about *what* is being taught in schools. At Els Alfacs, for example, the students were critical of how little control they had over what they were required to learn. In their final report they write:

We think that often the school spends too much time on certain topics or ideas, which we will never put into practice. This is likely why most adolescents believe that secondary school is a waste of time, because it doesn't explain things that they think are useful for the future. For this reason, we think an improvement could be made to give young people more choice in their academic experience.

We find that when given the opportunity to discuss the topic of learning, there was a strong tendency on behalf of the young people to critique the curriculum. Behind this critique we discover a deeply internalized association of learning with schooling. In an early conversation at La Mallola, for example, it became clear that some of the young people understood learning as something that takes place in the classroom:

Laura (looking at a graphic): Over here, listening and looking appear in. But you also look and listen outside.

Joan: Sure, but you don't learn!

Laura: Of course you do, maybe even more than inside! Outside you learn things you actually need, you know, from life experience.

Joan: Yeah, I guess...

While Laura expresses a different opinion, Joan's outburst indicates how closely tied together learning and school are in his mind.

Working to overcome this assumption, and in an effort to move past merely critiquing the schools, the research team encouraged the young people to think about how the in and out are related. As we have discussed elsewhere (Hernández-Hernández, Fendler, & Sancho, 2014), we were able to refocus the inquiry by introducing a mobilities perspective. We asked: *What inside learning travels outside and what learning from the outside travels in?* The first part of the question is fairly easy for the young people to answer, and they easily provided examples of how school contributes to their basic competencies (math, literacy), professional competencies, and their ability to relate to the world:

Els Alfacs (report written by all students): Some things we learn in school are useful for our day-to-day lives, like knowing math, or understanding our history so that we can be careful not to repeat the same mistakes today or in the future. Also, learning about different cultures and being able to understand people from different places and communicate with them.

Roser (La Mallola): Well for a lot of careers, you need a degree. If you want to do something specific, and go to university, it's important to stay in school and keep studying.

Nestor (Ribera Baixa): Sometimes when I'm watching the news, they'll be talking about something that relates to what I've studied before, or that I am studying. And so sometimes I am able to better understand what they're talking about because of it.

The second part of the question proved harder to answer. Rather than focus on what outside learning travels into the school, the young people were more likely to discuss how and where they engaged in learning, on their own time.

Sergio (El Palau): School teaches us a lot of interesting things but outside you can learn different things. At school, maybe you take Physics but on the street you get more day-to-day knowledge... Older people know a lot about history and they have a lot of stories. My father's restaurant is a great source of information. My Dad says it's tiring when everyone is always telling stories about when they were in the military, or what things were like when they were younger, but I really like hearing about it.

The young people spoke and wrote about their involvement in sports and music, their foreign language classes, and the time spent on hobbies like drawing or photography. We learned that some of them travelled, some of them cooked and took care of siblings, and all of them are dedicated friends. We observed that when the young people described how they learn outside school, they constructed narratives about who they are and what is important to them.

Laura (La Mallola): People are all doing the same things inside, while outside, everyone makes an effort with things they like to do, which are probably completely different. So, you can tell who a person really is outside, instead of inside.

The young people's contributions on learning outside school and their reflections on how learning contributes to their lives have the effect of establishing a spatial hierarchy, where *in* is a subset of *out*. This is evidenced by how easy it was for young people to identify how school contributes to their life (i.e., "outside"), while thinking in reverse was more difficult, illogical even. In this manner, over the course of the project the discussion around what goes in or out (and what doesn't) reveals an unexpected characteristic of school boundaries. We observed that they are not uniformly constructed; it is easier to go out than it is to get in.

Displacements. When we invited young people to occupy the role of researchers rather than students, we initiated a process of inquiry into the role learning plays in their lives. Over the course of the project, the young people identified how they learn, how learning changes when it passes from inside to outside school, and how their perspective has changed after having reflected on their identity as learners. These changes are the result of a displacement, as the young people gained distance – in the form of a critical perspective – from their own situation as students.

Many observations explored the relationship between personal interests and learning, as well as how information is transmitted and absorbed.

Sara (Ribera Baixa): I learn more the more I'm interested in something. And when someone says, "explain this to me," as if we were just talking or conversing about it, with less formality, than it's easier to feel like I get it, I understand.

Within this discussion, the term "effort" became a key concept, as it allowed the young people to think about both the sacrifice and the reward that are part of the learning process.

Adrià (La Mallola): When talking about learning we used the term effort. It's kind of abstract. We weren't able to measure it or have physical proof, but we were able to reach certain conclusions.

Effort is relative, and depends on where you are and what you're doing. It's not the same to make an effort doing something that you love, as it is to force yourself to do something that you don't enjoy at all. Something can seem to take forever and be really annoying, while sometimes you won't even notice the time passing.

But, well, effort is always rewarded. Even if you just try, it's a process. You can see where you went wrong and go back and try again.

Regarding the relationship between in and outside school, we found that this was initially addressed through a broad criticism of the formal curriculum. As our project evolved we succeeded in moving past the complaints and gained a better understanding of the relationship between learning and schooling.

Jordi (Virolai): When I think about communication in and outside school, I see a contradiction. Inside I can't use my mobile phone, and outside I use it everywhere. In school I can't access any social networks, like Facebook or Twitter, and outside I can. Inside school we aren't really in contact with what is taking place in the world around us because our access is restricted, but when I'm at home I feel like I can be connected to everything.

Jordi points out a contradictory outcome of the school curriculum when it results in a restriction of the access young people have to information (in this case materialized through the use of firewalls built into the school Wi-Fi networks).⁵ Adding to the contradiction, while the young people protest these limitations, they unanimously admit that when they do have access, they abuse it: "computers are a distraction, we pay less attention and are therefore less productive" (Roser, La Mallola). Faced with these paradoxes, some students interrogated to what extent the school actually encourages young people to take responsibility for their own learning.

Els Alfacs (report written by all students): It's said that young people don't have initiative. However, everything in school is so organized, and because everything is pre-planned, adolescents don't take the initiative to learn or discover something for themselves. That is what is different outside, where we have more initiative because everything is just out there, and once you learn something yourself, you become more motivated to gain new knowledge.

A not insignificant outcome of this research project was creating a disruption in the regular school day. The students who missed class or stayed after school to participate in the project weren't just following a syllabus, but developing a research project. In light of this last comment by the Els Alfacs team, we would argue that this

⁵ The use of firewalls was common practice in most participating schools, not only Virolai.

interruption – or displacement – is as much a "result" of the project as the accumulated observations shared by the young people. Brown (1997) has commented on the inexperience students have in thinking about learning, observing that this can limit young people's awareness of the learning practices available to them:

[children] had little insight into their own ability to learn intentionally; they lacked reflection. Children do not use a whole variety of learning strategies because they do not know much about the art of learning. (p. 400)

When youth participated in the project as researchers, documenting and reporting on their own experiences, they expanded their repertoire of learning strategies.

Activating collective imaginaries

The young people's participation in this study provides a portrait of when and where they identify as learners (which is distinct from their role as students). The identity work that took place over the course of the project reflects the extent to which the research design is also an ethical stance. Smyth (2006) advocates that young people need to have agency before they can begin to repair their disaffection and disinterest in school; incorporating students as researchers is one way of allowing this agency to develop.

The youth perspectives in this project contribute to a diversification rather than a categorization of what youth learning looks like. They changed how we understand the relationship between in and outside school and inspired us to abandon the notion that disaffection is the failure of a particular individual or institution. By turning to a mobilities perspective, we position the learner as a figure embedded in an assemblage of interrelations (i.e. a nexus of in and out conduits), a vision that supports an imaginary of learning across contexts.

Bereiter (2002) argues that:

to draw politicians and business people away from their fixation on achievement test gains one must offer them the vision of a superior kind of *outcome*. The failure to do that is, I believe, the most profound failure of educational thought in our epoch. (p. 490. Emphasis is original.).

Focusing on the relationships, transitions, boundary crossings or displacements that young learners currently navigate, we use the mobilities paradigm to develop a *dif-ferent kind of outcome* in our research into learning practices. We locate in the layered and polyphonic representations of learning a way to challenge the homogenization and standardization found in certain paradigms of traditional education and in doing so, seek to contribute to more inclusive learning practices.

References

- Bereiter, C. (2002). *Education and mind in a knowledge society*. Mahwah, NJ: Law-rence Erlbaum.
- Bland, D., & Atweh, B. (2007). Students as Researchers: Engaging Students Voices in PAR. *Educational Action Research*, 15(3), 337–349.
- Brooks, R., Fuller, A., & Waters, J. (Eds.) (2012). *Changing spaces of education: New perspectives in the nature of learning.* London: Routledge.
- Brown, A. L. (1997). Transforming schools into communities of thinking and learning about serious matters, *American Psychologist*, 52(4), 399–413.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society, Volume I, Second Edition*. Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell. Originally published in 1996.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. South Yarra: Macmillan Publishers.
- Cresswell, T. (2012). Towards a politics of mobility. In N. Edjabe & E. Pietrese (Eds.), *African Cities Reader II: Mobilities and Fixtures* (pp. 159–171). Vlaeberg, South Africa: Chimurenga and the African Centre for Cities.
- Department of Education. (2010). *Currículum d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria* [Compulsory secondary education curriculum]. Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Europe 2020. *Europe 2020 targets*. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/ europe-2020-in-a-nutshell/targets/index_en.htm.
- Eurostat (2012). Labour Force Survey. Retrieved from: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa. eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tsdsc410&plugin=1.
- Heath, S., Brooks, R., Cleaver, R., & Ireland, E. (2009). *Researching young people's lives*. London: Sage.
- Hernández-Hernández, F. (Ed.). (2011). Investigar con los jóvenes: cuestiones temáticas, metodológicas, éticas y educativas. [Researching with young people: methodological, ethical and educational issues]. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona. Handle: http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/2445/17362.
- Hernández-Hernández, F., Fendler, R., & Sancho, J. M. (2014). Framing multi-sited ethnography as an approach for coping with the complexity of young people's ways of learning, communicating and expressing themselves in and outside secondary schools. In P. Landri, A. Maccarini & R. de Rosa (Eds.), *Networked together: Designing participatory research in online ethnography* (pp. 97–106). Naples: CNR-IRPPS. Retrieved from: http://www.irpps.cnr.it/e-pub/ojs/index. php/mono/article/view/124.
- Hernández-Hernández, F., & Padilla-Petry, P. (2013). Cuestionar el éxito y el fracaso escolar [Questioning school success and failure]. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía 430*, 56–59.
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H.A., Lange, P.G., Mahendran, D., Martínez, K.Z., Pascoe, C. J., Perkel, D., Robinson, L., Sims, C., & Tripp, L. (2010). *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning with new media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J., Salen, K., Schor, J., Sefton-Green, J., & Watkins, S. C. (2013). *Connected learning: An agenda for research and design*. Irvine, CA: Digital Media and Learning Research Hub. Retrieved from: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/48114/.
- Landri, P., & Neumann, E. (2014). Mobile Sociologies of Education. *EERJ*, 13(1), 1–8.
- Latour, B. (1992). Where are the missing masses? The sociology of a few mundane artefacts. In W. E. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology / building society:* studies in sociotechnical change (pp. 225–258). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Leander, K. M., Phillips, N. C., & Headrick Taylor, K. (2010). The changing social spaces of learning: Mapping new mobilities. *Review of Research in Education*, 34, 329–394.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Nevala, A. M., Hawley, J., Stokes, D, Slater, K., Otero, M. S., Santos, R., Duchemin, C., & Manoudi, A. (2011). *Study on reducing early school leaving in the EU*. European Parliament. Retrieved from: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/cult/dv/esstudyearlyschoolleaving/esstudyearlyschoolleavingen.pdf.
- Patel Stevens, L. (2005). Youth, adults and literacies. Texting subjectivities within and outside schooling. In J. Vadeboncoeur & L. Patel Stevens (Eds.), *Re/Constructing the 'Adolescent': Sign, symbol, and body* (pp. 49–68). New York: Peter Lang.
- Sefton-Green, J. (2012). Learning at not-school: A review of study, theory, and advocacy for education in non-formal settings. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sharpe, R., Beethan, H., & de Freitas, S. (2010). *Rethinking learning for a digital age: How learners are shaping their own experiences*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sheller, M. (2011). Mobility. *Sociopedia*. International Sociological Association. Retrieved from: www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/mobility.pdf.
- Smyth, J. (2005). An argument for new understandings and explanations of early school leaving that go beyond the conventional. *London Review of Education*, 3(2), 117–130.
- Smyth, J. (2006). When students have power: student engagement, student voice, and the possibilities for school reform around 'dropping out' of school. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(4), 285–298.
- Smyth, J., & McInerney, P. (2012). Silent witnesses to active agents: Student voice in re-engaging with learning. New York: Peter Lang.
- Thomas, D., & Seely Brown, J. (2011). *A new culture of learning. Cultivating the imagination for a world of constant change.* Charleston, SC: CreateSpace.
- Urry, J. (2007). Mobilities. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Vadeboncoeur, J., Hady-Rachid, H., & Moghtader, B. (2013). Learning in and across contexts: Reimagining education. *National Society for the Study of Education*, 113(2), 339–358.
- Watkins, C. (2005). Classrooms as learning communities: a review of research. *London Review of Education* 3(1), 47–64.
Learning and Attitudes Towards the Knowledge of the Young Producers of Visual Culture

Imanol Aguirre

Abstract: This study strives to investigate the practices of youths as producers of visual culture that occur out of school. We attempted to determine how and where young people acquire the knowledge that they apply to their productions and identify their attitudes and interactions in relation to the learning processes. Consequently, we observed that the use of digital technologies and P2P learning dynamics, encouraged by the widespread use of the Internet, are central to the growing proliferation of creative practices engaged in by youth. All this occurs in a space of affinities, in which creation becomes indistinguishable from the learning and the socialisation. This is very different from what school can currently offer these students.

Keywords: visual culture production, youth studies, learning relationships

Introduction and research questions

This study is a component of the larger research project titled, "Young producers of visual culture: competencies and types of artistic knowledge in secondary education", which has been financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology (EDU 2009-13712).

This study begins with evidence: while schools are seeking profitability and competitiveness, we are witnessing major changes in the social and cultural circulation of knowledge. For young people, these changes configure a kind of Bourdieu's "habitus" that includes its own communicational skills and innovation and creativity processes at the same time that this gap between institutional interests and those of apprentice subjects is maturing.

From this assumption, our project strives to investigate the practices of youths as producers of visual culture that deviate from traditional master-apprentice and expert-novice relationships. These practices that occur along the margins of formal education (Drotner, 2008), in the realm what Trend (1992) termed "cultural pedagogies". Indeed, we are interested in how and where young people acquire the knowledge that they apply to their productions, the types of competencies that these types of knowledge are associated with and their attitudes and interactions in relation to their learning processes. All this is to understand, ultimately, what we can learn to promote educational experiences linked with students' real interests.

Review of the literature. The theoretical framework

The life and learning experiences that young people conducted as cultural producers have not been a dominant line in educational research. However, the growing consideration of youths as innovative actors in digital media usage has increased the number of researchers who are interested in the new forms of literacy (Buckingham, 2007; Gilje, 2011; Hull, 2003) and in the new methods of learning that occur through these productive practices (Sefton-Green, 2013; Ito et al., 2010).

In the educational research area, particularly, we find a large number of studies that have delved into the analysis of the tensions between school and non-school literacy forms (Hull & Schultz, 2002; Buckingham, 2007). Many of these studies are primarily related to the introduction of new methods of learning into the context of formal education.

However, there are not that many studies *committed* to analysing the learning features that young people develop in an everyday context, particularly those devoted to understanding how they visualise media production practices that *"are embed-ded in a broader social and cultural ecology"* (Ito et al., 2010, p. 4). Between these practices, we can find the "Digital Youth Project" (Ito et al., 2010) and a very large and deep review of the topic in Sefton Green's (2013) "Learning at non-school", in which the author maps the different dimensions of non-formal learning in the cultural production area.

At the same time, we are living in an intensely visual time in which everyday life is permeated by what is known as visual culture (Mirzoeff, 1998). Consequently, the visual field has been explored from many perspectives. One of the most interesting is the approach that considers that research on everyday life representations "*should be complemented by a study of what the cultural consumer 'makes' or 'does' during this time and with these images*" (De Certeau, 2000, p. xii). This statement refers to analysing what these representations mean for their consumers or practitioners and the aesthetic, cognitive or emotional use that they encourage. Indeed, this approach is a perspective that has several implications for education (Hernández, 2000) because it uses visual culture as a social space in which the representation or the 'social fact' of visuality occurs (Foster, 1988).

Hypotheses

Our project begins with a couple of core beliefs that became our main hypotheses. The first belief is the idea that formal education does not consider how youths are using knowledge beyond their school activities (Charlot, 2001). The second is the belief that the learning involved in these activities does not follow the traditional master-apprentice and expert-novice relationships, although we consider the "expert" and "novice" relationship as dynamic or as a socially constituted interactional achievement (Vigotsky, 1979; Sally & Gonzales, 1991).

Methodology

The advantage of adopting this approach in our inquiry on youth cultural production is that it allows us to move beyond the simple description of the visual universe in which young people live, prioritising the study of their practice and context. This approach pushes us not only to explore the meanings and significance that young people attributed to their creation but also to research the learning relationships conducted while the creation occurs, the methods of production developed, the distribution practices that such activities generate or the forms of subjective identity that they build (Rheingold, 2007).

Indeed, these types of studies require qualitative research that involves the analysis of a variety of empirical materials to describe "routines and problematic moments and meanings of individuals' lives" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 3). That is, a methodology capable of describing the phenomenon studied and, simultaneously, producing an interpretation that considers that its protagonists conferred with it.

Therefore, we have attempted to research 'with' and not 'investigate' young producers of visual culture (Aguirre, Olaiz, & Calvelhe, 2011), introducing a dialogic collaborative process in which young people were considered as subjects and not as mere objects of the educational research (Paulus, Woodside, & Ziegler, 2008). In accordance with this approach, our research project has been conducted over three distinct phases.

The first phase involved interviewing eight youths to determine which questions were the most relevant in relation to our subject of investigation. These talks resulted in a process of reflexivity (Macbeth, 2001), which provided us new experiential knowledge and caused us to redesign the direction of our research (Aguirre et al., 2011).

Based on this feedback, the second phase involved the design of a survey, completed by 786 students between 15 and 18 years of age from different regions of Spain; this helped us to obtain a general map of their activity as visual producers.

The third phase involved conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews of 12 young participants and analysing certain samples of their visual production. All these interviews were transcribed to allow the analysis of their contents.

The information obtained from the surveys such as the contents of the interviews was analysed by establishing categories or key concepts that helped us to articulate the results regarding the investigation's main problems or issues: the learning environments of young visual producers, the function or meaning of their productions, their attitudes toward knowledge, the places and references that nurture their productions or the relation with school knowledge.

Results and discussion

Based on the above mentioned different data sources, in this paper, we present the results obtained and discuss them, focusing on forms of learning that youths apply

while engaged in visual production and focusing on attitudes towards the knowledge that such activity offers.

Attitude of young people towards knowledge: self-learning and personal experimentation

In general, we have found that the attitude of young people towards the knowledge needed for their productions changes depending on the media elected and the production's sense. The young people do not show the same attitude with creative activity, such as graffiti (preferred by 2%) or painting (2%); this implies the recognition of different levels of experience and expertise more than their attitude when they encounter a more common activity, such as drawing in notebooks (preferred by 12%) or photography (50%).

However, the young people show very different attitudes regarding what they call mainstream pictures; those created "without thinking about them, as they come" (Maider says) are called vocational pictures. David states it clearly when he says: "any person can take a picture. But to take a good photo (with a good composition and so on...) you have to choose what you want to get and how."

In general, survey and interview respondents claimed to have begun and advanced in their creative activity through personal experimentation via observation/ trial/error. When asked how they began to engage in visual production, 35% of the youths surveyed claimed to have executed their first steps alone, and another 29% reported to have developed the skill with friends. Approximately 14% reported beginning the activity in a family setting, and approximately 9% claimed to have begun through school activities.

Even in cases in which the productive activity responds to the vocational approach referred to by Maider, we find self-learning attitudes. It is David, again, who explained that his method of learning involves scrupulously analysing interesting photographs to understand how these photos were created: "looking at how they made these photographs, and based on this, you can do it ... above all, handle the camera. You can take the same photo of this – 20 photos. Moving this up, opening the f-stop, closing ... you can go for hours."

David's explanation is interesting because it situates the question of the role of the references in the visual culture production of the young. At this point, our survey has provided controversial information¹. In fact, 32% of the respondents recognise the Internet as the main provider of images (always or often), whereas television, video games or advertisings provide images in 12%, 13% and 11% of the cases, respectively. However, at the same time, an overwhelming majority of the respondents say that their creations originate always (or at least often) from their own imagination (76%), whereas 5% of respondents claim they never use their own inventiveness.

¹ A similar controversy can be found in Reis (2014).

Other sources of youthful imagination: Family, school and expert knowledge

These data confirm the perception that a large majority of the study participants consider themselves to be self-taught, reflecting a general tendency among creative youths that has been identified in previous studies (Lange & Ito, 2010, Sefton-Green, 2013). However, the interviews allowed us to refine this information and, at the same time, identify other sources of youthful imagination.

Family is one source. Ana, for instance, reported that she works in handcrafts with her mother, who buys materials and provides feedback on Ana's projects. Similarly, Rebeca admits that this incipient childish curiosity regarding images solidified into true productive activity through helping her brother:

"I always saw him taking photos, with these super cameras that weigh a ton and he always told me 'come along, carry my camera!'. I began to take photos, tried it and liked it, because I made some really nice photos, and they conveyed a lot of emotion ... to me, it is a very beautiful world."

Although school is rejected by the vast majority as not suitable for their visual productions, participants recognise that certain types of school skills, particularly technical and formal skills, may provide a useful basis in a different learning context. Leire and Aroia, for instance, acknowledge the impact that their teacher has had on their impressionist painting techniques and how the art curriculum has enabled them *"to have a basis"*. Similarly, Raquel and Eduardo recognise that certain knowledge learned in class (above all, composition and colour) has been useful for their photographs, *"in the sense of providing basic ideas"* (says Raquel).

In any case, youths consider that these influences are merely elements that they are using at their convenience, within their own process of self-taught experimentation. This assertion can be suggested because this idea of autodidactism is accompanied by an evident rejection of the transmissive modes of learning and a lack of interest in acquiring expert knowledge to improve their creations.

When experiencing technical difficulties, more than half the respondents claim to consult Internet resources and, to a lesser degree, their friends. However, when the youth are not satisfied with the aesthetic results of their projects, this trend is inverted slightly, and more trust is placed in the opinions of friends than in information found in magazines or on the Internet.

However, in general, the respondents trust completely in autonomous experimentation as the best method for refining their results. Although they do not dismiss it outright, the respondents do not consider it absolutely necessary to learn or take specific courses that would improve their projects. David explains it as follows:

"I didn't sit down and read books like a maniac ... or take courses ... but instead kept experimenting and... if you want to do something, then you do it on your account or by looking for people or whatever... in order to develop what you are looking for."

Those people, to whom David refers, are not necessarily specialists in that field. Those people can be other producers who have the 'recognition' (Ito et al., 2010) of their peers, which is the acknowledgment of their achievements (Schmidt, Geith, Håklev, & Thierstein, 2009).

In the same line of estrangement from the usual transmissive modes of learning, youth participants disregarded information provided in manuals and instructional materials that accompany many of the tools and software packages they use for their projects. Leire describes the following reason for this type of behaviour: "I read the instructions and don't understand anything and so I prefer to just try it myself and see what I get." Aroia reinforces this opinion, claiming that she prefers to "keep on investigating how it functions. With more freedom, it's more fun."

The role of digital technology on the identity and practices of young people as creators

The revelations made by Aroia and Leire provide clues that help us to understand the manner in which they outline their relation to knowledge, both in the pedagogical and technological dimensions.

On the one hand, visual culture fosters a learning environment in which they can learn in a free and fun manner. This environment is a means of learning that is radically different from what the producers find in institutionalised settings, traditionally marked by norms, compulsory subjects and time framing, which makes schoolwork less engaging. As Raquel expressed, *"it gets tedious"*.

On the other hand, contemporary visual culture has a technological dimension that stresses the role of tools in experimentation and collaborative problem solving (Bohuijs, 1998. Quoted by Gwee, 2003). Digital technologies and Internet tools have also significantly shaped the creative and distribution practices engaged in by youths (Sefton-Green & Soep, 2007); this occurs at the same time that the diversity of these practices is continuously reshaping the tools, as stated by Boyd (2002).

Lange and Ito (2010) for example, support the findings of other researchers regarding the above topic, describing how the expansion of digital cameras and camera phones has resulted in many ubiquitous forms of capture and image sharing (Okabe & Ito, 2006; Villi, 2007). Similarly, other researchers such as Manovich (2008) or Gilje (2011) emphasise the role that certain software development plays in visual creation.

Behind these possibilities is hidden the idea that the knowledge needed to develop creative works has been previously included in the tools provided by technology. This inclusion may explain why photography is the visual production activity of choice for the overwhelming majority of youths. Certainly, modern cameras enable forms of production that do not require the mastery of expert knowledge. Digital camera use allows youths to engage in the instantaneous dynamics of testing, commenting with peers and composing again, which would not be possible using other media.

Eduardo is conscious of the potential included in the configuration of current photographic cameras and confesses to have ceased his training in professional photography:

"It's like now everyone has access to a good-quality camera ... people have stopped relying on professionals ... because when all is said and done, you put it on automatic, take a photo,

and if the camera is good and knows how to take the photos well, then you will produce a good photo."

Because the camera "knows", as Eduardo tells us, its mere possession eliminates any difference between professional expertise and the amateur's knowledge. When a medium does not offer all of the features that youths need for their projects, they can often use other pre-programmed tools to accomplish a task. Aroia and Leire, for example, report using easily accessible online programs that retouch and edit images.

Such programmable knowledge has been instrumental to the growing popularity of Instagram among youth. Rebecca reports that she is hooked on this program because it offers a tool that "gives you the option of retouching it (the photo), of adding different effects", which can improve the quality of one's projects, more than obtaining feedback from peers.

The impact of technological devices also shapes the identity of the young person as creator. In fact, the respondents to our survey have a rough vision of self-creation, related solely to their own imagination (76% of those surveyed) and nearly totally divorced from a consideration of the visual production as a result of complex knowl-edge acquisition processes.

Such confidence in the potential of the tool places the knowledge out of the margins of the game of creativity and connects to the old romantic idea that creativity is something that is already in individuals, who only need good tools to achieve good results (Sefton Green, 2014). We verified this impression when 67% of those surveyed agreed with the idea that having access to quality resources more effectively improves production capacities than increasing the engagement in learning.

However, the mediating influence of technology is not solely relevant to youth photographic production. We have found that this belief is held equally between those who engage in manual activities, such as drawing, which entails significantly less need for media. In our interview with Pablo, he reports how he uses specialised software to resolve difficulties with watercolour techniques:

"... with Nintendo DS it's easier... using Art Academy. In order to spread colour a little bit, you have to take the brush, moisten it a bit...and it comes out right, but I do this in real life, and it is very difficult for it to come out right!"

Maider also explains how she and her friends use the apparently limited possibilities for design offered by the game *The Sims* to realise their aesthetic decisions and to decorate private places where they meet for leisure purposes.

The uses of the Internet in the learning and distribution practices of visual producers

Software options for media, games and social networking are omnipresent in the lives of young people. However, the visual culture environment that has really changed the type of relation that young producers established between themselves and with apprenticeships has been the Internet (Boyd, 2008; Livingstone, 2009; Buckingham, 2007); this has led to what Ito and her colleagues have called 'connected learning' (Ito et al., 2013).

In our research, we have identified different forms and levels through which youths use the Internet for visual production. One of the most basic is one that uses the Internet as a huge repository of inspirational resources. Leire and Aroia, for example, tired of the green landscapes they observe every day at home, find images of different landscapes and colours that allow them to introduce variety into their oil paintings. This behaviour also applies to Pablo and Ana, who frequently use the Google image search service to find photos that they use as a reference for the hand-crafts they make, fostering a singular link between manual productions and new technologies. Pablo's case is quite particular because he showed us a drawing of the Alhambra created from a picture downloaded from the Internet, although he can view many images of the monument or the monument itself every day in his city, Granada.

However, beyond this primary use, the real change introduced by Internet use to produce visual culture originates from the new dynamics of interaction and learning that enable online participation in networks and communities (Mesch, 2009); they have clearly broadened the limits of the local environments available to youth.

Occasionally, these networks operate as situated "communities of practices"², such as those studied by Freedman, Heijnen, Kallio-Tavin, Kárpáti, & Papp (2013) or Martin (2015), in which youth activities of visual culture production are increasingly developed at higher intensities and frequencies. However, in our research, we have not found young people engaged in these types of groups formed around a specific issue or hobby. Nonetheless, we have detected random interactions and relations, which can be stable, casual or sporadic, that occur in the realm of other scenarios that also involve the dynamics of youth apprenticeship and action. These relations have been coined by Gee (2004) as "affinity spaces".

In several cases, such spaces exploit the dynamics fostered by pre-formalised social networks, such as Fotolog, Facebook, and Instagram, to which the youths in our research subscribe to find other youths with whom they share common interests. Such spaces generate broader communities that include co-friends derived from the local neighbourhood or school environment (Livingstone, 2008), as well as other collectives of individuals that Boyd (2006) calls "friendsters": individuals who typically do not know one another personally, but who form a larger space that fulfils the same functions as the local group.

These networks establish contexts in which individuals recognise each other and provide youths a new friendly space contiguous to their established and localised relationships; this leads to what has been known as participatory culture (Jenkins, 1992; Jenkins, 2006). For our collaborators, these networks become an arena for obtaining knowledge and for legitimising one's productions (Ito et al., 2010). Thus, the growing Internet usage by young people has resulted in major changes to the definitions of their public life. Online spaces have multiplied the opportunities for apprenticeship and for articulate identity (Livingstone, 2008; Boyd, 2002, 2006).

David agrees with this perspective and further contrasts the online environment with formal education:

^{2 &}quot;Groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder 2002, p. 4).

"The Internet is the best place for learning from people who are in the same place you are. The people who are interested in the same things as you are the ones who are going to teach you the most – more than a teacher or a professor."

Because of these features, a large quantity of youth interactions centred on visual culture activities occur online, particularly in networks that allow participants to post their creations (most typically photographic projects) and receive other people's opinions and comments (Soep, 2006). This phenomenon is what occurred with Raquel, who describes the learning experiences that she obtained upon posting her photos on Flickr:

"Sometimes I got comments from people in the USA or England, who said 'here you should do this or that'... Then, I would upload it right away following what they had said and... it was very good. I like these things a lot. They don't want to criticise, they just want to help you and I like that."

In addition to formal online networks through which young people recognise each other, we also examine the importance of youth activities that are facilitated through other online spaces that are more transient and anonymous and in which this kind of recognition is not required (Schmidt et al., 2009).

The methods by which the interviewees move through these spaces are similar to the approach that makes the flâneur to the city, as Baudelaire and Benjamin (1927) define, or more precisely, with the one proposed by Situationist International.

The Internet is used by the young, not as a predefined space to live, but rather as an environment that can be constantly (re)created through practices resembling the techniques of the dérive and the détournement, proposed by the situationists (Debord, 1956; Debord & Wolman, 1956), or similar to those that De Certeau (2000) called "arts of doing". That is, practices that involve the creative appropriation and reorganisation of what the Internet offers young people, with a critical-analytical goal and a creative and constructive, but opportunistic, behaviour.

The organised system of information through hyperlinks, associated with the ease of access to pre-indexed information, allows youths to find information that they are not specifically seeking but that they will recognise when they view it. This occurred for Ada, who described how she found Tumblr, a network unknown to her or her friends, by chance:

"So, I was on the Internet and found Tumblr and liked it. I thought, ah, look at this blog! And I followed it for about a year or so. Then I realised that it was a separate social network. I made myself a Tumblr, and didn't know how to use it".

It is interesting to emphasise how these precarious, diffuse and occasional journeys facilitate deinstitutionalised, intermittent and casual learning opportunities. Indeed, these opportunities allow practices of knowledge that fall outside of the regulatory control, typical of the sound and stable structures that usually support disciplinary knowledge.

David showed us an example that illustrates the type of sporadic learning relation that can emerge from this use of the dérive. He explains how he casually met an Italian individual on a site devoted to photography, of which neither was a member. David noticed that the Italian participant commented on other's photographs and decided to send the Italian his works for feedback. David told us he was very satisfied with the remarks made by the unknown Italian colleague because they affirmed his ability to engage in photography, an activity that he immensely enjoys; in addition, this was what David had desired foremost.

This case is interesting because, after that contact, the two individuals did not meet again. David never saw photos taken by his Italian critic. He does not know whether the Italian had ever returned to the website where David found him by chance because he does not intend to remain in this type of community.

David, as with many other youths, clearly knows what he wants from these interactions and believes that engagement in stable networks is not necessary for learning to occur. Although he does not discard the possibility of participating in more stable forums, David would engage in such networks if they offer him "*a good environment*" and offer what he calls "people with capacity", i. e., individuals who take the craft seriously.

Conclusions

The visual culture of young producers is characterised by its variety: different topics, different media, different places and different sources of knowledge. However, nearly all the studies we know regarding this topic place much emphasis on digital culture. In contrast, our study has revealed widespread interest in traditional production techniques, such as drawing and handicrafts; this can be explained by the age of the youths in our investigation. However, this interest can also be attributed to the more recent introduction of the digital world in our country, compared with other places (Gilje, 2011).

Regardless of the technique used, the survey and interviews clearly showed us the perception that young people view themselves as self-taught producers who learn through autodidactic experimentation. Therefore, the young accord great importance to P2P³ dynamics to advance in knowledge. Friends and 'friendships' (Boyd, 2006) are the real supporters of their activities as visual culture producers, disregarding the pursuit of more expert knowledge.

In this regard, we have found, as many researchers did previously, a large gap between school learning and what is generated through these P2P dynamics because schools cannot compete with learning spaces that are based on immediacy, the uncertainty of experimentation, the propensity for change and constant interaction. However, exploring their perception of self-teaching more deeply, we have found that young people have more references and resources, even inside the family or school, than they admit.

Furthermore, we have confirmed that, related to this idea of autonomous learning, an old idea of creativity, which is based upon individual inspiration, survives among the youths in our study. However, most recognise the importance of knowledge in regard to creating more elaborate or artistic products.

³ Acronym for Peer to Peer. Born in the computer world, refers to systems that communicate to each other directly, without passing through a central server.

Thus, the role that young people grant to the tool in shaping the autodidactic environment is striking. Therefore, we have found that the immediacy of responses and the capacity to revise results provided by the technology young people use, particularly digital cameras and editing software, allow the attainment of creative products and facilitate the attitude of self-teaching that young people exhibit.

In this respect, our study emphasises the idea that new possibilities offered through technology, particularly through digital technologies, are central to the implantation and to the growing proliferation of creative practices engaged in by youths.

In our research, we have found that the Internet is the main realm of resources, opinions, references and models for youths, who use it at different levels and with different objectives. The Internet is used, at a primary level, as a large provider of resources. However, the main factor that has introduced and facilitated the use of the Internet by youths for visual culture production is that it has significantly broadened the possibilities for interaction. The Internet provides the occasion to have stable or sporadic participations in affinity spaces and a background through which young people can act and move as a new flâneur, always ready to hunt for new suggestions and learning opportunities.

Therefore, it can be considered that the immediacy of responses and the capacity to revise results that are offered by digital media for image production, in combination with the multi-directional interactions and the peer-to-peer dialogue, are allowed by the dynamic provided by the Internet. Thus, we can conclude that the acts of creation become indistinguishable from the acts of learning and socialisation.

In short, a visual culture production environment provides youths the occasion to feel free to experiment, a community or audience in which to earn recognition, trust and complicity, and the opportunity to access many unexpected resources. These are items that today's Spanish school, institutionally, is not in a position to provide.

References

- Aguirre, I., Olaiz, I., & Calvelhe, L. (2011). Efectos de la reflexividad en una prueba piloto sobre una investigación con jóvenes. In F. Hernández (Ed.), *Investigar con Jóvenes* (pp. 115–123). Barcelona: Esbrina.
- Benjamin, W. (1927). Libro de los pasajes. Madrid: Akal (2004).
- Bohuijs, P. A. J. (1998). The Teacher and Self-directed Learners. In B. Jolly & L. Rees (Eds.), *Medical Education in the Millennium* (pp. 192–198). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, D. (2002) *Faceted id/entity: Managing representation in a digital world.* Ph. Thesis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boyd, D. (2006). Friends, friendsters and Top 8. *First Monday*, 11(12). Retrieved from http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1418/ 1336.
- Boyd, D. (2008). *Taken Out of Context: American Teen Sociality in Networked Publics*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

- Buckingham, D. (2007). *Beyond Technology: Children's Learning in the Age of Digital Culture*. London: Polity.
- Charlot, B. (2001). Os jovens e o saber. Perspectivas mundiais, Brasil: Artes Médicas.
- Debord, G. (1956). Theory of the Dérive. Les Lèvres Nues #9 (November). Retrieved from: http://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/theory.html.
- Debord, G., & Wolman, G. J. (1956). A User's Guide to Détournement. Les Lèvres Nues #8 (May). Retrieved from: http://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/presitu/usersguide.html.
- De Certeau, M. (2000). La invención de lo cotidiano. México: Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2000). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drotner, K. (2008). Informal learning and digital media: perceptions, practices and perspectives. In K. Drotner, H. Siggaard Jensen & K. C. Schrøder (Eds.), *Informal learning and digital media*. (pp. 10–28). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Foster, H. (1988). Vision and Visuality. Seattle, WA: Bay Press.
- Freedman, K., Heijnen, E., Kallio-Tavin, M., Kárpáti, A., & Papp, L. (2013). Visual Culture Learning Communities: How and What Students Come to Know in Informal Art Groups. *Studies in Art Education*, 54(2), 103–115.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). *What Videogames Have to Teach us about Learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilje, Ø. (2011). Two lenses on texts and practices: Analysing remixing practices across timescales. *Designs for Learning*, 4(2), 28–41.
- Gwee, M. C. (2003). Peer Learning: Enhancing Student Learning Outcomes. Successful Learning, 13. Retrieved from www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/success/sl13.htm.
- Hernández, F. (2000). Educación y cultura visual, Barcelona: Octaedro.
- Hull, G. (2003). Youth culture and digital media: New literacies for new times. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(2), 229–233.
- Hull, G., & Schultz. K. (2002). Schools Out! Bridging Out-of-School Literacies with Classroom Practice. Teachers College Press: New York.
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H. A., Lange, P. G., Mahendran, D., Martínez, K. Z., Pascoe, C. J., Perkel, D., Robinson, L., Sims, C., & Tripp, L. (Eds.) (2010). *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out. Kids living and learning with new media*. Cambridge, MA: MacArthur Foundation & The MIT Press.
- Ito, M., Gutierrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J., Salen, K., Schor, J., Sefton-Green, J., & Watkins, S. C. (2013). *Connected Learning: An Agenda for Research and Design*. Irvine, CA: Digital Media and Learning Research Hub.
- Jenkins, H. (1992). Textual poachers: Television fans & participatory culture. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century. Chicago: MacArthur Foundation.
- Lange. P. G., & Ito, M. (2010). Creative production. In Ito, M. et al. (Eds.), *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out*. Cambridge, MA: MacArthur Foundation & The MIT Press.

- Livingstone, S. (2008). Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New media & society*, 10(3), 393–411.
- Livingstone, S. (2009). Children and the Internet: Great Expectations, Challenging Realities. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Macbeth, D. (2001). On "Reflexivity" in Qualitative Research: Two Readings, and a Third, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1), 35–68.
- Manovich, L. (2008). *Software takes command*. Softbook. Retrieved from http:// softwarestudies.com/softbook/manovich softbook 11 20 2008.pdf.
- Martin, C. (2015). Fantasy Wrestling: Youth Digital Production and Visual Culture in a Competitive Fandom and Connected Learning Environment. In Aguirre, I. (Ed.) (2015), mor thn img cnsmrs: Mapping and Evaluating Research on Young People as Visual Culture Producers (pp. 217–229). Pamplona: Pamiela-Edarte (UPNA). Retrieved from www.edarte.org/?lang=en.
- Mesch, G. (2009). The Internet and Youth Culture. *The Hedgehog Review*, 11(1), 50–60.
- Mirzoeff, N. (1998). Visual Culture Reader. London: Routledge.
- Okabe, D., & Ito, M. (2006). Everyday Contexts of Camera Phone Use: Steps Toward Techno-Social Ethnographic Frameworks. In Höflich, J. & Hartmann, M. (Eds.), *Mobile Communications in Everyday Life* (pp. 79–102). Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Paulus, T., Woodside, M., & Ziegler, M. (2008). Extending the Conversation: Qualitative Research as Dialogic Collaborative Process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(2), 226–243.
- Reis, R. (2014). Um olhar sobre o papel das tecnologias da visão na construção de noções e práticas de literacia visual entre os jovens. *Revista Lusófona de Educação, 26*, 83–102.
- Rheingold, H. (2007). *The tools of cultural production are in the pockets of 14 year olds*. Retrieved from http://www.edge.org/q2007/q07_2.html.
- Sally, J., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The Constitution of Expert-Novice in Scientific Discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 149–181.
- Schmidt, J. P., Geith, C., Håklev, S., & Thierstein, J. (2009). Peer-To-Peer Recognition of Learning in Open Education. *International Review of Research in Open* and Distance Learning, 10(5), Retrieved from www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/ article/view/641/1389.
- Sefton-Green, J. (2013). Learning at Not-School: A Review of Study, Theory, and Advocacy for Education in Non-Formal Settings. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Sefton-Green, J. (2014). *How Might Creative Youth Cultures Understand the Nature of 'Creativity'*? Retrieved from http://dmlcentral.net/how-might-creativeyouth-cultures-understand-the-nature-of-creativity/.
- Sefton-Green, J., & Soep, L. (2007). Creative Media Cultures: Making and Learning Beyond the School. In Bresler, L. (Ed.) *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education* (pp. 835–856). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Soep, L. (2006). Beyond literacy and voice in youth media production. *McGill Journal of Education*, 41(3), 197–214.

- Trend, D. (1992). Cultural Pedagogy: Art, Education, Politics. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Villi, M. (2007). Mobile Visual Communication. Photo Messages and Camera Phone Photography. 18th Nordic Conference for Media and Communication Research. Helsinki. Retrieved from http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitelpdf/245_villi.pdf.
- Vigotsky, L. S. (1979). *El desarrollo de los procesas psicológicos superiores*. Barcelona: Grijalbo.
- Wenger. E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, M. (2002). Cultivating communities of practice: a guide to managing knowledge. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Researching Formal and Informal Learning: From Dichotomies to a Dialogic Notion of Learning

Kristiina Kumpulainen & Anna Mikkola

Abstract: This article is situated in a body of research focusing on learning in and out of school, often referred to as studies of formal and informal learning. Drawing on the dialogic approach, the article warns against simplistic and dichotomous definitions of what counts as formal and informal learning. Instead, it calls for the importance of understanding learning as a dialogue between contexts of discourse in which the attributes of "formality" and "informality" intersect. By taking *discourse* as the core unit of analysis, the approach advocated here focuses on examining how students' discourses embedded in diverse contexts are managed, negotiated, and hybridized during their academic work. We shall exemplify our argument with empirical data stemming from a case study on elementary school students' online interaction during creative collaborative writing. In our analysis of the data, we illuminate the hybridization of students' online interaction in which diverse contexts of discourse come into dialogue, producing opportunities and tensions for their engagement, learning, and identity. The article finishes by considering the wider implications of the dialogic approach to understanding learning across contexts.

Keywords: formal and informal learning environments, sociocultural approach, hybrid space, dialogic learning

Introduction

The discontinuities between in and out of school learning have been the source of robust scholarship since the early 20th century (Dewey, 1916; Kilpatrick, 1923, 1925). In her seminal work, Lauren Resnick (1987) illuminated discrepancies in students' learning across settings, illustrating how school learning is typically characterized by focus on individual performance, symbolic thought, as well as general skills and knowledge. Out-of-school learning, on the other hand, is mostly socially shared; tool-aided; and embedded in mediating objects, resources, and situations, resulting in contextualized competencies, skills, and knowledge practices (Resnick, 1987).

Examinations of the discrepancies between learning in and out of school have been enriched by more recent research that addresses the changing role of digital technologies and media in shaping the ways in which young people engage, learn, and build their identities. Research has demonstrated that informal digital learning practices are often highly social, characterized by various forms of self- and/or peer-teaching (Willet & Sefton-Green, 2002). Moreover, these practices are found to be typically self-initiated and self-motivated, evidencing a strong sense of agency on the part of learners.

While contrasts between the dominant features of learning in the formal institutional settings of the school and in more informal settings of everyday life are valuable in extending our understanding of the nature and conditions of learning in diverse sociocultural contexts, in this article, we argue that approaching learning in formal and informal settings dichotomously has limitations that may lead to fragmentation, stereotyping, and oversimplification (Bowker & Star, 1999; Colley, Hodkinson, & Malcolm, 2003).

Drawing on the dialogic approach, the goal of the article is to offer an alternative conceptual framing that does not regard contexts as backgrounds but rather as being produced, negotiated, and hybridized in social interaction, creating varying opportunities for students' engagement, learning, and identity (Leader, 2001). By taking *discourse* as the core unit of analysis, the approach advocated here focuses on examining how students' discourses embedded in diverse contexts are managed, negotiated, and hybridized during their academic work. Such an approach allows us to recognize changes to student engagement, learning, and identity when the balance between various discourses shifts in evolving social interactions.

We exemplify our argument with empirical data stemming from a case study on elementary school students' online interaction during creative collaborative writing. In our analysis of the data, we aim to illuminate the hybridization of students' online interaction in which diverse discourses meet, producing opportunities and tensions for their engagement, learning, and identity. The article finishes by considering the wider implications of the dialogic approach to understanding learning across contexts.

The Dialogic Approach

The dialogic approach to learning discussed in this article is guided by sociocultural theories (Cole, 1996; Kumpulainen & Renshaw, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). The dialogic approach focuses on social interactions that emerge in horizontal movement as we draw upon multiple contexts, including peer relations, family, and school, to make meaning with others (Barron, 2006; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999). By viewing context as a function of the dynamic interaction between multiple layers of activity, the dialogic view foregrounds that during joint engagement, participants are active in creating social and interactional contexts (Goffman, 1974; Kumpulain-en & Mutanen, 1999; Schubauer-Leoni & Grossen, 1993). From this standpoint, interaction is not determined by the medium or physical context; rather, it is nego-tiated dynamically in social interaction. Social interaction is performative and context-transforming, facilitating the ongoing negotiation of meaning and presentation of self (Thorne, 2003). Instead of conceptualizing learning merely as an epistemic process, in the dialogic approach, learning is considered as inseparably linked with existential and socio-emotional processes involved in transforming identities and developing agency (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000). It focuses on understanding how identities are locally and interactionally constructed and on shifts in relation to the social setting and actors (Hand, 2006; Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998; Nasir & Saxe, 2003). Here, identity is examined from the ways in which one is positioned and positions oneself in the moment and over time across social practices (Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998).

Discourse as a unit of analysis

The core analytic unit in our approach to unpack the production, negotiation, and hybridization of multiple contexts in social interaction is discourse (Gee, 2010). Discourses are enacted through the practices of the communities in which people participate (Wenger, 1998). They offer membership in communities that involve ways of being, valuing, and speaking. Gee referred to such memberships as identity kits (1996), situated identities (2010), and affinity groups (2001). Discourses are considered to be an integral part of value- and belief-laden practices that are lived, talked, enacted, and carried out in specific places and at specific times (Gee, 1996). It follows that discourses can be understood only within the sociocultural context in which they originate (Gee, 2010).

In our approach, we are specifically interested in the notion of "*hybrid*" space that can be achieved when diverse discourses embedded in young people's multiple life worlds intersect (Bhabha, 1994; Gutiérrez et al., 1999). According to Gee (2010), a hybrid space is where pupils' primary discourses, which are used in the home, community, and informal social interactions, and pupils' secondary discourses, which are endorsed by school and other formal institutions, intersect to form a subsequent "in-between" space. In this space, oppositional categories work together to open up different possibilities for student engagement, learning, and identity. A hybrid space can thus be both productive and constraining in terms of engagement and learning, and, ultimately, sense of self and belonging (Bhabha, 1994).

Empirical Study

Next, we exemplify our approach to researching learning as a dialogue between contexts of discourse by drawing on empirical data stemming from a case study on elementary school students' online interaction during creative collaborative writing. In our analysis of the data, we illuminate the hybridization of students' online interaction in which diverse discourses come into dialogue, producing opportunities and tensions for engagement, learning, and identity. The empirical research discussed in the article has been reported more substantially in other publications (see Kumpulainen, Mikkola, & Jaatinen, 2013; Kumpulainen & Mikkola, 2014).

Research setting

The data are derived from a case study of a yearlong school musical project in a Finnish primary school community of 240 students (grade levels one through six) and 16 teachers in the Helsinki district. All students in the school participated in a communal musical production, and during a period of one year, worked together with their teachers and collaboratively produced a number of poems, short movies, audio-visual effects, animations, stories, a school musical script, and a composition of the musical melody using various technological tools and devices. The outcome of the students' work, the fantasy school musical "Magic Forest Musical," was performed on the anniversary of the school's founding. The musical production was an integral part of the official curriculum of the school and not an extra addition.

The data discussed here come from a three-month phase in the musical project during which 21 fifth- and sixth-grade students (ages 11 to 12) took part in writing the school musical script. The students worked in 10 small, self-selected teams of two to three students, with each team writing one part of the script. To enable the students' collaborative creation of the script in and outside of school, they were given small, one-to-one computers set up with a 24-hour wireless Internet connection. The laptops were equipped with a collaborative writing tool called VisciPad, which included a chat channel. VisciPad enabled students to simultaneously edit the same text document, that is, work in real time.

The students were allocated two one-hour sessions every week to write the script at school. The teams were able to organize their writing as they wished without any prefixed daily schedules or teacher control. The only obligation was that the scripts had to be completed within the three-month time period for the musical project to proceed. As a final result of the project, the students produced 14 different scripts; some were relatively short, for instance, those to be performed by second graders, some had music and lyrics, and others had more dialogue.

Data analysis

The data we draw upon derive from the students' *online chat discussions* (N=4,744); these were messages they exchanged during the collaborative writing of the school musical script. The methodology guiding our analysis is based on educational linguistics, namely, interactional sociolinguistics (Gee, 1996) and ethnography of communication (Gumperz, 1982), which examine language as inseparable from the contexts of its use. In our analysis, we focus both on the content and organization of the students' evolving chat interaction. We paid specific attention to the contexts of the students' discourses and how these contexts are negotiated and managed in evolving online interaction (Bloome & Clark, 2006).

Illustrative Cases

Our analysis of the data reveals dynamic interaction between multiple contexts of discourse in the students' chat interaction during creative collaborative writing. The students produced and negotiated discourses that were related to their joint composition of the musical script, including planning, revising, and evaluating. These discourses were managed in dialogue with other discourses that specifically dealt with the students' socio-emotional work. Characteristic to these socio-emotional discourses was the students conveying their social presence to others, a necessary condition for collaborative work in online interaction (Gunawardena, 1995). The students' discourses also entailed playful interactions in which they gave supportive feedback to each other and asked for help in creating text and in using the technology. In addition, the students' socio-emotional discourses carried information about their state of mind and mood. Typical moods included expressions of being happy and positive and, likewise, expressions of being bored or tired. Here, the use of various forms of expression of emotions, including emoticons, repetitious punctuation, and conspicuous capitalization, was also evident.

Chat Interaction	Contexts of Discourse	
March 4		
1: Minna: Hiii		
2: Aino: Hahaa I corrected a spelling mistake!!.D	Evaluation of	
3: Outi: ye, well that's okay	joint writing	
4: Outi: I mean yes		
5: Satu: hi I found my way here so I left a footprint:))	Establishing mutual presence Playful	
March 5		
6: Outi: :) (11:37)		
7: Elli: hi (12:50)	interaction	
March 6		
8: Tanja: I need ideas!	Asking for help	
March 7		
9: Satu: morning;) How can I make a heart with this		
computer?		
10: Elli: öööö dunno		
March 11		
11: Elli: A piece of music from a record		
March 12		
12: Aino: Hi Sannanen and everyone else! It is a bit lonely	Establishing	
nere. halloo!!	mutual presence	
March 15	Further of	
13: Suski: ni sannaaaaa It seems that this is progressing	Evaluation of	
weil=)	Joint writing	
March 10		
14: Satu: IOOKS good		
March 21		
April A		
16: Suski: bellou looks goodll who teaches all the tricks to		
those guys??? or are they now so clever that they already		
know everything???????		

<i>Table 1.</i> Playful Evaluation of Joint Writing	Table	1.	Playful	Evaluation	of Joint	Writing
---	-------	----	---------	------------	----------	---------

The extract shown in Table 1 illustrates how socio-emotional discourses, such as playful use of language, in the students' chat interaction were an integral part of their collaborative writing activity. Seemingly, the students also engaged in thoughtful discussions about the nature and progress of their joint script for the school musical: They evaluated their collective work, gave supportive feedback to each other, and asked for help in creating text and in using the technology. All these discourses and their dialogue in ongoing chat interaction are important elements of productive creative collaboration and learning (Dillenbourg, 1999; Moran & John-Steiner, 2004).

In addition to discourses related to the joint writing activity and socio-emotional work, the students' chat interaction produced a context in which the students talked about their exams, homework, school lunch, and break time. They also shared their music and movie preferences, hobbies, food, travels, mundane observations of their living environment, and recent news covered by the media. Although the discourses of the students' local, everyday experiences and knowledge are not usually recognized or valued in the official script of schooling (Gutiérrez, Larson, & Kreuter, 1995), they appeared to play an important role here, supporting the students' joint creation of the musical script and strengthening mutual understanding and trust between the students.

The extract in table 2 illustrates how the students' active engagement in their joint writing activity interacted with the students sharing their music preferences. The extract begins by Sofia's two messages sent immediately after each other. In line 107, she asks Megan for her opinion on how to continue with their writing. In her next message (line 108), she queries Megan's music preferences. Megan responds to both of these initiations, and the students negotiate and manage the interplay of these different contexts of discourse in their evolving dialogue.

Chat Interaction	Contexts of Discourse
April 1107: Sofia: How should we do this then108: Sofia: And what are you listening to109: Megan: well, should we write the lines with the otherclass since it would be cool if they could also create them110: Megan: Cool pieces :D111: Sofia: ok112: Sofia: name????113: Megan: There it was114: Megan: h0h00115: Sofia: well, should we start to create those lines (tostart with) minute by minute!!!!! or????116: Sofia: let's say that we'll prefer to do it with thatclass since otherwise we could not get it ready117: Sofia: ?118: Sofia: Do you agree?	Joint writing Querying music preferences Joint writing Sharing music preferences Joint writing

Table 2. Joint Writing Activity Interacts With Sharing Music Preferences

The extract in Table 3 illuminates the students Enni and Pinja sharing their experiences and concerns about school exams. The extract reflects the pressures the students experience in getting high grades and fulfilling the expectations of others. Here, the discourse departs from the actual writing activity, serving yet another important function, that is, the students sharing their concerns about the requirements of the school and how they cope with them. We can also identify the students engaging in negotiating their identities as students.

Chat Interaction	Contexts of Discourse	
March 13		
134: (9:15)	Pinja: I'm afraid of the math exam. It went so badly from me!	Coping with the math exam
135: (9:16)	Enni: no it didn't	
136: (9:16)	Pinja: Especially the last page. I know I have lost at least two points!	
137: (9:16)	Pinja: mimimimimiiiii	
138: (9:16)	Pinja: history exam?	
139: (9:16)	Pinja: do you remember what you got from it?	Comparing exam results
140: (9:17)	Enni: =(
141: (9:17)	Pinja: did we loose the connection?	Establishing mutual presence
142: (9:17)	Enni: no	
143: (9:17)	Pinja: so?	
144: (9:17)	Pinja: what took so long what =(
145: (9:18)	Enni: I know that at least two	
	problems went badly	
146: (9:18)	Enni: I am a slow writer	Identity as a "slow writer"
147: (9:18)	Pinja: oh no.	-
148: (9:18)	Pinja: ok	
149: (9:18)	Pinja: they were easy	
150: (9:18)	Enni: yeah but I did not think enough	
151: (9:19)	Pinja: poor you.	
152: (9:19)	Pinja: you don't have any pressures!	
153: (9:19)	Enni: I marked 60% to the fourth thing.	Being accountable to others
154: (9:19)	Enni: how come you don't have	about success at school
155: (9:19)	Pinja: so if I don't get more than nine I feel that I have betrayed someone	
156: (9:19)	Pinja: that maybe you also have;)	
157: (9:19)	Enni: yeh well but my math number is eight	Comparing math achievement
158: (9:20)	Pinja: well but let's not bother talking about the school	
159: (9:20)	Pinja: especially about maths!	
160: (9:20)	Enni: so that there are no pressures	

Table 3. Coping With the School

The extract shown in Table 3 demonstrates how the interplay of various discourses in the students' chat interaction also creates tensions for the students to maintain their joint focus of attention on their writing activity. The tensions showcase how "hybrid" spaces accomplished by the interplay of diverse discourses require and afford continuous negotiation and attention from participants. On the other hand, negotiating tensions appeared to contribute to building a positive affective structure, thus building a sense of belonging and community (Kreijns, Kirschner, & Jochems, 2003).

Discussion

This article is situated in a body of research focusing on learning in and out of school, often referred to as studies of formal and informal learning. Drawing on the dialogic approach, the article has called for the importance of understanding learning as a dialogue between contexts of discourse in which the attributes of "formality" and "informality" intersect. In doing so, it has warned against simplistic and dichotomous definitions of what counts as formal and informal learning. We have explained our approach with empirical data stemming from a case study on elementary school students' online interaction during creative collaborative writing. In our analysis of the data, we have illuminated the hybridization of students' online interaction in which diverse contexts of discourse come into dialogue, producing opportunities and tensions for their engagement, learning, and identity.

Our study demonstrates how students' discourses and educational engagement in general were simultaneously nuanced and coherent, ambivalent and confused. The educational engagement identified broke away from the typical tightly defined and teacher-controlled learning activities that often silence more emotional and/or everyday discourses of the students (Kumpulainen & Mikkola, 2014). Here, the students' joint creative activity was distributed across several contexts, reflecting educational engagement where discourses that are often marginalized in formal schooling became visible. Hence, the students' learning activity could be characterized as situated within a matrix of multiple sociocultural contexts (Lantz-Andersson, Vigmo, & Bowen, 2013; Ramsten & Säljö, 2012).

The data demonstrate how the students' various discourses intersected, overlapped, and coexisted at different points in time and space (Barron, 2004, 2006). As students engaged in such "hybrid" spaces (Bhabha, 1994), they were co-constructing the cultural practices of what it means to participate and learn at school, thus also building their identities. Here, the students used various discourses to adopt and adapt extant discourse practices in their meaning-making as they defined their social relationships, social identities, and knowledge. It was in these "hybrid" spaces in which the multidimensionality of learners' identities came into play and in which new social practices emerged (Akkerman & van Eijck, 2013). The different discourses and their hybridization in the students' chat interaction appeared to support joint creative writing in several ways, such as establishing a common ground and negotiating responsibilities and shared commitment for collaborative work. The interplay of discourses also resulted in a space for the students' social construction of mutual inspiration and trust (Kumpulainen & Mikkola, 2014).

Our empirical case also demonstrates how sometimes competing discourses intersected in the students' chat interaction. These discourses and the tensions they created both reshaped and challenged the students' engagement in their collaborative creative learning activity. Moreover, these tensions showcase how maintaining a "hybrid" space requires and affords continuous attention from participants. This also underscores the important role of educational conditions in supporting sustained and productive engagement and learning toward valued educational goals (Kumpulainen, 2013). It can be concluded that the hybridity evidenced in this study ruptures the dominant idealization of formal education that seeks predictability and uniformity as well as narrowly defined notions of what counts as 21st-century educational engagement and learning.

Directions for Future for Research

Approaches to learning that address the interplay of contexts of discourse in social interaction raise several research questions that call for attention. Clearly, future research needs to investigate the degree to which the interplay of various contexts of discourse promotes students' engagement in learning and identity-building in different types of educational settings and among students and teachers. Future investigations also need to address the mechanisms of "hybrid" learning among diverse students and seek to identify and redefine learning supports and outcomes.

Lastly, while the interrelationships between various discourses can be examined in terms of situationally constructed micro-level activities in classroom communities, whether online or offline, it is essential to also address meso- and macro-levels of activity. This investigation can further our understanding of the wider sociocultural contexts that interact with students' engagement, learning, and identity in a given social setting, including its processes, purposes, and content of activity. Such inquiry can lead to highly relevant societal and political questions, such as the emancipatory potential of formal education in contemporary society.

References

- Akkerman, S., & van Eijck, M. W. (2013). Re-theorising the student dialogically across and between boundaries of multiple communities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 60–72.
- Barron, B. (2004). Learning ecologies for technological fluency: Gender and experience differences. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 31(1), 1–36.
- Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecology perspective. *Human Development*, 99, 193–224.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). The location of culture. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bloome, D., & Clark, C. (2006). Discourse-in-use. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 227–242). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cole, M. (1996). Culture in mind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Colley, H., Hodkinson, P., & Malcolm, J. (2003). Informality and formality in learning: A report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre. University of Leeds.

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press.
- Dillenbourg, P. (Ed.). (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. London, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Teenagers in new times: A new literacy studies perspective. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43(5), 412–423.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling. New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2010). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). Social presence theory and implications for interaction and collaborative learning in computer conferences. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 1(2/3), 147–166.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the thirdspace. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6, 286–303.
- Gutiérrez, K., Larson, J., & Kreuter, B. (1995). Cultural tensions in the scripted classroom: The value of the subjugated perspective. Urban Education, 29(4), 410–442.
- Hand, V. (2006). Operationalizing culture and identity in ways to capture the negotiation of participation across communities. *Human Development*, 49(1), 36–41.
- Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1923). Source book in the philosophy of education. New York: Macmillan.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1925). Foundations of method. New York: Macmillan.
- Kreijns, C. J., Kirschner, P. A., & Jochems, W. M. G. (2003). Identifying the pitfalls for social interaction in computer-supported collaborative learning environments: A review of the research. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19, 335–353.
- Kumpulainen, K. (2013). The legacy of productive disciplinary engagement. International Journal of Educational Research, 64, 215–220.
- Kumpulainen, K., & Mikkola, A. (2014). Boundary crossing of discourses in chat interaction during creative collaborative writing. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction.* doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2013.12.002
- Kumpulainen, K., & Mutanen, M. (1999). The situated dynamics of peer group interaction: An introduction to an analytic framework. *Learning and Instruction*, 9, 449–474.

- Kumpulainen, K., & Renshaw, P. (2007). Cultures of learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 46(3–4), 109–115.
- Kumpulainen, K., Mikkola, A., & Jaatinen, A.-M. (2013). The chronotopes of technology-mediated creative learning practices in an elementary school community. *Learning, Media and Technology*. doi:10.1080/17439884.2012.752383
- Lantz-Andersson, A., Vigmo, S., & Bowen, R. (2013). Crossing boundaries in Facebook: Students' framing of language learning activities as extended spaces. *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 8, 293–312.
- Leander, K. (2001). "This is our freedom bus going home right now". Producing and hybridizing space-time contexts in pedagogical discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *33*(4), 637–679.
- Moran, S., & John-Steiner, V. (2004). How collaboration in creative work impacts identity and motivation. In D. Miell & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Collaborative creativity: Contemporary perspectives* (pp. 11–25). London, England: Free Association Books.
- Nasir, N. S., & Saxe, G. (2003). Ethnic and academic identities: A cultural practice perspective on emerging tensions and their management in the lives of minority students. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 14–18.
- Packer, M. J., & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and constructivist theories of learning: Ontology, not just epistemology. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(4), 227–241.
- Ramsten, A. C., & Säljö, R. (2012). Communities, boundary practices and incentives for knowledge sharing? A study of the deployment of a digital control system in a process industry as a learning activity. *Learning Culture and Social Interaction*, 1, 33–44.
- Resnick, L. B. (1987). Learning in school and out. *Educational Researcher*, 16(9), 13–20.
- Thorne, S. L. (2003). Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7(2), 38–67.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willett, R., & Sefton-Green, J. (2002). Living and learning in chatrooms. *Éducation et Sociétés*, 10, 57–77.

What is Participation? Pedagogues' Interpretative Repertoires and Ideological Dilemmas Regarding Children's Participation in Swedish Leisure-time Centres

Anna Liisa Närvänen & Helene Elvstrand

Abstract: The aim of the article is to explore how pedagogues in Swedish leisure-time centres interpret and make sense of what may be meant by children's participation. We also focus on ambivalences and competing interpretations of participation and how pedagogues argue for or against divergent interpretations. The material consists of 18 digitally recorded reflection meetings in 6 leisure-time centres. The analyses reveal three interpretative patterns, or in other words, interpretative repertoires of participation, these being 1) formal democracy, 2) making individual choices and 3) responsibility. Ambivalences and competing interpretations concern, in the first place, the interpretation of participation as individual choice versus adult governance and compulsory activities. The arguments used refer to cultural values such as the value of countryside experiences, children's developmental needs, professional commitment and children's best interests. The severity of the clashing ideas is obvious as no working consensus is achieved.

Keywords: leisure-time centres, children's participation, interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas, inhabited institutions

Introduction

Children's leisure-time centres (LTC) in Sweden offer activities to children of ages 6–12, both before and after school hours. Since the school reforms of the early 1990'-s the LTC are incorporated in the Swedish education system, and also included in the comprehensive school curriculum. Consequently, the LTC are now compelled to practice the prescribed overarching values provided for the school. As Sweden, along with most countries, has ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the curriculum – and the entire education system – is described as rights-based. Democratic values and citizenship education are emphasised in the steering documents. The Swedish Education Act (The National Agency for Education, 2010) and the comprehensive school curriculum (Lgr11) not only stress the importance of children as holders of participatory rights but also that children

should be given the opportunity to actually influence the circumstances that concern them in school:

"The democratic principles of being able to influence, take responsibility and be involved should cover all pupils. Pupils should be given influence over their education. They should be continually encouraged to take an active part in the work of further developing their education and kept informed of issues that concern them. The information and the means by which pupils exercise influence should be related to their age and maturity. Pupils should always have the opportunity to take the initiative on issues that should be treated within the framework of their influence over their education" (The National Agency for Education, 2011, Lgr 11, p. 17).

Even though the curriculum seems to offer children far-reaching rights to exercise participation and to make a difference with regards to "issues that concern" them in school, a review of research on children's participation in Swedish comprehensive schools reveals that children's participation is often subject to certain conditions and thus limited. Elvstrand (2009), for example, shows that children's participation is restricted with respect to what kind of issues children are allowed to influence. Participation is not often recognised as a democratic right which, for example, means that participation is seen as something that has to be earned by good behaviour. The results of Tholander's (2007) study on participatory education in secondary schools also show complex patterns of interplay between undemocratic and democratic aspects between teachers and students as well as among students. Also, some recent studies on children's participation in school show constraints and limited opportunities with respect to practicing democracy and participation rights (Aspán, 2009; Thornberg, 2010; Thornberg & Elvstrand, 2012). The results from the Swedish studies are in line with international research on children's participation in compulsory education (Alderson, 1999; Pedder & McIntvre, 2006; Raby & Domitrek, 2007). Both Swedish and international research on children's participation in compulsory education shows that children's opportunities to participate are severely restricted. A predominant result in international studies is that children's participation in school is considerably limited when it comes to opportunities to influence issues that concern them (Raby & Domitrek, 2007; Varnham et al., 2014).

The results from studies on participation in comprehensive schools are, however, not directly applicable to LTC. Most of the research on participation in school has been conducted with older children. What is more, the specific policy documents for LTC also prescribe that the activities should be seen as complementary and beneficial to school (The National Agency for Education, 2014). According to these documents the activities in LTC should above all offer meaningful, stimulating and varied leisure-time activities, time for free play, and activities that enhance social skills. The guidelines and the somewhat more loosely scheduled organisation of the daily activities in LTC compared to school may be seen as grounds for participation.

While research on comprehensive schools has gained much interest, there is still a lack of research on LTC in Sweden. It seems, though, that the school reforms of recent decades have not quite succeeded in enabling children to participate in line with the values stressed in the curriculum. Research on school reforms also reveals that school reforms are not a guarantee of change. Steering documents prescribe goals and guidelines but these are formulated vaguely and consequently subject to interpretive practices in schools. Shared values and objectives are seen as critical for transformation of schools (cf. Abawi, 2013; Hemmings, 2012; Moliner & Garcia, 2013). The emphasis on meaning-making processes in social interaction and in understanding interpretive practices is here in line with the 'inhabited institutions' approach (Everitt, 2012; Fine & Hallett, 2014; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Hallett, 2010), presented in the section 'theoretical frame'. We assume that the teachers in schools and pedagogues in LTC are important actors in interpreting the steering documents and deciding how they could be put into practice in the daily activities. Consequently, the interpretation of what is meant by goals such as increasing children's participation is a focal issue in understanding children's opportunities to practice participation in these contexts.

How the pedagogues in LTC in interaction with each other construct what may be meant by children's participation, and what dilemmas emerge in the discussions of participation, is the focus of our analysis in this article. Even though the case here is children's participation in Swedish LTC, the results of our study are of relevance for other extended education settings, concerning whether extended education settings could offer distinct opportunities for children to exercise their right to participate in their education and what dilemmas this creates for pedagogues.

The material analysed consists of digitally recorded group meetings with pedagogues in 6 LTC. Children's participation is, as the results reveal, a contested issue amongst the pedagogues.

Previous research

LTC in Sweden have been developed successively since the1940'-s as a part of welfare policies. The aim has been to offer children organised activities before and after school hours and also to enable parents to take part in the labour market (Haglund, 2009, Saar, 2014). The proportion of children of ages 6–9 years old that attend LTC has increased successively. In 2014 the proportion was over 80% of all school children in this age range (The National Agency for Education, 2014).

Research on LTC in Sweden is still lacking, the rather long history of organised leisure-time activities notwithstanding (cf. Klerfelt & Haglund, 2014b). There are some studies on the ideological changes over the decades as regards the goals and aims of activities at LTC. After the 1980'-s, and up until today, the need for cooperation and integration between school and LTC has been stressed. Some studies with a focus on children's perspectives on the activities in the centres has pointed out that children themselves value the opportunities for decision-making (Klerfelt & Haglund, 2014a; Pálsdóttir, 2012). Haglund's (2015a) study shows that children's opportunities to participate may vary depending on the type of activity. Not surprisingly, free play was an activity where children were able to make decisions of their own, while thematic activities, most often planned by teachers, offered less such opportunities. However, children in the study did not ask for more opportunities to make decisions and be involved in decision-making processes.

When it comes to the pedagogues' perspectives on LTC, they emphasise the voluntary nature of leisure-time activities, that is, children are allowed to choose

to participate in various activities that are offered to them (for example free play, sports, arts, board games) (Saar, Löfdahl, & Hjalmarsson, 2012; cf. Saar, 2014). Also, they describe the activities as distinct from those offered at school, and more loosely structured than school (Saar et al., 2012). Some studies also show that the staff at LTC may have varying views on the degree of freedom the children have to attend specific activities, as well as on children's opportunities to influence the contents or the planning of diverse activities (Haglund, 2015b). Such ambivalence may be seen as mirroring the descriptions of LTC in steering documents that embrace both the recreational activities, free play and children's development. Haglund's results reveal, for example, that thematic activities, which are designed to enhance children's development in specific respects, were grounded in adult perspectives, i.e planned by the staff to meet certain developmental needs or goals in line with the curriculum and other steering documents. An interview study with pedagogues at LTC in Iceland shows that they described the children both as active and as lacking competencies which in the long run affect children's opportunities for participation (Pálsdóttir, 2012).

Previous research thus suggests that pedagogues at LTC may interpret children's participation differently. What is also shown is that the organisation of everyday activities in LTC is not as strictly scheduled as in comprehensive schools and this could enable and enhance opportunities to participate.

Theoretical frame

We have argued that an understanding of pedagogues meaning-making processes is of importance to the issue of children's participation. Such meaning-making emerges in social interaction (Blumer, 1969). How people interpret the situation (or issue at stake) in which they participate, and how such meanings may be negotiated, opposed to or altered in interaction with others is of importance here. These are important building blocks in the approach 'inhabited institutions' (Fine & Hallett, 2014; Everitt, 2012; Hallett, 2003; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006; Hallett, 2010;).

Institutions, such as schools, are seen as inhabited by people, who actively engage in sense-making of what counts as goals, rules, values, etc. The need to understand relationships between institutional goals, institutional environments and local production of meaning is emphasised. Schools, for example, are governed by the Education Act, but the enforcement of this law is a product of local interpretive practices (cf. Everitt, 2012). How the goals are interpreted and put into practice is a question of local sense-making within the staff and between the staff and children. Seeing this relationally as well as contextually, it is obvious that there might be different interpretations of the meaning of participation, and how it should be carried out in practice, both within staff and children and between different grades.

The inhabited institutions approach stresses the significance of understanding social organisation and meaning-making processes in local cultures. Local cultures are shaped by past experiences and definitions of what is valued and, what norms and rules are guiding expected conduct. Local cultures are thus significant for interpretations of opportunities and restrictions for action (cf. Coburn, 2004; Fine, 2010; Hallett, 2010). 'Inhabited institutions' as an approach "focuses on *meaning*, not only in terms of macro-logics such as "bureaucracy", but also in terms of the interactions through which the contours of these logics are negotiated to create different meanings and lines of future action at the micro-level, actions that have consequences for the situation (or organization) in question" (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006, p. 231, italics in original). Negotiation points here to the significance of meaning-making processes in interactions between actors, but also that actors may be unequal with regard to power to define the situation (or the issue at stake) (Strauss, 1978; Hallett, 2003). This even implies that there may be competing definitions of a given situation or issue at hand (Fine & Hallett, 2014; Hallett, 2010).

Understanding how pedagogues interpret what is meant by children's participation in LTC is the focus of this article. This is, of course, a somewhat limited focus with respect to the inhabited institutions approach, and does not embrace all the complexities of meaning-making processes in the daily activities. Instead, we focus here on how pedagogues talk about children's participation with each other, and thus construct various meanings of participation.

The notion of children's participation is a complex issue. Children's participation may for example be understood in terms of voice and the need to listen to their voices, or in terms of individual autonomy, but also as political participation, by which is meant that children are able, and should be allowed, to make a difference and exercise participatory power (cf. Wall & Dar, 2011). The notion of political participation is related to issues on democracy and citizenship, and consequently to issues of power relationships between adults and children (Bacon & Frankel, 2014; James, 2011). Of interest here is, for example, what forms of democratic participation are created for children's participation within LTC, whether or not such forms may differ from forms of participation in compulsory education and how pedagogues describe the purpose of different forms of participation, for example participation in democratic structures or making individual choices.

Methods

In this article we draw on data gathered within a larger research project on LTC that started in 2013 and is to be finished during 2016.

The project has a strong participatory element. An important point of departure in the study was that the staff who take part in the study should voluntarily engage in the project. A commitment to engage in the project was required in the form of an application. Other criteria were also employed – such as the LTC being located in areas characterised by different socio-economic conditions. Six LTC were included in the project. Four of the centres were located in urban areas and two in small communities. We also stressed that the ideas of development were to be grounded in the desires and experiences of the pedagogues, and not initiated or proposed by the researchers. A third point of departure was that the project should not, as its starting point, be based on a concrete problem, but instead start with visions for a desired future.

We were inspired by several ideas from various action research approaches that emphasise the idea of learning through reflection (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1999; Postholm, 2011; Schön, 1987). The idea of dialogue and equality in meetings between researchers and pedagogues as well as the explicit future orientation in the meetings were central guidelines (cf. Aagaard Nielsen & Nielsen, 2006). As researchers, our role was to lend structure to the process by arranging a round of reflection meetings with the pedagogues in each LTC beginning with visions, then moving on to reflections about obstacles and possible courses of action and then to concrete action plans. Having started developmental activities, the reflection meetings focused on the specific projects that each of the LTC worked with. Our role in these meetings was, in the first place, to orchestrate turn-taking amongst pedagogues and to maintain the focus on the subject under discussion. In this sense the meetings were to be seen as focused interaction described by Goffman (1961), sustaining mutual cognitive attention in communication.

Forty pedagogues took part in the study. The data analysed for this article consists of 18 digitally recorded reflection meetings. The recordings were transcribed for analysis. Each meeting lasted about 2 hours and the number of pedagogues that attended the separate meetings could vary between 3–12 depending on circumstances, such as the number of pedagogues working in a LTC, sick-leaves, holidays, etc. As our interest in this article is on how pedagogues interpret and construct meanings of children's participation, only the sequences in which children's participation was the subject for discussion were chosen for analysis.

Analysis

As we are interested in pedagogues' interpretations of children's participation, we use two analytical concepts in order to shed light on how they characterise participation when talking about it (i.e what is participation?), and if they come to shared understandings or competing definitions of participation. The concept interpretative repertoire is derived from discursive psychology and refers to "relatively coherent ways of talking about objects and events in the world" (Edley, 2001, p. 198). Ideological dilemmas refer to lived ideologies, "composed of the beliefs, values and practices of a given society [...] its common sense" (Edley, 2001, p. 203). Lived ideologies are not coherent, but may even be contradictory. The interest here is not only how people talk about an issue but also what resources they use when arguing for a specific point of view.

It should be noted that our interest is not on linguistic issues, but on how participation is characterised, and whether the ideas of what participation consists of are seen as contradictory. Furthermore, we are not focusing on separate LTCs or on individual pedagogues. The unit of analysis is discursive practices, that is, the *kinds* of interpretations that can be identified across the data. The assumption is that there is a variation of interpretations: "When studying repertoires, variability is a starting point. People do not only use one repertoire, but many, activated in different situations" (Juhila, 2009, p. 130).

In our analysis the first step was to identify variation in what is meant by children's participation. The craft in thematic analysis in this early phase is similar as in many other types of qualitative analysis (Wertz et al., 2011). The transcriptions of the meetings were read and reread to identify prevailing patterns of data. In the second step we moved on to conducting an across-case analysis, searching for commonalities across cases, i.e descriptions of the phenomenon under study that are common to the participants' accounts (cf. Ayres, Kavanaugh, & Knafl, 2003; Hökkä, Eteläpelto, & Rasku-Puttonen, 2010). The analysis focused on the contents of the characterisations of participation, which revealed a variety of repertoires. The kinds of interpretative repertoires we identified are representative of the entire data analysed both within and between cases.

The third step was to analyse the data with respect to competing or contrasting discourses on children's participation, and what arguments the pedagogues used when talking about various kinds of participation, specifically when arguing for or against a specific mode of participation (revealing ideological dilemmas).

Transcription notation

(-) material omitted by the authors

[text] material admitted by the authors for the sake of clarity

P refers to pedagogue, R to researcher. P1, P2 etc. is used to clarify turns in conversation between the pedagogues

Ethics

The participants in the study received information on the project before they applied to take part in it (before writing their application). Before the start they were invited to an information meeting. The information was repeated when the researchers met the staff in the centres separately. Also, during the recurring reflection meetings the project was discussed and it was clearly emphasised that participation in the project was voluntary. Separate information was received by parents and children. The ethical approval was received from the regional ethical committee for research ethics.

Results

Interpretative repertoires

During the reflection meetings with the pedagogues it was obvious that participation was understood in several ways by them. The interpretative repertoires used by the pedagogues when they talked about children's participation were:

- Repertoire of participation as formal democracy
- Repertoire of participation as making individual choices
- Repertoire of participation as (conditioned by) responsibility

Repertoire of participation as formal democracy

This repertoire represents accounts in which children's participation is described in terms of practicing formal democracy. In Sweden a school council is mandatory in compulsory school, but not in LTC. Four of the participating centres have, though, voluntarily chosen to organise LTC councils, where both pedagogues and children are represented.

- P1: But these activities are to a great extent governed by the children themselves because every Thursday we have the LTC council. There are, in total, five groups [of children] in a system of rotation so a group attends every fifth week and has LTC council. One part of their role is first to evaluate the week. How did the activities work? What worked well? What didn't work so well?
- P2: Did we achieve our basic goal? Have we worked successfully towards our goals?
- P2: We also look at [children's suggestions in] the suggestion box we have here at the LTC and think about what kind of activities we should do next week. (-) Then on Friday when the children come they can see what is planned for the following week and decide what things they want to be involved in.

In the first phrase above, the pedagogue emphasises children's opportunities to govern activities through the council. The system of rotation, according to the pedagogue, offers the children equal opportunities to participate in the council. The second pedagogue agrees by offering further examples of what is discussed at the council, with reference to the goals for LTC. In the last phrase the relationship between individual choices, decisions and the council is considered.

The council is seen as an arena for making choices about the children's suggestions for preferred activities for the coming week, as well as for evaluation of past activities. These suggestions may be proposed by other children to the child representative before the council, or in other cases written down and put in the suggestion box, which may be done anonymously. When the members of the council disagree on an issue, voting is used in order to obtain a majority decision.

In this repertoire the pedagogues refer to the need for practicing formal democracy, in line with the curriculum. The LTC council could be composed in various ways, but the general idea was that the participating children represented the child collective which they belonged to (age-grade or unit), and had to prepare for the council with the other children as well as to inform them after the council. Voting was not only practiced in the councils but also in other situations, such as afternoon meetings, when children had to choose between various possible activities. Practising formal democracy was not only seen as a form of participation but was also related to citizenship education in accordance with the curriculum. In some cases the council was formed after the LTC was assessed by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate, which had criticised the opportunities children had to influence their activities.

68

Repertoire of participation as making individual choices

This repertoire portrays the idea that participation is about making individual choices. "Free play" is traditionally seen as a common activity in LTC, which means that children can, to some extent, choose what they want to play and with whom they prefer to play. When the pedagogues refer to participation as making individual choices they often stress that children have substantial opportunities to influence the form and content of free play.

- R: In which situations do you think the way you act with the children, is guided by a democratic idea you have had?
- P1: It's like when they [the children] have had a break and come indoors. It is when you sit with them and talk [and say] now we will be indoors for one hour. What do you want to do?
- P2: You ask every single child.
- P1: Yes you really ask every child individually.
- P2: Then they can have an influence over their day. (-) Sometimes there are three activities they can choose from and sometimes they have a totally free choice. It is very different. But you can pose these two questions: What do you want to do today? How can I help you so that you will have a good day?

In the excerpt the researcher initiates the issue by asking about democratic ideas and ways of working in accordance with such ideas. The first pedagogue picks an example in which children are asked what they would like to do. The point of asking each child individually is later stressed by both pedagogues. The child is asked to express a preference for a particular activity or to choose among a few available activities. The idea that the time children spend in LTC is owned by the children and should be free is even more stressed in the next excerpt:

Then, they [the children] own their time at the LTC. Here we offer things but you [a child] don't have to, you take part in those things you want to. And there is a lot of freedom here. That is one way to give children influence. (-) if a child comes and asks if we can do something, we would rather say "yes we can" than "no we can't". That was what we said before, to seize the moment (-) to find possibilities together with the child and to help to achieve the child's objectives.

That the child owns his or her time is here put in relation to the child's opportunity to choose to take part in an activity or to just drop it, i.e the individual choice is described as individual autonomy. In both excerpts the pedagogues also describe a pedagogical approach oriented to the child's desires and to understanding the child's perspective in the first place.

Repertoire of participation as (conditioned by) responsibility

In this repertoire participation is either closely connected with a child's competence and ability to take responsibility or in fact accounted for as taking responsibility. This repertoire is related to the two other repertoires. In this respect the repertoires are somewhat overlapping. However, as the idea of responsibility is not only described as a prerequisite for participation, but also equated with participation, we have chosen to categorise this repertoire as separate but related to the others. Responsibility is also associated with learning progression, competency and experience. A child's capability to take responsibility is most often seen as a necessary condition for participation. Responsibility could refer to capability and willingness to accomplish various tasks in the centre, instructing or leading other children in various activities, informing others of decisions taken in council and obtaining other children's opinions before the council:

- P1: They [the children] take it seriously to present all opinions and we have talked about that.
- P2: And it is good that they take it seriously that I [the individual child] have to talk on behalf of maybe 50 children (-) [It is] a bit cool that they take the responsibility.

In the excerpt above children's capability to take responsibility in accordance with what is expected from a child representative in LTC council is discussed. To represent a child collective is to take responsibility. The interconnectedness between responsibility and influence is also described in the excerpt below:

- P1: One would like to be part of and develop that they [the children] can be with us and plan for and to carry out activities.
- P1: (-) we could let them have small planning groups where they can take responsibility.
- P2: Where they take decisions.

In the first phrase the pedagogue describes her preferences for new ways of engaging children in planning activities and thus increasing the children's opportunities to influence them. She then goes on to relate the planning to responsibility. In the last phrase the second pedagogue clarifies that the groups may have a mandate to take decisions.

Ideological dilemmas

Governed by the adults or children's free choices

In the reflection meetings discussions about children's free choices versus activities governed by the adults is a recurring subject. How much scope for individual autonomy in terms of free choices that should be allowed to children is an issue that is seen as, to some extent, contradictory to the pedagogical role of the staff and to the educational work in line with the curriculum. These demands can in some ways come into conflict with activities children would choose if they were free to make choices and take decisions of their own:

How can you make them choose something they don't know is good for them? We also have a commitment to introduce new things for the children. (-) The children must have participation and exercise influence and put forward their own suggestions. But then it must also be the way that we GIVE suggestions on things that we see are IMPORTANT and say are good.

The pedagogue poses a rhetorical question to begin with, to introduce the issue of how to make children make right choices, by which is meant that the children do not have knowledge of available choices or alternatives that, in some way, can be seen as good for them. She then turns to a description of her professional role as educator and what is expected of her. The two last sentences clearly reveal what is seen as contrasting ideas: On the one hand the demand for children's participation and the professional judgement on what children should do on the other. Further on children's choices, if free, are problematized in terms of "not making good choices" and if they are given an opportunity to decide there is a risk that they make bad decisions like "just want to stay indoors" or "just want to play". The pedagogues describe these dilemmas in terms of "different perspectives". On one hand they have the children who prefer certain activities because they are fun and on the other hand the pedagogues embrace the values of professional commitment and the demands to follow the curriculum and to document the on-going learning.

The ambivalence between the idea of children's free choices versus adult governance is also obvious in the next excerpt, a discussion between two pedagogues about making an excursion to the forest and whether or not such an excursion should be mandatory for all children or not.

- P1: There are so many who want to go to the forest but there are really many children who don't want to go. From my perspective I think it is really important that, okay, we make groups of those who want to go. Small types of free groups and for those who like to go to the forest it will be more fun for them. And the others maybe like more to do craft-work. I think in this way about leisure-time activities. For me the LTC is more like free time. For the children, there is so much structure in school.
- P2: I feel a little bit ambivalent about this. I don't think it is black and white. I actually think it is the way you say it. But I think that everyone needs to get out, to be honest. Some of them are just sitting at the computer and are never outdoors, in our beautiful forests and countryside practicing motor skills. (-) Then it is also as you say. It is an aspect. Leisure-time activities should also be a free choice.

In the first phrase the pedagogue initiates the discussion by a notion of two different preferences amongst the children concerning outdoor activities, such as an excursion to the forest. She then emphasises the importance of free will and the option of organising separate groups for children for separate activities in line with their preferences. She also defines the free choice as a core idea for children's activities in the LTC.

The second pedagogue contests the idea, announcing his ambivalence but also pointing out that the first pedagogues' statement is not nuanced enough. He then moves on to claim children's need to play outdoors by referring to the beautiful countryside, and even motor skills. The talk about beautiful countryside refers to the high cultural value ascribed to the countryside and forests in Sweden, while motor skills refers to development. In the last sentences he then also approves the core idea of LTC activities as a free choice.

The excerpt above is a sequence of a discussion of whether or not the children should have a say when it comes to going outside or staying indoors. The divergent ideas are even more pronounced in the next excerpt:

- P1: But I can't let the children always decide because they are never outdoors. And it is for the best interest of the child, they are just sitting at the computer playing games otherwise.
- P2: (-) I think that for me it is not in the best interest of the child to force them to go out if they don't want to. It is in the best interest of the child if they want to play with some friends in a corner. For me it is completely okay, and for me if I force them to go out it's not because it is in the best interest of the child. Maybe it's the best to do for the group. I don't know.
P2: I don't know, I don't totally agree with you.

- P3: I don't agree.
- P1: I don't agree because it can't be in the best interest of the child because they don't understand what it is.

In the first phrase the pedagogue announces that he will not always allow the children to take decisions on playing outdoors as they would drop out of the activity. He then goes on and refers to the idea of working for the children's best interests as the children risk choosing wrong activities (computer games).

The second pedagogue challenges the interpretation of the child's best interest and stresses children's free will. The first and the third pedagogue take a stance against the idea of free will and in the last phrase the issue is closed by the first pedagogue who now refers to children's lack of understanding of what may be in their best interest. In this sequence the issue is not solved in any way, the contradictory and ambivalent ideas remain. Even the notion of a child's best interest, which is used in the argumentation, is interpreted differently by the pedagogues.

Competent or not for participation

On one hand the pedagogues often described children in terms of "the competent child" able to take responsibility, but on the other hand descriptions of children's lack of competence with regard to participation are common. As discussed below, taking responsibility is closely linked to competency. Children's age is often referred to when pedagogues describe obstacles for implementing, organising or conducting various activities in the daily life at the LTC. In the example below one pedagogue describes children's opportunities to propose new activities that would make an excursion to the forest more appealing and fun for the children:

They are just children, and they do not have so many [new ideas of activities to choose].

Being just children is used as an explanation in its own right, i.e no further explanations are necessarily needed. The reference to age seems here to refer to lack of knowledge of new options, and thus lack of competency with respect to participation in terms of influencing the content of activities or proposing new alternatives. Also children's lack of language skills and other communicative skills are described as obstacles to participation.

In the reflection meetings with the pedagogues an ongoing theme and obstacle for children's influence is, according to the pedagogues, children's incapacity to act in a responsible way. In the following example the pedagogues discuss the difficulties that arise with the "children of today" as they don't take care of the material in the LTC and are not interested in cleaning up. The example is about putting bicycles back in the bicycle racks after being outside. Children are, according to the pedagogue, not willing to do it and instead argue that they have not even touched a bicycle and should not need to put it back.

P1: I understand after that this has happened a hundred times that we [the pedagogues and the children] are a long way apart on this matter. And I ask: Who owns this problem? Because a child may think I don't care about this. (-) I feel that we can't discuss and give the re-

sponsibility to the child. It is not possible. Then even with the best intentions, to ask the child, it is not possible. Just decide [for them]! It is a question of values.

- P2: That is one option and then you can ask, what has the child learnt by that?
- P1: But you have let them be involved so many times.

In the excerpt above, the first pedagogue opens the discussion of who is to decide by referring to her experience that children repeatedly ignore some rules or try avoid their obligations in LTC. She then continues the argumentation based on such experiences and comes to a conclusion that under these circumstances the adult has to take the decision, in this particular case a decision of who is to take the bike back to the bicycle rack. The second pedagogue contradicts the issue by posing a question that points out learning through activities. The first pedagogue refers again to her experience and the discussion is closed without resulting in a shared understanding.

Discussion

The aim of our analysis was to explore what interpretative repertoires could be identified regarding how pedagogues in the LTC interpret and make sense of what is meant by children's participation. Also we were interested in which ways such concepts were understood as contradictory or ambivalent.

The repertoires identified embrace the repertoire of participation as 1) formal democracy, 2) individual choice 3) and participation as (conditioned by) responsibility.

Interpreting participation in terms of formal democracy, organised in LTC councils or other similar arenas, and letting children vote for majority decisions was justified by referring to the curriculum, the goal to increase children's participation and also to citizenship education. As the Swedish Schools Inspectorate control the LTC the fulfillment of the goals is of utmost importance to the centres. The implementation of forms for formal democracy may in this respect also be seen as imposed by, or as an adaptation to, demands from the institutional environment (cf. Everitt, 2012), as voting procedures and council meetings are easily documented and thus accountable forms of participation. This repertoire was not contested in the material, even though children could be less interested in, for example, participation via the council. The implementation of LTC councils may in part be a consequence of the integration of LTC within the compulsory school in that the model for participation is copied from the school.

Participation was also interpreted in terms of having opportunities to make individual choices, which also means that the individual child may decide on the issue at stake. In some cases the individual choice was described in terms of individual autonomy. The emphasis on describing the importance of the child's perspective and letting the children make choices in accordance with their preferences is in line with other studies on how pedagogues describe the activities in LTC (cf. Haglund, 2015b). It is also in line with the traditional view that LTC should offer complementary activities that are associated with leisure time compared to school. However, the steering documents for LTC now stress the double mission for the LTC in terms of recreation and a complement to school which should contribute to the accomplishment of educational goals. The emphasis on recreational activities, free play and making choices may, in first place, mirror the preservation of traditional LTC culture. This is an issue that needs further research using single case analysis (cf. Fine & Hallett, 2014).

The third repertoire, responsibility, is partly related to both of the previous repertoires and to learning progress. Capability to take responsibility is described as a condition for participation but also as participation. Responsibility was discussed in terms of willingness to carry out tasks, instruct and help other children, take part in LTC council and behave according to the expectations and rules in LTC. The core idea was that participation (influence, taking decisions, representing a collective) is responsibility.

When the form and content of what was seen as participation were described there seemed to be a high degree of agreement within and between the cases. When participation was discussed in relation to concrete activities in the LTC, for example how to organise certain activities and groups of children, or what activities should be mandatory, the ambivalences and competing ideas became obvious. The issue of children's free will versus activities governed by adults was a recurrent subject in the meetings. Limiting children's scope of free choice was justified by professional commitment, or the need to work in accordance with the curriculum, that both are related to the institutional environment. Other discourses that were used as resources in the arguments referred to children's developmental needs and also to the notion of children's best interests. Even traditional cultural values such as experiencing the countryside were used to legitimise mandatory outdoor activities. It was also obvious that competing or conflicting understandings were not solved at the meetings, not even in terms of reaching a working consensus. Again the results reveal the need for further studies within the cases. Our results are in line with the notion of competing definitions of the situation and that there are various interpretations of what, in our case, participation is, and how the LTC may work with the issue of participation (cf. Hallett, 2010). We need also to understand what the consequences of such ideological dilemmas are in local cultures.

We also have to take a close look at the issue of age as a basis for assessment of the children, for example consequences of the assumptions of children's individual and collective development and opportunities to participate related to age in various situations. Further, our results so far also indicate that there is a need for further research on issues of power relations between children and the pedagogues and even between children themselves, in order to understand children's opportunities as well as the obstacles to participation. The idea of free will is emphasized by the pedagogues, but, as discussed by Wood (2014), the idea of free choice should not be idealised or equated to children's agency. The choices may embrace power relations between children that advantage some children and disadvantage others.

Our results reveal that pedagogues have divergent ideas and interpretations of what children's participation embraces and even more of what scope of influence should be allowed to the children. Such ambivalences may hinder the task of creating new forms of children's participation, especially if divergent ideas are not openly discussed and a working consensus achieved within the staff. A working consensus is, as previous research on school reforms and development shows, of utmost importance for success in local settings (cf. Hemmings, 2012). This should apply even to extended education settings. What is meant by participation can't be taken for granted. Such a discussion might also enable new, creative ideas of how to enhance children's opportunities to participate. School councils may not be a proper model to copy in extended education settings. Formal arenas for influence, such as the school council, have limitations and don't offer children substantial opportunities to influence issues that concern them in school (Wyness, 2009). If, for example, representational democracy is already practiced in compulsory school to meet the educational goals, the LTC or other extended education settings need not to implement just another council. What is more, the forms of participation as discussed by the pedagogues were grounded in adult perspectives (cf. James, 2011). As LTC are more loosely structured than schools there should be possibilities to enhance children's participation with children's experiences and ideas of what is meaningful participation as a point of departure, even engaging children in the task of creating forms of participation.

References

- Aagaard Nielsen, K., & Nielsen, S. B. (2006). Methodologies in Action Research. In K. Aagaard Nielsen & L. Svensson (Eds.) Action and Interactive Research. Beyond practice and theory (pp. 63–87). Maastricht: Shaker Publishing.
- Abawi, L. (2013). School meaning systems: The symbiotic nature of culture and 'language-in-use'. *Improving Schools, 16*, 89–106.
- Alderson, P. (1999). Human rights and democracy in schools: Do they mean more than "picking up litter and not killing whales?". *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 7, 185–205.
- Aspán, M. (2009). Delade meningar: om värdepedagogiska invitationer för barns inflytande och inkännande. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Ayres, I., Kavanaugh, K., & Knalf, K. A. (2003). Within-case and across-case approaches to qualitative data analysis. *Qual Health Res, 13,* 871–883.
- Bacon K., & Frankel, S. (2014). Rethinking Children's Citizenship. Negotiating Structure, Shaping Meanings. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 22, 21–43.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coburn, C. E. (2004). Beyond Decoupling: Rethinking the Relationship Between the Institutional Environment and the Classroom. *Sociology of Education*, 77, 211–244.
- Edley, N. (2001). Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as Data. A Guide for Analysis* (pp. 189–228), Sage Publication Thousand Oaks in association with The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK.
- Elvstrand, H. (2009). *Delaktighet i skolans vardagsarbete*. Diss. Linköping: Linköpings Universitet.

- Everitt, J. G. (2012). Teacher Careers and Inhabited Institutions: Sense-Making and Arsenals of Teaching Practice in Educational Institutions. *Symbolic Interaction*, *35*, 203–220.
- Fine, G. A., & Hallett, T. (2014). Group Cultures and the Everyday Life of Organizations: Interaction Orders and Meso-Analysis. Organization Studies, 35, 1773–1798.
- Fine, G. A. (2010). The sociology of the local: Action and its publics. Sociological Theory, 28, 355–376.
- Goffman, E. (1961). Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Haglund, B. (2009). Fritid som diskurs och innehåll. En problematisering av verksamheten vid 'afterschool-programs' och fritidshem. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 14, 22–44.
- Haglund, B. (2015a). Pupil's opportunities to influence activities: a study of everyday practice at a Swedish leisure-time centre. *Early Child Development and Care, 185*(10), 1556–1568.
- Haglund, B. (2015b). Everyday practice at the Sunflower: the staff's representations and governing strategies as contributions to the order of discourse. *Education Inquiry*, *6*, 209–229.
- Hallet, T., & Ventresca, M. (2006). Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. *Theroy* and Society, 35, 213–23.
- Hallett, T. (2003). Symbolic Power and Organizational Culture. *Sociological Theory*, *21*, 128–149.
- Hallett, T. (2010). "The Myth Incarnate: Recoupling Processes, Turmoil, and Inhabited Institutions in an Urban Elementary School." American Sociological Review. 75, 52–74.
- Hemmings, A. (2012). Four Rs for urban high school reform: Re-envisioning, reculturation, restructuring, and remoralization. *Improving Schools*, 15, 198–210.
- Hökkä, P., Eteläpelto, A., & Rasku-Puttonen, H. (2010). Recent tensions and challenges in teacher education as manifested in curriculum discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 845–853.
- James A. (2011). To Be (Come) or Not to Be (Come): Understanding Children's Citizenship. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 633(1), 167–179.
- Juhila, K. (2009). From Care to Fellowship and Back: Interpretative Repertoires Used by the Social Welfare Workers when Describing their Relationship with Homeless Women. *British Journal of Social Work*, 39, 128–143.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1999). *The action research planner*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Klerfelt, A., & Haglund, B. (2014a).Walk-and-talk conversations: a way to elicit children's perspectives and prominent discourses in the schoolage educare centre activity. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education*, 2(2), 119–134.

- Klerfelt, A., & Haglund, B. (2014b). Presentation of Research on School-Age Educare in Sweden. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education*, 2(1), 45–62.
- Moliner L. M., & Garcia, O. D. (2013). The role of teachers' shared values and objectives in promoting intercultural and inclusive school cultures: a case study. *IJ of Qualitative Studies*, 26, 1373–1386.
- Pálsdóttir, K. (2012). Care, learning and leisure: The organisational identity of after-school centres for six-to nine-year old children in Reykjavík. The organizational identity in after-school centres for six to nine years old children. University of Iceland.
- Pedder, D., & McIntyre, D. (2006). Pupil consultation: The importance of social capital. *Education Review*, 58, 145–157.
- Postholm, B. (2011). Teachers' learning in a research and development work project. *Educational Action Research*. 19(2), 231–244.
- Raby, R., & Domitrek, J. (2007). Slippery as fish ... but already caught? Secondary students' engagement with school rules. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30, 931–958.
- Saar, T, Löfdahl, A, & Hjalmarsson, M. (2012). Kunskapsmöjligheter i svenska fritidshem. Nordisk Barnehageforskning, 5, 1–13.
- Saar, T. (2014). Towards a new Pedagogy in the after-school setting. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 22*, 254–270.
- Schön, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Strauss, A. (1978). Negotiations. Varieties, Contexts, Processes, and Social Order. The Jossey-Bass Social and Behavioral Science Series. San Francisco.
- The National Agency for Education (2010). Education Act 2010: 800.
- The National Agency for Education (2011). *The National curriculum policy document for the Primary school system, preschool classes and after-school centers*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- The National Agency for Education (2014). *Skolverkets allmänna råd med kommentarer. Fritidshem,* Skolverket: Stockholm.
- Tholander, M. (2007). Working with rules: lived democracy in school. *Ethnography and Education*, *2*, 109–126.
- Thornberg, R., & Elvstrand, H. (2012). Children's experiences of democracy, participation and trust in school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 44–54.
- Thornberg, R. (2010). School democratic meetings: Pupil control discourse in disguise. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 924–932.
- Varnham, S., Evers, M., Booth, T., & Avgoustinos, C. (2014). Democracy in schools: Encouraging responsibility and citizenship through student participation in School decision making. *International Journal of Law and Education*, 19, 23–41.
- Wall J., & Dar, A. (2011). Children's Political Representation: The Right to Make a Difference. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 19, 595–612.
- Wertz, F. J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R., & McSpadden, E. (2011). Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis: Phenomenological Psychology, Grounded Theory, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Research, and Intuitive Inquiry. New York: Guilford.

Wood, E. A. (2014). Free choice and free play in early childhood education: troubling the discourse. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 22*, 4–18.

Wyness, M. (2009). Adult's involvement in children's particiaption: Juggling children's places and spaces. *Children & Society*, 23, 395–406.

Program Implementation and Effectiveness of Extracurricular Activities: An Investigation of Different Student Perceptions in Two German All-Day Schools

Stephan Kielblock

Abstract: During the past decade, many schools in Germany have added extracurricular time to their regular curricular classes. This raises questions about the successful implementation of extracurricular programs and what makes them effective. The aim of this study is to illuminate the connection between these two questions. The theoretical and conceptual framework suggests that individual perception is a core concept that links both issues. Based on multi-method data from the Study on the Development of All-day Schools (StEG), the individual perceptions of two different activities will be investigated. One activity is perceived by the students as just an "extra" curricular activity (an extension of regular classes), whereas the other activity is seen as a real new "extracurricular" opportunity. The results emphasise the importance of viewing student perceptions in a qualitative manner.

Keywords: program implementation, effectiveness, student perception, all-day school, extracurricular activities

Introduction and research question

Research efforts in the field of German all-day schools¹ have intensified over the past decade in Germany. This can be determined by a literature search using the data base of FIS-Bildung. Papers, articles and books tagged with the keyword *Ganztagsschule* (all-day school) are presented in figure 1. Similar to Holtappels et al. (2008), figure 1 shows that the annual amount of literature dealing with all-day schools has increased in particular since 2003. In recent years, the number of such publications has levelled off, yet remains relatively high.

¹ A short summary in English on how an all-day school is defined in Germany can be found e. g. in Fischer & Klieme (2013, especially p. 29).

 Figure 1. Annual number of publications concerned with all-day schools (Ganztagsschule) in Germany from 1980 to 2012. Source: Literature search using the FIS-Bildung database; annual number of publications tagged with the keyword: Ganztagsschule (all-day school). Literature search on 18 February 2014 (dark graph line) and Holtappels et al. (2008, p. 37; light graph line) in comparison.



In Germany, the PISA 2000 study resulted in an intensive public and academic dialogue about the appropriateness of the German educational system. Since 2003, massive public funds (especially the IZBB program; 2003–2009) have been granted to change former half-day schools into all-day schools and to build new all-day schools. The result has been an almost linear increase in the number of all-day schools (Kielblock & Stecher, 2014). More than half of all schools (or more precisely "administrative divisions") are now organised as all-day schools in Germany. The most recent statistical data (KMK, 2006–2014) shows an average of 1,080 new all-day schools in Germany per year for the past decade. The annual increase of new all-day schools fluctuated between almost 400 (between 2011 and 2012) to up to more than 1,500 (between 2008 and 2009).

To evaluate this expansion, the Study on the Development of All-day Schools (StEG) was established in 2005. At the end of the first StEG project phase, which lasted from 2005 to 2011, Klieme and Rauschenbach (2011) concluded that the elaborated multi-perspective and longitudinal design of the StEG produced differentiated knowledge. Yet, more specific knowledge is still necessary in order to provide profound recommendations for educational policy on how to implement attractive, high-quality extracurricular activities (Klieme & Rauschenbach, 2011, p. 349). Although it is predictable that growth in the number of new all-day schools per year will eventually decrease, two major issues in Germany's all-day schools continue to be (1) how to successfully implement extracurricular activities in schools and (2) what makes them effective.

Both of these are very difficult questions that cannot reasonably be answered in a single paper. However, according to Klieme and Rauschenbach (2011), the question of implementation and the question of effectiveness appear to be connected. Consequently, the aim of this paper is to illuminate whether and how these two questions have a common basis. Therefore, the research question is how the problem of successful program implementation is related to the issue of program effectiveness.

Program implementation: a literature search

Successful program implementation is a major topic of implementation science. Kelly states that "implementation science is the study of the processes and methods involved in the systematic transfer and uptake of evidence-based practices into routine, everyday practice" (Kelly, 2012, p. 4). Although it is a relatively new approach to investigate the implementation of innovations in real world contexts (Kelly, 2012, p. 3), there are at least some common core characteristics and ideas. Implementation is seen as a process that can be systematised into different stages. The progress through these different stages is promoted by competency drivers (e. g. coaching), organisation drivers (e. g. decision-support data system) and sufficient leadership (Blase et al., 2012, p. 16).

Since research on the implementation of extracurricular activities or programs in German educational literature is not very extensive, an intensive literature search was performed to consider international literature in identifying relevant papers. The Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) indexes a wide variety of international journal sources, so this database was searched using the term "implementation." The following criteria led to a significant number of published papers concerning program implementation from the past ten years. Three main issues were considered in the selection of sources. First, these papers should focus on the implementation of a specific non-curricular program, activity or intervention. Second, papers are included that have a focus on schools in a broader sense. For example, papers dealing with higher education or early childhood have been excluded. And finally, the programs described in the papers should primarily target students.

The literature reveals both facilitators and barriers of program implementation. Most importantly, the implementation of a new program must fit into an established system or curriculum. Therefore, new ideas could possibly collide with existing standards (Greaney, et al., 2007, p. 254) and could present a significant change from traditional patterns (Schwalm & Tylek, 2012). For example, Olvera et al. (2008) found that one barrier for program implementation was mandatory school tutorials during afterschool time, which hindered female students in attending the new BOUNCE program. Similar conflicts with already existing afterschool programs, students' competing priorities or an unalterable infrastructure (e. g. school busses) are also reported in other studies (Schwalm & Tylek, 2012; Greaney et al., 2007). In these cases, problems arose because the new program upset a well-established daily routine. That "each school's rhythm must be respected" (Deslandes, 2006, p. 102) is a wise notion for program implementation in this respect, yet it is not easy to follow. One idea for solving the problem of fitting in with the school's rhythm is to integrate the new program into the school's developmental (or improvement) plan so that it becomes a priority (Deslandes, 2006, p. 100). Choosing program content appropriate for the needs of students and the community (Grimmett, Rickard, & Gill, 2010, p. 61) and keeping an eye on the local context (McIntyre et al., 2005, p. 89) are other ideas that can be found in the literature. The external environment or the community is also discussed in several studies that reflect program implementation against the backdrop of the school context (Huang et al., 2009; Olvera et al., 2008; Grimmett, Rickard, & Gill, 2010).

The literature search also reveals the facilitators and barriers of program implementation with respect to the importance of leadership and effective management (Deslandes, 2006; Grimmett, Rickard, & Gill, 2010; Hall, 2010). In a wider sense, the director of the afterschool program is seen as the backbone due to the motivation of teachers to support program implementation (Greaney et al., 2007; McIntyre et al., 2005). In concurrence, Huang et al. (2009) report in their analyses of a health promotion program in Taiwan "that the major guiding force was from the school principal and head of academic affairs office" (Huang et al., 2009, p. 94).

Yet, the principal is not the only person who encourages all of the stakeholders to support program implementation. Deslandes (2006) speaks of liaison agents "with a stable and credible relationship with other players in the school and with demonstrated motivational skills" (Deslandes, 2006, p. 101). In addition, other stakeholders such as students, teachers, other staff, parents and other community members are seen as crucial for program implementation (Grimmett, Rickard, & Gill, 2010; Greaney, et al., 2007; Davis & Clark, 2012; Hallenbeck & Fleming, 2011; Schwalm & Tylek, 2012). All of them must understand the program's purposes (Huang et al., 2009), share a common vision and work cooperatively (Ocak, 2011). This coincides with the findings of Collier and Henriksen (2012) that "success for program implementation by teachers depends, in part, upon how comfortable they are with the approach and how motivated they are about the approach" (Collier & Henriksen, 2012, p. 14).

One further aspect concerning the facilitators and barriers of program implementation emerged in the literature search. Deslandes (2006) derives from her empirical analyses in Canada that patience is very important for successful implementation. There must be "time to become familiar with the project" (Deslandes, 2006, p. 101). In their data from the US, Greaney et al. (2007) find time constraints that also challenged successful implementation. Yet, the literature not only reports time as a scarce resource, but also funds and money (Deslandes, 2006, p. 101; Greaney et al., 2007, p. 255; Grimmett, Rickard, & Gill, 2010, p. 61). As Ocak (2011) summarises: "A considerable investment of time, effort, resources, and money" (Ocak, 2011, p. 1399) is needed.

Additional evaluation of organisational achievements, as reflected in Huang et al. (2009, p. 95), should also be seen as a facilitating component of program implementation. By and large, evaluation should help to understand the results of specific program implementation processes and should therefore aid in planning further adjustments of the implemented program or inform about the implementation of other programs. However, Zhang et al. (2011) criticise the common summative evaluation practice and suggest that the best evaluation approach should "systematically guide both evaluators and stakeholders in posing relevant questions and conducting assessments at the beginning of a project [...], while it is in progress [...], and at its end" (Zhang et al., 2011, p. 59). Consequently, Zhang et al. (2011, p. 61) propose using Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, and Product evaluation model (CIPP). On the one hand, there is the question as to what the different stakeholders need (context evaluation) and how these needs are addressed through the program (input evaluation)

tion) (Zhang et al., 2011). On the other hand, product evaluation "measures, interprets, and judges project outcomes and interprets their merit, worth, significance, and probity" (Zhang et al., 2011, p. 59). Between the context and input on the one side and product on the other, process evaluation "monitors the project process and potential procedural barriers, and identifies needs for project adjustments" (Zhang et al., 2011, p. 59).

The main problem with process evaluation is to not misinterpret it as an earlier or repeated product evaluation. The literature search presented here includes neither solid nor reliable examples of a process evaluation. This could be due to resource constraints, such as the fact that formative assessment takes exorbitantly more time, effort, resources and money in comparison to summative assessment, which only illuminates the products of the processes. This is true for all stakeholders involved in the ongoing processes. One illustration of the investigation of these processes can be found in Zhang et al. (2011, p. 73–74). Biweekly meetings, observations and several curriculum-based measure probes were introduced to monitor service learning program implementation. Although Zhang et al. (2011) do not explicitly discuss the amount of work, it can be assumed from their descriptions that process-accompanying evaluation could be quite exhausting for all stakeholders.

In addition to this practical consideration of process evaluation, methodological issues arise. The evaluation of specific *states* of ongoing *processes* (for example, several curriculum-based measure probes; Zhang et al., 2011) establishes the imperative that an evaluator must have a good theoretical representation of what happens during the processes of implementation. Otherwise, process evaluation is mistakenly informed solely by program goals and therefore underestimates the complexity of ongoing change processes.

An interesting insight into change and implementation processes is given by Hall (2010) with his metaphor of the "implementation bridge." This metaphor explains that "current practices in schools and classrooms" and "new practices" are divided by a chasm and that only an "implementation bridge" enables the movement from current to new practices. This bridge consists of three layers that illustrate the different processes on their way from one side to the other. These layers are "stages of concern" (stages from "unconcerned" up to "refocusing"), "levels of use" (stages from "non-use" up to "renewal") and "innovation configurations" (stages from "no fidelity" up to true implementation "fidelity") (Hall, 2010). On the whole, "the researcher/evaluator can use information from each dimension to measure how far across the bridge each implementer has progressed. Change facilitators can also use the same constructs and information for planning and making interventions to help implementers move further across the bridge" (Hall, 2010, p. 235).

The components of this metaphor seem very reasonable. It also seems to be true that "the extent and quality of use for new approaches can be greatly enhanced when there is understanding of how people change" (Hall, 2010, p. 232). Yet, in consideration of the notion that it is important to understand how people change and how the complexity of implementation processes can be theorised, a genuinely process-oriented perspective on students seems to be omitted by Hall (2010, as well as by others, e. g. Skaggs & Bodenhorn, 2006; Everhart, 2005). The literature search presented here highlights this gap. Therefore, the next section attempts to bridge this

gap by introducing a model for illuminating student processes that lead to student outcomes.

Processes leading to student outcomes

In the previous section, the literature review suggests that the students' perspective is commonly represented not as a process but only as a result of other processes that lead to student outcomes. Therefore, it seems that student-specific processes leading to student outcomes are barely considered by literature on program implementation. For example, this is true for Hall (2010), who has an elaborated multi-layer approach to implementation with a specific focus on teacher's views and teacher actions that impact students' outcomes. Hall (2010) calls on researchers to investigate student outcomes ("test scores") with regard to "how far across the [implementation] bridge each implementer has moved" (Hall, 2010, p. 251). However, if more or less successfully implemented "new practices" lead to student outcomes (or not), it remains unclear what exactly happened to the students. Consequently, it is assumed here that the reflection on program implementation might benefit from understanding the student-specific processes leading to specific student outcomes. As a result, this section focusses on introducing a model that genuinely considers student outcomes as a process.

A model commonly used by German researchers concerned with the effectiveness of extracurricular activities at all-day schools is the "model of educational quality of extracurricular activities in all-day schools" (*Modell der Bildungsqualität ausserunterrichtlicher Angebote in der Ganztagsschule*) that Stecher et al. (2007, p. 350) derived mainly from the reflections of Miller (2003, p. 43) on US afterschool programs. After years of the model being refined in the German-speaking community (e. g. Radisch et al., 2008; Radisch, 2009; or Fischer et al., 2012), it actually re-entered international discourse (e. g. in Fischer & Klieme, 2013 or in Stecher & Maschke, 2013).

The basis of the model is an input-process-outcome relation. The input or context perspective contains the quality of the school, the external context (e. g. cooperation partners of the school) and the individual and family context. The process perspective focuses on two different aspects of extracurricular activities. On the one hand, the process characteristics of the activities are modelled by means of the basic dimensions of pedagogical process quality. On the other hand, they consist of measuring attendance for the extracurricular activities in terms such as the absolute attendance, intensity, duration and breadth of attendance. The input or context perspective and the process perspective result in the outcome perspective that includes educational outcomes, school achievement and school attainment.

Another model commonly used by German researchers concerned with the effectiveness of pedagogical contexts is the "offer and use model" (Helmke, 2003, 2009). This model breaks with the tradition of having direct paths from instruction to outcomes; instead, individual perception and interpretation is crucial for individual action. Placing an emphasis on the ideas of Helmke (2003, 2009), the model of educational quality (Stecher, et al., 2007) requires specific revisions that are described in the following paragraphs. Figure 2 shows the merging of the two models. The dark grey colour of the model components indicates the input and outcome perspective, whereas the light grey colour of the model components indicates the processes that lead from input to outcome.

Figure 2. Generalised model of educational quality concerning activities in the field of extended education. Own development based on the models of Stecher et al. (2007) and Helmke (2009)



On the one hand, the model depicts that the activity (or activities) of interest is (are) implemented or embedded in a specific organisational quality. Therefore, the "quality of organisation" (A) is one of the starting points. The "external context" (B) of the organisation provides resources that are immediately connected to the opportunities of the organisation. This is why both of them are joined together in just one model component. On the other hand, the "individual and family contexts" (C) of the participants affect the ongoing processes as well. So they are also part of the input perspective. When taken together, these model components (A, B & C) actually have an impact on the "quality of activities" (D). They also affect how individuals "perceive"² (E) the quality of activities, as well as affecting the intensity, duration and breadth of attendance (F). Out of the recursive process between E and F, the student delves into individual learning activities (G) that facilitate specific outcomes (H). As Helmke (2003, 2009) emphasises, the individual student must become actively involved in the learning processes. Otherwise, significant student outcomes are not likely.

The processes shown in figure 2 reflect the basic ideas of Stecher et al. (2007). Yet, two new model components are introduced: the perception of the quality of the activities (E) and the individual learning activities (G). The former is an extension of the "quality of activities" (D) connected with the three "basic dimensions of instructional quality" (Klieme, et al., 2006; Kunter, et al., 2007; and in English e. g. Lipowsky, et al., 2009) that include cognitive activation, supportive climate and classroom management. The common conception of the "quality of activities" (D) is a standardised measure (the dimensions are predefined) and a global measure (the standardised indicators target students in general or the "activity" but not how the individual feels during the activities or how he/she individually defines his/her situation "to be in the activity" and which aspects of the quality are relevant to the in-

² The German term *Wahrnehmung* is difficult to translate literally because it corresponds very much to the English term "perception" yet is also related to meanings of "experience."

dividual). This is the central focus of the offer-and-use model (Helmke, 2003, 2009). It doubts that the quality of activities could have an *immediate* effect on students. Therefore, Helmke (2003, 2009) separates classes ("offer") and learning activities ("use") by a mediating model component, namely the individual perception and interpretation (German: *Wahrnehmung und Interpretation*). In this sense, it is not so important to the individual how he/she describes the activities (What is the activity like?). Yet, how he/she reflects his/her own stance within the activities (What is my position within the activity? What is my situation in the activities and is it a significant experience with regard to my educational biography?) is crucial (this differentiation is also discussed e. g. in Klerfelt & Haglund, 2014).

From this point of view, it becomes clear why attendance and its intensity, duration and breadth (see Fiester, Simpkins & Bouffard, 2005) are closely and recursively connected to the "perception of the quality of activities." The individual grows into the setting of the specific activity; in becoming more and more socialised within that setting, the perception of the quality of activities becomes more affected. This is why the "perception of the quality of activities" (E) is modelled in a recursive process with the "duration" (F) in figure 2. And because of this the term 'duration' is used in the model for the different aspects of attendance.

Theoretical backing for the model is provided by methodological individualism (see e. g. Coleman, 1990). The transition in figure 2 from D to E/F corresponds to what is called the "logic of the situation." This means that the individual perceives or defines a situation (for example, in a certain activity) to be "new" or at least as "odd" in comparison to the daily routine. In defining a situation as "new," the individual faces an altered set of possible actions. One chosen path of action corresponds to the transition from E/F to G in figure 2. In terms of methodological individualism, the chosen action and the action itself are called the "logic of selection." The aggregate of all actions is called the "logic of aggregation" and is represented by the transition from G to H.

As the literature review revealed, the processes leading to specific student outcomes through program implementation are mainly illuminated by observing the pedagogical staff and their individual paths towards implementation. This section focuses on and emphasises the student's point of view. From this perspective, the conviction emerges that particularly the recursive process between the individual perception of the quality of activities and their duration should be considered as important. Consequently, the proposition arising from this is that actual gains in student outcomes may possibly become achievable through individual learning activities only if students see their situation in the program of interest as new and significant. Conversely, if a program is interpreted by students to be a daily routine, it is very unlikely for considerable outputs to be produced that could possibly be traced back to the program of interest.

According to the research question formulated at the end of section one, how the problem of a successful program implementation is related to the problem of their effectiveness holds considerable interest. When informed by the theoretical and conceptual framework presented in sections two and three, it becomes evident that change processes on an "institutional level" (such as the implementation of a program) are based on the processes of perception, definition and interpretation (and action) by students on an "individual level."

To support these theoretical and conceptual considerations, it is necessary to have empirical evidence as to how students *perceive* different activities. To be more precise with regards to figure 2, the transformation from D to E/F and from E/F to G holds specific interest. The empirical data presented in the following might give initial clues in this direction as to how a specific "offer" (D) is transformed into subjective perceptions (E/F) and how these lead to action (G).

Methods

As mentioned in the introduction, the first project phase of the StEG (2005-2011) was very productive in generating broad knowledge about all-day schools in Germany. This is why the current project phase of the StEG (2012-2015) concentrates on more specific issues and aims for a much closer focus on the effectiveness of extracurricular time. One of the sub-projects of the StEG (called StEG-Q) concentrates on case studies of specific extracurricular activities.

The StEG-Q research team investigated various extracurricular activities at allday schools in Hesse, a German state. Two years of field work were planned for 2013 and until the end of 2014. For this paper, two extracurricular activities were chosen at two different all-day schools: the first is a Cooperative Comprehensive School and the second is a German *Gymnasium*³. Both schools may differ with respect to organisational structure, but they have comparable elements with regard to their efforts at integrating what has traditionally been considered "homework" into the extracurricular time of the school day. Because of the extended school day at allday schools, homework has become no longer feasible. Therefore, both schools have implemented special extracurricular activities to replace traditional homework done in the afternoon at home.

In addition to interviews with those conducting the activities, 36 students at the two selected schools also participated in the StEG-Q study. There were 19 girls and 17 boys. Most of them were from 10 to 11 years old. Only one student was 9 and two students were 12. Because no quantitative data was collected on all students of the participating schools, it can only be speculated that the *Gymnasium* may have a different composition in comparison to the Cooperative Comprehensive School regarding students' SES, for example. But what is commonly referred to as "selection bias" in qualitative inquiries leads here to two quite similar groups of students who individually agreed and whose parents also agreed to participate in the long-term StEG-Q investigation. So there are no considerable differences between the participating students with regard to their number, gender or age.

³ A Gymnasium is one form of secondary education in Germany, the completion of which enables students to further pursue an academic (university) degree. This is not necessarily the case in cooperative comprehensive schools as three different qualifications are possible that enable further education at either trade, professional or academic institutions.

Data was collected in the autumn of 2013. At both schools, multiple methods were utilised to investigate extracurricular activities. First, data was collected by interviewing the member of the pedagogic personnel providing the activity in question. In a semi-structured interview format, the staff members were asked by trained interviewers to talk about their intents and ideas of their extracurricular activity. For the most part, interviewers followed the instructions of problem-centred interviews (Witzel & Reiter, 2012; Kielblock & Lange, 2013) as a brief guide that roughly informs the progress of the conversation. Second, group discussions with students attending those extracurricular activities were carried out in order to investigate the collective student perspective. The methodological discourse on "group discussions." Yet, there were at least some differences (Bohnsack, 2004). Instructions for conducting group discussions were based primarily on Bohnsack's (2007, 1989) recommendations.

In addition to the collective student perspective, a third method of individual student interviews was conducted using problem-centred interviews (Witzel & Reiter, 2012; Kielblock & Lange, 2013). As a fourth method, data was collected by observing the activity of interest and taking field notes on episodes that attracted the researcher's attention.

Interview and group discussion material was audio taped and subsequently transcribed. The transcript does not reflect every single vocal expression, but it takes all of the expressed words literally. The steps of analysis are loosely based on Bohnsack's (2010, 1989) experiences and recommendations. First of all, not only the resulting text data but also the audio material of group discussions and interviews were examined to acquire an overview of the topics that were talked about. A "topic structuring" per group discussion or interview was created. The topic structuring consists basically of a chronological list of topics, each of which is specified by an appropriate topic title and a short summary of what was said about this topic. Then these documents were used to select specific passages in the transcribed material that were especially interesting on two accounts: either because relevant information was given in the passages concerning the research question or because they included very extensive and detailed descriptions. Selected passages were subsequently analysed in greater detail. The field notes were typewritten and used for an analytical illustration of the interview and group discussion analyses. This resulted in two multi-perspective case studies, each of which focused on one of the homework substitute activities.

The interpretation of the empirical material was driven by the model introduced before. The model shows that the offer (called the "homework substitute" in the following) from the teacher/pedagogue is perceived by the student body and perceived and processed by each student individually (see D>E/F, figure 2). The interpretation and presentation of the results initially reflect this process by explaining the offer (especially with regard to interviewing the member of the pedagogic staff who provided the associated activity); second, this was accomplished by revealing the students' perception in general (using group discussions with students who participated in the associated activity); and third, by illuminating the individual perception of each student (interpretation of interviews with students who participated in the asso-

Results

Homework substitute at a Cooperative Comprehensive School

The homework substitute at the first school is called "free learning time" (German: *Freie Lernzeit*). The person providing this activity is not employed as a teacher but as supplementary pedagogic personnel. For purposes of this paper, the pseudonym "Ms. Jacobs" is used. She offered free learning time every day for about two or three school hours. The room where free learning time takes place is called the "learning workshop" (German: *Lernwerkstatt*). Folders with self-study material sorted by school subjects are available here. Students participate voluntarily in free learning time, which they attend together with other students of the same age group. The exact meaning of "voluntarily" is vague. The concept behind the learning workshop is "individual support." The students receive curriculum-based complex tasks that should be done at school (instead of at home) within the next two weeks, for example. Students who finish these tasks earlier than the classmates do extra or different tasks at the learning workshop. Ms. Jacobs pointed out that there is no regular constellation of specific students as a result. The attendance simply varies: sometimes just three students attend and sometimes there are 30.

During free learning time, students can individually choose the tasks that they work on. They can also ask which tasks they should do and complete tasks that they brought with them from their classes. Ms. Jacobs saw her duty in particular as ensuring that the students are quiet, answering questions and helping with the self-study material. She said that there are at least three fundamental ideas for the free learning time: First, students who are intellectually quicker than the rest of their class can go beyond the scope of the regular curriculum and do extra tasks. Second, students struggling with some topics in classes are encouraged during the free learning time to do extra repetitions so they can catch up with the others. And third, learning time is also good for relatively free study such as preparing for tests.

During the interview, Ms. Jacobs mentioned problems with the free learning time. She complained that learning time could not start on schedule because students did not arrive punctually and were not properly prepared. They forgot the things that they needed for the classroom work and it took time for them to finally be ready to start working.

In the first group discussion, six students confirmed that they are required to work with specific folders on the one hand and to finish tasks from classes on the other. The aspect of choosing the tasks independently and becoming actively involved in their own learning, as Ms. Jacobs also emphasised, is not clearly represented in this group discussion. However, the children have positive remarks about free learning time in that this makes it possible for them to improve a bit in school and do better on tests. Another positive aspect is that they do not have to do any homework as a result. They also emphasised that they enjoyed attending free learning time because it ends ten minutes earlier than other classes, so they did not have to stand in a queue for lunch. (As an aside, Ms. Jacobs also explained that this is necessary because the canteen cannot deal with the rush of students if they all finish classes at the same time.)

In the second group discussion, six other students talked about how they needed the signature of the teacher to sign out of classes and in to the free learning time. The students were certain that their teachers and parents decided whether and how often they had to visit the free learning time. The group discussions suggested that free learning time was not perceived by the students as actually being "free" in terms of their individual autonomy to learn. The case seemed to be quite to the contrary.

The individual interviews with students revealed a closer look at their perception of free learning time. A few new insights were provided in comparison with the group discussions. In the face-to-face interviews, some students actually told the interviewer that it was possible to individually decide whether they wanted to do the assigned tasks or study for an upcoming test. In addition, one student explained that free learning time is only one remedial course among many others. Another student elaborated that these courses were all in different rooms and "it is totally chaotic because no one ever knows where they should go."

As shown above, the interviews revealed information about "organisational matters" such as that children are confused by the broad range of services on the one hand. If students actually struggle to comprehend the organisation of the different courses, including what to bring to them, this is not only a problem for the confused students but also creates a disturbance for those who found the right room at the right time and have the right materials with them. The field notes of the observation revealed that students do not enter the learning workshop all at once but rather in an unsteady stream of student by student.

The data suggests that students interpreted the situation not as "free" time for "free" learning but rather as a routine and clearly hierarchical learning environment. During the free learning time, students are told what to do by the pedagogue and even the teachers and parents. The field notes support this impression. From the observer's point of view, the pedagogical setting somehow mirrors regular classes: The students complete worksheets and the pedagogue walks around the room to give individual support when necessary.

However, there is at least one obstacle: Many children studied with worksheets from the folders administered by Ms. Jacobs. A student who received a single worksheet was not engaged with it for a lengthy period of time and then needed another one. Ms. Jacobs was therefore mainly busy with the folders and giving the students appropriate worksheets. As a result, she did not really have much time to accompany the students' learning progress.

Homework substitute at a German Gymnasium

Like Ms. Jacobs, the person providing the homework substitute at the second school was also not employed as a teacher. Her pseudonym is "Ms. Schrader." Ms. Schrader called her extracurricular activity "homework and learning support." Students sat together in groups and were focused on their tasks. The activity is organised across classes. There were only a few rules: "no eating, no drinking and keep it quiet."

In the first group discussion at this school, six students talked about the extracurricular time at their school. Even without being asked, they referred to the "homework support" several times. One student remembered that she attended homework support during the previous school year and that it was great because after finishing homework she was always allowed to delve into the books and have other tasks to do. Another student confirmed that this was still the good thing about homework support.

In addition, the students pointed out that Ms. Schrader is a very active learning companion. One student said:

"Well, she doesn't sit on her chair or at her computer and check who has borrowed books. She goes around, watches for who is ready and [...short passage skipped...] whether a student is ready and says 'yes I am ready.' Then she asks something like 'should I practice vocabulary with you?' And that's because of the students, that they stay quiet." (Student in group discussion)

The students emphasised that due to Ms. Schrader, a stable work climate prevailed. She always had clever ideas on how to keep the students busy with meaningful tasks. And she managed to maintain presence with all of the students even while giving individual students help with their tasks.

In the group discussion, students reflected on the differences between curricular classes and extracurricular activities. Most activities were very similar to classes. For example in the cooking activity, the pedagogue explained cooking issues and the children had to learn about them. Only homework support was seen as entirely different from the regular classes:

Student: "Homework support is completely different because no teacher stands up in front and talks about something, saying that this works like this and that works like that. And telling us what we have to do next. Actually it is just completely different."

Discussion moderator: "How is it different?"

Other student: "We just work on our homework there and no teacher talks at us by saying 'you have to do it like that! No, that's wrong!"

However, this does not mean that students want to be left alone. The case is quite to the contrary because they emphasised how important it is to have a teacher or pedagogue around who can provide help when it is needed.

One further aspect concerning homework support is that students felt that they can do homework and other tasks with each other. The presumption may have been that there would be no difference between doing homework alone and doing homework in a setting where each student must be rather quiet and focused on the individual task. Yet, being socially embedded during homework support emerged as a major issue in this group discussion.

They also discussed the fact that Ms. Schrader can get angry and be rigorous. The students in this discussion say that this was okay and even necessary to create a steady and calm work atmosphere. In the second group discussion, the other students did not reflect at this high level. They just said that Ms. Schrader is a little bit weird; initiated by this topic, the discussion was almost completely about situations in which other teachers and pedagogues behaved improperly. It was not possible to draw much additional information about homework support from this second discussion.

A closer look at homework support is provided by considering the individual interviews with students. Most commonly, the interviews reinforced the viewpoint of the first group discussion: Homework support enables students to work individually on their individual tasks. "You can do what you want" as one student stated and pointed out that he liked such flexibility and also the fact that Ms. Schrader helps students. He said that "you are not just left high and dry, especially if your parents cannot properly help you with homework or test preparation." Another student elaborated on the previously mentioned option of delving into books once the homework was done. She added that the additional reading material helps to understand specific topics. It seems that the books are not only used for fun but also for knowledge expansion.

In conclusion, the student perspective on the homework and learning support at the second school seemed to be very rich. Students emphasised working individually in homework support, attending it with the other students, receiving support and being encouraged to go beyond their regular tasks. All of this suggests that homework support significantly differs from the regular classes and other activities.

The observations and field notes support the idea, that this activity might have a significant meaning for many of the students considered here. For example, in one episode that was documented in the field notes, a student finished his arithmetic worksheet and went to Ms. Schrader to have his calculations corrected. She took the sheet and said: "Shall we check your answers with the calculator? Maybe you got everything right." The two of them fetched the calculator and Ms. Schrader started to check the student's answer. But he began a conversation with another student sitting next to Ms. Schrader's' desk. Ms. Schrader immediately gave the student his worksheet and her calculator and said: "You have to check your answers carefully." Field notes like this support the impression that Ms. Schrader very well knows how to keep students busy and quiet. If she had checked the entire worksheet by herself, the boy's conversation with another student would have disturbed the remaining students. And it seems important that she gives the students the impression that they are capable of doing even difficult tasks (e. g. correcting worksheets with the calculator) on their own.

Discussion

This study has analysed the interrelation of successful program implementation and the effectiveness of these programs. The literature search revealed that this is a common question to varying degrees. On the one hand, implementation science is at least concerned with implementation and with student outcomes as a measure of effectiveness on the other. Yet, how processes of implementation actually enhance the specific processes that lead to student outcomes is hardly considered in the literature. Therefore, the third section elaborated on the mechanisms that lead to student outcomes. This study has emphasised that the transition from the quality of the activity to the individual perception of the activity's quality appears to be crucial for further processes that lead to distinct outcomes.

Based on the empirical data of the StEG-Q project, the results demonstrate how two quite similarly implemented programs can be perceived very differently by their students. On the one hand, it is quite surprising that the individual learning support provided by the "learning workshop" in case 1 is perceived as an extension of regular classes. In outlines of the reported and observed actions of the students, they appear to engage in a kind of a sabotage of this "extra"-curricular activity (in some cases, it seems that they forgot their material on purpose, etc.). On the other hand, the individual learning support provided by the "homework and learning support" in case 2 seemed to appeal to the students because they believed that they had a real new "extracurricular" opportunity to do homework together with their classmates and friends at school.

The reported and observed actions not only support the idea that Ms. Schrader is an assertive pedagogue, but also that the students like to delve into specific tasks *together*. Although there are no measures in the StEG-Q data concerning student outcomes (see discussion of limitations), the conceptual and theoretical framework suggests that such differences in perception (and action) will result in various student outcomes (e. g. "academic achievement, learning strategies or features of the personality that are connected with learning success [...] social learning, intercultural learning or a positive academic self-concept" Stecher & Maschke, 2013, p. 35).

These findings agree e. g. with the results of O'Hare (2014), who measures student perceptions of an afterschool program and the actual change in student outcomes, for example. In his quantitative analysis, he only found a "small but significant link between children's perceptions of this afterschool program and the actual change in their outcomes" (O'Hare, 2014, p. 3789). O'Hare (2014) operationalised predefined dimensions of perception: His analysis uses standardised and global measures that are not necessarily equal to what the individual personally defines or interprets as significant and relevant. This could be one explanation of why greater links between children's perceptions and outcomes are not predictable. Yet, further research is still needed to provide more conclusive evidence. One promising way to expand upon O'Hare's paper with regard to the ideas presented here might be to investigate a complex – especially an 'embedded' – mixed methods design. Having qualitative interviews systematically embedded into the quantitative analysis of the quality-to-outcomes connection may offer a more extensive opportunity to tap the full potential of the model presented in figure 2.

In particular, case 2 showed that students interpret "doing homework at school" as a possibility of being socially embedded during "homework" time and not having to do homework at home alone. The need for relatedness seems to be a prerequisite for competence and autonomy, as it is conceptualised e. g. by self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan 1985). In this sense, it would be a desirable goal for further studies to consider self-determination theory and reflect especially on the role of relatedness. Perhaps attempts to implement *individualised* forms of learning at schools are headed in a critical direction because they lack a social component. There may be clues in this direction in the first case presented here.

However, some limitations should be mentioned at this point. These cases were specifically chosen as the most illustrative. Yet, regardless of how carefully these cases were selected and how prototypical they may represent matters of implementation, a major limitation is that this qualitative study underestimates the diversity of possible cases. A further limitation is that the two cases are utilised to illustrate the substantiation of the conceptual framework. On behalf of the detailed description of implementation issues (see chapter 2) and explanation of the model (see chapter 3), the empirical results section (see chapter 4 and chapter 5) has been kept rather brief. A paper that focusses completely on homework practices and that uses more elaborated and detailed versions of these two cases is in preparation.

There are also limitations concerning the included or available data. Some evidence in the data of StEG-Q could possibly illuminate aspects of implementation fidelity or other aspects of the implementation bridge. Including them in this paper may have made the analysis richer. This might be added in future papers when the longitudinal data of StEG-Q is completely available. The StEG-Q also has not investigated student outcomes in a narrower sense, which is why the processes leading to student outcomes cannot be fully proven in these cases. Systematically embedding the StEG-Q data into other sub-projects of the StEG (that explicitly measure different kinds of impacts and outcomes of extracurricular activities) may help to close this gap in future analyses.

This paper has created a conceptual framework that provides insight into the relatedness of program implementation and the effectiveness of these programs. In addition to the limitations, the paper has reported at least some evidence that the perceptions and actions of students should inform implementation processes. Consideration of the evidence presented here supports the conviction that a program has not been successfully implemented if it becomes a daily routine or if the implementers arrive at "new practices"; instead, is successfully implemented if it matters to the students.

References

Barbour, R. (2007). Doing Focus Groups. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Blase, K. A., Van Dyke, M., Fixen, D. I., & Bailey, F. W. (2012). Implementation Science. Key Concepts, Themes, and Evidence for Practitioners in Educational Psychology. In B. Kelly & D. F. Perkins (Eds.), *Handbook of Implementation Science for Psychology in Education* (pp. 13–34). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bohnsack, R. (1989). Generation, Milieu und Geschlecht. Ergebnisse aus Gruppendiskussionen mit Jugendlichen. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Bohnsack, R. (2004). Group Discussions and Focus Groups. In U. Flick, E. von Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 214–220). London, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bohnsack, R. (2007). *Rekonstruktive Sozialforschung. Einführung in qualitative Methoden* (6th ed.). Opladen & Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Bohnsack, R. (2010). Documentary Method and Group Discussions. In R. Bohnsack, N. Pfaff, & W. Weller (Eds.), *Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research* (pp. 99–124). Opladen, Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge (Mass.), London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Collier, C., & Henriksen, R. C. J. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions of a Multiple High-Risk Behavior Prevention Program and Delivery of Universal Programming. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(100), 1–19.
- Davis, E. S., & Clark, M. A. (2012). Elementary School Counselors' Perceptions of Reality Play Counseling in Students' Relationship Building and Problem-Solving Skills. *Journal of School Counseling*, 10(11), 1–35.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deslandes, R. (2006). Designing and Implementing School, Family, and Community Collaboration Programs in Quebec, Canada. *The School Community Journal*, 16(1), 81–105.
- Everhart, N. (2005). A Crosscultural Inquiry into the Levels of Implementation of Accelerated Reader and Its Effect on Motivation and Extent of Reading: Perspectives from Scotland and England. *School Library Research*, *8*, 1–20.
- Fiester, L. M., Simpkins, S. D., & Bouffard, S. M. (2005). Present and accounted for: Measuring attendance in out-of-school-time programs. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 105(12), 91–107.
- Fischer, N., & Klieme, E. (2013). Quality and effectiveness of German all-day schools. Results of the study on the development of all-day schools in Germany. In J. Ecarius, E. Klieme, L. Stecher, & J. Woods (Eds.), *Extended Education an International Perspective. Proceedings of the International Conference on Extracurricular and Out-of-School Time Educational Research* (pp. 27–52). Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

- Fischer, N., Radisch, F., Theis, D., & Züchner, I. (2012). *Qualität von Ganztags*schulen – Bedingungen, Wirkungen und Empfehlungen. Gutachten im Auftrag der SPD-Bundestagsfraktion. Frankfurt a. M.
- Greaney, M., Hardwick, C. K., Mezgebu, S., Lindsay, A. C., Roover, M. L., & Peterson, K. E. (2007). Assessing the Feasibility of a Multi-Program School-Based Intervention to Promote Physical Activity and Healthful Eating in Middle Schools Prior to Wide-Scale Implementation. *American Journal of Health Education*, 38(5), 250–257.
- Grimmett, H., Rickard, N. S., & Gill, A. (2010). The Perilous Path from Proposal to Practice: A Qualitative Program Evaluation of a Regional Music Program. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 44(2), 52–65.
- Hall, G. E. (2010). Technology's Achilles Heel: Achieving High-Quality Implementation. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 231–253.
- Hallenbeck, A., & Fleming, D. (2011). Don't You Want to Do Better? Implementing a Goal-Setting Intervention in an Afterschool Program. *Afterschool Matters*, 13, 38–48.
- Helmke, A. (2003). Unterrichtsqualität erfassen, bewerten, verbessern. Seelze: Kallmeyer.
- Helmke, A. (2009). Unterrichtsqualität und Lehrerprofessionalität. Diagnose, Evaluation und Verbesserung des Unterrichts (3rd Ed.). Seelze-Velber: Klett/Kallmeyer.
- Holtappels, H. G., Klieme, E., Radisch, F., Rauschenbach, T., & Stecher, L. (2008).
 Forschungsstand zum ganztägigen Lernen und Fragestellungen in StEG. In
 H. G. Holtappels, E. Klieme, T. Rauschenbach, & L. Stecher (Eds.), *Ganztagsschule in Deutschland. Ergebnisse der Ausgangserhebung der "Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagsschulen" (StEG)* (2nd Ed., pp. 37–50). Weinheim, München: Juventa.
- Huang, J.-J., Yeh, G.-L., Tseng, C.-C., Chen, W. W., Hwu, Y.-J., & Jiang, D. D.-S. (2009). Using Organization Development Concept to Conduct Administrative Assessment of Health Promoting Schools in Taiwan – A Preliminary Study. *International Electronic Journal of Health Education*, 12(1), 89–98.
- Kelly, B. (2012). Implementation Science for Psychology in Education. In B. Kelly & D. F. Perkins (Eds.), *Handbook of Implementation Science for Psychology in Education* (pp. 3–12). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kielblock, S., & Lange, A. (2013). Das problemzentrierte Interview. Grundlagen und Forschungspraxis. In Zeitschrift f
 ür Soziologie der Erziehung und Sozialisation, 33(4), 439–448.
- Kielblock, S., & Stecher, L. (2014). Ganztagsschule und ihre Formen. In T. Coelen & L. Stecher (Eds.), *Die Ganztagsschule. Eine Einführung* (pp. 13–28). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.
- Klerfelt, A., & Haglund, B. (2014). Walk-and-Talk Conversations: a Way to Elicit Children's Perspectives and Prominent Discourses in School-Age Educare. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education*, 2(2), 119–134.
- Klieme, E., & Rauschenbach, T. (2011). Entwicklung und Wirkung von Ganztagsschule. Eine Bilanz auf Basis der StEG-Studie. In N. Fischer, H. G. Holtappels, E. Klieme, T. Rauschenbach, L. Stecher, & I. Züchner (Eds.), *Ganztagsschule:*

Entwicklung, Qualität, Wirkungen. Längsschnittliche Befunde der Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagsschulen (StEG) (pp. 342–350). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.

- Klieme, E., Lipowsky, F., Rakoczy, K., & Ratzka, N. (2006). Qualitätsdimensionen und Wirksamkeit von Mathematikunterricht. Theoretische Grundlagen und ausgewählte Ergebnisse des Projekts "Pythagoras". In M. Prenzel & L. Allolio-Näcke (Eds.), Untersuchungen zur Bildungsqualität von Schule (pp. 127–146). Münster: Waxmann.
- KMK (2006–2014). Allgemein bildende Schulen in Ganztagsform in den Ländern in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Retrieved from http://www.kmk.org/statistik/ schule/statistische-veroeffentlichungen/allgemein-bildende-schulen-in-ganztagsform.html.
- Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Dubberke, T., Baumert, J., Blum, W., Brunner, M., et al. (2007). Linking aspects of teacher competence to their instruction. Results from the COACTIV project. In M. Prenzel (Ed.), *Studies on the educational quality of schools. The final report on the DFG Priority Programme* (pp. 39–59). Münster: Waxmann.
- Lipowsky, F., Rakoczy, K., Pauli, C., Drollinger-Vetter, B., Klieme, E., & Reusser, K. (2009). Quality of geometry instruction and its short-term impact on students' understanding of the Pythagorean Theorem. *Learning and Instruction*, 19(6), 527–537.
- McIntyre, E., Powell, R., Coots, K. B., Jones, D., Powers, S., Deeters, F., & Petrosko, J. (2005). Reading Instruction in the NCLB Era: Teachers' Implementation Fidelity of Early Reading Models. *Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*, 5(2), 66–102.
- Miller, B. M. (2003). Critical Hours: Afterschool Programs and Educational Success. Quincy, MA: Nellie Mae Education Foundation.
- O'Hare, L. (2014). Did Children's Perceptions of an After-School Social Learning Program Predict Change in their Behavior? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 3786–3792.
- Ocak, Ş. (2011). Discussed Issues in Preventive Intervention Programs. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 11*(3), 1396–1402.
- Olvera, N. N., Knox, B., Scherer, R., Maldonado, G., Sharma, S. V., Alastuey, L., & Bush, J. A. (2008). A Healthy Lifestyle Program for Latino Daughters and Mothers: The BOUNCE Overview and Process Evaluation. *American Journal* of Health Education, 39(5), 283–295.
- Radisch, F. (2009). *Qualität und Wirkung ganztägiger Schulorganisation: Theoretische und empirische Befunde*. Weinheim und München: Juventa.
- Radisch, F., Fischer, N., Stecher, L., & Klieme, E. (2008). Qualität von unterrichtsnahen Angeboten an Ganztagsschulen. In T. Coelen & H.-U. Otto (Eds.), *Grundbegriffe Ganztagsbildung* (pp. 910–917). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Schwalm, J., & Tylek, K. S. (2012). Systemwide Implementation of Project-Based Learning: The Philadelphia Approach. Afterschool Matters, (15), 1–8.
- Skaggs, G., & Bodenhorn, N. (2006). Relationships between Implementing Character Education, Student Behavior, and Student Achievement. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(1), 82–114.

- Stecher, L., & Maschke, S. (2013). Research on Extended Education in Germany A General Model with All-Day Schooling and Private Tutoring as Two Examples. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education*, 1(1), 31–52.
- Stecher, L., Radisch, F., Fischer, N., & Klieme, E. (2007). Bildungsqualität außerunterrichtlicher Angebote in der Ganztagsschule. Zeitschrift für Soziologie der Erziehung und Sozialisation, 27(4), 346–366.
- Witzel, A., & Reiter, H. (2012). *The Problem-Centred Interview. Principles and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K. (2011). Using the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a Comprehensive Framework to Guide the Planning, Implementation, and Assessment of Service-Learning Programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(4), 57–84.

Influential Factors in the Out-of-class Activities of Korean College Students

Sang Hoon Bae, Sue Bin Jeon* & Song le Han

Abstract: This study aimed to explore who participates in what kinds of out-of-class activities in Korea's universities. Therefore, the researchers examine whether differences exist in the pattern of out-of-class experiences according to the individual characteristics of the students, including gender, grade, household income level, high school performance and major. The researchers also aimed to examine the empirical evidence to determine the relationships between the patterns in out-of-class activities and the institutional characteristics of the university that the student attends. In terms of the institutional characteristics, this study is concerned with the location and size of the university. To explore these questions, the researchers analyzed K-NSSE data with hierarchical linear modeling. In sum, the findings of the statistical analysis of this study support the results of the preceding research in which different personal and institutional characteristics are related to five types of out-of-class activities.

Keywords: out-of-class activities, college experiences, K-NSSE, hierarchical linear modeling

Introduction

College students, in comparison with students in secondary schools, are involved in a wide range of experiences and activities while attending college. Interacting with a variety of people, they participate in academic and social programs, are engaged in cultural and sports activities, and sometimes work either on or off campus. According to the I-E-O model (Input-Environment-Outcome Model) proposed by Astin (1970), these activities are essential parts of the environmental factors that finally influence the students' behavior and college outcomes, including their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. In his 'Student Integration Model', in which he shows the predictors of the college students' departure decisions, Tinto (1993) explains that their experiences have multiple aspects but that they mostly take place in the two domains – academic and social systems. In the academic system, students who occasionally interact with the faculty members are generally involved in learning programs in their regular classrooms, while in the social system they mostly participate in various out-of-class activities together with their peers. These experiences, in turn, lead to higher levels of goal and institutional commitment through the academic and

^{*} corresponding author

social integration processes (Tinto, 1993). Similarly, Pascarella (1985a), in his 'General Model of Assessing Change', suggests that students' interactions with agents of socialization (such as faculty and peers) are positively associated with the quality of their effort and, finally, influence their learning and cognitive development. Of note, many of these events in college take place not only in class and on campus but also outside of class and off campus.

Time may be one of the most important assets for college students. Compared to high school students who abide by firm time table under the framework of the nationally mandated curriculum, college students tend to get more free time that could be used for their own plans. A great deal of studies (Astin, 1993; Choi & Rhee, 2009; Ehrenberg & Sherman, 1987; Ha, 2010; Hammes & Haller, 1983; Kim, 2004, Tinto, 1993; Yoon, 2013) have shown that students' out-of-class experiences are positively associated with academic and social integration, satisfaction, enrollment and persistence, learning outcomes, and so forth. Given the limit to the total amount of time available, however, strategies for time allocation between various activities are of great importance. In other words, how to manage out-of-class hours is significant for having a successful college life and outcome. With the growing importance of out-of-class activities, however, little effort has been made to investigate who participates in what kinds of activities in Korea's universities. This study attempts to fill this void.

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, it sets out to examine whether differences exist in the pattern of out-of-class experiences by the individual characteristics of the students, including gender, grade, household income level, high school performance, and major. Based upon the literature review, the out-of-class experiences and activities of college students can be categorized into five types: interaction with faculty, preparation for class, working on/off campus for pay, peer interaction, and doing community services. In this study, special attention was given to the differences in the gender and socio-economic status of the students measured by the level of monthly household income. Given the significance of out-of-class experiences on student outcomes, the study results could offer considerable implications to those who want to promote the effectiveness of educational practices, and enhance the equality of educational opportunities for higher education. For instance, if low-income students (compared to higher income students) are found to spend more hours working, and thus have difficulties in finding time for study or enriching interactions with people, it may be necessary to develop policies and/or programs to help those low-income students reduce their hours of work and find the time for study (e. g., needs-based scholarship, student welfare systems).

Second, this study intends to examine empirical evidence to determine the relationship between the patterns of the out-of-class activities of the students and the institutional characteristics of the universities that the students attend. In terms of the institutional characteristics, this study is concerned with the location of the university and its enrollment size. As known in many studies (Bae et al., 2014; Han, 1983; Kim, 1983; Kim, 1986; Lee, 2007; Lee & Brinton, 2014), one notable characteristic of the Korean higher education system is its tendency to place too much focus on the university rankings that have been historically established. The university's ranking, albeit unsubstantiated, has been known to influence the selectivity and recruitment of students between the universities. In relation to student engagement, studies on Korea's college students found that there exist differences between students attending local universities, and their peers in the Seoul metropolitan area universities (Bae et al., 2014; Bae & Han, 2015). For instance, those students from local universities were found to have a lower level of commitment to their institutions and participate in less writing classes, compared to their counterparts. Also, the above studies found that the size of the campus (measured by the number of students) affects the college experience of the students. This study attempts to extend these studies to cover the topic of the pattern of out- of-class activities.

Literature Review

Although the research interest in students' out-of-class experiences has grown year by year across all educational research fields, there has been no consensus on its definition as yet (Bartkus et al., 2012). In general, these activities are called "out-of-class' or 'co-curricular' activities, which are referred to as occurring outside of the classroom, are conducted under the auspices of the school, do not provide a grade or academic credit, can be academic as well as non-academic, and can be either voluntary or optional (Bartkus et al., 2012). Notwithstanding the absence of agreement on the definition, numerous studies has proven that out-of-class activities are significant factors impacting undergraduate students' overall college experiences (Bartkus et al., 2012; Everson & Millsap, 2005; Kuh, et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2014; Zacherman & Foubert, 2014). According to previous studies, the more a student participates in out-of-class activities, the better experiences (i.e. academic achievement, engagement, satisfaction, self-efficacy, core competencies and more) he/she may have during college years (Astin et al., 2000; Bartkus et al., 2012; Everson & Millsap, 2005; Kuh, et al., 2012; Everson & Millsap, 2005; Kuh, et al., 2014; Zacherman & Foubert, 2014).

In this part, numerous studies on the undergraduate students' out-of-class activities will be explored in order to determine 1) how these activities are related to the undergraduates' overall college experience and 2) how personal and institutional factors are associated with the patterns of college students' out-of-class activities.

Interaction with faculty

A volume of studies have shown that college students' interaction with faculty is closely related to their overall college experiences (Kuh et al., 2006). According to the studies, college students' interaction with faculty is one of the key factors in a better college experience (Astin, 1993; Cox & Orehovec, 2007; Kuh, 1995; Tinto, 1993). In detail, frequent and positive interaction with faculty can promote the undergraduates' academic performance, as well as their satisfaction and retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005; Kim & Conrad, 2006; Twale & Sanders, 1999); however, Endo and Harpel (1981) argued that the quality of interaction is more im-

portant than the quantity of interaction. The researchers explained that the intimacy and content of the faculty-student interaction are more significant than the frequency.

Some studies focused on interaction with faculty outside the classroom. Astin (1993) suggested that the more a student interacts with faculty outside the classroom, the more he/she feels satisfaction in their college experiences. This finding can be backed up by Tinto's theory of institutional departure (1993). According to the theory, undergraduate students can experience academic integration via interaction with faculty, which plays an important role in keeping students enrolled in their schools and devoted to learning. In his adjustment and attrition model, Pascarella (1980, 1985b) also presented informal interaction between faculty and undergraduate students as being highly associated with the "quality of the student effort" on learning and cognitive development.

In Korea, along with the recent rapid increase of scholarly interest in higher education, a volume of studies about the influence of interaction with faculty in the different college experiences of undergraduate students have been conducted by various researchers. These studies generally agreed that students who connect with the faculty more often tend to have higher academic motivation, a higher devotion to learning, and they lead a more positive college life, as well as attain higher academic outcomes (Bae & Kim, 2013; Choi & Cho, 2014; Kim, 2005). Also, Kim (2014) suggested that faculty-student interaction, through an increase in reading, contributes to academic improvement. However, some studies have presented opposite results, in regard to faculty-student interaction. For example, Kim and Rhee (2003) presented that an interaction with faculty outside the classroom is not associated with the development of "core competency." In addition, Rhee and Choi (2008) suggested that interaction with faculty has a slight influence on undergraduate students' improvement of higher thinking, while negatively affecting general interpersonal relations. In spite of different research outcomes, numerous studies have proven that there is a certain amount of association, whether it is positive or negative, between the interaction with faculty and the undergraduate students' college experiences.

Working on/off campus for pay

Many undergraduate students work on or off campus during their college years. They work for various reasons, such as to meet educational and/or living expenses, build a job-related career, or simply to explore different occupations. Therefore, it is now common to see 'student workers' both on and off campus. Different from voluntary activities, these students work for pay. In many societies, higher educational organizations have a large number students working on or off campus while enrolled. For example, in the United States, nearly half of the students who were enrolled full-time in any forms of higher educational institutions reported having had work experience at least once in 2007 (Pema, 2010). Therefore, it is necessary to examine carefully what kind of personal or organizational factors are associated with the undergraduate students' deciding to work on/off campus for pay during their college years. Although students may obtain skills and knowledge from their work experiences.

these work experiences may not complement their academic performance or other college experiences.

Studies on students working on/off campus, and their academic achievement, are not consistent. For instance, Hammes and Haller (1983) suggested that student workers tend to perform academically better than their non-working peers; however, Chacon, Cohen and Strover (1983) suggested that students from low-income families are more likely to work on/off campus for pay, which makes them unable to be fully involved in college. Moreover, Dolton and his colleagues (2003) showed that there is no statistically significant correlation between the students' working experience and their academic achievement. Furthermore, Ehrenberg and Sherman (1987) argued that employment during the undergraduate years can negatively influence both their academic performance and post-college outcomes. Also, they suggested that if a student works more than a certain amount of time, he/she would more likely fail to enroll in the following semester and graduate within an appropriate time.

In line with these studies, Korean researchers also investigated the association between the undergraduates' working experiences and their overall learning outcomes, such as academic performance, and cognitive and psychological development. Korean studies generally present a rather negative correlation between the college students' working experiences and their desirable learning outcomes. Baik (2006) suggested that working on/off campus for pay does not have a significant influence on the undergraduate students' academic performance; however, he additionally argued if a student devotes him or herself too much to their job, it may have a negative impact on their academic performance, emotional adaptation and sense of belonging to the college. Ahn and Bae (2011) also reported that students who work to cover their living expenses have a higher likelihood to gain lower academic grades, be enrolled in college less long, and enter the low-wage labor market.

Doing Community Service

Unlike working for pay, participating in community service and volunteer work is an activity freely given that benefits another person or group (Parnell, 2010; Wilson, 2000). Williams (2000) argues that student participation in various forms of volunteer work is the "trend of the 21st century." Numerous studies regard volunteer work as one of the more significant activities and factors on the success of the undergraduate students' college experiences. Doing community service, or participating in volunteer work may be positively associated with the undergraduates' college experiences. For instance, undergraduate students can develop their humanitarianism by participating these activities (Kuh & Lund, 1994; Parscarella et al., 1988). Also, by being involved in different volunteer works, college students can be provided opportunities to develop themselves as "responsible citizens" (Rubin, 1990). In the United States, the Campus Outreach Opportunity League was founded in 1989 to expand community service opportunities for college students (Parnell, 2010). Also, recently, higher educational organizations in the US have integrated community service and volunteer work programs into the regular course curriculum (Parnell, 2010; Williams, 2000).

Grounded in this recent trend in American universities, researchers examined the association between participation in community service (or volunteer work) and the diverse experiences of undergraduates. For example, Astin et al. (2000) found that undergraduate students who participate in both community service and service learning (course-based service) show significantly more positive outcomes in their academic performance, including improvement in their grade point average (GPA), critical thinking, and critical writing. The researchers also argued that being involved in community service is positively associated with self-efficacy and leadership. Other researchers found that the personal factors of the students, including their gender and their major, were associated with their volunteer work participation. Parnell (2010) argued that female college students are more likely to participate in volunteer work than their male counterparts. She also added that female students who participate in community service or volunteer work tend to gain higher academic grades than their male or non-participating counterparts. She also found, depending upon the student's major, that participation in community service and volunteer work is correlated with their academic achievement. According to her finding, nursing and art major students who had participated in the service gained higher GPAs.

Based upon these research findings, it is necessary to investigate how personal and institutional factors are associated with college students' participation in community service or volunteer work.

Preparation for class

As noted above, out-of-class activities are positively associated with college students' academic involvement and achievement (Astin, 1984, 1993; Kim, et al., 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005). Among the different out-of-class activities, continuous learning-related activities are highly associated with better academic outcomes (Kuh & Hu, 2001; Kuh et al., 2008, 2011). Theoretically, different models for college learning suggested that undergraduate students who put more effort into their learning tend to gain better academic outcomes and remain enrolled in the institutions until they graduate (Astin, 1993; Kuh, et al., 2006; Pascarella, et al., 2004). Also, undergraduate students who put more effort and time into learning outside the classroom may understand the content of the course better and retain a more deepened knowledge (Tinto, 1993). This may result in the students attending to their courses by asking questions and participating in classroom discussion actively.

Korean researchers also claimed that undergraduate students who put more effort into learning outside the classroom tend to actively participate in classroom activities and learning and, as a result, gain higher grades (Baek & Jung, 2012; Kim et al., 2001; Ku, 2001). According to the literature, the most common forms of college students' investment or commitment to learning outside the classroom are participating in study groups or peer mentoring (Jacobi, 1991; Kim & Kim, 2013). Jacobi (1991) reviewed numerous studies regarding the peer mentoring of undergraduate students, and determined that the students' mentoring activities, in general, are positively associated with their academic performance. Kim and Kim (2013) also suggested that undergraduate students who join study groups with their peers are more likely to develop a self-directed learning capacity and improve their academic motivation which, therefore, can result in better and higher academic attainment (Kim & Kim, 2013).

Peer interaction

Peer interaction is a critical factor in how college students perceive their college experiences (Astin, 1993; Kuh, 1993). Astin (1993) called peer interaction "the single most potent source of influence" which can impact almost all aspects of the college students' development (Kuh, 1993). The students spend the greatest amount of time with their peers throughout their college years and, therefore, peers are "the primary agents of socialization for one another in a variety of domains" (Moran & Gonyea, 2003). Peer interaction can occur both in and outside the classroom, and in different forms. For example, students collaborate for a group project in or outside the classroom, they can socialize by becoming a member of campus organizations, or participate in various events at their dormitory (particularly in fraternities and sororities in the US). Aside from these forms of peer interaction activities, in Korea the high school alumni association is another common form of socialization activity, particularly for freshman and sophomore students.

Many studies on undergraduate students' interaction with their peers have focused on how this interaction affects their students' college experiences, especially their academic performance and outcomes, psychological development, and overall attitude toward the institution (satisfaction or involvement), and thus accumulate the skills required to be good and able citizens (Astin, 1993; Bean & Kuh, 1987; Carrell, Fullerton, & West, 2008; Ha, 2010; King, 1990; Kim, 2004; Kim & Park, 2010; Kuh, 1993, 1995; Kuh et al., 2006, 2011; Moran & Gonyea, 2003; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Weidman, 1989; Yoon, 2013). According to Bean and Kuh (1987), undergraduate students who are involved in campus organizations gain a moderately higher GPA than their counterparts. In addition, students who get along with their peers are less likely to drop out, but are more likely to gain better academic outcomes and career success (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Moran and Gonyea (2003) suggested that the students' academic-oriented interaction with their peers is highly associated with better academic achievement. Weidman (1989) determined that the students' interaction with their peers can expose them to "normative pressures" that will affect their socialization outcomes, such as knowledge, social skills, and dispositions. Also, their interaction with their peers outside class affects the students' ability to develop social, intellectual, and civic development (Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004). In Korea, similar studies have been conducted regarding undergraduate students' socialization activities. For example, according to Ha (2010), the way in which the undergraduate students spend their out-of-class hours is highly related to their adjustment to college life. Other researchers also suggested students who actively participate in school organizations have higher satisfaction with their college life than the counterparts (Kim, 2004; Kim & Park, 2010; Yoon, 2013).

Likewise, more recent studies have proved and emphasized the significant influence of peer interaction on the undergraduate students' college experiences; however, some studies have found that students' personal and institutional factors can moderate the effect of peer interactions on their college experiences (Bronkema, 2014; Nelson Laird & Niskode, 2008). Therefore, it is necessary to investigate thoroughly those personal and institutional factors associated with the peer interaction or socialization activities of the college students.

Institutional factors on student out-of-class activities: location and size

As indicated previously, out-of-class activities have been widely studied by different researchers as critical factors on undergraduate students' satisfaction, involvement, and success with their college experience (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Porter, 2006). In addition, some studies explored institutional features that are associated with college students' out-of-class experiences (Kuh et al., 2006; Pike & Kuh, 2005; Wilson et al., 2014). Pike and Kuh (2005) argued that the students' negative perceptions of their institution are related with diverse institutional characteristics like size, policy and mission, selectivity, and location. According to the researchers, the undergraduates' out-of-class activity participation is highly associated with how they perceive their institutions, which eventually influences the students' persistence. Wilson et al. (2014) also found that institutional features (type, size) are more associated with engineering, computer sciences, and math students' participation in out-of-class activities. Although the institutional size is not a single key factor on the undergraduates' extracurriculr activity, it still can be considered as a mediating or indirect factor (Kuh et al., 2006).

The location of an institution is rarely considered by American researchers, with regard to the undergraduate students' out-of-class activities. Nevertheless, one cannot fully understand the topic without considering institutional location, when examining any issues regarding Korean higher educational institutions. In Korean higher educational institutions, undergraduates' out-of-class activities can be better explained only when the location of the institution, as well as its size, is included; this is because the location of the institution contains not just its geographical position but a wide range of the organization's features, such as selectivity, size, whether it is research-oriented or not, and so forth. Korean higher educational institutions are strictly stratified, from top to bottom (Kim, 1983; Han, 1983; Kim, 1986; Lee & Brinton, 2014). Lee and Brinton (2014) argued that "the South Korean higher education system is indeed characterized by the clear hierarchical ranking of schools." Also, the top institutions are mostly located in and around Seoul, the capital of South Korea.

Numerous studies on Korean students' college experiences, therefore, include location to control for institutional influence (Bae & Jang, 2012; Choi & Rhee, 2009; Hong, 2014; Im & Han, 2013; Jin, 2014; Min, 2003;). Likewise, it can be assumed that institutional location may affect undergraduate students' out-of-class activities in Korea. This assumption, for example, can be supported by the findings of Min (2003). According to this researcher, students enrolled in metropolitan universities tend to spend more time, effort, and expense in doing out-of-class activities, particularly those related to career development.

Summary and hypotheses

In this section, a substantial amount of studies on college students' out-of-class activities were examined. A relatively large number of studies have reported the positive effects of undergraduate students' participation in different out-of-class activities. In particular, activities related to the interaction with faculty and peers, as well as preparation for class, were consistently reported to have a positive influence on the students' academic engagement and performance. However, studies have reported inconsistent results on the impact of activities related to working on/off campus for pay, and doing community service, on the undergraduate students' overall college experience. On the organizational level, some institutional features, such as size, policy, mission, selectivity, and location were reported to be moderately related to college students' participation in out-of-class activities and overall school engagement. Based upon the findings from the literature review, this study sets two hypotheses:

- 1. There may exist differences in the patterns of out-of-class experiences according to the individual characteristics of the students, including: gender, grade, house-hold income level, high school performance, and major.
- 2. Institutional features such as size and location may affect the patterns of the Korean undergraduates' out-of-class activity participation.

Methodology

Data and Sample

The data was collected using the Korean-National Survey of Student Engagement (K-NSSE). The K-NSSE is the Korean validated version of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that has been widely used in the US in order to measure college students' engagement. The survey includes questions that measure both the quantity and quality of the college students' in/out-of-class activities that are related to their engagement and academic performance. Bae et al. have conducted the K-NSSE since 2011. This study employed the data from the 2014 K-NSSE. The sample population of this study is comprised of students attending four-year universities in Korea. 49,775 students, from 84 universities across the nation, completed the K-NSSE survey. After cleaning up the missing data, 40,506 samples were finally used for analysis.
Variables and measurement

Based upon the findings of the literature review, to examine the association between personal and institutional factors, and the patterns of the undergraduates' out-ofclass activity participation, this study included and analyzed different variables, such as the following:

Dependent Variables. To measure the pattern of the out-of-class activities of college students, five dependent variables were used:

- a) Interaction with Faculty (IF)
- b) Preparation for Class (PFC)
- c) Working on/off Campus for Pay (WFP)
- d) Interaction with Peers (IP)
- e) Doing Community Services (CS)

IF consists of four questions: 1) talking about career plans with a professor, 2) discussing course topics, ideas, or concepts with a professor outside of class, 3) discussing your academic performance with a professor, and 4) working with a professor on the activities other than coursework (e. g. student clubs or unions). Each question has been measured using a 4-point Likert scale, coded from 1 to 4 (never=1, sometimes=2, often=3, very often=4). The reliability of the IF variable is substantially high (Cronbach's alpha=.83). The other dependent variables were measured using an 8-point Likert scale which were coded on an hours-per-week basis (never=0, 1–5 hours=1, 6–10 hours=2, 11–15 hours=3, 16-20 hours=4, 21–25 hours=5, 26–30 hours=6, more than 30 hours=7).

Independent Variables. The independent variables were chosen from two different levels – student and university. The student-level variables are a) gender (female=0, male=1), b) academic grades (1=freshman, 2=sophomore, 3=junior, 4=senior), c) household income (from less than 1 million won = 0 to more than 7 million won=8), d) high school performance (from the bottom $\sim 4\%$ =1 to the top $\sim 4\%$ =9), and e) major (four variables where the reference group is Humanity). In regard to the gender composition of the sample, there were 21,053 female students, and 19,453 male students. Among the survey participants, there were 14,707 freshmen, 8,762 sophomores, 9,305 juniors, and 7,732 senior students. The household income variable was used to infer the students' socio-economic status (SES). The household income variable consists of an 8-point Likert scale (1=less than 1 million won, 2=1~1.99 million won, 3=2~2.99 million won, 4=3~3.99 million won, 5=4~4.99 million won, 6=5~5.99 million won, 7=6~6.99 million won, 8= more than 7 million won). The students' majors fall into five categories: humanity, social science, engineering, natural science, and art & music. The high school performance was reported using stanine grades. The 9th grade (=9) in the stanine system means that the student falls within the top 4% in academic achievement, while the 1st grade means that the student falls below the 4%.

The university-level variables include a) the location of university (non-metropolitan=0, Seoul metropolitan area=1), and b) the institutional size (number of students enrolled). In terms of the size of the universities, the variable was composed of 34 large-sized universities where more than 10,000 students were enrolled, and 40 small- to medium-sized universities where less than 10,000 students were enrolled.

			Interaction with		Preparation for		Work	on/off	Interaction with		Community		
		n	faculty		cla	class		campus for pay		peers		service	
			М	SD	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD	
Gandar	Female	21,053	0.94	0.75	3.48	1.77	2.20	1.47	2.35	1.90	1.97	1.65	
Gender	Male	19,453	1.05	0.78	3.63	1.79	2.24	1.55	2.67	2.05	2.11	1.73	
	Freshman	14,707	0.94	0.73	3.39	1.70	2.09	1.44	2.50	1.92	1.93	1.60	
Grade	Sophomore	8,762	0.95	0.75	3.62	1.78	2.21	1.48	2.54	2.01	2.00	1.66	
	junior	9,305	1.03	0.79	3.67	1.83	2.29	1.53	2.53	2.02	2.09	1.74	
	Senior	7,732	1.10	0.81	3.66	1.85	2.39	1.61	2.43	1.99	2.21	1.82	
	Less than 1 million	2,487	0.99	0.77	3.60	1.87	2.46	1.58	2.52	2.01	2.10	1.77	
	1~1.99 million	5,532	0.98	0.77	3.49	1.77	2.36	1.52	2.47	1.99	1.95	1.61	
	2~2.99 million	8,997	0.99	0.76	3.48	1.76	2.26	1.50	2.43	1.93	1.99	1.66	
Household	3~3.99 million	8,714	0.99	0.75	3.52	1.74	2.20	1.50	2.50	1.99	2.06	1.69	
income	4~4.99 million	5,703	1.01	0.76	3.57	1.74	2.16	1.47	2.56	1.95	2.04	1.65	
	5~5.99 million	3,846	1.00	0.78	3.59	1.78	2.12	1.47	2.50	1.97	2.05	1.69	
	6~6.99 million	1,662	1.00	0.78	3.61	1.76	2.07	1.46	2.54	1.99	2.02	1.72	
	More than 7 million	3,565	1.03	0.81	3.82	1.93	2.04	1.52	2.62	2.06	2.19	1.87	
	9 (the top ~4%)	1,575	0.93	0.82	3.90	1.90	2.13	1.51	2.77	2.09	1.95	1.67	
	8 (4~11%)	5,178	0.93	0.78	3.73	1.83	2.15	1.48	2.62	2.00	2.01	1.68	
	7 (11~23%)	11,051	0.98	0.78	3.62	1.78	2.22	1.49	2.56	2.00	2.06	1.70	
TT -111	6 (23~40%)	11,855	1.01	0.75	3.49	1.74	2.22	1.51	2.45	1.95	2.05	1.69	
High school	5 (40~60%)	7,131	1.01	0.75	3.41	1.76	2.22	1.51	2.37	1.92	2.00	1.67	
performance	4 (60~77%)	2,311	1.04	0.77	3.43	1.79	2.31	1.55	2.43	1.95	2.03	1.68	
	3 (77~89%)	987	1.10	0.78	3.46	1.83	2.33	1.58	2.46	2.00	2.12	1.80	
	2 (89~96%)	310	1.09	0.81	3.36	1.82	2.39	1.59	2.59	2.03	2.23	1.78	
	1 (96%~ the bottom)	108	1.24	0.89	3.90	2.02	2.56	1.89	2.77	2.07	2.49	2.13	
	Humanity	5,789	0.99	0.75	3.45	1.73	2.19	1.48	2.41	1.95	1.95	1.65	
	Social Science	13,225	0.95	0.77	3.39	1.73	2.26	1.53	2.56	2.00	2.20	1.80	
Major	Engeineering	10,626	0.98	0.76	3.63	1.80	2.14	1.48	2.55	1.98	1.95	1.62	
	Natural Science	5,722	1.01	0.77	3.65	1.77	2.20	1.49	2.42	1.95	1.95	1.62	
	Art & music	5,144	1.11	0.76	3.84	1.90	2.32	1.54	2.46	1.97	2.00	1.67	
Logation	Metropolitan	10,390	0.88	0.75	3.57	1.78	2.25	1.46	2.53	1.98	1.92	1.64	
Location	Non-metropolitan	30,116	1.03	0.77	3.55	1.78	2.21	1.52	2.49	1.97	2.08	1.71	
e:	Large-sized	13,787	0.94	0.77	3.66	1.81	2.20	1.49	2.59	2.03	2.00	1.69	
Size	Small & medium-sized	26,719	1.02	0.76	3.50	1.77	2.22	1.51	2.46	1.95	2.06	1.69	
	Total	40,506	0.99	0.77	3.56	1.78	2.22	1.51	2.50	1.98	2.04	1.69	

Table 1	. Summa	ary of V	Variables	and I	Descriptive	Statistics
		2			1	

Note. Household income measured by Korean Won (₩)

Table 1 presents the descriptive results of the dependent and independent variables in this study. In general, male students spent more hours participating in all types of out-of-class activities, compared to their female peers. As they advance into higher grades, students showed patterns of greater involvement in most out-of-class activities, with the exception of working on/off campus for pay. Students from lower-income families tended to have a lower level of interaction with faculty and spend less time for preparing for class, interacting with peers, and doing community service, while they spent more hours working on or off campus. Interestingly, students who had the lowest high school performance showed patterns of conducting more frequent interaction with professors, spending as much time as the highest performers in preparing for class and interacting with peers. In addition, the lowest showed that they work for pay the most. Besides the lowest high school performers, students who did better in high school tended to interact less with faculty and work less hours for pay, while spending more hours preparing for class; however, there was an irregular pattern between high school performance and both interaction with peers and doing community service. In addition, the students who are majored in art and music had a larger level of interaction with the faculty, preparation for class, and working on/off campus for pay, while those who majored in social science spent more time in peer interaction and community service.

At the university level, students attending local universities- in comparison with their counterparts who were enrolled in the universities in the Seoul metropolitan area- were likely to have more frequent meetings with professors, and participate more in community services. Instead, students who were enrolled in the universities located in metropolitan areas spend more hours in preparing for class, working for pay, and interacting with peers. Moreover, students attending large-sized universities showed a tendency to spend more hours in preparation for class, and interacted more frequently with their peers.

Data Analysis

To examine the patterns of college students' participation in out-of-class activity, according to student and university characteristics, the researchers conducted both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) 18.0 was adopted to conduct a descriptive analysis and calculate correlation coefficients among the variables. First, the means and standard deviations of both dependent and independent variables were calculated and suggested in Table 1. Then, to measure the effects of the student- and university-level predictors on the patterns of participation in out-of-class activities, this study employed Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) 7, taking the hierarchically nested data structure of this study into account (i.e., in this study, students as the unit of analysis are nested within the universities). The HLM method – a hierarchical system of regression equations (Hox, 2002, p. 11) – has been widely used in social science to deal with hierarchically nested data, and associated problems like aggregation bias and erroneous estimation of effects (Luke, 2004; Osborne, 2000; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

Statistical Models: Hierarchical Regression Equations

Two-level hierarchical linear models are formulated to investigate the direct effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables, both at the student and university levels.

Null Model. The null model, with no predictor variables, was used to examine the extent to which the predictive ability of the fitted model (conditional model) was improved by the inclusion of the student- and university-level predictors. Methodologically, the student- and university-level residual variances, σ_r^2 and σ_{u0}^2 (of the null model with no predictor variables) were compared to those of the fitted conditional model.

$$\begin{split} Y_{ij} &= \beta_{0j} + r_{ij} \\ \beta_{0j} &= \gamma_{00} + u_{0j} \\ Y_{ij} &= \gamma_{00} + r_{ij} + u_{0j} \end{split}$$

Where

 Y_{ii} = outcomes for student *i* within university *j*;

 β_{0i} = the intercept (student-level);

 r_{ii} = the residual error term indicating a unique effect associated with student *ij*.

These residual student effects are assumed to be normally distributed, with a mean of 0 and a variance σ_r^2 ;

 γ_{00} = the intercept (university-level);

 u_{0j} = the residual error terms indicating a unique effect associated with university *j*. All variations among the universities that are not explained by the two predictor variables are captured by these residual error terms.

Conditional Model. To explain the direct effects of the individual variables on the dependent variables, this study created the conditional model below. In the student-level model, the units of analysis are the students. The outcomes, Y_{ij} , is predicted by six student-level predictor variables, as below. It should be noted that the intercept (β_{0j}) and slope coefficients $(\beta_{1j} \text{ to } \beta_{8j})$ in this regression equation are assumed to vary randomly across the universities. The variation of the regression coefficients indicates that the initial status and the effects of the predictor variables on the outcome variables are different across the universities.

$$\begin{split} Y_{ij} &= \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} \ (gender) + \beta_{2j} \ (grade) + \beta_{3j} \ (household \ income) + \beta_{4j} \ (high \ school \ performance) + \beta_{5j} \ (social \ science) + \beta_{6j} \ (engineering) + \beta_{7j} \ (natural \ science) + \beta_{8j} \ (art \ and \ music) + r_{ij} \end{split}$$

Where:

 $\beta_{1i} \dots \beta_{8i}$ = regression coefficients of the student-level equation;

The university-level model was created to explain the variation of the student-level regression coefficients, as follows:

$$\beta_{0i} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} (location) + \gamma_{02} (size) + u_{0i} \beta_{ii} = \gamma_{i0} (i=1 \dots 8)$$

Where

 γ_{01} , γ_{02} = slope coefficients indicating the direction and strength of association between the school-level predictors.

The final mixed model is below:

$$\begin{split} Y_{ij} &= \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{10} \ (gender) + \gamma_{20} \ (grade) + \gamma_{30} \ (household \ income) + \gamma_{40} \ (high \ school \ performance) + \gamma_{50} \ (social \ science) + \gamma_{60} \ (engineering) + \gamma_{70} \ (natural \ science) + \gamma_{80} \ (art \ and \ music) + r_{ij} + \gamma_{01} \ (location) + \gamma_{02} \ (size) + u_{0j} \end{split}$$

In order for the value of the intercept to be meaningful and interpretable, the predictor variables are all grand mean centered, with the exception of some dummy variables, including gender, major, and school location. "Centering is simply the process of linear transforming a variable X by subtracting a meaningful constant, often some type of mean X" (Luke, 2004, p. 48). Therefore, the intercept is the expected outcome for student *i* within university *j* whose values on independent variables are equal to the grand mean.

The HLM analysis shows the statistical parameters, including: a) the fixed effects regression parameters (the gammas), which provide information about the direction and strength of the relationship between independent and dependent variables, and b) the random effects variance components, which present the residual variance at the student- and university levels. Random effects variance components were employed to investigate the predictive ability of the fitted model. More specifically, the proportional reduction of the prediction error (PRE) (Luke, 2004) was calculated by comparing the residual variances between the conditional and null models. The PREs at the student- and university-level are represented by the following equations:

$$PRE_{student} = \frac{\sigma_{r(null)}^2 - \sigma_{r(conditional)}^2}{\sigma_{r(null)}^2} \qquad PRE_{school} = \frac{\sigma_{u0(null)}^2 - \sigma_{u0(conditional)}^2}{\sigma_{u0(null)}^2}$$

Findings

Table 2 shows the results of the correlation analysis. Most variables were shown to be statistically correlated (p < .01 < <.001). Since some of the correlation coefficients were greater than .40, multicollinearity was assessed for all variables. All variance inflation factors (VIFs) were smaller than 10 with a tolerance of more than .1, and which means no multicollinearity existed in this analysis.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Gender	-	03****	06***	08***	12***	05***	.31***	08***	13***	06***	00	.07***	.04***	.01**	.08***	.04***
2. Grade		-	02***	.03***	.01	.01**	00	.01*	03***	.05***	.02**	.08***	.06***	.08***	01	.06***
3. Household income			-	.05***	.00	.01	02**	.00	.00	.08***	.01	.02**	.04***	07***	.02***	.02***
4. High school performance				-	.01	.02***	.00	.04***	09***	.23***	.08***	05***	.06***	03***	.04***	01*
5. Humanity					-	28***	24***	17***	16***	.04***	.03***	00	03***	01	02***	02***
6. Social Science						-	42***	28***	27***	01*	06***	04***	06***	.02***	.02***	.07***
7. Engeineering							-	24***	23***	01	03***	01	.03***	03***	.01**	03***
8. Natural Science								-	16***	01	.13***	.01	.02***	00	02**	02***
9. Art & music									-	01	04***	.06***	.06***	.03***	01	01
10. Location										-	10***	09***	.01	.01**	0.01	04***
11. Size											-	06***	.02***	03***	.01*	03***
12. Interaction with faculty												-	.27***	.23***	.26***	.28***
13. Preparation for class													-	.27***	.30***	.30***
14. Work on/off campus for pay														-	.35***	.42***
15. Interaction with peers															-	.41***
16. Community service																-
*																

Table 2. Pearson's correlation coefficients among the variables

p < .05, p < .01, p < .01

Hierarchical Linear Modeling Statistics

Table 3 presents the results of the HLM analysis. It shows the point estimates of the effects of the student- and university- level independent variables on the dependent variables.

In terms of gender, the fixed effects regression parameters (the gammas) in the upper panels show that male students had more active participation in most out-ofclass activities compared to female students in college ($\gamma_{10} = 0.14, 0.20, 0.09, 0.35, 0.19, p < 0.01$). These results are consistent with previous studies that suggest the gender imbalance in terms of student involvement and leadership development (Astin, 1993; Hall & Sandler, 1984; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

In relation to the student grade, the results suggest that the grade of the students is positively associated with their interaction with the faculty, and the hours spent in preparation for class, work for pay, and community services ($\gamma_{20} = 0.06, 0.09, 0.10, 0.09, p < 0.01$). However, the students' grade was not statistically related to time spent interacting with their peers in out-of-class activities, like club activities, sports, and student government.

The student SES, measured by the monthly household income, was found to be statistically and positively associated with interaction with the faculty and all other types of out-of-class activities, with the exception of working for pay (γ_{30} =0.02, 0.04, 0.02, 0.03, p<0.01). Not surprisingly, low-income students were found to spend more hours at work, either on or off campus, compared to their peers (γ_{30} =-0.05, p<0.01).

Students who performed better in high school were found to have more interaction with the faculty in college (γ_{40} =0.02, p<0.01). This result is opposite to that of the descriptive statistics analysis. The reason for the difference can be deduced that 1) in Korea, students with lower performance in high schools are usually enrolled in colleges and universities located in non-Seoul metropolitan areas, 2) according to previous studies (Hong, 2014; Min, 2003), these students more frequently interact with the faculty, 3) these institutions are often teaching-oriented universities, in which faculty-student interaction more often occurs (Pike & Kuh, 2005). Therefore, in the HLM analysis results, in which the institutional location effect was controlled, students with a higher GPA were more likely to interact with faculty as in previous studies. The study also found that the high school performance of the students is statistically and positively related with hours spent preparing for classes, interaction with peers, and conducting community services (γ_{40} =0.08, 0.05, 0.03, p<0.01). The current research, however, found that no relationship exists between high school performance and time spent working on or off campus.

In terms of the major, the study found no consistent patterns of participation in out-of-class activities across the majors. Interestingly enough, it was found that students who major in art and music, compared to students majoring in the humanities, spent more hours interacting with the faculty, preparing for class, and working for pay (γ_{80} =0.16, 0.43, 0.15, *p*<0.01). From these findings, one may assume that students majoring art and music are encouraged to meet the faculty to share their works, not only in class, but also out-of-class.

Regarding the university level independent variables, the location of the institution was found to affect how much students interact with the faculty members, and the degree to which students conducted out-of-class community services during the week. Students attending universities in non-metropolitan areas were found to have more meetings with their professors (γ_{01} =-0.23, *p*<0.01) and more actively conducted community services as their out-of-class activities (γ_{01} =-0.21, *p*<0.01), compared to their counterparts in the Seoul metropolitan areas.

The random effects analysis, implying the analysis of the proportional reduction of the prediction error (which can be calculated by comparing the student- and university-level residual variances), suggests that about 1 to 2% of the student level variances were explained by the student level predictors. By contrast, the university level independent variables were found to greatly explain variations in the students' participation in certain types of out-of-class activities. More specifically, 17% of the university level variance in the interaction with faculty was explained by the two university level predictors- i.e., the proportional reduction of the prediction error for the university level = (0.06-0.05)/(0.06=0.17). The results were similar to the preparation for class and interaction with peers (i.e. the proportional reduction of the prediction error for the university level were 25% and 11%, respectively). However, the predictive abilities of the university level independent variables were minimal. both in work for pay and community services. The proportional reductions of the prediction error for the university level were 3% and 10%, respectively. These findings suggest that there exist gaps in the interaction with the faculty, preparation for class, and interaction with peers across the universities. However, few gaps exist in out-of-class activities, like working for pay on or off campus and conducting community services.

	Interaction with		Preparation for class		Work on/o	off campus for	Interac	ction with	Community service			
	fa	culty	Tiopului	· F · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		pay		peers				
	Null	Conditional	Null	Conditional	Null	Conditional	Null	Conditional	Null	Conditional		
Fixed effect												
Intercept(γ_{00})	0.98***	0.96***	3.58***	3.40***	2.19***	2.12***	2.51***	2.30***	1.99***	1.92***		
Student-level												
Gender(γ_{10})		0.14***		0.20**		0.09***		0.35***		0.19***		
Grade(y20)		0.06***		0.09***		0.10***		-0.02		0.09***		
Household income(y30)		0.02***		0.04***		-0.05***		0.02***		0.03***		
High school performance(γ_{40})		0.02**		0.08***		0.01		0.05***		0.03***		
Major(reference:Humanity)												
Social Science(y50)		-0.04		-0.09*		0.08^{*}		0.11**		0.17***		
Engineering(γ_{60})		0.02		0.12*		-0.02		-0.01		-0.06		
Natural Science(y70)		0.02		0.13**		0.01		-0.08		-0.05		
Art & music(y ₈₀)		0.16***		0.43***		0.15***		0.06		0.03		
University-level												
Location(γ_{01})		-0.23***		-0.00		-0.02		0.04		-0.21**		
$Size(\gamma_{02})$		-0.00***		-0.00		-0.00*		0.00		-0.00*		
Random effect												
Student-level(γ_{ij})	0.54***	0.53***	3.11***	3.06***	2.21***	2.19***	3.84***	3.81***	2.78***	2.75***		
University-level(u _{0j})	0.06***	0.05***	0.08^{***}	0.06***	0.06***	0.06***	0.09***	0.08***	0.10***	0.09***		

Table 3.	The HLM	results for stu	dent- and	organizati	ional-	level fact	ors on	the
	patterns of	f college stude	nts' out-o	of-class act	ivity p	articipatio	on	

*p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.001

Discussion and conclusion

This study started with the single question of who participated in what kinds of outof-class activities in Korea's universities. With this curiosity, first, this study sets out to examine whether differences exist in the pattern of out-of-class experiences according to the individual characteristics of students, including gender, grade, household income level, high school performance, and major. Second, this study also aimed to examine the empirical evidence to determine the relationship between the patterns of out-of-class activities and institutional characteristics of the university that the student attends. In terms of the institutional characteristics, this study concerns the location and size of the university. To explore these research questions, the researchers analyzed the K-NSSE data with hierarchical linear modeling.

In sum, the findings of the statistical analysis in this study support the results of the preceding research suggesting that different personal and institutional characteristics are related to the college students' five types of out-of-class activities. Among the personal factors, the male gender is associated with more active participation in all types of out-of-class activities compared to female students. These results are consistent with previous studies that suggest the gender imbalance in terms of student involvement and leadership development (Astin, 1993; Hall & Sandler, 1984; Kezar & Moriarty, 2000; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). The students' high school performance was also found to be positively related to interaction with the faculty, hours spent in preparation for study, interaction with peers, and community services. This result corresponds to previous research findings (Astin, 1993; Choi & Rhee, 2009; Ha, 2010; Kim, 2004; Kuh et al., 2006, 2011; Tinto, 1993; Yoon, 2013). However, unlike the findings of numerous studies (Bean & Kuh, 1984; Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Ha, 2010; Kim & Park, 2010; Moran & Gonyea, 2003; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Yoon, 2013) stating that the undergraduates' academic achievement, or GPA, is highly associated with their peer interaction, the finding of this study indicates that the student grade was not statistically related to their interaction with their peers. It can be presumed that Korean students who obtained a higher GPA may have had no time to participate in student organizations, or socialize with their peers in/outside the campus. This assumption can be backed up by Baek and Jung (2012), who presented that students who vigorously participate in any student organizations (e.g. student union and clubs) tended to gain lower GPAs.

The student SES measured by the monthly household income was found to be statistically and positively associated with all five types of out-of-class activities, with the exception of working for pay. In other words, students from low SES families tend to spend a substantial amount of time in working to cover their expenses, rather than participating in peer/faculty interaction and community service. As Ahn & Bae (2011) reported, undergraduate students who work to make a living are usually from lower SES families, have a higher likelihood of gaining lower grades, tend to be enrolled in college less long, and enter the low-wage labor market. Although most personal level factors are generally associated with all five of the undergraduates' out-of-class activities, working on/off campus for pay is consistently unrelated to the students' high school performance, and major (except for art & music).

In terms of the major, the study found no consistent patterns of participation in out-of-class activities across the majors. Interestingly, students majoring in arts and music participate more in interactions with the faculty, preparation for class, and work on/off campus. This finding can be explained by some studies on the lives of college students who major in music and arts (Ha, 2012; Yoon & Jung, 2010). According to the study, students majoring in music and arts occasionally take lessons in/outside classroom, which increases the frequency of the faculty-student interaction. In addition, they spend a substantial amount of time practicing and training in their skills and techniques, which naturally results in an increase in preparation for class. Furthermore, many music and arts students tend to work as private tutors to earn pocket money or meet living expenses. On the contrary, regarding the students' major, one finding of this study is not accordance with what Wilson et al. (2014) suggested. Wilson and his colleagues found that when institutional features (type, size) work as a medium, then engineering, computer, and math students participate more in out-of-class activities. In this study, undergraduate students who major in engineering and science only moderately conducted course-related out-of-class activities (i. e. preparation for class).

The bigger the institution is, the less faculty and students interact with each other. This finding is in accordance with previous studies on the institutional size and student engagement or involvement (Astin, 1993; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Pike & Kuh, 2006; Porter, 2006). According to previous studies, institutional size has a negative effect on students' college experience, including less interaction with faculty and peers. The location of the institution was found to affect the degree and extent of the faculty interaction and performance of community services. Students attending universities in non-metropolitan areas were found to have more meetings with professors, and more actively conduct community services as their out-of-class activities, compared to their counterparts attending universities in Seoul metropolitan areas. This may be because many higher educational institutions in Seoul-metropolitan areas are research-oriented universities. According to Pike & Kuh (2005), interaction within or outside the classroom occurs the most in baccalaureate-liberal arts institutions, whereas faculty-student interaction at research-oriented, doctoral/master institutions is relatively limited.

Differently from secondary school students, undergraduates have more time that they can spend for diverse out-of-class activities. Therefore, how they utilize the given time by participating in what kind of out-of-class activity may affect their success in college life. Previous studies on college students' out-of-class activities were mostly intended to clarify the influence of the activities on the students' college experiences, like their GPA, cognitive and psychological development, and engagement /involvement. However, this study reversely examined how various personal and institutional factors can influence undergraduate students' out-of-class activity participation and patterns. Moreover, under the era of the universalization of higher education (Altbach et al., 2009; Hayes, 2006), colleges and universities will be valued by their customers' (i. e. students) satisfaction. Thus, the emphasis on the cultivation and enhancement of the quality of higher educational institutions will accordingly increase (Alexander, 2000; Altbach et al., 2009; Harvery & Green, 1998; Hayes, 2006; Neave, 1988). Therefore, to keep up with this trend, higher educational institutions need to carefully and empirically grasp the status quo as it relates to their students' out-of-class activities as well as their regular courses.

References

- Ahn, J. K., & Bae, H. J. (2011). The effects of working while in college on the labor market transitions and outcomes. *Korean Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(4), 149–180.
- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 411–431.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Retrieved on July-10-2015 from http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/trends-global-higher-education-2009-world-conference-en.pdf
- Astin, A. W. (1970). The methodology of research on college impact, part one. *Sociology of Education*, 43(3), 223–254.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297–308.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education. Phoenix: Oryx Press, Phoenix.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). How Service Learning Affects Students. Higher Education Research Institute. CA: Los Angeles. Retrieved June, 20, 2015 from http://heri.ucla.edu/pdfs/hslas/hslas.pdf
- Bae. S. H., & Han, S. I. (2015). The impact of out-of-class activities on active and collaborative learning and institutional commitment of university students. *Korean Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 323–356.
- Bae, S. H., & Jang, H. Y. (2012). The Determinants of Time Spent for Preparing for Class and Student-Faculty interaction of University Students. *Asian Journal of Education*, 13(4), 163–187.
- Bae, S. H., & Kim, H. J. (2013). Influential factors for the academic challenge of university students: mutual impact of learning supportive environment, student-faculty interaction, and active and collaborative learning. *The Journal of Yeolin Education*, 21(4), 201–225.
- Bae, S. H., Park, I. S., Kang, M. S., Kim, H. J., Kim, S. Y., & Song, H. D. (2014). The research on the quality management and possibility of improvement of undergraduate teaching-learning. Seoul: Korean Council for University Education.
- Baek, W. Y., & Jung, H. N. (2012). An analysis of the effect of the extra-curriculum activities and teaching method on college educational performance. *The Journal* of Economics and Finance of Education, 21(1), 261–284.
- Baik, J. S. (2006). *Part-time work experience of college students and its effects on college adaptation*. Korea Institute of Youth Facility & Environment, 4(1), 3–17.

- Bartkus, K. R., Nemelka, B., Nemelka, M., & Gardner, P. (2012). Clarifying the meaning of extracurricular activity: a literature review of definitions. *American Journal of Business Education*, 5(6), 693–704.
- Bean, J. P., & Kuh, G. D. (1984). The relationship between student-faculty interaction and undergraduate grade point average. *Research in Higher Education*, 21, 461–477.
- Bean, J. P., & Kuh, G. D. (1987). The reciprocity between student-faculty informal contact and academic performance of university undergraduate students. *Re*search in Higher Education, 21(4), 461–477
- Bronkema, R. H. (2014). *Campus Friends, Gender, and College Student Success*. (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, MI).
- Carrell, S. E., Fullerton, R. L., & West, J. E. (2008). *Does your cohort matter? Measuring peer effects in college achievement* (No. w14032). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Chacon, M. A., Cohen, E. G., & Strover, S. (1983). *Chicanas and Chicanos: Barriers to Progress in Higher Education. Paper presented for the Conference on the Latino College Student.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service.
- Chang, M. J., Astin, A. W., & Kim, D. (2004). Cross-racial interaction among undergraduates: Some consequences, causes, and patterns. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(5), 529–553.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and Identity. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Choi, B. K., & Cho, S. H. (2014). The analysis of change in college students' interaction with faculty and peer students and differences in self-determination motivation. *Korean Journal of Educational Research*, 52(3), 29–54.
- Choi, J. Y., & Rhee, B. S. (2009). Examining factors related to college students' learning outcomes: focusing on effects of college. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(1), 227–249.
- Cox, B. E., & Orehovec, E. (2007). Faculty-student interaction outside the classroom: a typology from a residential college. *Review of Higher Education*, 30(4), 343–362.
- Dolton, P., Marcenaro, O. D., & Navarro, L. (2003). The effective use of student time: A stochastic frontier production function case study. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(6), 547(14).
- Ehrenberg, G., & Sherman, R. (1987). Employment While in College, Academic Achievement, and Postcollege Outcomes: A summary of Results. *Journal of Human Resources, 22*(1), 1–23.
- Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. L.(1981). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Mineapolis, MN, May 17–20, 1981.
- Everson, H. T., & Millsap, R. E. (2005). Everyone Gains: Extracurricular Activities in High School and Higher SAT Scores. College Board Research Report 2005-2. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. Retrieved September 28, 2012 from http://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-2005-2-extracurricular-activities-high-school-higher-sat-scores.pdf

- Ha, E. H. (2012). A study on the recognition and satisfaction for the dance education courses in university students of dance major. (Master's thesis, SangMyeong University, Seoul, Korea).
- Ha, S. W. (2010). The relationships among leisure motivation, leisure involvement and the university life adjustment in leisure activities of university student. *Korean journal of physical education*, 49(2), 331–342.
- Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1984). Out of the classroom: A chilly campus climate for women? Washington (State): Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C. Project on the Status and Education of Women.
- Hammes, J., & E. Haller (1983). Making ends meet: some of the consequences of part-time work for college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 16, 529–535.
- Han, J. S. (1983). *The Characteristics of Korean Higher Education*. Seoul: Munumsa.
- Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18(1), 9–34.
- Hayes, A. F. (2006). A Primer on Multilevel Modeling. *Human Communication Research*, 32(4), 385–410.
- Hong, J. I. (2014). The Relationship between Faculty-Student Interaction and Student's Institutional Commitment. (Master's thesis, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea).
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Im, S. H., & Han, Y. K. (2013). Impacts of financial factors of private colleges on student dropout rates. *Journal of Educational Finance and Economy*, 22(2), 83–113.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: a literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(4), 505–532.
- Jin, M. S. (2014). An exploratory study on inequality of core competence of college students in korea. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 24(1), 105–127.
- Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(1), 55-69.
- Kim, S. I. (1983). Educational policy and social structure. 252–74 in Korean Social Science (in Korean). Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Kim, S. I (1986). Mass transformation of education and competition for education. pp. 444–71 in *Social change and problems in Korea* (in Korean), edited by Korean Social Science Research Council. Seoul: Bupmunsa.
- Kim, H. S. (2004). Impact on academic achievement and the satisfaction in school life resulted by perceived school environment and professional prospect. *Korean journal of youth studies*, 11(3), 199–215.
- Kim, A. N., & Rhee, B. S. (2003). An analytic study of identifying personal and institutional influences on the perceived development of core competencies of college students. *The Journal of Korean Education*, 30(1), 367–392.

- Kim, E. J. (2014). An analysis of the structure relationship among professor-students interaction, class satisfaction, reading and learning outcomes of students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 1–22.
- Kim, E. K. (2005). Effects of student-faculty interaction on college student outcomes and development. *The Korean Journal of Educational Psychology*, 19(4), 877–895.
- Kim, E. K., & Kim, A. R. (2013). A study on the educational meaning of learning community activities in college students: Focused on continuous participants of the Study group program. *Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 13(5), 91–119.
- Kim, H. K., Shin, H. S., Seo, M. W., & Hwang, K. W. (2001). A study on the level of students' educational achievement. *The Journal of Research in Education*, 15, 1–24.
- Kim, H. S., & Park, Y. S. (2010). Differences in Campus Life Satisfaction and Self-Achievement based on Sport Club Participation among College Students. *Journal of Leisure and Recreation Studies*, 34(3), 43–54.
- Kim, M. M., & Conrad, C. F. (2006). The impact of historically black colleges and universities on the academic success of African-American students. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(4), 399–427.
- King, A. (1990). Enhancing peer interaction and learning in the classroom through reciprocal questioning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 664–687.
- Ku, B. D. (2001). The effect of teaching-learning related variables on academic achievement through meta-analysis. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Human Resource Development*, 33(2), 131–140.
- Kuh, G. D. (1993). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, *30*(2), 277–304.
- Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 123–155.
- Kuh, G. D., & Hu, S. (2001). The effects of student-faculty interaction in the 1990s. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 309–332.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature. National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC).
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 540–563.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2011). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kuh, G. D., & Lund, J. P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government? New directions for student services, 1994(66), 5–17.
- Lee, D. H. (2007). A study on the strategies for ending the fixed university ranking system. *Korean Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(3), 131–157.
- Lee, S., & Brinton, M. C. (2014). Elite education and social capital: the case of South Korea. Sociology of Education, 69(3), 177–192.
- Luke, D. A. (2004). Multilevel modeling, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Min, H. R. (2003). A study on the Experiences and Costs of the Private Tutoring of University Students for Preparing Employment. *Journal of Educational Sociol*ogy, 13(3), 133–149.
- Moran, E. T., & Gonyea, T. (2003). The Influence of Academically-Focused Peer Interaction on College Students' Development. Retrieved on July, 15, 2015 from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED478773
- Neave, G. (1988). On the cultivation of quality, efficiency and enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986–1988. European Journal of Education, 7–23.
- Nelson Laird, & Niskode (2008). How Gender and Race Moderate the Effect of Peer Interactions across Difference on Student and Faculty Perceptions of the Campus Environment. Retrieved on June, 15, 2015, from http://cpr.indiana.edu/ uploads/2008nsse-fsse-diffeffectsofdivinteractionsonenv.pdf
- Osborne, J. W. (2000). Advantages of hierarchical linear modeling, Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation, 7(1), Retrieved June 5, 2005 from http:// PARE-online.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=1.
- Parnell, A. R. (2010). "The relationship between volunteering and undergraduate academic achievement at Florida state university" Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations. Paper 2204.
- Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(4), 545–595.
- Pascarella, E. T. (1985a). College environmental influences on learning and cognitive development: A critical review and synthesis. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–64). New York: Agathon
- Pascarella, E. T. (1985b). Students' affective development within the college environment. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(6), 640(24).
- Pascarella, E. T., Ethington, C. A., & Smart, J. C. (1988). The influence of college on humanitarian/civic involvement values. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 412–437.
- Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(3), 249–284.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students: Finding and insights from twenty years of research. Sanvfrancisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). How college affects students: A third decade of research, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pema, L. W. (2010). Understanding the Working College Student. Retrieved June, 20, 2015 from http://www.aaup.org/article/understanding-working-college-student#.VZDy1tEw9aQ
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). A typology of student engagement for American colleges and universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 185–209.
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interactions and perceptions of the campus environment. *Review of Higher Education*, 29, 425–450.
- Porter, S. R. (2006). Institutional structures and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(5), 521–554.

- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rhee, B.S., & Choi, J.Y. (2008). Analyzing influences on the perceived development of core competencies of college students. *Journal of Korea Education*, *35*(2), 243–266.
- Rubin, S. G. (1990). *Transforming the university through service learning*. In C. I. Delve, S. D.
- Ryan, S. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. New York: Touchstone.
- Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving *college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Twale, D., & Sanders, C. S. (1999). Impact of non-classroom experiences on critical thinking ability. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 36(2), 108–121.
- Weidman, J. (1989). Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 5, New York: Agathon.
- Williams, D. R. (2000). Participants in, not spectators to, democracy: the discourse on civic responsibility in higher education. *Michigan Journal of Community Ser*vice Learning, Fall, 158–164.
- Wilson, D., Jones, D., Kim, M. J., Allendoerfer, C., Bates, R., Crawford, J., Floyd-Smith, T., Plett, M., & Veilleux, N. (2014). The link between co-curricular activities and academic engagement in engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 103(4), 625–651.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. Annual review of Sociology, 26(1), 215-240.
- Yoon, H. S., & Jung, Y. J. (2010). Study on Culture and Arts School Students' Satisfaction on College Life. *Journal of Students' Life*, 18, 285–305.
- Yoon, Y. M. (2013). The relationship among extracurricular club activities with adaptation to campus life and career preparation behavior of college students. *Community Development Review*, 38(2), 21–30.
- Zacherman, A., & Foubert, J. (2014). The relationship between engagement in co-curricular activities and academic performance: exploring gender differences. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *51*(2), 157–169.

Research on Extended Education Around the Globe? A Brief Examination of the First Five Issues of the IJREE

Amina Fraij & Stephan Kielblock

The emergence of the term 'extended education'

After school programs, out-of-school time programs, leisure time activities, extracurricular activities, all-day schools – there are many terms used to refer to non-curricular, yet educationally based time spent by children and young people beyond the 'school gates'. Although it is not a new phenomenon to extend pupils education in this way, the extent of government investment into this area has been growing since the turn of the millennium. Examples of such initiatives include the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program in the United States that started in the 1990s (James-Burdumy et al., 2005), the Investitionsprogramm "Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung" (IZBB) that started in Germany in 2003 (Zickgraf & Zickgraf, 2009) and the initiative to foster extended services in England, starting in 2005 (e. g. Cummings, Dyson, & Todd, 2011).

These developments, which occurred globally, were the start of a network that aimed to bring together specialists in this field to share ideas, research and practices. An international conference held in Giessen, Germany in 2010 was the formal starting point for the development of this Network on Extracurricular and Out-of-School Time Educational Research (NEO ER) (Ecarius, Klieme, Stecher, & Woods, 2013; Bae, 2014).

During this inaugural conference it became increasingly clear that the terms "extracurricular" and "out-of-school time" did not cover the full scope and variety of activites under the heading 'non-formal services' within the different countries that initiated the network activities: England, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. A second issue for participants was the lack of an appropriate publication platform for the exchange of ideas and research.

The IJREE. A brief description

To address both of these challenges in 2013 the International Journal for Research on Extended Education (IJREE) was launched. This was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG). The editors agreed on the use of the term 'extended education' as this was seen as being broad enough to capture a wide range of relevant practices and research. The journal aimed to present a platform for cross-cultural and cross-national exchange around issues in the field of extended education.

The current journal 2/2015 is the fifth issue of the IJREE – one in 2013, two in 2014 and two in 2015. The first two issues (1/2013; 1/2014) were concerned with specific national research reports. Aspects of extended education were examined across seven countries (in that order): Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, Korea, England, United States, and Sweden. In the next issue 2/2014 the main topic was University-Community Links: Collaborative Engagement in Extended Learning. Issue 1/2015 was a collection of 'free contributions' (collection of papers without a specific main topic), and the current issue 2/2015 is now on blurring educational boundaries.

How 'international' is the IJREE?

One of the stated aims of the IJREE is to be an *international* platform for the exchange of ideas and research on aspects of extended education for children and young people. Using the R package rworldmap (South, 2011) figure 1 shows the countries so far included in the journal after only five issues.

Figure 1. Coverage of countries that are involved and have published in the IJREE. Own illustration using author's information (of main topic papers and free contributions) in the end of each IJREE issue (1/2013–2/2015) and the R package rworldmap (South, 2011)



Researchers from 14 different countries have so far been published. In 2013 the IJREE's authors came from Germany, Netherlands, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States. In 2014 in addition three new countries, Taiwan, United Kingdom and Spain, were involved. Five additional countries were included in 2015 – Australia, Denmark, Finland, Japan and Norway. Although the IJREE is still in its early stages of development it already covers a remarkable range of different countries and perspectives. It is becoming a truly 'international' journal. Several parts of Europe, and also selected parts of North America, Asia and Australia are involved. However, there are no researchers publishing in the IJREE from South America and Africa as of yet.

Prospects and future challenges

A challenge for the researchers in the field of extended education is to develop a comprehensive global network. There are researchers concerned with extended education in countries so far not included and the aim is to try to link with these people sharing ideas and research. The IJREE and the NEO ER seem to be appropriate platforms to bring these people together. It will need the continued engagement of IJREE's editors and NEO ER's participants (including the IJREE authors) to reach out and link with relevant researchers, who are not currently affiliated to NEO ER and encourage them to contribute to the journal and the network. In a short space of time the IJREE has started to build a solid reputation as an international journal focused on sharing research and ideas on extended education.

References

- Bae, S. H. (2014). Values and Prospects of Extended Education: A Critical Review of the Third NEO ER Meeting. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education*, 2(2), 135–141.
- Cummings, C., Dyson, A., & Todd, L. (2011). Beyond the School Gates. Can Full Service and Extended Schools Overcome Disadvantage? New York: Routledge.
- Ecarius, J., Klieme, E., Stecher, L., & Woods, J. (2013). Introduction. In J. Ecarius,
 E. Klieme, L. Stecher, & J. Woods (Eds.), *Extended Education an International Perspective* (pp. 7–9). Opladen, Berlin & Toronto: Barbara Budrich.
- James-Burdumy, S., Dynarski, M., Moore, M., Deke, J., Mansfield, W., & Pistorino, C. (2005). When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program: Final Report. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from www.ed.gov/ies/ncee.
- South, A. (2011). rworldmap: A New R package for Mapping Global Data. *The R Journal*, *3*(1), 35–43.

Zickgraf, A., & Zickgraf, P. (2009). Vier Milliarden Euro für einen gerechten Start ins Leben. Realisierung des Investitionsprogramms "Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung" (IZBB). In F. Prüß, S. Kortas, & M. Schöpa (Eds.), Die Ganztagsschule: von der Theorie zur Praxis. Anforderungen und Perspektiven für Erziehungswissenschaft und Schulentwicklung (pp. 99–108). Weinheim: Juventa.

Authors

Prof. Dr. Imanol Aguirre, Public University of Navarra (Spain). Main research interests: Visual culture production among youth and education. Art and visual culture education from a pragmatist approach in youth and early childhood. Address: Department of Psychology and Pedagogy, Public University of Navarra. Campus Arrosadia. 31006 Pamplona/Iruñea (Spain). Email: imanol@unavarra.es.

Prof. Dr. Sang Hoon Bae, Sungkyunkwan University, Department of Education, Sungkyunkwan University. Main research interests: student engagement, educational innovation and reform, educational policy analysis, university development model, out-of-class activity (afterschool program). Address: Hoam hall 507, Sungkyunkwan University, 25-2, Sungkyunkwan-ro, Jongno-gu, Seoul, Korea. Email: sbae@skku. edu.

Dr. Helene Elvstrand, Senior lecturer, Linköping University, Department of Social and Welfare Studies. Main research interest: children's right issues and research on educare in leisure-time centres. Address: Linköpings University, Department of social and welfare studies, 621 34 Norrköping, Sweden. Email: helene.elvstrand@ liu.se.

Prof. Ola Erstad, Department Of Education, University of Oslo. Main research interests: digital literacy, formal and informal ways of learning, 21st century skills. Address: Department Of Education, PO Box 1092 Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway. Email: ola.erstad@iped.uio.no.

Rachel **Fendler**, *PhD*. Assistant Professor of Art Education, Florida State University and member of the consolidated research group Esbrina – Contemporary Subjectivities, Visualities and Educational Environments, University of Barcelona. Main research interests: learning mobilities, youth visual culture, participatory research. Address: Department of Art Education. 1033 William Johnston Building. 143 Honors Way. Florida State University. Tallahassee, FL, USA. 32306. Email: rfendler@gmail.com.

Amina Fraij, *M. A.*, University of Kassel, Department of Education. Main research interests: Extended Education and development in adolescence. Address: Department of Education, University of Kassel, Nora-Platiel-Str. 1, 34127 Kassel, Germany. Email: amina.fraij@uni-kassel.de.

Graduate student, Song Ie Han, Sungkyunkwan University, Department of Education. Main research interests: student engagement, educational innovation. Address: 600th

anniversary hall 202, Sungkyunkwan University, 25-2, Sungkyukwan-ro, Jongno-gu, Seoul, Korea.

Fernando Hernández-Hernández, University of Barcelona. Cultural Pedagogies Unit. Main research interests: Visual culture and moving subjectivities, learning as event, inclusive research in education. Address: University of Barcelona. Cultural Pedagogies Unit. Fine Arts Faculty. Pau Gargallo, 4. 08028 Barcelona. Spain. Email: fdohernandez@ub.edu.

Research Prof. Dr. Sue Bin Jeon, Dongguk University, Education Research Institute. Main research interests: student engagement, educational leadership, teacher policy, diversity in education. Address: Education Research Institute, Hakrimkwan 408, Dongguk University, Phildongro 1gil Jung-gu, Seoul, Korea 100-715. Email: suebinjeon@gmail.com.

Stephan Kielblock, Justus-Liebig-University Giessen, Department of Education. Main research interests: Extended education and inclusion. Address: JLU Giessen, FB 03 – Department of Education, Empirical Educational Research, Karl-Gloeckner-Str. 21B, 35394 Giessen, Germany. Email: Stephan.Kielblock@erziehung.uni-giessen.de.

Prof. Dr. Kristiina Kumpulainen, University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education. Main research interests: learning across contexts, learner agency and identity, resilience, tool-mediated interaction, visual participatory methodologies, sociocultural theories. Address: Department of Teacher Education, P.O. Box: 9, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. Email: kristiina.kumpulainen@helsinki.fi.

Anna Mikkola (MSc), University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education. Main research interests: sociology of education, sociology of children and childhood, sociology of risk, visual studies. Address: Department of Teacher Education, P.O. Box 9, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. Email: anna.mikkola@helsinki.fi.

Raquel Miño Puigcercós, *Ph.D. Candidate*, Department of Didactics and Educational Management, University of Barcelona. Main research interests: youth learning culture and new media, critical thinking in higher education. Address: Campus Mundet, Edifici Llevant, 2. Passeig de la Vall d'Hebron, 171. 08035, Barcelona, Spain. Email: rmino@ub.edu.

Associate prof. Dr. Anna Liisa Närvänen, Linnaeus University, Department of Social Studies. Main research interest: sociology of age, socialization theories, children's agency and social identities. Address: Linnaeus University, 351 95 Växjö, Sweden. Email: annaliisa.narvanen@lnu.se.

Juana María **Sancho-Gil**, University of Barcelona. Department of Didactics and Educational Management. Main research interests: The institutional, organizational, technological and symbolic dimensions of contemporary learning environments. Languages and visualities in the constitution of subjectivities and learning. Digital

and visual culture in teaching and learning in the knowledge society. Address: University of Barcelona. Department of Didactics and Educational Management. P. Vall d'Hebron, 171. 08009 Barcelona. Spain. Email: jmsancho@ub.edu.