Chapter 1

Introduction

Claudio Baraldi

The CHILD-UP project

This book collects reflections based on the results of the Children Hybrid Integration: Learning Dialogue as a way of Upgrading Policies of Participation (CHILD-UP) Horizon 2020 project (GA 822400). The project involved seven countries: Belgium, Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (England, in particular). The coordinating institution was the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (Italy), working in collaboration with six more research partners: Université de Liege (Belgium); Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences (Finland); Zentrum für Foschung, Weiterbildung und Beratung – University of Dresden (Germany); Jagiellonian University Krakov (Poland); Malmö University (Sweden); and the University of Northampton (United Kingdom). The study was supported by three international organisations ensuring communication and the dissemination of the project results, and coordinating the involvement and support of local and international stakeholders: the International Institute of Humanitarian Law (based in Italy); the European School Head Association (based in The Netherlands); and the Forum des Régions européennes pour la Recherche, l'éducation et la Formation (based in France).

The CHILD-UP project aimed to analyse the introduction of methods based on dialogic practices supporting the agency of children with a migrant background[1] (CMB) and hybrid integration in the education system, thus suggesting new educational policies. These concepts guided the formulation of two general objectives. The first objective was to investigate the possibilities and opportunities of CMB to exercise agency, that is, to participate in changing their social and cultural conditions of integration in host societies. The second objective was to propose methodologies and tools to support and improve the promotion of CMB's agency, dialogue, and hybrid integration with the perspective of providing equal opportunities for children, both migrant and non-migrant, to exercise agency inside the education system.

The CHILD-UP research aimed to investigate the challenges posed to CMB's agency in constructing knowledge and changing their educational contexts, in terms of hybrid integration, as well as the means to support these processes of knowledge construction and change for integration, by enhancing CMB's

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-1

possibilities of exercising agency. For this purpose, the research: (1) addressed the social contexts supporting or hindering CMB's agency and hybrid integration, and (2) investigated dialogic practices that could enhance CMB's agency and hybrid integration. The CHILD-UP research also focused on gender-based aspects and differences related to migration and hybrid integration, studying expectations and interactions in which gender identities are expressed and negotiated. Finally, the research aimed to generate change in interventions and policies by investigating practices promoting standards of equitable access to high-quality education, as well as by comparing and suggesting new practices and promoting collaboration among organisations with the function of educating and protecting children.

Why the CHILD-UP project

In their communication to the European Parliament in 2017, the European Commission had highlighted that "early and effective access to inclusive, formal education […] is one of the most important and powerful tools for the integration of [migrant] children" (European Commission, 2017, p. 12). In particular, the quality of teaching is considered as "the most important school-level factor influencing [migrant] student outcomes" (Janta & Harte, 2016, p. 24). Clearly, the problem of the quality of teaching is not limited to migrant students, which suggests that a possible support to migrant students' positive or more positive outcomes needs to be understood against the background of a general conceptualisation of teaching in the host territories.

Several analyses of teaching in the Western world have been conducted within the area of sociology of education since the 1970s. In particular, both Delamont (1976) and Mehan (1979) stressed the importance of teaching interaction as a collective construction, including children's collaboration. In the last twenty years of the twentieth century, several studies focused on teachers' strategies in managing classroom order (Cohen, Lotan, & Leechor, 1989; Pollard, 1982; Waterhouse, 1991) and pupils' contributions to the construction and maintenance of this order (Davies, 1980, 1983; Scarth, 1987; Stevenson, 1991). In these studies, the hierarchical relation between teacher and pupils, as the expression of a generational order (Alanen, 2009), emerges as seemingly unavoidable. These studies suggest that teaching is conceived as a *monologue*: meanings seem to result from the teacher's intentions and strategies alone, while pupils are seen as recipients of the units of information prepared by the teacher, who claims for a primary right to act and control the distribution of opportunities for action. Thus, children "become mere recipients of information from the teacher" (Sharma, 2015, p. 173) and the education system turns children into pupils by instructing children to be "proper children" (James & James, 2004, p. 123).

The condition of migrant children seems to be particularly vulnerable in the education system, as portrayed above (European Commission, 2017; e.g. Darmody, Byrne, & McGinnity, 2014; Kovač-Cerović, 2021). Vulnerability may clearly be attributed to migrant children's deficits in previous education, unhelpful families or language barriers. There is, however, another, possibly less obvious, factor

which is important in defining migrant children's vulnerability. This is the idea that migrant children's participation in education has been regarded, since the beginning, as an indicator of "super-diversity" (Vertovec, 2007), enhancing high complexity in teaching, including teaching in kindergartens and preschools (Lauritsen, 2011; Palludan, 2007; Seele, 2012). The main concern underlying this perspective is that teachers' actions are ineffective to enhance learning of migrant children in that these children belong to different cultural groups or speak different languages (Devine, 2013). The interpretation of migrant children's vulnerable condition in the education system is primarily based on a narrative foregrounding ethnicity as production of cultural differences and identities, which are seen as a primary threat for teaching. Several studies focus on the ways in which cultural diversity influences classroom communication, associating migrant children's identity with membership of a specific cultural group and taking it for granted that migrant children's actions predictably follow the rules of those cultural groups the children's families belong to (e.g., Ensor & Godziak, 2010; Kostet & Verschraegen Noel Clycq, 2021; Mahon & Cushner, 2012; Schell, 2009). The consequence of this conceptualisation is that the hierarchical structure of education, in fact, enhances the cultural or ethnic labelling of migrant children, even in absence of any explicit intention of discriminating or marginalising them. The combined narratives of vulnerability and cultural belonging of migrant children stress their need of support in the education system, but obscure the migrant children's contribution to change the ways in which such need of support may be conceived and designed.

Other studies have contested traditional education and explored forms of *dialogic teaching* which can support children as active constructors of knowledge who can express their views, challenge different ones and explore different options (e.g., Mercer, 2002; O'Connor & Michaels, 1996; Wells, 2015). These studies suggest that learning is based on reciprocal interactions between teachers and pupils, producing mutual influence. In dialogic teaching, "both teachers and pupils make substantial and significant contributions […] through which children's thinking on a given idea or theme is helped to move forward" and teachers "encourage students to participate actively" (Mercer & Littleton, 2007, p. 41). Consequently, learners' active participation in the interaction is displayed as autonomous construction of meanings (Young, 2007). Undoubtedly, applying this conception of dialogic teaching helps migrant children's chances of inclusion in schools since active participation in learning can increase the quality of their school experience. Dialogic teaching, however, does not truly affect the hierarchical structure of education. In dialogic teaching, even if children have the possibility to show learning through their active participation and are thus conceived as active learners, they are still *learners*.

The CHILD-UP project is based on the concept that dialogic promotion of (migrant) children's *agency*, rather than learning, is extremely important to change the structure of teaching in the education system. Agency is distinguished from learning since it means *making autonomous choices* in the ways of participating, thus co-creating educational contexts (Baraldi, 2014, 2022). It was the objective of

CHILD-UP to understand if and how CMB's agency can be encouraged or discouraged in schools, and if and how hybrid integration can be enhanced in the education system. CHILD-UP aimed to analyse interventions supporting CMB's agency in educational institutions, through the development of dialogic methods. The underlining assumption was that dialogic promotion of CMB's agency can lead to hybrid integration. Following this assumption, the research focused on "multicultural" classrooms and schools as settings allowing for the production of hybrid integration based on the contribution of both CMB and non-migrant children.

The CHILD-UP project has enhanced a bottom-up approach in which research, local interventions, and local policies are strictly related to developing synergetic connections between schools and their social and cultural contexts, encouraging coordinated planning and collaborative enhancement of agency and hybrid integration. The project has provided research evidence to the current debate to stimulate public policies that are coherent with the findings of our research and to integrate these findings into the overall policy goals. For this purpose, CHILD-UP has also provided: (1) a plan to multiply its impact through the action of Local and International Stakeholder Committees, (2) guidelines for interventions and their self-evaluation, and (3) a training package for professionals (available online: see www.child-up.eu).

The CHILD-UP research methodology

The CHILD-UP project reached its objectives through *desk research* and *field research*. Desk research mainly consisted in a study of CMB's conditions of integration in the seven countries involved, based on both scientific and grey literature. Research in this case considered existing data on CMB's social life and practices of integration. The analysis regarded the assessment of the wellbeing of CMB and their families, evaluated through data on legislation, integration policies, support programs and educational practices.

Field research regarded specific areas in the seven participating countries, which were chosen to analyse the largest possible variety of ways of involving CMB in the education system (see Table 1.1 in the Appendix). Field research addressed the involvement of CMB and native children attending kindergartens/preschools (aged 5–6 years), primary schools (aged 9–10 years), lower secondary schools (aged 12–13 years), and higher secondary schools (aged 15–16 years). Field research was based on the use of mixed methods and included: (1) a quantitative survey in the local schools, protection services, educational and mediation agencies, and families; (2) a qualitative research on the perspectives of children and professionals working with children; (3) an evaluative research on relevant examples of school activities.

Quantitative research: the survey

The survey was conducted in the seven participating countries, involving all children attending selected local schools, their parents/guardians, teachers, social

workers, interpreters or mediators working in schools, and professionals working in reception centres. The choices of schools and professionals depended on the specific local conditions, but the focus was primarily on primary and lower secondary schools, which are crucial for the hybrid integration of most CMB, and, more frequently, plan activities concerning their inclusion. The other types of schools were selected depending on CMB local conditions of integration (see Table 1.1 in the Appendix). The general objective of the survey was to gain a detailed and multi-angled portrait of the diverse situations by studying how the education and social protection systems enhance or hinder CMB's agency. Specific objectives of the survey were: (a) understanding CMB's participation and agency from the viewpoint of the children, their parents/guardians, and professionals; and (b) investigating several factors influencing children's participation in education, such as gender, age, country of origin, language skills, family composition, and length of stay.

The questionnaire was adapted to the children's age; in particular, a specific type of questionnaire with simple questions was applied in kindergartens/preschools. The questionnaires were distributed to the entire class, CMB and non-migrant children alike, CMB being identified only afterwards through their personal data (the origin of their parents and their places of birth). While allowing for a comparison of CMB and non-migrant children, this type of sampling prevented pre-selecting CMB and possible use of parameters different from the two established ones. The total number of collected questionnaires was over 7,000, and the number of children who filled out the questionnaire was almost 4,000 (see Table 1.2 in the Appendix) so 3,000 questionnaires were compiled by adults, parents and professionals. More than one-third of children and approximately one-third of parents have a migrant background, with relevant differences among the seven countries (see Table 1.3 in the Appendix). The gender balance of girls and boys among child respondents was almost fifty-fifty. By contrast, most professional and parent respondents were female; this data shows the strong gender bias among professionals involved in children's education and social protection, as well as among parents who take care of children's school education. It is also important to note that gender was not restricted to a binary variable; however, implementing this principle in practice was not as easy. For instance, due to the upswing of anti-LGBTQ+ sentiment in Poland, the question concerning gender did not include the choice "other" but rather an open-ended question for respondents to state their gender. The number of respondents who selected "other" was very low in all cases (never reaching 1%) and frequently based on joking. This seems to show that children's awareness of non-binary genders is still discouraged in European countries.

Qualitative research: the interviews

The qualitative research on the perspectives of professionals and children was based on interviews (see Table 1.4 in the Appendix), addressing narratives about

the conditions of migrant children and hybrid integration. Children participating in individual or collective interviews were 1,305. Individual interviews involved CMB and collective interviews included both CMB and non-migrant children. The group sizes of the collective interviews with children varied from 2 to 24, depending on countries and schools. The professionals participating in the interviews were 284, all having regular contacts with CMB; the professionals included teachers, community educators, mediators/interpreters, social workers working with migrants and guardians in reception centres. The interviews aimed to capture the attitudes and values of the respondents, seen through the prism of their personal experiences. The interviews also allowed for the expansion of the findings from the quantitative survey, depicting a more detailed and nuanced picture of the levels of participation, agency and hybrid integration of CMB. All interviews addressed gender issues, the intercultural dimensions of social relationships, the specific aspects of (dis)satisfaction concerning education and social relations in the community, as well as the assessment of meanings of agency and hybrid integration in the school and community. The interviews focused on children's expectations, their relationships with the school system and the protection systems (where existing), ways in which professionals motivate migrant children to participate in educational and social contexts, peer relationships, cooperation with parents, difficulties at school, potential and opportunities provided by schools, impact of policies, and support offered to CMB and professionals working with them.

Evaluative analysis: audio- and video-recordings

The evaluative analysis of activities implemented in kindergartens/preschools, primary schools, lower and higher secondary schools, was based on video-recordings and audio-recordings of activities on the one hand, and questionnaires and collective interviews with children on the other (see Table 1.5 in the Appendix). The analysed activities involved approximately 1,600 children. CMB comprised almost half of the total number of children participating in the activities; this data shows that the objective of involving CMB together with native children was reached and thus makes up for a notable result. Evaluative research took into account both the processes and the results of the activities, aiming to assess their effectiveness in supporting agency and promoting hybrid integration. The research included different types of activities that could be considered effective in supporting CMB's agency and hybrid integration. Many activities were based on facilitation of children's participation in meetings regarding, for instance, solicitation of children's reflections on relevant topics, contrast of prejudice and exclusion, support of personal contributions to positive classroom relations, reflections on assigned narratives or tasks, experiences of lockdown, past personal experiences, and comments to pictures. Other activities included meetings aimed to improve second-language learning and parent–teacher meetings with the support of language mediation for those parents who could not speak the language of the teachers.

Video-recordings and audio-recordings were used to document whether and how hybrid integration was realised and, when it was, how far such realisation was based on the facilitation of children's (and parents') agency and production of narratives. Recordings allowed for the assessment of the relevance, forms, and problems of interaction, as well as of the narratives produced in the interactions. In particular, video-recording is a technique that captures the complexity of both verbal and non-verbal actions and captures anything that happens in a meeting, including the physical environment of the interaction. The researchers can re-wind the recorded data many times, thus reflecting on their meanings with extreme accuracy. After a minute analysis of the video-recorded meetings, several transcriptions were selected, for further analysis and discussion. The transcription of video-recordings is a very effective additional tool: in that they are available multiple times, they can be used for discussion involving more researchers and improved reflection.

Two limitations or disadvantages of video-recording should be pointed out, however. The first limitation concerns the incompleteness of observation. Since video-recordings take the perspective of the camera, they cannot include everything in the context of the meeting. This prevents researchers from having a complete panorama of all that happens in the meeting. This implies a careful methodology in choosing the way of using the machine. The second limitation concerns possible lack of spontaneity. Since voices, faces and physical appearances are recorded, video-recording needs to be used in ways as to avoid participation inhibiting. There are a number of ways to do it, the easier one being that of letting the camera go for long stretches of time, so that the participants no longer note it. However, this study has confirmed what already noted in previous author's experience (e.g., Baraldi, 2022; Baraldi, Joslyn, & Farini, 2021) by showing that, if participants are intensively involved in the interaction, they tend to forget the video-recorder quickly. In the CHILD-UP research, the technical resources were used cautiously, avoiding being too invasive and therefore inhibiting participation. Video-recordings were impossible in the UK, since classes were closed to external researchers during the pandemic period, and in Poland, since consent was denied. In these two cases, video-recordings were replaced by audio-recordings (collected by class teachers in the UK). Audio-recordings were also used in parent–teacher mediated meetings. Audio-recordings are not effective in capturing non-verbal and "visual" events, but they can be effective nevertheless in understanding and analysing verbal communication.

The recordings were analysed to understand the efficacy of the activities in facilitating and mediating children's agency (and parents' agency in case of language mediation). Recordings and their transcriptions documented whether the facilitation of dialogue and exercise of agency were, in fact, achieved and the ways used to achieve facilitation. Transcribed recordings provided qualitative indicators to check the relevance, forms, and problems of interactions; production of narratives; and differences in participation and agency in interactions.

Pre-tests and post-tests delivered through questionnaires allowed for an understanding of the children's perception of the activities. The pre-test included

information on the perception of the objectives of the activities and the expected outcomes. The post-test checked if the objectives and the outcomes were achieved and how they were assessed by the participating children, providing information about the short-term results of the activities. In several cases, and where possible in times of pandemic, the post-test was followed by a focus group to understand, by qualitative means, the children's perspectives on the activities.

Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic caused widespread school closures at the precise moment in which interviews and recordings were planned to start. Excluding very few recordings in Italy, the data collection on field fully coincided with the pandemic outbreak and continued throughout, causing enduring uncertainty in all countries regarding the actual possibility of carrying out research and the extent to which this could actually be done (Amadasi & Baraldi, 2022; Damery & Raziano, 2021). In all countries, new regulations made access to schools much more difficult, leading to delays in the recruitment process, in the collection of interviews and in the recording of the activities. New obligations caused changes in planned activities; and even the manner in which interviews were conducted and activities were facilitated. In particular, face-to-face interviews were not allowed in several locations due to social distancing requirements and to ensure the health and well-being of both the children and professionals. The most relevant difficulty concerned research on mediation, since mediators were not admitted in schools in most countries. Many individual interviews were conducted online. More difficulties arose with regard to the collective interviews, as well as the recording of activities, since in several cases the researchers were not admitted in schools. Special attention was also paid to protect the interviewees and the participants in the activities. The pandemic was difficult and stressful for professionals and children, who had to reorganise their activities and adapt to remote work instantaneously. However, with considerable effort on the part of the researchers involved, the quantity and quality of data were surprisingly and extraordinarily good. Despite their increased workload, both professionals and children appreciated the work of research as well as the tools and programmes they used, and perceived the whole process as a way to reflect on their practices,. Thus, the success of the project was based on the strong commitment of school personnel and the prompt and effective organisation of remote activities in schools.

Considering the lack of access to in-person interactions, using digital platforms provided an excellent opportunity to engage in research work during school closures, respecting physical distance both for interviews and for recording meetings. In Italy, for instance, video-recordings were conducted on digital platforms under two conditions in different phases of COVID prevention: (1) with all participants on a digital platform in different locations; and (2) with researchers and facilitators on a digital platform and children in the class. In both cases, digital platforms

provided the opportunity for the children to share their views with the researchers, the facilitators, and their classmates (Amadasi & Baraldi, 2022; Farini, Baraldi, & Scollan, 2021). Limitations to online research included transmission delays and connection problems; difficulties in reading and assessing body language, eyes contact and smiles; and the possibility of children switching cameras off. However, some new communication channels could be activated as resources for interaction with children. For instance, the use of the chat function was an opportunity for hesitant students to share views without taking the floor orally during an activity. Video-recordings on digital platforms were more discreet compared to a camera placed in front of the children in the classroom. When children were in the classroom and researchers and facilitators were online, some strategies were adopted to ensure children's participation. For example, during a collective interview in an Italian kindergarten, children were asked to express their opinions by moving through different areas in the classroom or showing objects having certain colours, where each area or colour corresponded to a preference. Finally, when participating children were at home, they seemed to be relaxed and provided rich personal expressions. However, those activities including children's use of the body as a way of self-expression could not be realised either through a digital platform or in person. In Sweden and, in the final phase of the project also in other countries, in-presence meetings were finally restored, which allowed for at least a small sample of data being collected in-presence. Pre-tests and post-tests were luckily possible throughout the whole period, so that all participants could provide their evaluation of the activities.

The ethical challenge

Research in CHILD-UP involved vulnerable individuals and sensitive data. Vulnerable individuals included children (aged 5–16) as persons unable to provide informed consent and volunteers for social science research (parents and professionals), many of them migrants. Sensitive data included tracking and observation of participants and personal information processing. For these reasons, ethics was a crucial issue during the entire research. Ethical guidelines were provided at the beginning of the project, and all research partners obtained authorisations from local ethical committees. An expert, a well-known ethics advisor (Virginia Morrow), was appointed to support ethical choices in research. In accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (2016/679) of the European Union, accurate information sheets and consent forms were distributed to all participants, including parents of minors. Information was provided about the meanings and methods of the research, the rights of participants and the processing of the data. Throughout all its phases, the research followed the key principles of ethical research, securing the emotional well-being, physical well-being, rights, dignity, and personal values of research participants, with the supervision of the ethics advisor. While, in some cases, the outbreak of the pandemic did not change the ethical conditions of field research, in other cases, it determined new research conditions with changes affecting ethical issues too. Thus, new information sheets and

consent forms were delivered for remote meetings, and parents and children were invited to provide new specific consent through emails when it was not possible for them to meet teachers or researchers.

Structure and contents of the volume

This book summarises the most significant results achieved through field research during the CHILD-UP project. It does not have the ambition to record all the research findings, which have been described separately, in four research reports. Instead, the purpose of the book has been to develop the results of the CHILD-UP work by selecting and re-organising the most relevant data and highlighting those findings that could really have an impact on the education system and possibly on future research. The book focuses on research findings across seven European social contexts, engaging with both the perspective and the experiences of CMB and the perspective and experiences of professionals working with CMB, as they tackle the challenges of hybrid integration in their everyday lives. It thus provides a key to understand the achievement of hybrid integration combined with the promotion of empowerment and equality in schools by discussing whether and how the value of children's agency in designing and narrating their personal cultural trajectories is interpreted in the education system. The volume includes eight chapters and a general conclusion.

Chapter 2, following this introductive chapter, discusses facilitation of exercise of agency and hybrid integration, two concepts which underpin the whole CHILD-UP research. The chapter highlights how the facilitation of a variety of children's narratives of personal cultural trajectories related to children's experience can enhance children's agency. Children's agency is here viewed as a specific form of participation based on the choices of action that enable children to promote change in their social contexts. Facilitating participation in this sense can also produce hybrid identities, that is, changing and flexible manifestations of cultural identities, thus producing an interesting form of hybridisation that can be observed as hybrid integration.

The following series of chapters (Chapters 3–9) present and discuss the most relevant research findings. Chapter 3, in particular, analyses the policies and practices regarding migration in the seven participating countries, offering an overview of migrant children's well-being, protection, and education, as well as a comparative investigation of the legislation that impacts young migrants and their families. The chapter draws on the analysis of policies and legislation and on findings from a survey conducted in selected locations in these countries, which involved professionals (teachers, social workers and mediators), children, and their parents. The chapter shows not only the complex position migrant children occupy, but also their exercise of agency, highlighting at once challenges and inspirational local practices that support hybrid integration and innovative social planning.

Chapters 4–9 discuss the analysis of two types of findings. The first type concerns children and professionals' narratives, based on mainly qualitative data collected through individual and focus groups interviews with children and

professionals. The second type of data concerns the facilitation of conversations on children's rights or social relations, second-language learning and language mediation based on video- and audio-recordings of school activities. The latter type of data allows for an understanding of the practices that are, in fact, facilitative of children's exercise of agency and children's narratives in the classroom or group interactions.

Chapter 4 concerns the importance of social relationships for the hybrid integration of children with migrant backgrounds, taking the children's perspective, while still valuing the views of teachers and social workers and differentiating symmetric (peer relationships) and asymmetric relationships (those between adults and children). The analyses of interviews with children and professionals highlight the importance of the construction of identity and the consequences of such construction for children's identity, participation, and well-being with regard to perception, representation, and language. The interviews point out that the quality of group contexts and interactions has a crucial influence on children's participation. Chapter 5 explores the gender dimension of participation in school activities and in practicing agency at school by migrant children. Based on qualitative research with professionals and children, it highlights the social expectations towards boys and girls aroused from family and school and their impact on boys' and girls' agency. This chapter aims to discuss the role of school in empowering boys and girls, the context in which their agency is visible and the factors contributing to enhancing their agency. Chapter 6 analyses classroom interactions in primary and secondary schools, providing a detailed transcription of audio- and video-recorded activities. The chapter concentrates on the facilitation of CMB's agency and shows how different forms of facilitation, or different phases of the same process of facilitation, are based on combinations of actions, produce different narratives, and have an important impact on children's agency. Moreover, the chapter shows that these forms of facilitation can be related to different levels of school education and different research contexts. Chapter 7 discusses the results of research on day care centres and nurseries. The discussion focuses on educators' methods of facilitation and opportunities and limitations of young children's exercise of agency, based on interviews/focus groups and transcriptions of interactions. The chapter elucidates how the hybrid integration of migrant children in nurseries is a consequence of practices aimed at enhancing and supporting the agency of children regardless of their background. However, data suggest that this strategy encounters problems when needs or problems specifically related to the migrant background of children emerge requiring professional support. Chapter 8 focuses on students' participation in the view of language use in the multilingual classroom and the teacher's role as that of a facilitator. Methodologically, the chapter draws on insights from the literature about monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies in classrooms and empirically on video-recordings of classroom interactions and interviews with teachers. The analysis shows and discusses how different approaches to teaching and facilitation of classroom interactions impact students' participation. It argues for a stronger focus on the role of the teacher in the (multilingual) classroom interaction and for the upgrading of children's diversity as a resource for learning and

for giving opportunities of exercising agency in the classroom. Chapter 9 focuses on mediated interactions between teachers and migrant parents. The corpus of data consists of audio-recorded interpreter-mediated interactions between teachers and foreign-speaking parents in primary schools in Italian contexts. Mediation is provided by professional intercultural mediators, who are employed in several public services in Italy. The meetings focus on the children's performance at school and during home activities. In particular, the chapter discusses how language mediation between teachers and parents may support parents' participation and initiatives.

The concluding chapter, Chapter 10, summarises the most important findings from the CHILD-UP research by combining the results presented in Chapters 3–9. It provides a thorough reflection on the success of the CHILD-UP empirical research against its objectives. The implications of CHILD-UP are discussed with regard to the potential impact of its results on the quality of education practices toward hybrid integration based on children's exercise of agency. Chapter 10 thus provides practical suggestions by: (1) illustrating effective practices in the education system that promote children's agency and hybrid integration; and (2) suggesting what can be done to apply these practices and overcome challenges toward better results.

Appendix

Table 1.1 Research areas

Country	*Location*
Belgium	Wallonia and Flanders
Finland	Tampere region and South Ostrobothnia
Germany	Saxony and Hamburg
Italy	Modena, Reggio Emilia and Genoa
Poland	Kraków and Łuków (region of Małopolska)
Sweden	Malmö
UK	Boroughs of Barnet, Bromley and Merton (Greater London)

Table 1.2 Collected questionnaires

	Total	*Males (%)*	*Females (%)*
Children	3,959	49.4	50.6
Parents	2,341	22.9	77.1
Teachers/educators	421	15.7	84.3
Social workers	332	29.1	70.8
Mediators/interpreters	123	25.8	78.2
Total	7,176	—	—

Table 1.3 Distribution of CMB and migrant-background parents

Country	*CMB*		*Parents*	
	n.	%	*n.*	%
Belgium	221	57.9	94	74.0
Finland	122	21.0	26	25.5
Germany	127	22.8	24	8.1
Italy	334	46.7	255	39.0
Poland	152	22.6	137	26.8
Sweden	144	77.0	9	47.4
United Kingdom	203	32.2	156	39.6
Total	1,303	36.7	701	33.3

Table 1.4 Number of participants and interviews

	Participants	*Individual interviews*	*Collective interviews*
Children	1,305	65	103
Teachers/educators	164	145	5
Social workers and guardians in reception centres	72	62	3
Mediators/interpreters	48	13	11
Total	1,589	285	122

Table 1.5 Recordings of activities and tests

	Number	*Girls*	*Boys*	*CMB*	*Non-migrant*
Classes/groups	103				
Recordings classes/ groups	207				
Pre-tests	1,684	51.3	47.0	49.4	50.1
Post-tests	1,601	53.5	49.1	48.6	50.1
Recordings mediation	18				

Note

1 The general category of Children with a Migrant Background (CMB) is constituted by: (1) long-term resident children; (2) newcomers, including refugees and children who recently arrived through family reunification; and (3) unaccompanied children, including both long-term residents and newcomers. Within the category of long-term residents, we included children with at least one foreign-born parent.

References

Alanen, L. (2009). Generational order. In J. Qvortrup, W. Corsaro, & M.S. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies* (pp. 159–174). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Amadasi, S., & Baraldi, C. (2022). The child as a medium. Breakdown and possible resurgence of children's agency in the era of pandemic. *Childhood*, *29*(4), 561–577.

Baraldi, C. (2014). Formulations in dialogic facilitation of classroom interactions. *Language and Dialogue*, *4*(2), 234–260.

Baraldi, C. (2022). *Facilitating children's agency in the interactions. Challenges for the education system*. Cham: Palgrave.

Baraldi, C., Joslyn, E., & Farini, F. (Eds.) (2021). *Promoting children's rights in European schools: Intercultural dialogue and facilitative pedagogy*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cohen, E.G., Lotan, R.A., & Leechor, C. (1989). Can classroom learn? *Sociology of Education*, *62*, 75–94.

Damery, S., & Raziano, A. (2021). Excluded and included by COVID 19? The impact of COVID 19 on inclusive education efforts with regard to migrant children in Belgium. *Migration Studies. Review of the Polish diaspora*, *4*(182), 183–203.

Darmody, M., Byrne, D., & McGinnity, F. (2014). Cumulative disadvantage? Educational careers of migrant students in Irish secondary schools. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(1), 129–151.

Davies, B. (1980). An analysis of primary school children's accounts of classroom interaction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *1*(3), 257–278.

Davies, B. (1983). The role pupils play in the social construction of classroom order. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *4*(1), 55–69.

Delamont, D. (1976). *Interaction in the classroom*. London: Methuen.

Devine, D. (2013). 'Value'ing children differently? Migrant children in education. *Children & Society*, *27*, 282–294.

Ensor, M., & Godziak, E. (2010). *Children and migration. At the crossroads of resiliency and vulnerability*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

European Commission. (2017). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council*. Brussels.

Farini, F., Baraldi, C., & Scollan, A. (2021). The cohesion of schools as communities in the management of COVID-19 pandemic: Reactions, narratives, fears and hopes from the voices of children in England and Italy. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*, *9*, 120–148.

James, A., & James, A.L. (2004). *Constructing childhood. Theory, policy and social practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Janta, B., & Harte, E. (2016). *Education of migrant children. Education policy responses for the inclusion of migrant children in Europe*. Cambridge: RAND Europe.

Kostet, I., & Verschraegen Noel Clycq, G. (2021). Repertoires on diversity among primary school children, *Childhood*, *28*(1), 8–27.

Kovać-Cerović, T. (2021). Education of migrants and vulnerable groups: Trauma or protective factor? In A. Hamburgr, C. Hancheva, & V.D. Volkan (Eds.), *Social trauma. An interdisciplinary textbook* (pp. 371–378). Cham: Springer.

Lauritsen, K. (2011). Cultural complexity and border markers in Norwegian kindergartens. *Children & Society*, *27*(5), 350–360.

Mahon, J., & Cushner, K. (2012). The multicultural classroom. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 434–448). London: Routledge.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. (2002). Developing dialogues. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st Century* (pp. 141–153). London: Blackwell.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and development of children's thinking*. London: Routledge.

O'Connor, M.C., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 63–103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palludan, C. (2007). Two tones: The core of inequality in kindergarten? *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *39*(1), 75–91.

Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *3*(1), 19–37.

Scarth, J. (1987). Teacher strategies: A review and critique. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *8*(3), 245–262.

Schell, A. (2009). Schools and cultural difference. In H. Kotthoff & H. Spencer-Oatey (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 303–321). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seele, C. (2012). Ethnicity and early childhood. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *44*(3), 307–325.

Sharma, C. (2015). Co-creating joyful learning and augmenting social skills in children by employing creative drama. In T. Dragonas, K. Gergen, S. McNamee, & E. Tseliou (Eds.), *Education as social construction. Contributions to theory, research and practice* (pp. 140–155). Chagrin Falls, OH: Publications of Taos Institute.

Stevenson, D.L. (1991). Deviant students as a collective resource in classroom control. *Sociology of Education*, *64*(2), 127–133.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *30*(6), 1024–1054.

Waterhouse, S. (1991). Person formulation in the process of schooling. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *12*(1), 45–60.

Wells, G. (2015). Dialogic learning: Talking our way into understanding. In T. Dragonas, K. Gergen, S. McNamee, & E. Tseliou (Eds.), *Education as social construction. Contributions to theory, research and practice* (pp. 62–89). Chagrin Falls, OH: Publications of Taos Institute.

Young, R.F. (2007). Language learning and teaching as discursive practice. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, W. Li, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social inter-action* (pp. 251–271). Basingstoke: Palgrave.