School is More than Just a Place to Learn; School is, First and Foremost, a Place to Live

Barbara Drinck

In 2012, Dr. Iris Mortag from the Department of Educational Sciences of Leipzig University published a book that did not receive much attention at the time. It was titled „*Qualität des Lebens und Qualität der Schule*" ("Quality of Life and Quality of School"). The subtitle ("*Wohl-fühlen in der Schule aus der Sicht der Beteiligten*") indicates quite clearly what the authors were aiming at with this book project: they investigated "Feeling Good at School from the Point of View of Those Involved." This makes it a rather unusual project in education science research—one that analyses schools from the point of view of its protagonists, i.e. the acting subjects at schools. Against this backdrop, schools are evaluated with respect to how much quality of life they provide. What is evaluated thus, is not the efficiency of the institution as measured by objective evaluation criteria; it is not the output of excellent academic achievements of its students, nor long-term outcome, i.e. the achievement of objectives of instruction as provided by profile guidelines. Instead, all stakeholders —students, teachers, head teachers and parents—are asked what their school should provide in terms of quality of life and learning for them to feel comfortable there, to enjoy being there and learning, too.

Ever since the rather sobering results for Germany in the PISA study that compared student achievement internationally and ranked German schools in the medium field only, Germany's Local Education Authorities (LEA), Ministries of Education and, most of all, political parties have been struggling to improve the performance of its educational institutions.

This is no easy undertaking as schools in Germany are facing

several grave problems that have not been resolved for decades:

Firstly, the German federal, and therefore heterogeneous, school system lacks a uniform structure. Instead, structure is determined by the Ministries of Education of the different federal states, and varies—like the curricula, too—between federal states. It is further differentiated internally by a selective structure, and it tends to reproduce unequal opportunities because it excessively favours children from academic families. Even UN Special Rapporteur for the Right of Education, Vernor Muñoz Villalobos, decried, in 2010, the unfairness of this selective structure causing disadvantages for non-native German children and children from less educated social backgrounds. Effectively, this means that poverty and migration in Germany lead to lower educational attainment whereas a family background of wealth and better education guarantees success in education.

Secondly, German schools, especially *Hauptschulen*—offering Lower Secondary Education leading to the *Hauptschulabschluss*—have very high dropout-rates of youths, with less than 8% of school leavers not even achieving this elementary qualification (Statistisches Bundesamt, Schulen auf einen Blick, 2012, p. 34–35). Although this figure varies slightly between different German federal states, it has been stable over more than 25 years.

Thirdly, Germany has a very high rate of functional illiterates. The results of the PISA study revealed that more than 20% of students leave school without the most essential reading and writing skills. They even lack the basic education (*Grundbildung*) that is required to take up qualified employment. (Grotlüschen & Riekmann 2011, p. 2)

What has school research done so far?

Germany has been reunited into one state since 1989. To understand the efforts made in school development, one must not forget that while Germany was still divided into two separate states, different educational systems had developed on the two sides. After German reunification, these two school systems, as much as they differed in their structure and ideological orientation—the socialist comprehensive school system of the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany) and the achievement-oriented and competitive system of the Federal Republic

of Germany (West Germany)—needed to be aligned with each other in order to gain consistency. But this synthesis proceeded in a rather unbalanced way: the East German "New *Länder*" of the former GDR were generally made to adapt to the structure of the West German system. Education researcher Gabriele Köhler described this as the "adaptation of school systems to the federal states of the Federal Republic of Germany" (Köhler 2002, p. 24). But the politically indoctrinated school of the former GDR could not possibly have been continued after the reunification. It would not have been possible to free its comprehensive schools of their ideological shackles without imposing a process of fundamental restructuring on the school system.

In West Germany there had been efforts, especially since the 1970s, to implement educational reforms aimed at educational expansion and equal opportunities (Dahrendorf 1965; Picht 1964). Instruction was organised accordingly: critical, emancipating and compensatory elements were included.

Both German state systems wanted scientifically and empirically founded results and employed scientists who facilitated the methodical implementation of issues with the educational system and delivered well-founded evaluations of the qualitative development of educational institutions. Outside of universities, the East German Academy of Educational Sciences (*Akademie der Pädagogischen Wissenschaften der DDR*, APW) and the West German Institute for International Educational Research (*Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung*, DIPF) as well as the Max Planck Institute for Educational Research (*Max-Planck-Institut für Bildungsforschung*, MPIB) in Berlin were working on these issues. To this day, they continue to be the most important Educational Research institutions outside universities.

It was a loss for school research to no longer be able to use most of the APW's studies on Educational Psychology and Didactics when, after the reunification, the APW was closed and the studies stored in its archives were no longer available. They were deemed anachronistic because since the 1960s, research on school and instruction in the GDR had been geared to a common, socialist educational system whose educational aim was to yield socialist personalities. As a consequence, Didactics had to serve societal and ideological tasks according to plan. On the

234

other hand, precisely this research on Instruction Didactics might be relevant for today's education that is increasingly determined by its economic benefit (Waterkamp 1990).

To sum up, one could say that due to the transformation of the educational systems after the reunification, many concepts conducive to improving school quality had to be abandoned by both systems. Sacrifices had to be made by the East, like giving up the former all-day schools that used to offer free day care and meals. School years were cut down to 12 in almost all of Germany while maintaining or even extending the scope of subject matter, putting high pressure on students, especially at grammar schools (*Gymnasium*). The rather critical attitude towards an achievement-based school system in the West decreased over time. But all in all it is safe to say that educational reforms after the re-unification and restructuring of the school systems led to tangible changes on both sides, leading in turn to a significantly increased workload for the students. Students', teachers' and parents' satisfaction with school life has since decreased. According to a survey by Statista, 43% of parents today are rather dissatisfied, and 11% very dissatisfied, with their school.[1] A study commissioned by the Bertelsmann Foundation found that only one third of children and youths enjoy going to school (Meinhold-Henschel; Beisenkamp; Menge 2003, p. 35).

The three bigger problem areas of the German school system have already been named: firstly, the early selection process following criteria of achievement and achievement motivation, in which migrants and the educationally disadvantaged mostly lose out; secondly, a high dropout rate and, thirdly, the high number of school leavers—even those completing school with a qualification—lacking the necessary skills of basic education. Unfortunately, these three big problem areas are currently not in the focus of interest in education research. In order to investigate these problems thoroughly, scientists would have to work together with students, teachers and parents because a realistic picture of the underlying problems can only be established with all stakeholders being involved.

---

1   http://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/191426/umfrage/zufriedenheit-von-eltern-mit-dem-deutschen-schulsystem/

Consequences

Improving schools will only be successful if schools and their stakeholders themselves take on responsibility for the quality of their school and instruction. It just won't do if the ministries and LEA set educational standards in a top-down approach and expect schools to abide by them. On the contrary, such prescriptive requirements often fail to take into account the actual needs of schools.

This is why teachers today are invited to reflect on, and improve, their way of teaching. Heads of school should be able to identify weaknesses in their school and to develop strategies to tackle them. Improving schools is a responsibility shared between teachers, head teachers, students and parents. They are all expected to actively contribute to school development if school is seen as a self-contained organisational unit responsible for its own development. As a "pedagogic action unit" (translation of "*pädagogische Handlungseinheit*", Fend 2008, p. 146) and a learning organisation, each individual school needs a certain freedom and autonomy to be able to optimally adapt to the ever-changing economic, demographic and political conditions.

But Helmut Fend (2008) also found that schools, even if they are given this much responsibility, will not necessarily react in an appropriate way to societal changes and political objectives. Schools seem to lack the necessary methodological research training which is why some important decisions are taken intuitively and often the wrong choices will be made. This is mostly due to the fact that teachers themselves lack the technical and methodological skills for research, and that not only they but also the head teachers will rely on their "common sense" which is often more of a preconception. If external but well-trained researchers conduct studies at a school, this may lead to a situation where the acting subjects themselves are not actively involved in the research which in turn leads to the creation of a twisted image of the situation at the school. On the other hand, representative comparative studies of performance, school quality research, output research etc. carry the risk of yielding results that are too general and do not apply to the school under investigation. As mentioned before, good school research needs to take a close look at the subjects of the sample in their lifeworld (*Lebenswelt*), the school.

(38)

However, research coming from within the schools is still outweighed by top-down approaches to research. Hilbert Meyer (2004), a renowned school researcher, criticised this situation in an interview and warned that too much research is done that leads to results which are often of no use to schools because they do not consider the schools' individual situation and specific challenges.[2]

According to Meyer, one way of avoiding this is to put school protagonists at the focus of interest, i.e. directly involve them in research as Iris Mortag also postulates in her book quoted above.

Quality of school and quality of life—independent or interdependent factors?

1. What is school quality in the first place? In answering this question, it proved difficult to identify criteria that are objective enough to define school quality. Mortag illustrates the search for a definition by outlining the discourse on how the concept of "school quality" emerged in Germany—in both German states—in the 1980s (2012, p. 15). She points out a constant interaction between school and society: Societal discourse determines the idea of what makes a good school while schools take on their tasks of socialisation, qualification, selection and integration assigned to them by society (Fend 1980).

Processes of change and re-orientation of society, especially with respect to its values, play a decisive role in curriculum and instructional design, and in defining learning objectives. Thus, the concept of "quality" remains a relative one, losing its objective perspective, i.e. it needs to be re-evaluated according to the respective social situation. As a consequence, it becomes complicated, if not impossible, to assess school quality independently, cross-regionally and with comparable results, as required in research.

However, Mortag still points out some options to narrow down the definition: "Usually, quality refers to a product or process matching the promises or expectations [of different stakeholders, B. D.]" (ibid., 2012, p. 15). With respect to school quality, this means that those quality criteria will gain in importance which stakeholders at the individual

---

2   http://YouTube/wach?v=1GYHcT-4JeI

schools set themselves. Most commonly, these will be normative ideas of what makes up a good school. Some of these ideas will be drawn from prominent theories such as Hilbert Meyer's ten characteristics of "good instruction" ("*guter Unterricht*", Meyer 2004). Pedagogical considerations based on a society's educational goals also play into this, as in the five basic didactical questions postulated by Wolfgang Klafki (1976) which monitor if instruction is relevant and important to students, with respect to societal issues. There is also an analytical approach in school research that facilitates the assessment of a school's quality level (status quo) and indicates development goals for the school (target status), following previously defined profiles or goals as agreed with the LEA.

2.   In assessing the concept of "quality of life", as compared to school quality, even more complex aspects need to be taken into account. In 1949, the WHO defined quality of life—in analogy with the concept of "health"—as the physical, psychological and social well-being of an individual (WHO 1949). Thus, quality of life comprises the "spheres of life, such as living space, family, working conditions, leisure time and personal pursuits, political activities, environment, health etc." (translation of Mambetalina 2007, p. 1 in: Mortag, 2012, p. 29). This illustrates the subjective nature of the evaluation of someone's living situation. It is no longer possible to objectively judge what different individuals define as quality of life precisely because it depends on the individuals' feelings about their living conditions and their/about future expectations (cf. ibid.).

With the quality of life being a multidimensional construct (including health, work, family etc.), it can only be defined by appropriate indicators which in turn need to be defined beforehand and must be well-founded. This can either be done assuming empirical objectivity, which is problematic, or by building on individual evaluations of the quality of life. The latter approach emphasises the subjective personal situation, which cannot be measured by objective evaluation. Quality-of-Life-Research has hugely contributed to this approach that gives greater weight to immaterial values. In conclusion, we can premise that any evaluation of the quality of life can only be implemented by asking the individuals, students and teachers, themselves.

(40)

How should schools contribute to improving the quality of life?

Mortag makes it a point (cf. pp. 38 ff.) that while analysing ways to improve the conditions of living, teaching and learning, priority should always be given to the improvement of learning and working conditions as well as to safeguarding the quality of life. According to her, schools have the task to contribute to the physical, psychological, mental and social well-being of its stakeholders. According to Wettstein (2005, p. 9 in Mortag 2012, p. 38), the individual, rather than objective criteria of performance and output, should take centre stage.

It should be taken into consideration that firstly, physical well-being in school is influenced by the constructional and architectural design as well as by the interior design of classrooms and other school facilities. Size and variability of classrooms play a decisive role, and so does the structuring of school hours, i.e. the rhythm of a school day, with alternating periods of concentration and relaxation. Schools need to offer more opportunities for students to move around. There is some important research from the Faculty of Sports Sciences at Leipzig University on how to "get moving in school" (Müller & Petzold 2006), allowing students to not only sit but move around in class. From the point of view of health, it is also important to provide students with high quality school meals.

Secondly, mental well-being must be bolstered by a sense of achievement, facilitated by a whole range of different ways of assessment. This requires the students' self-assessment, individual assessment standards, assessment through differentiated and individualised tasks etc. Achieving success in learning will boost motivation and the joy of learning. Social interaction will not be impacted because performance-oriented competition is less emphasised. In addition, partner classes or student buddy programmes may be introduced for mutual support, at the same time improving conflict management and communication skills.

A good school" considers the quality of life and school for students, teachers and parents alike

Just as including the different stakeholders into school research is something new, so is the evaluation of school quality from the students' perspective, a rather young line of research (Bergmann 2012, p. 87).

School research has only recently started to ask the students themselves about their school and their assessment of school quality. Two earlier educational schools of thought were revived in the process: the child-centred pedagogy ("*Pädagogik von Kinde aus*") originating from reform pedagogy (Key 1902; Montessori 1952) that lives on in today's child-centred instruction, including open learning formats as found in general schools, and emancipatory pedagogy, emphasising the self-responsibility of the individual subject (Adorno 1971), like e.g. in Klafki's critical-constructive didactics (Klafki 2000).

These two educational schools of thought can be seen in continuation of Reflective Educational Sciences (Lenzen 1992) which analyse pedagogic factors such as school and instruction, the teacher-student-relationship, the educational canon and the structures of educational systems, among other things, in order to reconstruct the conditions and processes of their development, the so-called "mythical knowledge" ("*Mythenwissen*", Lenzen 1996, p. 105f.) and the discourses and visible results they produced.

Such discourse-analytical reconstructions (cf. Foucault 2002; Jäger 2001) cannot comprehend the school if it is detached from the students' perspective. Because, in the heads and bodies of students, self-constructions are built that cannot be separated from societal discourses. Fairclough calls this the "colonising incursions of mediated representations" (Fairclough 2006, p. 153) while Bourdieu (1990) describes it as „incorporation". The same applies to teachers and parents. For instance, the stakeholders of a school tend to build a framework of communication within which they communicate or, individual acts of refusal may be enacted (such as daydreaming in school, playing truant, not preparing homework etc.), which can only be understood within the overall complex comprising society, school and individuals.

1. Students are the main addressees of school because it is mandatory for them to attend school. They are the addressees of the curriculum; they are the ones that are subjected to exams and assessment. They have the least freedom of decision to change anything within the school as an institution. "School is organised in order to convey to them knowledge and education, as well as the skills, the willingness and orientations relevant for active participation in social life" (Nölle 1995, p.

20 in Bergmann 2012, p. 90).

Because the obligatory nature of school for students is evident, they are denied active involvement in shaping school processes such as instruction or the school climate. But a democratic society needs to take a different approach. "From a democratic point of view, consensus cannot be reached and quality cannot be achieved if the students' views are not taken into account, if their opinions are not seen as potentially equal" (cf. Nölle 1995, p. 21 in Bergmann, p. 90). Moreover, students "gain special importance due to their triple role as, firstly, addressees of instruction, secondly, constitutive elements of educational contexts and, thirdly, active co-designers of these contexts" (translation of Bergmann 2012, p. 91). In order to achieve the students' endorsement for truly "good instruction", it is essential, according to Fichten (1991) and de Haan (2007), for students to be given the opportunity to present their own views in class so that their wishes and interests can be taken into account too, i.e. their individual lifeworlds (cf. lifeworld orientation, *Lebensweltorientierung*", according to Hans Thriesch 2005) are mirrored in the topics of instruction. Only if instruction also includes elements in which students have an active, controlling and creative role, will passivity, refusal and problems with attention decrease.

2.   Those who have chosen to be the teachers were sometimes not completely aware of the fact that they would be required to do more than just instructing children. Ever since the German Conference of the Ministers of Education (*Kultusministerkonferenz*, KMK) adopted its resolution in 2000, it has required teachers to display comprehensive skills. The KMK states expertise in teaching, student assessment, mandatory professional development and participation in school development as today's teachers' tasks. This, in turn, requires them to be experts of internal and external evaluation (KMK)[3]. Teachers also cooperate with parents and support their community with their commitment. Teachers in Germany teach an average of 26 hours of classes per week. This is a very demanding task and sometimes, teachers will fall ill under this high workload.

---

3 http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2000/2000_10_05-Aufgaben-Lehrer.pdf

Altenstein (2010, p. 9) quotes three typical sources of strain on teachers: 1. There are burdens on a personal level, leading to health problems. 2. There are burdens on the school level, caused by school itself: a poor school climate, little support at the workplace, difficult colleagues. A positive working environment that is important to maintain teachers' performance and health, depends notably on social support from the head of school and the staff. 3. Furthermore, Mortag quotes the importance of maintaining a balance between personal resources and the demands made by school. This can be achieved through targeted support measures offered by the school. But things turn difficult when there is no support to be expected from the side of the school (cf. Mortag 2012, p. 111).

The Potsdam Study on Teacher's Health (*Potsdamer Studie zur Lehrergesundheit*) by Arold, Schaarschmidt and Spörer (2002) was one of the first representative studies to ask teachers about the strains of their job. Researchers were able to identify four coping strategies that teachers display in the context of their work in school: 1. Pattern G, where G stands for Good Health (German: *Gesundheit*), resilience and contentment. 2. Pattern S, where S stands for a Slackening Attitude (German: *Schonungshaltung*), implying reduced engagement in school. 3. Pattern A, where A stands for Ambitiousness (German: *Anstrengung*(*sbereitschaft*)) and total exertion caused by self-exploiting behaviour. 4. Pattern B, where B stands for Burnout, a physical and mental state of resignation and exhaustion.

Schaarschmidt judges the professional group of teachers as one that applies unsuitable coping strategies: "The percentage of the desirable G-Pattern is small (17%); on the other hand, Risk Patterns A and B display a high frequency (30% each)" (translation of Schaarschmidt 2010, p. 12).

This is why we agree with Iris Mortag that measures to improve teachers' health and performance will only be effective once sustained changes in the schools' framework conditions are achieved. These changes must consider professional satisfaction, based on a positive social climate in school, teacher autonomy in instruction and a healthy environment (cf. Mortag 2012, p. 112).

Positive personal experiences with students and their parents are

helpful circumstances for teachers. If teachers are given greater autonomy and freedom in classroom planning—by the head of school, the parents and, last but not least, the students—this will also have a positive impact on professional satisfaction. This autonomy in educational work is also conducive to building an individual professional identity. It turns out that, when teachers can design their instruction creatively and open, when they are allowed to cover a broad variety of topics and have the opportunity to include issues from their students' individual lifeworlds for more variation in their classes, they are highly satisfied with this professional autonomy and take better care of themselves, too (cf. work-life-balance). This way, they avoid stress and the much-dreaded burnout (cf. Hilgenfeld 2012, p. 120f.).

But if teachers experience less autonomy, constant over-regulation and rigid framework conditions, if on top of that, their students display behavioural problems and are aggressive, and their parents controlling, then work becomes increasingly distressing for them (Mortag 2012, 121f.).

3. What about the parents' role? Is it possible for parents and schools to cooperate well? In Germany, parental cooperation is a right stipulated in school laws, i.e. parents have the right and the duty to contribute to school education. For instance in Saxony, "parent representatives [are] [...] independent bodies elected by and composed of the parents themselves. They work on a voluntary basis. The bodies of parental cooperation are entitled to support from the LEA and all those involved in school life, in order to be able to fulfil their tasks within the framework of the School Law for the Free State of Saxony [...] and the Regulation on Parental Cooperation. [...] The statutory bodies of parental cooperation are: the Parent Bodies of each class, the Parent Representatives, the Form Parent Representatives, the Parents Council and the Chairpersons of the Parents Council. Cross-regional bodies are: the District or Municipal Parents Council [...] and the Federal State Parents Council [...]" („*Sachsen-macht-Schule*" Portal)[4].

Due to their function for the school, parents are taken very seriously in their work in the school and with the teachers. In a repre-

---

4 http://www.bildung.sachsen.de/3361.htm

sentative education study in 2012, parents were given the opportunity to state their expectations regarding school and instruction. All in all, they agreed with the current goals of education policy: Most of the parents (84%) want the policy of equal opportunities in education to be continued. 80% expect schools to provide their children with a comprehensive general education. Also, most parents (79%) feel that weaker students should receive special assistance. Political objectives of aligning curricula with the demands of the labour market found less approval (only 44% of parents). Special assistance for gifted students was endorsed by only 52%, and only 28% wished to see the achievement principle implemented (TSN Emnid 2012, p. 3[5]).

According to an older study by Helmut Fend (1998, p. 129), parents can be shown to assess school differently from students, and differently from teachers. They are not pleased just because their children feel comfortable or teachers are well. To the contrary, they are hardly interested in these facts. Parents are satisfied with the school when discipline and pressure for achievement are both strong at the school. Parents seem to be suspicious of student-centred or even anti-authoritarian ("too" democratic) instruction. First and foremost, parents seem to be driven by worries that their children might not learn enough in school that demands are low and little control is exercised over them. Parents expect teachers to optimally support and assist—especially— their child: "In this, the child's performance is key. Satisfaction with their child's achievements is likely to have an effect on their satisfaction with the school" (Fend, 1998, p. 138, in: Mortag 2012, p. 130). Thus, parents assess school quality on the basis of their children's actual output results. School Pedagogy expert Werner Sachet therefore sees success of cooperation with parents in school as dependent on their children's learning success (Sacher in a 2012 presentation[6]).

The 2012 Study on Education mentioned before (TNS Emnid 2012, p. 8) found that parents generally feel under enormous pressure to facilitate the best possible learning conditions for their children. 91% of parents felt obliged to support their children with school demands, such

---

5 https://www.jako-o.de/medias/sys_master/8808453308446.pdf
6 http://li.hamburg.de/contentblob/3998828/data/download-pdf-vortrag-prof-sacher-2013-06-03.pdf

as doing homework with them—one third of them even indicated that they did extensive homework with their children. Parents will go to any length to make sure their children succeed in school. 63% jointly work through the subject matter with their children, 77% prepare exams together with them, and 31% of parents are involved in parental representation in order to actively collaborate in school.

There is a marked conflict of expectations between teachers and parents that some of the parents seem to be more aware of. Roughly, there are two different groups of parents: one group that cooperates with the school, and another one "fighting a lonely battle with their child about his/her school career, underpinned by opposition and rejection of huge parts of their school" (translation of Fend 1998, p. 189, in: p. 132–3).

Mortag points out that parents cannot be experts for the evaluation of a school's pedagogical quality (unless they are pedagogues themselves). But she also says that parents, representing an important reference group in the social system of the school, must not be ignored and should therefore be more involved. According to her, this is also the reason why it is important to include parents in concrete school research. External school evaluation and inspections make a first contribution in this respect by asking parents about their school. The results are highly relevant for the evaluation of the school. (p. 135–6)

Conclusion

According to Fend, the three groups of stakeholders in school may be described as follows: Parents are mostly concerned by a "care-interest" i.e. the wish that their children are properly being cared for, students mostly have a "fun-interest" whereas teachers predominantly display an "interest to minimise their burdens" (cf. Fend 1998, p. 189, in Mortag 2012, p. 132).

Education and teaching are especially effective when the interests of the school, the parents and the students are all taken into account and when the parents' and the school's educational responsibilities are well-aligned. This makes it essential for parents to accept the concepts of their children's school. Parental involvement and cooperation are the fundamental principles of a good school. Shared responsibilities must be

reflected in everyday work at the school (cf. Mortag 2012, p. 137).

Bibliography:

Adorno, Theodor: Erziehung zur Mündigkeit. Vorträge und Gespräche mit Hellmut Becker 1959–1969. Edited by Gerd Kadelbach. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt 1968/1971

Altenstein, Christine: Der Einfluss schulischer Merkmale auf das Beschwerdenerleben von Lehrern. Kovac, Hamburg 2010

Arold, Helga; Schaarschmidt, Uwe; Spörer, Nadine: Belastung im Lehrerberuf (IV). Ergebnisse der Potsdamer Studie zur Lehrergesundheit—ein Fallbeispiel. Lernwelten, 2002, p. 77–80

Bergmann, Alexander: Unterricht aus Schülersicht. In Mortag, Iris: Qualität des Lebens und Qualität der Schule. Zaklad Poligraficzny ZU 2012, p. 87–108

Bourdieu, Pierre: Homo Academicus. Standford University Press 1990.

Dahrendorf, Ralf: Bildung ist Bürgerrecht. Plädoyer für eine aktive Bildungspolitik. Nannen, Hamburg 1965

Dietmar Waterkamp, Dietmar: Handbuch zum Bildungswesen der DDR BWV Berliner-Wissenschaft, Berlin 1990

Fairclough, Norman: Global Capitalism and Critical Awareness of Language. (Original in: Language Awareness, 8, (2), 1999, p. 71–83), in Jaworski, Adam; Coupland, Nikolas: The Discourse Reader. Routledge Abingdon 2006, p. 146–157

Fend, Helmut: Qualität im Bildungswesen. Schulforschung zu Systembedingungen. Schulprofilen und Lehrerleistung. Juventa, Mannheim, München 1998

Fend, Helmut: Schule gestalten. Systemsteuerung, Schulentwicklung und Unterrichtsqualität. VS Publisher, Wiesbaden 2008

Fend, Helmut: Theorie der Schule. Urban & Schwarzberg, München 1980

Fichten, Wolfgang: Förderung der Handlungsfähigkeit durch schülernahen Unterricht. Die Schülerwahrnehmung und ihre Verarbeitung im Unterricht. In Lehrer-Schüler-Unterricht, Handbuch für den Schulalltag. Raabe Publisher, Stuttgart 1991

Foucault, Michel: Archaeology of Knowledge. Routledge, London 2002

Grotlüschen, Anke; Riekmann, Wibke: Leo.—Level-One Studie Literalität von Erwachsenen auf den unteren Kompetenzniveaus http://blogs.epb.uni-hamburg.de/leo/files/2011/12/leo-Presseheft_15_12_2011.pdf, 2011

(48)

Haan, Gerhard de: Grundlagen zur Demokratiepädagogik. Beltz, Weinheim, Basel 2007

Hilgenfeld, Franziska: Die Berufszufriedenheit von Lehrern, ihre Einflussfaktoren und Auswirkungen auf Lebens- und Schulqualität. In Mortag, Iris: Qualität des Lebens und Qualität der Schule. Zaklad Poligraficzny ZU 2012, p 117–126

Jäger, Siegfried: Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. DISS, Duisburg 2001

Key, Ellen: Das Jahrhundert des Kindes. Deutsche Erstausgabe 1902, new published Beltz, Weinheim und Basel 1992

Klafki, Wolfgang: Aspekte kritisch-konstruktiver Erziehungswissenschaft. Handlexikon zur Erziehungswissenschaft. Edited by Roth, Leo; Ehrenwirth Publisher, Weinheim 1976, 50–55

Klafki, Wolfgang: Kritisch-konstruktive Pädagogik. Herkunft und Zukunft. In Eierdanz, Jürgen; Kremer, Armin (ed.): Weder erwartet noch gewollt—Kritische Erziehungswissenschaft und Pädagogik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Zeit des Kalten Krieges. Schneider, Baltmannsweiler 2000, p. 152–178

Lenzen, Dieter: Handlung und Reflexion. Vom pädagogischen Theoriedefizit zur Reflexiven Erziehungswissenschaft. Beltz, Weinheim, Basel 1996

Lenzen, Dieter: Reflexive Erziehungswissenschaft am Ausgang des postmodernen Jahrzehnts oder Why should anybody be afraid of red, yellow and blue? In Benner, Dietrich; Lenzen, Dieter; Otto, Hans-Uwe (Ed.): Erziehungswissenschaft zwischen Modernisierung und Modernitätskrise. Beltz, Weinheim 1992, p. 75–92

Meinhold-Henschel, Sigrid; Beisenkamp, Anja; Menge, Annett: Entwicklungsperspektiven für die kommunale Schullandschaft. Wie zufrieden sind Schüler, Eltern, Lehrer und Schulleiter? Bertelsmann Foundation, Gütersloh 2003

Meyer, Hilbert: Was ist guter Unterricht? Cornelsen, Berlin 2004

Montessori, Maria: Kinder sind anders. (1952) Herder, Freiburg 1967

Mortag, Iris: Qualität des Lebens und Qualität der Schule. Wohlf?hlen in der Schule aus der Sicht der Beteiligten. Zaklad Poligraficzny ZU 2012

Müller, Christina; Petzold, Ralph: Bewegte Schule. Academia, St. Augustin 2006

Picht, Georg: Die deutsche Bildungskatastrophe. Analysen und Dokumentationen. Walter, Freiburg im Breisgau 1964

Schaarschmidt, Uwe: Die Situation hat sich nicht wesentlich verändert. Was hat

die Potsdamer Lehrerstudie bewirkt? In B&E—Das bildungspolitische Magazin des VBE-Bundesverband, Heft 4, 2010, p. 12–13

Statistisches Bundesamt, Schulen auf einen Blick, 2012 https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Schulen/BroschuereSchulenBlick0110018129004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

Thiersch, Hans: Lebensweltorientierte Soziale Arbeit. Aufgaben der Praxis im sozialen Wandel. Juventa, München 2005

School is More than Just a Place to Learn;
School is, First and Foremost, a Place to Live

Barbara Drinck

School has always been understood as a place for socializing, where children and young people gain important experiences by interacting with peers and teachers. It is at school that students learn the ground rules of living together as a society, which they need for their lives, and especially for the professional competencies they will need. Therefore, a school is far more than just a place to learn, but is foremost an important living space for pupils, including the design of spaces, facilities (buildings, playgrounds, and schoolyards), curriculum and instructional design, as well as leisure time required in living spaces.

Schule wird immer als Sozialisationort verstanden, an dem Kinder und Jugendliche wichtige Erfahrungen im Umgang mit Gleichaltrigen und Lehrern machen. Sie erfahren die Grundregeln des sozialen Zusammenlebens, die sie fuer ihr weiteres Leben, insbesondere fuer die berufliche Komptenz, benoetigen. Daher ist Schule weit mehr als bloss ein Lernort, Shule ist in erster Linie ein wichtiger Lebensraum fuer Schueler, Lehrer, und auch die Eltern. Der Aufsatz diskutiert die verschiedenen Aspekte der These, dass Schule sich in der Gestaltung der Raeume und architektonischen Anlagen (Gebaeude, Schulhof und Gaerten) und in der Organisation von Unterricht und Freizeit auf die Ansprueche an einen Lebensraum ausrichten muss.