

# The Development of All-Day Schooling in Germany: How was it possible in this Conservative Welfare State?

*Sandra Augustin-Dittmann*

Technische Universität Braunschweig (Germany)

## Abstract

The German school system has been changed considerably during the past years. Traditional half-day schooling was supplemented nationwide by full-time alternatives. The establishment of all-day schooling modifies the German welfare state in a double model which has—according to Esping-Andersen—been rated a conservative type: Firstly, the traditionally separated relation between education and social policy is getting closer. Secondly, the welfare state's support of the traditional family model is supplemented by the perspective of reconciliation of family and working life. This article shows how this change from traditional half-day schooling to the development of all-day schools in Germany was possible.

## Zusammenfassung

Das deutsche Schulsystem hat sich in den letzten Jahren stark verändert. Das traditionelle Halbtagschulsystem wurde bundesweit sukzessive um ganztägige Alternativen ergänzt. Der Ausbau der Ganztagschule verändert den deutschen Sozialstaat, der zu den konservativen Typen nach Esping-Andersen gezählt wird, in einer doppelten Weise: Erstens wird das traditionell stark getrennte Verhältnis von Bildungs- und Sozialpolitik im Zuge ganztägiger Angebote deutlich enger. Zweitens wird die traditionelle Unterstützung des klassischen Familienbilds durch den deutschen Sozialstaat um die Perspektive der Vereinbarkeit von Familie und Beruf erweitert. Der vorliegende Beitrag zeigt, wie dieser Wandel vom traditionellen Halbtagschulsystem zum Ausbau von Ganztagschulen in Deutschland möglich wurde.

## 1 Introduction

In the recent past, the German school system has been changed considerably: the traditional half-day school—open only until noon—has been supplemented by the alternative of all-day mod-

els. This development has strong impacts on the structure of the German welfare state. The promotion of all-day schools, on the one hand changes the relationship between social policy and the educational system, and on the other hand affects family policy and the underlying gender relations. Accordingly, the German welfare state as a conservative type—following Esping-Andersen (1990)—becomes more preventive and more women-friendly. In the light of the long tradition of the German half-day school and its social implications this development is quite astonishing.

Therefore, the main concern of this article is to explain how this change from the half-day school system to the establishment of full-time models was possible. Chapter 2 shows the embedding of the half-day school in the conservative German welfare state and its historical role for the efficiency of the social order. It shows that half-day schooling is an expression and a stabilization of the conservative structure, in which the preservation of the status quo and the traditional family model are important factors. The chronological course of events must be broken at that point to show first of all the fundamental change, which has been implemented through the promotion of all-day schooling. Before analyzing the political program, the impact of these policies for the German educational and social system is demonstrated: A double de-familialization can be identified, which modifies the traditional arrangement of the German welfare state. It is shown that the further development of all-day schooling is part of a third order change (Hall 1993) and matches the discourse on a so-called sustainable family policy.

After demonstrating the outcome, Chapter 3 brings the formation of the federal program for the promotion of all-day schools into focus. The program ‘Future of Education and Care’—the so-called IZBB (*Investitionsprogramm ‘Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung’*)—was signed on May 12<sup>th</sup> 2003 by the social-democratic Federal Minister of Education, Edelgard Bulmahn, and the 16 Ministers of Education of the federal states. According to this administrative agreement (*Verwaltungsvereinbarung*) the federal government put four billion Euros at the federal states’ disposal to invest it into the development of all-day

schools from 2003 to 2009<sup>1</sup> (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung 2003). In fact, the concept of all-day schooling was not new in Germany, but very few schools of this type already existed. There has been much public discussion on this matter and committees of the educational system called for such reform during the time of educational expansion (Deutscher Bildungsrat 1969; Bund-Länder-Konferenz für Bildungsplanung 1973). However few all-day schools were created at that time. It seems as if this well-known policy has suddenly been reawakened at a critical time. How was that possible?

To answer this question, the emergence of the IZBB will be explained by application of the multiple streams approach (Kingdon 1995). The combination of Esping-Andersen and Kingdon might be initially surprising. But whereas Chapter 2 is based on Esping-Andersen criteria to show the change in substance, his approach is not suited to explicate the process of policy change because it zooms in on stability and path dependency. In contrast, the multiple streams approach enables an analysis of how policy change is developing. It allows a holistic consideration of the political setting in which the change emerges. Esping-Andersen and Kingdon are combined because Esping-Andersen's typology can define *which* modifications happened and Kingdon's theoretical approach can explain *how* these changes came about.

The multiple streams approach makes comprehensible how certain solutions at certain times are converted into political decisions. It assumes that there are three independent streams flowing through the political system. Within the problem stream, it is defined what are circumstances to live with and what are problems to be solved by politicians. In the policy stream, political ideas are discussed. Here the decision is made whether an idea survives or is rejected. The politics stream contents political events like elections, campaigns or public opinion. In this stream, the mood is in favor or against a specific idea. The three streams can be coupled by policy entrepreneurs if a window of opportunity

---

<sup>1</sup> Initially the program was intended to last until 2007. It was extended in 2006, since the federal states had not been able to invest the whole amount of money until 2007 (BMBF 2006).

opens. These policy windows are occasions that make political reforms possible; for instance crisis, catastrophes, or the ‘honeymoon’ of a new government. Policy entrepreneurs are advocates of a particular idea (e.g. politicians, civil servants, lobbyists). They invest their resources—time, money, access to important people—to accomplish them. Describing the process of agenda setting in the US-American political system, the founder of the approach, John W. Kingdon, does not follow the idea of rational choice. Instead, he builds up on the assumptions of the garbage can model (Cohen et al. 1972) and questions the logic of the policy cycle (e.g. Lasswell 1956). While the policy cycle demonstrates the political process as a sequence of different phases, the multiple streams approach supposes that the streams flow *simultaneously*.

Kingdon’s basic question is: “How does an ideas time come?” (Kingdon 1995: 1). Nikolaos Zahariadis added two more dimensions to the approach. One the one hand, he does not only adopt it for agenda setting, but also for the stage of political decision making. On the other hand, he does not only apply it to analyzing the presidential system of the United States, but also to parliamentary systems like in Great Britain, Germany or Greece. This way, the role of political parties becomes an important factor for the entire process (Zahariadis 2003, 2005). How the approach can explain the case at hand is shown in Chapter 3. On this basis, modification proposals are made in the conclusion. In the following Chapter 2, the shift of the German welfare state provoked by the promotion of all-day schools is analyzed.

## **2. The Development of All-Day Schooling as a Change in Educational and Family Policy**

In the following, the situation before IZBB will be described. Half-day schooling was an important part of the entire social arrangement of the traditional conservative German welfare state. Subsequently, the impact of the program is analyzed: the establishment of all-day schools in the recent past entails a double de-

familialization in the conservative German welfare state and therefore changes it profoundly.

## ***2.1 Half-day Schooling in a Conservative Welfare State***

In Esping-Andersen's typology, Germany comes very close to the ideal type of a conservative welfare state, which is distinguished from the liberal and the social democratic one. The liberal type—shaped by liberal political forces—is characterized by a low degree of de-commodification, a less removed system of social security and its focus on poor relief. In contrast, the social democratic type—based on the activity of Social Democrats and strong labor movements—is a developed welfare state with high de-commodification and a universal claim. Formative characteristics of the conservative type are its development by conservative forces, the corporative design and the arising preservation of status differentials, as well as the upholding of traditional familyhood (Esping-Andersen 1990: 26-32). Germany relates to these three characteristics, and, accordingly, can be called conservative in a triple manner. Firstly, the development of the German welfare state was strongly influenced by conservative parties and the churches. Secondly, the core of German social policy is the system of social insurances and therefore the logic of actuarialism, which conserves the status quo of the insurants. And thirdly, its structure encourages traditional ways of living and classical gender roles. The development of all-day schools modifies the last two points of the conservative structure. Therefore, they elaborated further in the following.

### **2.1.1 Preservation of status quo**

Germany plays a significant historical role in the development of the social insurances, since they were established by Bismarck (Esping-Andersen 1990: 48). Until now, they are—quantitatively and qualitatively—the most important parts of the German welfare state. They are organized as contribution systems of all wageworkers. The amount of monetary benefits of health, unemployment and pension insurances depends on the previous in-

come. This actuarial principle maintains the living standards of the German insurants. Likewise, the actuarial principle also maintains social inequalities, since the social positions are carried into the phase of joblessness (Bäcker et al. 2008: 65). Hence, the German welfare state targets the conservation of the status quo of social stratification (Esping-Andersen 1990: 75).

The emphasis on the preservation of the status quo continues when looking at education as part of the welfare state. In contrast to many countries, the German welfare state traditionally does not include the educational system. Although education is a central parameter to combat social inequalities, the two policies were traditionally strictly separated in Germany. Furthermore, different federal levels are responsible: Social policy lies in the authority of the federal government, whereas education is located at the federal states (Kaufmann 2003: 269). Beyond the deep interconnection between social and educational policies concerning the distribution of opportunities in life, there are also great differences. Social policy predominantly reacts to problems that already occurred, and compensates with monetary benefits. Educational policy affects future conditions by qualifying children and adults in public institutions. That is to say, the logic of social policy is the preservation of the status quo. In contrast, educational policy is distinguished by the creation of status identity (Allmendinger 1999: 36-37).

Several international comparisons of educational performance pointed out that most countries can be classified primarily a welfare system *or* an educational system on the basis of financing (Castels 1989; Heclo 1985; Flora and Heidenheimer 1981). In this regard, education and social security are two alternative strategies of handling social inequality (Heidenheimer 1981: 269-271). Esping-Andersen's typology can be amended by educational policy. By comparing how different countries invest in both policies, a specific coherence emerges: Whereas liberal states pay much more for the educational system than for social security, and social democratic states make high investments in both, social and educational policy, conservative states focus on social policy and, therefore, more on the preservation of the status quo (Hega and Hokenmaier 2002; Schmidt 1999: 181-183).

Measured by the gross domestic product, the budget of German educational policy is comparatively ‘middle-rate’ (Schmidt 2002). All social democratic and most of the liberal states invest more in the field of education (Schmidt et al. 2006: 14). This low level can be explained by the competition between the education system and the high investments in social policy, especially in the pension and unemployment system (Schmidt et al. 2006: 35-37; Nikolai 2007). At this point, two issues become apparent. Firstly, the German welfare state is dominated by the preservation of the status quo, and secondly the status creating educational policy plays only a subordinate role in this setting.

### 2.1.2 Encouragement of Traditional Family Models

The German welfare state’s conservative structure is also shown by its focus towards the social concept of traditional family types. Esping-Andersen disregards the traditional division of labor between women and men in his typology. For this reason, he was criticized by feminist welfare state researchers (Lewis 1992; Orloff 1993; Lewis and Ostner 1994; Sainsbury 1996), who created alternative typologies. Sainsbury composed two ideal types to clarify the welfare states’ effects on gender relations. On the one hand, the ‘breadwinner model’ demonstrates the social concept of traditional familyhood and stereotyped gender-roles. On the other hand, the ‘individual model’ shows a concept, in which both—men and women—are responsible for the family income, for the care of children and the household. The welfare state’s benefits are addressed to both sexes equally (Sainsbury 1996: 152-153). Esping-Andersen reacted to the feminists’ critique by integrating a new parameter in his analysis: Defamilialization measures the level of women’s freedom from family commitments and, accordingly, the freedom to pursue gainful occupation. Sweden is an example for a strong defamilializing welfare state, as the developed domain of public childcare promotes female labor. In contrast, the German welfare state is familializing, because many duties are passed to the families to handle them by themselves (Esping-Andersen 1999: 144-146). In Sainsbury’s terms, Germany can be described as a strong

‘breadwinner model’. The German Basic Constitutional Law already refers to that point: Article 6 posits the protection of marriage and family and codifies childcare as a natural right and the highest duty of parents. Thus, the German welfare state stabilizes the traditional role allocation in families by privileging it in the social and taxation laws (Gerhard 2003: 281). That is shown in the conception of the social insurances, especially in the health and pension system, in which the housewife is provided for by her husbands’ entitlements (Klammer 2005: 342; Leitner 2002: 173). The encouragement of traditional familyhood becomes definite in the German taxation law: The highest savings from married couples tax splitting (*Ehegattensplitting*) are achieved when one spouse has a high income and the other one is not working. With the married couples tax splitting, the tax system sets marginal incentives for married women to have a job (Schratzenstaller 2002: 190). Additionally, placing emphasis on monetary benefits and disregarding public services, the traditional German family policy makes the reconciliation of family and work difficult. In Western Germany, an appropriate offering of public childcare is missing, mainly for children under three years of age. In addition, many facilities close at noon (Gottschall 2004: 130; Klammer 2005: 325-227).

### 2.1.3 The Half-day Schooling System

The half-day school is at the same time an expression and a stabilization of the setting, which has just been described. Part-time schooling supports the welfare states’ focus on the preservation of the status quo, because the short time is exclusively reserved for knowledge transfer, whereas units of individual advancement are not intended. They are passed to the afternoon, managed by parents. That way, social strata are replicated by the school system. The ‘Programme for International Student Assessment’ (PISA) points out that in no other country the interconnection between family background and school career is as high as in Germany (Baumert and Schümer 2001: 384). Moreover, the half-day school supports the ‘breadwinner model’, as it assumes a mother who is home at least at noon—caring for her child and

supervising homework. Additionally, the half-day system implies a full-time working husband, who earns enough money to support a whole family (Gottschall 2004: 130; Gottschall and Hagemann 2002: 14-16).

Half-day models are rare in international comparison. All Anglo-American countries have full-time school systems and also the French system is an all-day model. Since the educational reforms of the 1960s und 1970s, Scandinavian schools are also organized as full-time models. In Southern and Eastern European states, part-time and full-time patterns coexist, so that parents can choose. Germany and the German-speaking countries are single cases of having traditionally almost exclusively half-day schools (Alleman-Ghionda 2009: 194-196). Historically, the German development can be explained by three factors: After World War II, a ‘triple front’ (Hagemann and Mattes 2008: 9) against all-day schools formed in the German society. Education in the Federal Republic of Germany ought to be separated firstly from the national socialist education, which was lasting all-day and was an important instrument to create young national socialist , and secondly from the educational policy reforms in the Soviet-occupied zone, where all-day models were intended. Thirdly, they should be separated from the attempts of the Western Allies to implement their own school systems, i.e. full-time comprehensive schools. In the Democratic Republic of Germany, all-day models were built up in the 1960s and became—like working mothers—part of the social normality (Hagemann and Mattes 2008: 9-12; Mattes 2009). Not only the development, but also the persistence of half-day schools in the Federal Republic of Germany can be traced back, amongst others, to the Cold War competition between East and West Germany (Hagemann 2006: 246).

More fundamental changes were not implemented until German reunification. The 1990s were shaped by divided school systems and family ideologies in the Eastern and Western federal states. All-day schools were common in the eastern part of Germany, while the western part was shaped by half-day facilities. A nationwide movement started with the federal government’s program for the promotion of all-day schools in 2003, whose devel-

opment will be explained in the following chapter. At first, the change of educational and family policy (and therefore of the entire welfare system), which was caused by this program, will be demonstrated.

## ***2.2 The Impact of IZBB: Double De-Familialization in a Conservative Welfare State***

After signing the program in May 2003, the cash outflow was quite slow. In April 2005, most of the federal states announced plans for constructing all-day schools, but there were only few realizations. It was doubtful that the program was going to be a success story. But bit by bit, the capital outflow by the federal states increased. More and more all-day schools were built up in Germany, as will be shown in the following. Finally, the outcome of the IZBB exceeded the output. The output was just an administrative agreement, in which the federal government placed four billion Euros at the federal states' disposal. But the program had a greater outcome. It led to the establishment of full-time models, to the acceptance of all-day schooling in the German society and to a policy change in the German welfare state.

### **2.2.1 Establishment of All-Day Schooling**

In the course of the program, the spread of all-day schools has increased considerably. The statistics of the Conference of the German Educational Ministers (*Kultusministerkonferenz*) shows that in 2002 only 16.3 percent of the units of administration (*Verwaltungseinheiten*) were organized as all-day models, while this rate was 38.9 percent in 2007 (Kultusministerkonferenz 2008: A 1, Kultusministerkonferenz 2009: A 1). Accordingly, almost 40 percent of all schools in Germany provide full-time offers. Meanwhile, they have been accepted in society as a whole as the following points demonstrate. In the run-up to IZBB, the CDU/CSU remained skeptical about the development of all-day schooling. These days, Conservatives are determined to carry on promoting full-time models. The former Prime Minister of the federal state of Hesse, Roland Koch, who keenly criticized the

program in the first place, called the all-day school a central issue of his educational policy: On the fourth nationwide congress of all-day schools in 2007, he announced to convert all elementary schools and thereafter all schools in Hesse into all-day schools until 2015 (Koch 2007). In the 2008 election campaign in Hesse, he demanded full-time offers for all children close to their homes (Welt Online 2008). Beyond the consensus of the political forces, this school type became widely accepted by schools and pupils. Although the IZBB expired, more and more schools asked for funds to keep on building up all-day offers. A senior civil servant in the Ministry of Education in the federal state of Lower Saxony cites an example in an interview<sup>2</sup>. Even though the program ended, there were 234 new applications in March 2009 in Lower Saxony—as many as never before (Interview Temming 2009: 19). Moreover, the affirmation in society continued to rise. In 2009, more than 50 percent of the German population stated that they want all-day schools not only as an alternative to the half-day system, but as standard in the education field (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung 2009).

All in all, considerable changes in the German school system have happened. The SPD spokesman of educational policy, Ernst-Dieter Rossmann, draws a parallel to the educational dawn (*Bildungsaufbruch*) in the era of Willy Brandt (Interview Rossmann 2008: 4). Pointing out the extent of change, the former Minister of Education of the federal state of North Rhine-Westphalia, Barbara Sommer (CDU), compared the development of all-day schools to the implementation of compulsory education in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Sommer 2009: 4). These remarks show the dimension of change that was caused by the IZBB. The following parts analyze the modifications in substance.

<sup>2</sup> This article is based upon a case study to reconstruct the implementation and the impact of IZBB. Methodically, the study draws on documentary analysis and elite interviews. Some of the documents and the interviews are presented here. Usually, interviewees were made anonymous. However, as there are only few experts in the case of IZBB, true anonymity cannot be assured. It would have been easy to reconstruct the identity of the involved persons. Therefore the interviewed experts have agreed to be mentioned by name.

### 2.2.2 Double De-Familialization

The development of all-day schools provokes a structural shift in school policy and, subsequently, also in the field of family policy. The former Minister of Education and Research, Edelgard Bulmahn, describes the impacts of IZBB as a cultural change in a double mode:

The IZBB has caused a cultural change in two respects. On the one hand, this all-day-school program has enabled us to focus all our pedagogical efforts on the important demand for the specific development of the individual child, which is crucial for education. [...] The second success of the program lies in the fact that now nobody in the public discourse dares to claim that all-day schooling takes away responsibility from parents or that those parents would neglect their primary responsibility for the upbringing and education of the child [...]. (Interview Bulmahn 2008: 2<sup>3</sup>)

The modifications described can be considered as a double de-familialization in the German conservative welfare state. As exposed in the previous part, de-familialization measures the extent to which family responsibilities are relaxed either by state or by market provisions. Thereby, it indicates the states' contribution to promote women's employment. The concept can be expanded to the field of education. All-day schools can establish offers of individual advancement in school structure. Therefore, high quality courses become accessible for children with low socio-economic family background, too. In this regard, de-familialization corresponds to the isolation of educational opportunities and social origin. It is hard to say to what extent the German full-time offers assure the improvement of individual advancement, though. Since all-day schools are still emerging, there are not many studies yet. However, much more research has been conducted on the US-American extra-curricular offers. Numerous studies demonstrate the positive impacts on academic motivation and performance: Structured leisure facilities and mainly specific offers of academic advancement enhance the ambition and the grade point average of participating children (for an overview see: Miller and Truong 2009). For Germany, there is

---

<sup>3</sup> The citations (documents and interviews) were translated by the author.

only one survey in this realm: the study on the development of all-day schools (*Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagsschulen—StEG*), which started in 2005. On this data base, it was possible to show that the common decline of motivation and output of the pupils from class 5 to class 7 is decreasing when the children take part in full-time offers. This result becomes even more evident when considering that both—academic and free time offers—were implicated. At this point, the high potential for enhancing academic advancement is evident. Summing up, there is a positive interrelation between all-day schools and the improvement of academic motivation and achievement (Fischer et al. 2009: 160). In this way, the development of all-day schools involves a change in educational policy, from preserving the status quo of social stratification to strengthening individual advancement. Thus, the proportion of status creating, preventive social policy is on the increase. Accordingly, a deeper connection between educational and social policy is occurring in Germany. At this point, it is important to say that all-day schools have great opportunities to improve individual advancement in the future.

Whereas the impacts on educational policy have been insufficiently studied up to the present, considerable changes have already been identified in the case of family policy (e.g. Blum in this issue). The development of all-day schools improves work-life balance in Germany. Nationwide, more than half of the new all-day schools built up by IZBB-capital are elementary schools (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung 2009). Providing day care primarily for young children, these new schools tend to allow both parents to keep a job. The so-called StEG (*Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagsschulen*) shows the effects that have already occurred in the field of family policy. In total, mainly children whose both parents are working and children with working single parents are sharing full-time offers. The children's attendance increases with increasing labor time of their mothers: Children from non-working mothers attend to 30.6 percent, children from part-time working mothers to 32.3 percent and children from full-time working mothers to 45.3 percent (Klieme et al. 2008). Furthermore, all-day schools encourage mothers to take up employment. Particularly full-time offers in elementary

schools entailed significant commencement and extension of female employment: 35 percent of mothers whose children attend full-time offers regularly began to work (again). In addition to their work performance, mothers of attending children started academic studies or advanced vocational training to a definite higher extent (Züchner 2009: 275-277). Up to now, a considerable part of women's labor participation has been realized. Furthermore, the pure opportunity of letting children attend an all-day school explicitly increases gender equality in Germany, compared to the situation before IZBB. Against this background, the former orientation towards the social concept of traditional familyhood in the conservative welfare state changes to one that includes reconciliation of work and family life and establishes a higher freedom of choice between different family models.

However, several measures encouraging traditional family models, like the taxation system, persist. However, in the recent past the German welfare state moved towards the 'individual model'. Mainly, the change to a so-called "sustainable family policy" (cf. Ahrens 2010 in this issue) influenced this development. The discourse concerning the concept of sustainability aims to modernize family models and gender roles by arguing in economic terms. In this vein, the Seventh Family Report, edited by the Federal Family Ministry under of the former Minister of Family, Elderly, Women and Youth, Renate Schmidt, points out that against the background of demographic changes, there is an economic necessity to realize reconciliation of work and family life (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend 2006: XXIV). Some changes mentioned in the discourse of this so-called sustainable family policy, like the federal act of parental benefit and parental leave (*Bundeselterngeld- und Elternzeitgesetz*) and the children advancement act (*Kinderförderungsgesetz*), will be discussed in Chapter 3.

### **3. The Implementation of IZBB: how was it possible?**

After revealing the change of the German welfare state, the question of how it was possible to accomplish a program to promote

all-day schools in a conservative welfare state is to be posed. The following analysis of the implementation of the IZBB is structured according to the concept of the multiple streams approach. Methodically, the following paragraphs base on an analysis of documents as well as on expert interviews conducted with relevant persons from the political and administrative system (Gläser and Laudel 2006; Mayring 2003; Meuser and Nagel 2005). The intention is to reconstruct the setting in which the IZBB developed. In contrast to causal explanations which tend to answer ‘why’ questions (Héritier 2008: 61), this is a holistic constitutive explanation. It aims to answer ‘how possible’-questions and explicates the entire context (Wendt 1999: 83). The most important conclusions are as follows (for a more encompassing perspective see Augustin-Dittmann 2011).

### ***3.1 Problem Stream***

In the problem stream, several circumstances have made that all-day schools were seen as a solution for societal problems. First of all, the results of the first PISA-study published in 2001 shocked the German society. German pupils’ achievements were below average compared to all 32 participating countries (Artelt et al. 2001: 102). Furthermore, the social selectivity of the school system is in no other country as high as in Germany. In this context, the social democratic government judged the federal organization of educational policy to be problematic and decided to arrange it more uniformly. However, as already explained the federal states are responsible for educational policy in Germany. The federal government has the right to intervene in some issues in the field of higher education, but not in the field of school policy. Accordingly, the former German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder (SPD) published a famous article in the German weekly journal Die ZEIT in which he questioned the division of the German educational policy in 16 responsible federal states: “Due to the bad German performance in PISA, the whole federal organization of education policy is to be on trial. [...] We don’t need a 16-fold promise of salvation” (Schröder 2002).

In addition to that, the opportunities to reconcile work and family life were insufficient at that time. Due to the increase of women's labor participation rate and because of skill shortages resulting from demographic changes, arrangements of work life balance were seen as highly in need of improvement.

### ***3.2 Policy Stream***

In the policy stream, the idea of all-day schools developed into a generally accepted model. After the concept had been discussed prominently during the phase of educational expansion, it remained less recognized in the following time. Nevertheless, the need for full-time offers rose at the same time, as a report for the Federal Ministry of Education and Science shows (Bargel and Kuthe 1991). A new input occurred during the electoral campaign in the federal state Rhineland-Palatinate in 2001. The Social Democratic party (SPD) intensified the softening up process of the idea by announcing a comprehensive all-day school program if they should get re-elected (SPD Rhineland-Palatinate 2001). Especially the nationwide debate in the 'Forum Bildung'—a committee established in 1999, meant to put forward educational reforms—encouraged the de-ideologization of the all-day school. Mainly the conservative parties (CDU/CSU) judged this concept as an illegitimate intervention of the state in the parents' responsibility for education based on article 6 of the German Constitutional Law. However, the promotion of full-time models has been supported by all members of the 'Forum Bildung'<sup>4</sup> and was unanimously included into the recommendations. Nevertheless, the CDU/CSU remained reserved concerning the federal state's activities in the field of education.

### ***3.3 Politics Stream***

The politics stream was shaped by three issues. Firstly, there was an explicit agreement with regard to all-day schooling in the pub-

---

<sup>4</sup> Those were the Federal Minister of Education, the Ministers of Education of the federal states, representatives of the trade unions and the employer associations, scientists, students and pupils.

lic opinion and in most of the parties and organizations. Even employers' and employees' organizations agreed. The chairman of the 'Forum Bildung' pointed out the importance of this issue. "There already had been a consensus on this between employers and employees at that time. Because of the complex composition of 'Forum Bildung', this claim would not have been made without that all-over willingness to achieve consensus" (Interview Koch 2008: 6). Secondly, the conservatives ambivalently rejected the federal states' intervention, but favored all-day offers for children in deprived areas as well as the extension of afternoon childcare for working mothers.

Full-time offers inside or out of schools should be expanded in line with demand. But all-day schooling is no universal remedy. On the contrary, a poorly equipped all-day school would just boost recent problems. Proper offerings, however, are reasonable for people in deprived areas and in cases where parents clearly signal a need to advance their compatibility of career and family. (Federal Board of Educational Policy of CDU (Bundesfachausschuss Bildungspolitik der CDU) 2002)

Thirdly, full-time models were not judged to be important at the responsible level of the federal states' Ministries of Education. Except for Rhineland-Palatinate, there were almost no plans to promote all-day schooling.

### ***3.4 Window of Opportunity***

The results of the first PISA study opened a window of opportunity as it shocked the German society. So to speak, the home country of Goethe and Schiller was ranked on place 21 of 32 participating countries in the area of reading competences. Furthermore, Germany led the scale of social selectivity. In this situation, the actors of the educational system did not only agree on reforming the system, but thought of it as their duty. As already mentioned, the German system of federalism defines that the federal state is not allowed to intervene in school policy. Yet, the internalization of educational policy (Martens and Wolf 2006) enabled the federal government to act, because the pressure of public opinion legitimated this intervention. The case shows the logic of benchmark-studies: "Countries that deviate from rec-

ommended policy models or rank low in international league tables face pressure to legitimate their policy approaches in light of „international scrutiny” (Holzinger and Knill 2005: 785).

### ***3.5 Policy Entrepreneur***

The Federal Minister of Education and Research, Edelgard Bulmahn, took the occasion to attach the idea of all-day schools to the problem of the shocking German PISA performance. As a policy entrepreneur she was able to join the streams. When she became Minister in 1998, she initiated the formation of the ‘Forum Bildung’ to start a nationwide discussion on reforming the educational system. In this committee, she spoke up for the promotion of all-day schools. After the release of the first PISA results, Bulmahn managed to persuade responsible actors in the SPD of her ideas, amongst them the party leader Franz Müntefering, the Minister of Finance Hans Eichel and the Chancellor Gerhard Schröder (Interview Bulmahn 2008: 5-6; Interview Koch 2008: 10). A case of serendipity helped her being successful: The vendue of the UMTS- royalties augmented the national budget so that there was additional money to spend. Gerhard Schröder announced the IZBB program in a government declaration of April 2002 (Schröder 2002). The Christian Democratic policy makers reacted ambiguously. Indeed, all of the persons in charge at the level of the federal states agreed on not allowing the federal government to engage in the field of school policy. But all of them had a stake in gaining additional financial resources. Whereas the Social Democratic ruled federal states could be convinced quite quickly, the Christian Democrats remained ambivalent as described previously. On this basis, Bulmahn framed the situation. She pointed out that this program was a mandatory answer to the shocking PISA results and emphasized that all-day schools improve the quality of the German educational system by sustaining the individual advancement of every child. In his government declaration, Schröder included arguments that were also approved of by the CDU/CSU: He referred to advantages for kids in deprived areas and to the enhancement of the reconciliation of

work and family life. Later on, Bulmahn implicated these issues, too.

Bulmahn provided four billion Euros for promoting all-day schools. In this regard she offered ‘golden reins’, which convinced the *Länder* of building up all-day schools with the additional financial resources provided by the federal government. The Ministers of Education of the federal states tried to slacken these reins by rendering the program more flexible and limiting the federal government’s influence on the organization of the schools. Indeed, they managed to push through fewer control and a higher scope of eligible investments. Furthermore, the federal government could not enforce a standard definition of all-day schools anymore; the federal states were to decide how many days a week and how many hours a day full-time schools open. In addition, they determine which kind of courses are offered in the afternoon. The former Minister of Education of the federal state Hessen, Karin Wolff (CDU),—a castigator of the IZBB—explained the ‘slackening’ as follows.

There have been discussions over and over again about what single Federal States conceive as all-day schools or as an all-day offer. The Federal Government has treated some forms very disrespectfully, for example it tried to defame a very basic form of all-day school as ‘soup kitchen mentality’. Moreover, by virtue of its power it tried to give the ultimate definition of what counts as a full-time offer. But in the end it did not succeed. (Interview Wolff 2008: 8).

The legal basis of the administrative agreement (*Verwaltungsvereinbarung*) remained the same, although responsible persons of the federal states tried to apply another way of getting the money than article 104 a, 4 of the German Basic Constitutional Law. Since if this article had been used, the federal states would have been *constrained* to spend the money on the building up of all-day schools. In contrast, article 106 of the Constitutional Law would have opened the alternative of obtaining the four billion Euros by increasing the federal states’ part of the value-added tax (*Umsatzsteuer*) in the financial configuration of German federalism. This way, the federal government could not force the federal states to invest the money in all-day schools.

However, Edelgard Bulmahn enforced the application of article 104 a, 4.

The IZBB was signed in 2003. In the following, all-day schools were built up in Germany to a large extent. As seen in Chapter 2, this development provoked a double defamilialization in the German welfare state. Beyond that, the IZBB had also spillover effects.

### ***3.6 Spillover Effects***

In fact, the IZBB had spillover effects on the German Basic Constitutional Law as well as on German family policy. One effect concerns the reform of German federalism in 2006. The program was a crucial reason for deleting educational policy from the federal government's jurisdiction. In the case of IZBB, the federal government interfered in the field of school policy for the first time in the history of the Federal Republic of Germany. Referring to this fact, the previous prime minister of the federal state Hessen, Roland Koch (CDU), a former castigator of all-day schools, called the IZBB a 'fall of mankind' (Interview Koch 2008: 22; Interview Rossmann 2008: 13). This intervention of the federal government was cause for the Christian Democrats to demand a strict division of competences in educational policy, as a senior civil servant of the federal state Bremen explained.

The agreement between the Federal States and the Federal Government concerning IZBB was later used in the reform of the Federal system as an argument against a prominent role of the Federal Government in educational policy. Therefore the realm of education was excluded from the collaboration between the divisions. (Interview Hempe-Wankerl, 2008: 1)

The relations between the federal levels was changed explicitly in the German Constitutional Law. In the field of education, the federal government's power was severely limited. As a consequence it has fewer responsibilities in higher educational policy and almost no more responsibilities in school policy. It just takes part in arranging the PISA studies and editing an educational report for Germany. In addition it is allowed to give references in collaboration with the federal states. The base of the

IZBB, article 104 a, 4 of the German Constitutional Law, has been canceled. That is why today, the program would not be possible anymore.

However, there have also been positive spillover effects as the IZBB's logic has eradicated in the whole field of family policy. It was the first nationwide program to promote a large-scale offer of day care. In this way, the IZBB is an original precedent. In the course of the program there was a change in public opinion concerning the judgment of working mothers. Whereas women were supposed to stay at home with their children in earlier times, the combination of motherhood and work now is accepted in principle. The IZBB has not caused but strongly accelerated this debate and thereby goes in the same direction as the discourse on a sustainable family policy. Furthermore, the program has contributed to a modernization inside the conservative parties. The former conservative family ideology was partly abandoned while different family models gained acceptance. The previous Christian Democratic Minister of Family, Ursula von der Leyen, realized a concept that was originally intended by her Social Democratic antecessor Renate Schmidt. The parental benefit (*Elterngeld*) established in 2007 accords 67 percent of the former net income to parents who stay at home up to 14 months after their child's birth. There are 300 Euros minimum and 1800 Euros maximum paid<sup>5</sup> (cf. Blum in this issue). This way, the economic status can be maintained in the phase of child caring. Saving the living standard, it should mainly encourage working couples to get children. The parental benefit exclusively reserves two months for either parent. The remaining ten months can be split between them. Single parents can receive the parental benefit for the entire 14 months. According to that, a working person can take at most 14 months of parental benefit (Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend 2007). Thereby, a fast reintegration into the labor market is supported. This reform

---

<sup>5</sup> The austerity package of the Merkel Administration from June 2010 appoints the parental benefit to be 65 percent (from an adjusted net income of 1240 Euro). Furthermore, it is to be canceled for recipients of unemployment benefit II (former social welfare benefit).

shows a paradigm shift in German family policy: By advocating working parents, the economic aspect of family policy is highlighted. On the one hand, this may be seen as a reaction to the demographic changes as working couples are encouraged to have children. On the other hand mainly women are supposed to rather quickly reintegrate the labor market compared to the long time of child care defined in former arrangements (cf. Ahrens in this issue).

Additionally, the federal government passed the children advancement act (*Kinderförderungsgesetz*) in 2008. This act implies that the federal government places four billion Euros from 2009 until 2013 at the federal states' disposal to invest in building up day nurseries for under three-years-olds (Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend 2009)<sup>6</sup>. At this point, a close resemblance between this act and the IZBB is conspicuous. However, there is also a wide difference. The children advancement act is not based on article 104a, 4 of the German Constitutional Law as the latter was canceled in the reform of German federalism in 2006. One part of its financial resources arise from a special property of the federal government. The other part is given to the federal states by increasing their part of the value-added tax (*Umsatzsteuer*). Thus, guidelines with regard to content of the federal government were excluded. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the federal states actually invest the capital in building up day nurseries. However, the daycare in Germany is developing. The IZBB played a crucial role in this movement. In summary, the IZBB had spillover effects in structure—reform of federalism—and spillover effects in substance—development and acceptance of public daycare. In this way, it is part of a larger movement towards modernizing family policy.

---

<sup>6</sup> The children advancement act (*Kinderförderungsgesetz*) includes also the implementation of childcare allowance (*Betreuungsgeld*) for parents who care for their children at home until they are three years old. There is not yet a consensus, but parts of the CDU/CSU are fighting for this concept. At this point, the fragmentation of conservative family policy is obvious.

#### 4. Conclusions

All-day schools have developed in the conservative structure of the German welfare state and have strongly changed it. The former half-day system corresponded to the conservative focus on preserving the status quo and the orientation towards traditional familyhood. Providing full-time offers boosts the preventive part of social policy and improves the reconciliation of work and family life. Now, the relation between educational and social policy is getting closer. In addition, different ways of life and family models are accepted to a higher extent. In view of the high intensity and long persistence of the conservative order in Germany, these are big steps.

As shown above, the IZBB was possible because a set of various structural factors—including serendipity—enabled the enforcement of the program and a committed policy entrepreneur joined the streams. The historical change of policy from the persistence of a half-day school system to the nationwide promotion of full-time models appeared as an answer to the shocking PISA performance. But there was no inherent necessity to respond to the shock with all-day schools. From this point of view, it is contingent: PISA and the IZBB cohere more temporally and in a certain kind more accidentally than functionally. Yet, the IZBB would not have been realized if Bulmahn had not campaigned for the program. Accordingly, this change of policy happened between contingency and strategy.

In the light of this empirical research, the multiple streams approach is to be amended in two directions. The first point is easy. Dealing with the German political system means dealing with the German federalism in the most cases. Particularly, the analysis of the educational system is not possible without regarding the different federal levels. That is why the multiple streams approach has to implicate the conditions of German federalism. This is important for the entire approach, primarily for the development in the politics stream and the strategies of the political entrepreneur.

The second point is harder to explain. The empirical analysis of the enforcement of the IZBB points out that it is important to consider agency and structure equally. Otherwise, it would not be

possible to understand policy changes. This is central to the multiple streams approach represented by Kingdon. As seen, Zahariadis enhanced the approach. Later on, he also quits the equal consideration of structure and agency, but focuses on agency (Zahariadis 2008). In this variation, policy change cannot be understood completely. By regarding the enforcement of the IZBB only as a result of the successful policy entrepreneur Bulmahn, the understanding of the long-term outcome is strongly constrained. In the case of IZBB the synergetic quality of the idea of all-day schooling was important to follow the entire process: On the one hand the IZBB has strong impacts on the educational system and on family policy. For the Social Democrats, the anticipated effects on educational policy were crucial to fight for this concept. The Christian Democrats mainly agreed because they approved of the impacts on family policy concerning the aid for children in deprived areas and for working mothers. On the other hand all-day schools do not represent the common trade-off between social justice and economic efficiency. Therefore, they are supported by different societal groups . Especially the presented consensus of the Confederation of German Employers' Organization (*Bundesvereinigung Deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände*—BDA) and the Federation of Trade Unions (*Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund*—DGB) indicates the synergetic quality of all-day schools. The following citation from a collective commitment points it out: "Coming from a perspective of efficiency and equity we cannot afford not to foster and use these talents" (Bundesvereinigung Deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände und Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund 2005: 1). This coherence is an important reason for the great success of the IZBB as it established all-day schools as a generally accepted model in Germany and therefore changed the conservative structure of the German welfare state.

## References

- Ahrens, R. (2010). Sustainability in German Family Policy and Politics, in this Volume.

- Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2009). Ganztagschule im europäischen Vergleich. Zeitpolitiken modernisieren—durch Vergleich Standards setzen? In: Stecher, L., Allemann-Ghionda, C., Helsper, W., Klieme, E. (eds.): *Ganztägige Bildung und Betreuung*, Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 54. Beiheft, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz, 190-208.
- Allmendinger, J. (1999). Bildungsarmut: Zur Verschränkung von Bildungs- und Sozialpolitik, in: *Soziale Welt* 50 (1), 35-50.
- Arbeitsstab Forum Bildung (2001). Empfehlungen des Forum Bildung vom 19.11.2001. Retrieved from [www.ganztagschulen.org/\\_downloads/Forum-Bildung-Empf.pdf](http://www.ganztagschulen.org/_downloads/Forum-Bildung-Empf.pdf).
- Artelt, C., Stanat, P., Schneider, W., Schiefele, U. (2001). Lesekompetenz: Testkonzeption und Ergebnisse. In: Deutsches PISA-Konsortium (Eds.): *PISA 2000. Basiskompetenzen von Schülerinnen und Schülern im internationalen Vergleich*, Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 69-137.
- Augustin-Dittmann, S. (forthcoming 2011). Politikwandel zwischen Kontingenz und Strategie. Zur Etablierung der Ganztagschule in Deutschland.
- Bäcker, G., Naegle, G., Bispinck, R., Hofemann, K., Neubauer, J. (2008). *Sozialpolitik und soziale Lage in Deutschland*, Bd. 1: Grundlagen, Arbeit, Einkommen und Finanzierung, 4., grundlegend überarb. u. erw. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Bargel, T., Kuthe, M. (1991). *Ganztagschule. Untersuchungen zu Angebot und Nachfrage, Versorgung und Bedarf*, Bad Honnef: Bock.
- Baumert, J., Schümer, G. (2001). Familiäre Lebensverhältnisse, Bildungsbeteiligung und Kompetenzerwerb. In: Deutsches PISA-Konsortium (Ed.): *PISA 2000. Basiskompetenzen von Schülerinnen und Schülern im internationalen Vergleich*, Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 323-407.
- Blum, S. (2010). Between Instrument Tinkering and Policy Renewal: Reforms of Parental Leave in Germany and Austria, in this Volume.

Bundesvereinigung Deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände und Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (2005). Gemeinsame Erklärung von BDA und DGB zu den Konsequenzen aus den Ergebnissen von „PISA II“, Papier der Bundesvereinigung Deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände und des Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbunds. Retrieved from [www.einblick.dgb.de/hintergrund/2005/02/text01/](http://www.einblick.dgb.de/hintergrund/2005/02/text01/).

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (2003). Investitionsprogramm „Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung“ 2003—2007. Retrieved from [www.ganztagschulen.org/\\_downloads/VerwaltungsvereinbarungIZBB.pdf](http://www.ganztagschulen.org/_downloads/VerwaltungsvereinbarungIZBB.pdf).

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (2006). Ergänzende Informationen zur Veraltungsvereinbarung Investitionsprogramm „Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung“, Kostenneutrale Verlängerung des Bildungszeitraums. Retrieved from [www.ganztagschulen.org/\\_downloads/Ergaenzende\\_Information\\_zur\\_Verwaltungsvereinbarung\(1\).pdf](http://www.ganztagschulen.org/_downloads/Ergaenzende_Information_zur_Verwaltungsvereinbarung(1).pdf).

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (2009). Ganztagsschulen—das Investitionsprogramm „Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung“ 2003-2009 (IZBB), Ergebnisse: Der Jahresberichte seit 2003 bis 2008 und der endgültigen Vorhabenplanungen 2009 über alle Länder. Retrieved from [www.ganztagschulen.org/\\_downloads/BMBF\\_Grafiken\\_2009.pdf](http://www.ganztagschulen.org/_downloads/BMBF_Grafiken_2009.pdf).

Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2006). Familie zwischen Flexibilität und Verlässlichkeit. Perspektiven für eine lebenslaufbezogene Familienpolitik, Siebter Familienbericht, Retrieved from [www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung2/Pdf-Anlagen/siebter-familienbericht,property=pdf,bereich=,rwb=true.pdf](http://www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung2/Pdf-Anlagen/siebter-familienbericht,property=pdf,bereich=,rwb=true.pdf).

Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2007). Elterngeld und Elternzeit. Das Bundeselterngeld- und Elternzeitgesetz. Retrieved from [www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/Elterngeld-und-Elternzeit,property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf](http://www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/Elterngeld-und-Elternzeit,property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf).

- Bundesministerium für Familien, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2009). Kinderförderungsgesetz (KiföG). Retrieved from [www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/kinder-und-jugend,did=133282.html](http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/kinder-und-jugend,did=133282.html).
- Bund-Länder-Konferenz für Bildungsplanung (1973). Bildungsgesamtplan der Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung, Bd. 1, Stuttgart.
- Castles, F. (1989). Explaining Public Education Expenditure in OECD Nations. In: European Journal of Political Research 17 (4), 431-448.
- CDU (2002). Konsequenzen aus PISA, Beschluss des Bundesfachausschusses Bildungspolitik der CDU Deutschlands. Retrieved from [www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/21022002\\_bundesfachausschuss\\_bildungspolitik.pdf](http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/21022002_bundesfachausschuss_bildungspolitik.pdf).
- Cohen, Michael D., March, James G., Olsen, Johan P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. In: Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1), 1-25.
- Deutscher Bildungsrat (1968). Empfehlungen der Bildungskommission: Einrichtung von Schulversuchen mit Ganztagschulen, Sicherung der öffentlichen Ausgaben für Schulen und Hochschulen bis 1975, verabschiedet auf der 13. Sitzung der Bildungskommission am 23./24.02.1968, Bonn.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies, Oxford.
- Fischer, N., Kuhn, H.P., Klieme, E. (2009). Was kann die Ganztagschule leisten? Wirkungen ganztägiger Beschulung auf die Entwicklung von Lernmotivation und schulischer Performance nach dem Übergang in die Sekundarstufe. In: Stecher, L., Allemann-Ghionda, C., Helsper, W., Klieme, E. (Eds.): Ganztägige Bildung und Betreuung, Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 54. Beiheft, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz, 143-167.

- Flora, P., Heidenheimer, A.J. (Eds.) (1981). *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Gerhard, U. (2003). Geschlecht: Frauen im Wohlfahrtsstaat. In: Lessenich, Stephan (Ed.): *Wohlfahrtsstaatliche Grundbegriffe. Historische und aktuelle Diskurse*, Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 267-285.
- Gläser, J., Laudel, G. (2006). Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse, 2., durchges. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Gottschall, K. (2004). Vom Statuserhalt zur Sozialinvestition? Erziehung und Bildung als Sozialstaatstransformation. In: *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform*, 50 (1-2), 126-146.
- Gottschall, K., Hagemann, K. (2002). Die Halbtagschule in Deutschland: Ein Sonderfall in Europa? In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 41/2002, 12-22.
- Hagemann, K., (2006). Between Ideology and Economy: The „Time Politics“ of Child Care and Public Education in the Two Germanys. In: *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State, and Society*, 13 (2), 217-260.
- Hagemann, K., Mattes, M. (2008). Ganztagschulerziehung im deutsch-deutschen Vergleich. In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 23/2008, 7-14.
- Hall, P. A. (1993): Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State, in: *Comparative Politics*, 25 (3), 275-296.
- Heclo, H. (1985). The Welfare State in Hard Times, Washington, D.C..
- Hega, G., Hokenmaier, K. (2002). The Welfare State and Education: A Comparison of Social and Educational Policy in Advanced Industrial Societies. In: *German Policy Studies*, 2 (1), 143-173.
- Heidenheimer, A.J. (1981). Education and Social Security in Europe and America. In: Flora, P., Heidenheimer, A. J. (eds.): *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 269-304.

- Héritier, A. (2008). Causal explanation, in: della Porta, D., Keating, M. (eds.): *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences. A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge, 61-79.
- Holzinger, K., Knill, C. (2005). Causes and conditions of cross-national policy convergence. In: *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12 (5), 775-796.
- Kaufmann, F.X. (2003). Varianten des Wohlfahrtsstaats. Der deutsche Sozialstaat im internationalen Vergleich, Frankfurt/Main.
- Kingdon, J.W. (1995). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, 2. Ed., New York: Harper Collins College Publication.
- Klammer, U. (2005). Soziale Sicherung. In: Bothfeld, S., Klammer, U., Klenner, C., Leiber, S., Thile, A., Ziegler, A. (eds.): *WSI FrauenDatenReport 2005. Handbuch zur wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Situation von Frauen*, Berlin: Edition Sigma, 307-382.
- Klieme, E., Fischer, N., Stecher, L., Rauschenbach, T., Holtap-  
pels, H.G. (2008). Studie zur Entwicklung von Ganztagschulen, Ergebnisse der 2. Befragungswelle, Pressekonferenz, Berlin, 08. September 2008. Retrieved from [http://www.projekt-steg.de/files/pk080908/Pressekonferenz\\_Steg\\_Folien.pdf](http://www.projekt-steg.de/files/pk080908/Pressekonferenz_Steg_Folien.pdf).
- Kultusministerkonferenz (2008). Allgemein bildende Schulen in ganztagsform in den Ländern der Bundesrepublik Deutschland—Statistik 2002-2006. Retrieved from [www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen\\_beschluesse/2008/2008\\_03\\_04-Allgem-Schulen-Ganztagsform-02-06.pdf](http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2008/2008_03_04-Allgem-Schulen-Ganztagsform-02-06.pdf).
- Kultusministerkonferenz (2009). Allgemein bildende Schulen in ganztagsform in den Ländern der Bundesrepublik Deutschland—Statistik 2002-2006. Retrieved from [www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/Statistik/GTS\\_2007.pdf](http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/Statistik/GTS_2007.pdf).
- Koch, R. (2007). Ganztägig Lernen—Konzepte und Ideen: Der hessische Weg, Rede auf dem Kongress „Ganztagschulen werden mehr—Bildung lokal verantworten“, 21.09.2007,

- Berlin. Retrieved from [www.ganztaegig-lernen.org/www/web701.aspx](http://www.ganztaegig-lernen.org/www/web701.aspx).
- Lasswell, H.D. (1956). *The Decision Process: Seven Categories of Functional Analysis*, Maryland: College Park.
- Leitner, S. (2002). Alte Gräben—neue Fronten. Zur Geschlechtsspezifik der Rentenreform 2001. In: Maier, Friederike, Fiedler, Angela (eds.): *Gender Matters. Feministische Analysen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik*, Berlin, 161-180.
- Lewis, J. (1992). Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes. In: *Journal of European Social Policy* 2 (3), 159-173.
- Lewis, J., Ostner, I. (1994). Gender and the Evolution of European Social Policies, ZeS-Arbeitspapier, 4/94, Bremen.
- Martens, K., Wolf, K.D. (2006). Paradoxien der Neuen Staatsräson. Die Internationalisierung der Bildungspolitik in der EU und der OECD. In: *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen*, 13 (2), 145-176.
- Mattes, M. (2009). Ganztagsziehung in der DDR. „Tageschule“ und Hort in den Politiken und Diskursen der 1950er bis 1970er-Jahre. In: Stecher, L., Allemand-Ghionda, C., Helsper, W., Klieme, E. (eds.): *Ganztägige Bildung und Betreuung*, Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 54. Beiheft, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz, 230-246.
- Mayring, Philipp (2003). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken*, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz.
- Meuser, M., Nagel, U. (2005). ExpertInneninterviews—vielfach erprobt, wenig bedacht. Ein Beitrag zur qualitativen Methodendiskussion. In: Bogner, Alexander/Littig, Beate/Menz, Wolfgang (eds.): *Das Experteninterview. Theorie, Methode, Anwendung*, 2. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag, 71-93.
- Miller, B.M., Truong, K.A. (2009). The Role of Afterschool and Summer in Achievement. The Untapped Power of After-school and Summer to Advance Student Achievement. In: Stecher, L., Allemand-Ghionda, C., Helsper, W., Klieme, E.

- (eds.): *Ganztägige Bildung und Betreuung, Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 54. Beiheft, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz, 124-142.
- Nikolai, R. (2007). Sozialpolitik auf Kosten der Bildung? Verteilungskonkurrenz in Zeiten knapper Kassen. In: *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform* 53 (1), 7-30.
- Orloff, A.S. (1993). Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States. In: *American Sociological Review* 58, 303-328.
- Sainsbury, D. (1996). Women's and Men's Social Rights: Gendering Dimensions of Welfare States. In: Sainsbury, Diane (Ed.): *Gendering Welfare States*, London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi, reprint, 150-169.
- Schmidt, M.G. (1999). Das politische Leistungsprofil der Demokratien. In: Greven, Michael Th. (Ed.): *Demokratie—eine Kultur des Westens*, Opladen, 181-200.
- Schmidt, M.G. (2002). Warum Mittelmaß? Deutschlands Bildungsausgaben im internationalen Vergleich. In: *Politische Vierteljahrsschrift* 43 (1), 3-19.
- Schmidt, M.G., Busemeyer, M.R., Nikolai, R., Wolf, F. (2006). Bildungsausgaben im inter- und intranationalen Vergleich. Bestimmungsfaktoren öffentlicher Bildungsausgaben in OECD-Staaten, Heidelberg.
- Schratzenstaller, M. (2002). Steuer- und transferpolitische Aspekte aktueller Familienpolitik. In: Maier, Friederike, Fiedler, Angela (eds.): *Gender Matters. Feministische Analysen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik*, Berlin, 181-209.
- Schröder, G. (2002). Ein Gesetz für alle Schulen. Pisa und die Konsequenzen für das deutsche Schulsystem. In: *Die Zeit* (27/2002) vom 04.07.2002.
- Sommer, B. (2009). Sprechzettel zur Schuljahres-Eröffnungs-Pressekonferenz des Ministeriums für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, am 14. August 2009. Retrieved from [www.sspl.de/downloads/MSW-Presse\\_090814.pdf](http://www.sspl.de/downloads/MSW-Presse_090814.pdf).

- SPD Rhineland-Palatinate (2001). Tischvorlage zur Pressekonferenz mit dem Thema Ganztagschule und Kommunen vom 19.03.2001, Mainz, Retrieved from library.fes.de/pd/www.spd-rlp.de/lverband/2001/ganz1903.htm.
- Thenner, M. (2000). Familienpolitik als Politik zur Vereinbarkeit von Familie und Beruf—Geldwerte Leistungen, zeitwerte Anrechte, familienunterstützende Infrastruktur und ihre Auswirkungen auf das Familienverhalten. In: Dingeldey, I. (Ed.): Erwerbstätigkeit und Familie in Steuer- und Sozialversicherungssystemen. Begünstigungen und Belastungen verschiedener familialer Erwerbsmuster im Ländervergleich, Opladen, 95-129.
- Welt Online (2008). Koch macht Wahlkampf mit SPD-Forderungen, vom 27.11.2008. Retrieved from www.welt.de/politik/article2793013/Koch-macht-Wahlkampf-mit-SPD-Forderungen.html.
- Wendt, A. (1999). Social Theory of International Politics, Cambridge.
- Zahariadis, N. (2003). Ambiguity and Choice in Public Policy: Political Decision-Making in Modern Democracies, Washington DC.
- Zahariadis, N. (2005). Essence of Political Manipulation: Emotion, Institutions and Greek Foreign Policy, New York.
- Zahariadis, N. (2008). Ambiguity and Choice in European Public Policy. In: Journal of European Public Policy 15 (4), 514-530.
- Züchner, I. (2009). Zusammenspiel oder Konkurrenz? Spuren-suche zum Zusammenhang von schulischen Ganztagsangebo-teten und dem Zeitregime von Familien. In: Stecher, L., Allemand-Ghionda, C., Helsper, W., Klieme, E. (eds.): Ganz-tägige Bildung und Betreuung, Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 54. Beiheft, Weinheim/Basel: Beltz, 266-284.

**Table of Interviews**

Interview Bulmahn (2008). Interview with Edelgard Bulmahn 10/15/2008 at Paul-Löbe-Haus, Berlin.

Interview Hempe-Wankerl (2008). Interview with Christel Hempe-Wankerl 10/16/2008 at the Senator for Education and Science, Bremen.

Interview Koch (2008). Interview with Hans-Konrad Koch 11/20/2008, Berlin.

Interview Rossmann (2008). Interview with Ernst-Dieter Rossmann am 11/13/2008 at Paul-Löbe-Haus, Berlin.

Interview Wolff (2008). Interview with Karin Wolff am 11/27/2008 at Landtag of Hesse, Wiesbaden.