up

Children Hybrid Integration: Learning Dialogue as a way of Upgrading Policies of Participation

Milestone

MS10 Report on the analysis of quantitative data

Deliverable Responsible: Seinäjoki University of Applied sciences (SeAMK)

Deliverable due date: 31/01/2020

Submission date: 13/03/2020

Updated version: 24/09/2020

Version: 2.0

Child-Up

Document Control Page	
Title	Executive summary, quantitative analysis, Work package 4.
Creator	Paula Kuusipalo, Tiina Hautamäki, Claudio Baraldi
Description	Compilation of Child-up survey; seven country reports with executive summary
Publisher	Child-Up Consortium
Contributors	Alissia Raziano; Thomas Drößler, Margund K. Rohr, Franziska Wächter; Paula Kuusipalo, Tiina Hautamäki, Jaakko Sihto, Maiju Kinossalo; Sara Amadasi, Chiara Ballestri, Claudio Baraldi; Krystyna Slany, Justyna Struzik, Magdalena Ślusarczyk, Marta Warat; Erica Righard, Anne Harju, Petra Svensson Källberg, Morten Frisch; Federico Farini, Jane Murray, Kim Woodbridge-Dodd, Eva Prokopiou and Angela Scollan
Creation date	24.09.2020
Type	Report
Language	English
Rights	copyright "Child-Up Consortium"
Audience	☐ public X restricted
Review status	☐ Draft x WP leader accepted ☐ Technical Manager accepted X Coordinator accepted
Action requested	☐ to be revised by Partners ☐ for approval by the WP leader ☐ for approval by the Technical Committee ☐ for approval by the Project Coordinator
Requested deadline	N. A.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Child-Up

Contents

ANNEXES I-VII:

COUNTRY REPORTS

I Belgium
II Finland
III Germany
IV Italy
V Poland
VI Sweden
VII United Kingdom

The following metadata and survey data are deposited and available for consortium in IDA repository. Requests for accessing the data, contact person: Tiina Hautamäki tiina.hautamaki@seamk.fi

- CODEBOOK
- QUESTIONNAIRES & TRANSLATIONS
- DATA

1 Introduction

The CHILD-UP survey collected quantitative data for providing insights on the condition and hybrid integration of children with migrant background into education. The target group of **migrant-background children** includes (1) first- and second-generation long-term resident children, (2) newcomers, including refugees and children recently arrived through family reunification, (3) unaccompanied children, who can be both long-term residents and newcomers. The overall aim of WP4 is to collect quantitative data and analyse it in order to answer questions related to children's integration the survey was conducted in the following areas:

Country	Location
Belgium *	Flemish and Walloon regions
Finland	Tampere region and Southern Ostrobothnia region
Germany	Saxony and Hamburg
Italy	Provinces of Modena, Reggio Emilia and Genoa
Poland	Kraków (region of Małopolska) and Lubelskie Region
Sweden	Malmö
UK	Boroughs of Barnet, Bromley and Merton (Greater London)

* In Belgium the selected areas are different from what was foreseen in the project (Brussels region), since it was not possible to find schools interested in the project in this region in which many projects are proposed to schools.

The specific objectives of the survey were the following:

- To gain a detailed and multi-angled understanding of the circumstances and integration of migrant-background children.
- To focus on how children's agency is present and absent in relation to integration and everyday life in schools from the viewpoint of children, their parents or guardians and professionals working with them (teachers, social workers, interpreters/mediators working in schools).
- To investigate essential factors in children's integration, i.e. gender, country of origin, language skills, family composition, length of stay.
- To study how the schooling system and social protection systems at large interact with migrant-background children and with one another to enhance integration.

The questionnaires have been distributed to the whole class, however participation was voluntary for all the pupils in the class. Migrant children have been identified through a question about the origin of their parents and their own place of birth. There are two reasons for this procedure. First, and above all, this type of sampling allows for the comparison of levels of integration of migrant-background children and national children, as it is important to compare data from migrant and non-migrant children and parents. Second, it avoids the possible labelling of migrant children as selected for research activities.

The collected data help to describe the variety of life situations of migrant-background children and the different aspects that are essential for integration. This report concerns three important aspects which give meaning to migrant-background children's social life and were included in the conceptual part of CHILD-UP project proposal.

- Children's social life is based on contextual conditions, such as gender, sexual orientation, geography, age, abilities and status (intersectionality).
- Migrant-background children can contribute to the host society and to their own integration. This implies focusing on children's agency as a specific form of participation, based on the choices of action that are available to children in terms of promoting change, particularly in school life.
- Cultural identity is a contingent product of social negotiation in school interaction. This negotiation can produce hybrid identities, i.e. loose, unstable manifestations of cultural identities, and hybrid integration.

This report includes elected tables, results and comments displaying data from the different countries, in order to highlight some relevant differences and similarities between the research areas, concerning children's social life and educational experience.

Data analysis is divided into 8 sections. Following this introduction, **section 2** introduces some preliminary data, including the number of questionnaires collected. It is divided into different target groups (children, parents, teachers/educators, social workers and interpreters/mediators); the distribution of children and parents among ISCED 0 (kindergartens), 1 (primary schools), 2 (lower secondary schools) and 3 (higher secondary schools); distribution of migrant-background children and migrant parents; and distribution in terms of gender.

The following sections include data and comments concerning the different variables analysed throughout the survey. In particular, the analysis aims to understand, on the one hand, the general trends among children, and, on the other hand, whether migrant-background children differ from these trends. Since there may be important differences between the number of native children and the number of migrant-background children in each class, this report presents a comparison between the percentages of all children and the percentages concerning migrant-background children, to make it possible to see if the trend for migrant-background children is different from the general trend in the classroom. This choice, which may be different from those made in the country reports, reflects the idea that the project does not aim to stress or fill a difference between children with and without

a migrant background, but rather to bring migrant children at the same level of participation with all children. In this way, inclusion may be pursued.

Section 3 includes general data about children, parents and professionals. First, in this section, the analysis concerns children's conditions, with a special reference to migration. The section includes tables about children who used to live in another country before moving to the present country, children's living conditions, parents 'educational attainment, teachers' formal education, and professionals' training in multicultural issues.

Section 4 concerns the language use, an essential aspect of children's integration. The chapter explores children's proficiency in the local language; children's experience of multilingualism at school, in the classroom and in the playground; use of language (and possible multilingualism) in teaching and social work; and language support available in schools.

Section 5 focuses on institutional experience in general. Of particular interest are children's and their parents' perceptions of children's schoolwork, level of satisfaction of professionals (teachers, social workers and interpreters/mediators) with their work.

Section 6 concerns school relations, both teacher-children and children's peer relations. Specifically, this section includes experience of school relations from the point of view of children and teachers, experience of communication between teachers and parents (channels, difficulties, level of satisfaction).

Section 7 focuses on children's agency from the point of view of children themselves and professionals', particularly teachers', support for children's agency. Moreover, this section explores professionals' sense of self-efficacy in working with children.

Section 8 introduces some challenges related to schools and institutions, exploring the point of view and the experience of children, and the same phenomena interpreted by parents, teachers and interpreters/mediators. The section also describes (forms of) support received by children.

Section 9, finally, provides information about perceptions of the levels of integration by teachers, social workers, interpreters/mediators and parents.

Section 10 provides a summary and a reflection of issues emerging from the survey. However, this report does not intend to generalise situations or countries. It aims to **provide data in the selected areas that will guide the** CHILD-UP **project forward during the following phases of research and innovation.** The analysis involves the classes that were selected in the different countries, so that it is possible to compare the data concerning migrant-background children and non-migrant children. The report includes the most important results emerging from the survey; other, more detailed, tables and comments about the specific research areas can be found in the country reports (Annexes I-VII).

All percentages included in this report are based on the valid number of respondents or responses when multiple responses have been provided. In order to ease the understanding of the tables, the number of valid responses is not shown.

2 General notes about the respondents

The survey is based on the administration of questionnaires to children, their parents, teachers, social workers and interpreter/mediators. Table 1 presents the number of questionnaires that researchers managed to collect in each country vis-á-vis the foreseen target. Due to the method of collecting data in cooperation with schools and social service, the turnout was generally quite high, compared to random sample surveys. However, the situations and methodological challenges varied between countries, and respondents could leave some questions unanswered. In the UK, for example, interpreters/mediators were not chosen as a target since such professionals are absent from the school context in UK. In Belgium, to take another example, it was not possible to collect enough questionnaires from social workers and interpreters/mediators, thus data are not provided in the following presentation; data about these issues will be collected for the qualitative phase of research.

Table 1. Number of questionnaires collected (C) and the goal (G).

Country	Children		Parents		Teachers, Educators		Social Workers, Guardians		Mediators/ Interpreters		Total	
	C	G	C	G	C	G	C	G	C	G	C	G
Belgium	387	360	128	360	29	20	2	20	1	20	547	780
Finland	672	700	103	700	59	60	37	50	20	20	891	1,530
Germany	557	900	297	900	139	80	139	80	20	20	1,152	1,980
Italy	856	900	829	900	84	70	83	60	36	30	1,888	1,960
Poland	673	900	511	900	35	50	21	20	10	10	1,250	1,880
Sweden	194	300	19	300	39	60	39	40	36	30	327	730
United Kingdom	640	700	395	700	36	45	11	15	-	-	1,082	1,460
Total	**3,958**	4,760	**2,282**	4,760	**421**	385	**332**	285	**123**	130	**7,116**	10,320

The number of parents who responded to the questionnaire is much lower than what was foreseen although the questionnaires were translated and available in many languages in all participating countries, except in Belgium and the UK (where multilingual practices do not officially show in the classroom). Reaching the parent respondents was the most difficult task in all countries except in Italy. In several cases, the expectation to reach parents via schools rather than contacting them in person (a pure impossibility in most cases) proved too optimistic. With the time allocated, it was not possible to arrange many individual and focus group encounters with parents, even though that proved a successful strategy. In Finland, the share of migrant parents among respondents was higher than the percentage of migrant population in the regions due to researchers' personal contacts and face-to-face encounters in reception centres, as well as to cooperation with key informants spreading the online survey in their networks.

Another challenging issue in almost all participating countries was getting access to schools. The schools contacted often rejected cooperation on several grounds. Some of them related to the school in general (e.g. examination period; insufficient number of teaching staff; recurring cooperation demands), some to the CHILD-UP project per se (e.g. too low a number of migrant pupils vis-á-vis project criteria; organisational burden, including the informing of teachers, pupils and parents, and distributing and collecting consent forms etc.), and some to the situation of individual teachers (e.g. corresponding work overload and lack of time; involvement in other projects; former negative experiences with research projects; time problems regarding to curriculum and regular teaching requests – sometimes even irrelevance of or disinterest in project themes).

A further difficulty in reaching parents related to the participant information sheet concerning, among other things, privacy and data protection protocol, and the related request for parents/guardians to give informed consent for children's participation in the study. Although the information sheets and consent forms were provided in different languages, many parents were overwhelmed by the amount and complexity of information and often refused cooperation without (completely) reading the materials.

Finally, the societal and political climate during the realisation of WP4 needs to be considered. Migration and asylum-seeking are sensitive political topics all over Europe, and in a heightened sense since the 2015 crisis. Although no direct causal link can be shown to exist between this climate and the difficulties in acquiring consent for children's participation in the study it may be have had some influence on parents' and professionals' support for and interest towards the project. However, the professionals in all participating countries seemed quite interested to participate in the survey in general. In the context of Belgium, the difficulty to find mediator respondents reflects the actual lack of formal interpreters supporting schoolwork.

Table 2 shows the distribution of children and parents in different types of schools: kindergartens (ISCED 0), primary schools (ISCED 1), lower secondary schools (ISCED 2) and higher secondary schools (ISCED 3). During the kick-off meeting, the consortium agreed to limit the age of the children participating in the survey. The choice was: five-to-six-year-olds in ISCED 0; nine-to-ten-year-olds in ISCED 1; 12-14 -year-olds in ISCED 2; and 15-16 -year-olds in ISCED 4.

Respecting the plan of the project included in the Grant Agreement, infant schools (ISCED 0) were only included in Finland, Germany and Italy, while in the UK, only primary schools were selected. Discrepancies between Table 1 and Table 2 depend on the lack of declaration of respondents, since, for example in Belgium where the directors of the Flemish schools distributed the questionnaires to parents, the researchers were not always present, making it impossible to find out about the distribution on the basis of questionnaires only. In Germany, parents were also contacted through different channels from school; parents with children in different age groups are not reported in the table.

Table 2 shows that primary schools (ISCED 1) present the highest percentage of respondents, followed by lower secondary schools (ISCED 2).

Table 2. Distribution of children and parents for ISCED

Country	ISCED 0		ISCED 1		ISCED 2		ISCED 3		Total child	total par
	child	par	child	par	child	par	child	par		
Belgium*	-	-	150		163		72		385	128
Finland	74	32	202	58	228	44	151	30	655	164
Germany	185	59	170	38	126	58	75	17	556	172
Italy	141	176	323	301	200	184	192	168	856	829
Poland	-	-	289	348	384	273	-	-	673	621
Sweden	-	4	66	10	56	9	72	10	194	33
United Kingdom	-	-	640	394	-	-	-	-	640	394
Total	400	271	1,840	1,149	1,157	568	562	225	3,959	2,213
Total %	10.1	12.2	46.5	51.9	29.2	25.7	14.2	10.2	100	100

*In Belgium, the questionnaires were distributed in mixed groups of parents, so the distribution across ISCED levels was based on the data from the question in the questionnaire. As the question about which grade your child/ren is/are in can have multiple answers, it is impossible to get an accurate distribution.

The survey concerned classrooms including children with and without migration backgrounds. Table 3 below shows the share of children and parents with and without migration background in the survey sample. This share is clearly different in different research areas; it depends on the schools and centres which were involved in the CHILD-UP survey. This share follows the plans made in the kick-off meeting (at least 20% of migrant-background children) everywhere, and it is useful to give a clear idea of a possible difference between migrant and non-migrant background in the school system. However, the sample distribution of children and parents with and without migration background is not equal with their distribution in the entire population in the researched regions (for a more detailed picture, see the country reports in ANNEXES I-VII). Table 3 shows that in the whole sample about one third of the respondents (both children and parents) have a migrant background, with a slightly higher percentage of children.

Table 3. Distribution of migration background children and parents (% on the total number)

	Children		Parents	
Country	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 4 shows the distribution of gender. Due to collecting survey data in schools, the gender balance of girls and boys among child respondents is almost fifty-fifty throughout the sample and thus gender comparison is possible. Concerning professionals' and parents' gender the situation is the same in all countries: most professional and parent respondents are female and between 70-80% of parent respondents are mothers. Therefore, gender comparison does not make much sense in these respondent groups, but evidently, this issue of gender imbalance is of interest in further research.

Table 4. Sex /Gender

	Males		Females	
	n.	%	n.	%
Children	1,932	49.5	1,968	50.6
Parents	508	22.9	1,708	77.1
Teachers	65	15.7	350	84.3
Social workers	93	29.1	226	70.8
Interpreters/mediators	31	25.8	89	74.2

While planning the questionnaire, it was agreed that gender should not be restricted to a binary variable. Implementing this principle in practice was not as easy, however. I In the translated versions, each country adjusted the questionnaires to suit their national contexts. For instance, due to the upswing of anti-LGBTQ+ sentiment in Poland, the question concerning gender did not include the choice "other" but an open-ended question for respondents to indicate what their gender is.

3 General data about children, parents and professionals

Table 5 shows that the migration trajectories of children vary quite a lot. For example, 38% of children with a migration background in **Belgium**, 43% in **Finland**, nearly one fifth in **Germany** and 17% in **Italy** had lived in another country before arriving to the destination country. The total percentage is 37.1% (25.7% for more than one year), which shows that most children did not experience life in other countries.

Table 5. Children who lived in another country before arriving to the present country

Country	More than one year		Less than one year		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	19	24.1	11	13.9	30	38.0
Finland	20	30.8	8	12.3	28	43.0
Germany	15	19.2	9	11.5	24	30.7
Italy	10	8.5	10	8.5	20	17.0
Poland	21	16.4	10	7.8	31	24.2
Sweden	16	24.2	12	18.2	28	42.4
United Kingdom	61	62.9	12	12.4	73	85.3
Total	162	**25.7**	72	**11.4**	234	**37.1**

These experiences of living in different countries can have an effect on children's education and learning skills. Depending on the residence country conditions and family situation, the children have or have not attended school. In addition, school language and quality of teaching may vary depending on the local conditions and the family's resources. **During the qualitative phase of research, it is important to pay attention to teachers' awareness of migrant children's background in that it can have consequences on learning.**

Table 6 shows that families living in asylum seekers' reception centres are few. However, living conditions of migrants are slightly different in different countries. For instance, homelessness is an increasing problem in **England** and London in particular, but the data produced speak of the ability of local authorities to secure access to housing for children and their families. The **Polish** sample was collected in towns in the south-eastern part of the country, where the Centers for Foreigners are situated, and this shows in that a significant percentage of child respondents (36%) report living in reception centres where housing conditions are difficult due to limited space in the rooms. In addition, migrant families in this sample are distinguished by a larger number of children. In **Germany,** all the child respondents with a migrant background live in a house or apartment, and in three out of 75 cases together with another family/person. This is because of political and welfare reasons: refugee families and asylum-seeking families with children should not be accommodated in

reception centres. However, this does not represent the particular living condition according to place or neighbourhood.

Table 6. Children's living conditions

	Children ISCED 1-3		Migrant background	
	n.	%	n.	%
My family lives in a house/apartment	2,837	94.0	1,091	87.5
My family shares a house/apartment with another family/person	106	3.5	66	5.3
My family lives in a residential home/institution	63	2.1	66	5.3
I live in a residential home/institution without my family.	13	0.4	24	1.9
Total	3,019	100	1,247	100

Table 7 concern parents' higher educational attainment. The table is based on the division of the different levels of education according to ISCED (0-8). In more details:

ISCED 0 = no formal schooling
ISCED 1 = primary education
ISCED 2 = lower secondary education
ISCED 3-4 = upper secondary education / post-secondary non-tertiary education
ISCED 5 = short cycle tertiary education
ISCED 6 = university degree, bachelor's level
ISCED 7 = university degree, master's level
ISCED 8 = university degree, doctoral level

Table 7 shows that parents with a migrant background are quite highly educated, but also that many of those parents who have no or a very low-level education (primary or lower secondary) have a migration background. In general, migrant parents make up the biggest group among those with an upper secondary education and short tertiary education.

Table 7. Parents' higher educational attainment

	All Parents		Migrants	
	n.	%	n.	%
ISCED 0-2	100	4.8	81	10.2
ISCED 3-4	1,147	54.7	464	58.7
ISCED 5-8	849	40.5	245	31.0

Total	2,096	100	790	100

Table 8 shows that 59.6% of teachers have a formal teacher education. It also shows that there are some important differences between the participating countries in terms of the type of educational requirements for teaching. These differences explain the high number of teachers who do not have such an education.

Table 8. Formal teacher education

Country	n.	%
Belgium	27	93.1
Finland	58	98.3
Germany	27	19.4
Italy	28	49.1
Poland	34	97.1
Sweden	37	94.8
United Kingdom	26	72.2
Total	235	**59.6**

The teachers in **Belgium**, **Finland**, **Poland** and **Sweden** mostly have a formal teacher education, which reflects the obligation to hold a MA/BA degree in education to teach in these countries. All teachers in **England** must hold a post-graduate teaching qualification; therefore, the educational background of participating teachers is similar, except for teaching assistants (n=10) who do not need a professional qualification to work in schools.

In **Germany**, the picture is different for preschool teachers/ educators (n=108) and teachers (n=30). While for the former, within German Democratic Republic a graduate course suffices to work as an educator in preschool, for the latter today a BA/MA degree is needed. However, with regard to teaching within the former GDR, it was still common that ISCED1 teachers were qualified together with educators; correspondingly, they have completed graduation courses in teaching (i.e., n=12 out of 30 teachers). Accordingly, the ratio of educators/ teachers with a BA/MA-degree is rather low in the German sample. Nevertheless, graduate courses in teaching even today represent sufficient formal qualification in primary school teaching. In **Italy**, a degree in education has become mandatory rather recently and only for teaching in infant schools and primary schools; therefore, only a few teachers have a degree in education. Many more teachers have a post-degree specialization in specific areas, which is mandatory to teach in secondary schools.

Table 9 concerns professionals' training in multicultural issues. The data produces interesting differences between countries, regions and professional groups. In general, 58.8% of teachers, 69.9% of social workers and 75.4% of interpreters/mediators have

received training in multicultural issues, which is an important result of the survey, showing professionals' preparation for multicultural issues.

Table 9. Professionals' training in multicultural issues*

Country	Teachers		Social Workers		Mediators/ interpreters	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	12	41.4	-	-	-	-
Finland	27	45.8	30	81.1	4	23.5
Germany	60	43.5	100	72.7	17	85.0
Italy	50	59.5	62	74.7	27	77.1
Poland	35	100	5	23.8	7	70.0
Sweden	27	71.0	22	57.9	34	94.4
United Kingdom	36	100	11	100	-	-
Total	247	58.8	230	69.9	89	75.4

* Respondents have provided more than one answer

Table 9 also shows some interesting differences between the countries. In **Belgium,** 58% of teachers have never attended a training on multicultural issues. The discrepancy between regions is relevant: in Flanders, 60% of teachers did attend such a training, whereas the percentage of teachers in Wallonia was only nine. In **Finland**, slightly less than 50% of teachers and 80% of social workers had participated in multicultural training. An interesting finding is that interpreters/ mediators did not participate in multicultural training to the same extent.

In **Germany**, training in multicultural issues shows several differences and imbalances across different professional groups. Social workers (73%) and mediators/interpreters (86%) received such training more often than teachers and educators (43.5%). The Finnish and German data indicate a difference in multicultural knowledge and competences between the professionals and probably a general issue regarding teachers' and educators' professional education. Only a minority of educators and teachers had received training on multicultural issues during their formal education. This might either clarify the differences or indicate a lack of formal professional qualification.

In **Italy**, training on multicultural issues and multilingualism is diffuse among social workers and mediators. Considering the rather low sensitivity for multicultural issues in the country, a high percentage of teachers also participated in this type of training. This shows that many teachers who participated in the research were already interested in the CHILD-UP objectives. In **England**, all professionals have undergone training on multiculturalism as part of the CPD provision that employees must be provided with. In Poland, all teacher

respondents had completed multicultural training, mostly as part of their formal education. It is noticeable that the majority of teachers had worked quite a long time in schools (one third had been working for more than 26 years, and almost half of them for 16 to 25 years), which shows multicultural training has been included in the training programme for a long time already. By contrast, among social workers, only one in four declared that they participated in training that included elements of social work in multicultural or multilingual settings.

As knowledge of language is the criterion for employing a language mediator/interpreter, many mediator/interpreter respondents in this study are native speakers of other languages than the official language(s) of their country of residence. Since not all mediators/interpreters have undergone multicultural training (only 23% in Finland), it may be asked whether a professional with a migration background is considered multiculturally competent for the sake of his/her origin merely. In addition, mediators/interpreters do not always find full-time employment, and, because of the precarious work situation, they may not be able to participate in multicultural training or other type of training for that matter.

4 Use of language

Tables 10 and 11 show the level of children's proficiency in the local language. There are two tables since the questions were differentiated according to children's age (a simplified question was addressed to children in ISCED 1). However, the Swedish team decided to use the same (simplified) question for all children; therefore, all Swedish children are included in Table 10.

Table 10 (ISCED 1) only includes the proposed negative value (*not so well yet,* as a response to the question "How well do you speak the local language?"), which was proposed to children in primary schools. The table shows that, in most cases, the children reported that they speak the local language sufficiently well. In primary schools, only 19.1% of children declared to not speak the local language so well yet. Especially children with a migration background mainly declared that they master the local language well or very well in all research contexts. The most relevant exceptions concern **Poland**, where one third indicated that they still have some problems with the language, and **Italy** (26.7%).

Table 10. Children's proficiency in local language (ISCED 1)

	Not so well yet	
Country	n.	%
Belgium	10	12.3
Finland	12	12.5
Germany	0	-
Italy	48	**26.7**
Poland	50	**33.1**
Sweden	4	8.3
United Kingdom	3	4.1
Total	127	**19.1**

Table 11 concerns children in ISCED 2 and ISCED 3. Data from the UK are missing since the UK sample only included children in ISCED 1. Table 11 is also a simplified version of the complete table, including both the positive value of understanding and expressing and the difficulty in doing so.

It is worth noting that the question was phrased in terms of *speaking* the local language. The positive responses may have been fewer if the question had been phrased in terms of writing texts or understanding specific subject matters taught in school. This choice was made in relation to the objectives of the CHILD-UP project, which focuses on children's active participation. However, in general, insufficient local language skills might explain, to some extent, the missing cases and missing data in the survey; although researchers offered

translations and interpreting in many languages, sometimes the schools did not recognise the need for language support.

Table 11 shows that 42.2% of children can understand and express the local language, while only a few have problems in doing that. However, there are relevant differences between **Belgium**, **Finland** and **Germany** (and **Sweden**, see above), one the one hand, and **Italy** and **Poland**, on the other. In Italy and Poland, the percentages of children who are able to understand and express the local language are much lower. Moreover, in Italy, the percentages of children who have difficulties in understanding and expressing are much higher than in the other countries, although they are not so high as such.

Table 11. Children's proficiency in local language (ISCED 2 and 3)

Country	Understand and express		Difficulties in understanding		Difficulties in expressing	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	46	79.3	.	-	3	5.2
Finland	42	72.4	2	3.4	2	3.4
Germany	22	73.3	1	3.3	1	3.3
Italy	33	24.1	17	12.4	22	16.1
Poland	45	29.8	-	-	-	-
Total	188	**42.2**	20	**4.5**	28	**6.3**

Table 12 shows children's experience of multiple languages (plurilingualism) in class and in the playground. Table 12 shows that the research locations in the seven participating countries are characterised largely as "monolingual" since only 18.2% of all children and 28.8% of children with migrant background declare they have experienced multilingualism in the classroom. For children with a migrant background only, the percentage increases in the playground, which probably means that children with a migration background (in the table M-B Children) tend to gather in the playground, while they cannot do the same in the classroom.

Table 12. Children's experience of multilingualism in school (Children ISCED 1–3)

Country	Class				Playground			
	All children		M-B children		All children		M-B children	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	45	11.9	42	19.18	71	18.8	62	28.4
Finland	162	27.6	45	35.2	134	22.9	78	61.9
Germany	86	23.5	24	31.6	24	31.6	36	47.4
Italy	185	26.7	120	37.4	158	22.8	95	29.1
Poland	116	17.4	92	63.4	141	21.2	111	76.0
Sweden	45	23.3	34	23.1	52	27.1	42	28.8
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	30	4.8	9	3.5
Total	639	**18.2**	357	**28.8**	610	17.5	433	**35.1**

It is worth noting that in the UK classrooms, according to this survey, multilingualism does not show at all. In two cases, namely **Belgium** and **Finland**, more than one official language is used. In Belgium, researchers accessed schools both in French- and Dutch-dominated regions, whereas in Finland both research areas were predominantly Finnish-speaking, hence neither Swedish nor Sami were local languages, but could be identified by respondents as their mother tongue.

In many schools in **Belgium**, children are not allowed to use another language than the local one. If they do so, they are warned by teachers or other members of the school staff. This is a situation in which children could feel stigmatised and marginalised. Indeed, if they cannot express themselves in their native language, maybe the children could have the impression that their identity related to this cannot be fully lived. The Belgian research team suggests that the consequent feelings of migrant children, when denied using their native languages, should be explored further in the qualitative phase. In **Finland**, on the contrary, majority of teachers - although mainly using only Finnish in their teaching - responded that they mostly allow pupils to use translation into their mother tongues. Quite often, Finnish teachers also use a third language or encourage children to use other languages in learning situations and to use their mother tongue in school playground.

In **Poland**, the vast majority of children indicated that they use Polish only in the classroom, in the school playground or with friends. In the case of children with a migration background, slightly more than one third indicated using Polish only in the class. by. Most of them use different languages in the school playground. Thus, the highest percentage of migrant-background children with an experience of multilingualism is in **Poland** (63.4%); this depends on the specificity of the Polish data, which was largely collected in centres for migrant children. A high percentage of children with a migration background experiencing multilingualism was also found in **Italy**; this is probably connected with the presence of intercultural mediators supporting these children with interpreting. In all participating countries, the experience of multilingualism systematically increases in the playground, although not dramatically, above all for children with a migration background, except for **Italy**, probably because mediators do not support children in the playground. In **Finland**, while only 22.9% of all children experience multilingualism in the playground, 61.9% of children with a migration background have this experience. This may indicate separation between migrant and non-migrant children in the playground. In **Germany,** on institutional levels, as in classrooms, kindergartens, as well as in exchange with teachers and social services, German vastly dominates the communication, although more than half of the children reported that they receive help in their mother tongue or can use translations. Both children and parents with a migration background, as well as educators, teachers and social workers underline that German is the commonly used language in professional contexts.

Table 13 shows the ways in which language is used in teaching and social work (data on social workers not collected in Belgium), stressing in particular the difference between monolingualism (exclusive use of national language) and plurilingualism, i.e. use of children's native languages, use of translation and use of various languages.

Table 13 shows there is a rather clear difference between teachers and social workers in terms of language use. The majority of teachers only use national language (71.4%), while they rarely resort to many languages (9.5%) or native languages (i.e. pupils' mother tongues) (12.2%). Translation is used frequently, by 52.7% of teachers. While monolingualism is frequent among teachers, social workers use many languages much more frequently (20.6%) and less frequently national language only (45.5%). Translation is used by 42.4% of social workers. Thus, plurilingualism is more frequent in social work than in teaching. Monolingualism in teaching is particularly evident in Germany, where use of translation is also limited.

Table 13. Language use in teaching and social work (multiple answers)

Country	National language				Native languages				Translation				Many languages			
	Teachers		SW		Teachers		SW		Teachers		SW		Teachers		SW	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	18	62.1	-	-	7	**24.1**	-	-	20	69.0	-	-	3	10.3	-	-
Finland	43	72.9	25	67.6	2	3.4	5	13.5	37	62.7	21	56.8	8	13.6	9	24.3
Germany	109	**80.0**	73	53.0	9	4.1	11	7.9	27	20.0	77	55.0	5	3.6	36	**26.0**
Italy	54	64.3	47	26.9	13	15.5	10	5.7	48	57.1	38	21.7	9	10.7	25	14.3
Poland	10	28.6	8	38.1	11	**31.4**	6	**28.6**	30	**85.7**	12	57.1	8	**22.9**	1	4.8
Sweden	29	74.4	28	**71.8**	9	23.0	8	20.5	27	**69.2**	20	51.3	7	17.9	16	41
United Kingdom	36	**100**	11	**100**	-	-	-	-	32	**89.1**	11	**100**	-	-	-	-
Total	299	**71.4**	192	**45.5**	51	**12.2**	40	**9.5**	221	**52.7**	179	**42.4**	40	**9.5**	87	**20.6**

In **Finland**, most of the teachers and social workers use Finnish at work. However, many social workers reported (see the country report of Finland in the Annex) helping their clients or providing language support in clients' native language (13,5 %), in another language almost fifty per cent (48,6%) and over fifty per cent allowing the clients to use translation or peer support (56,8%). In **Italian** schools, migrant children's languages are very rarely used. The multilingual context is much more evident in social work, as only one in four social workers exclusively use Italian, while the use of interpreting and translation is widespread.

In **Poland,** the use of native language, use of translation, and teachers' use of multiple languages are much common than in the other countries. Although most of the teachers know and can use another language, prevalently English, some teachers (probably older) can also speak Russian, French, German and/or Ukrainian. Still, most teachers mainly use Polish only in their teaching. However, they declare using some resources to support children with linguistic challenges. The most popular are allowing the use of translation if needed or helping pupils in another language than Polish: pupils' native language or third language. It is not very common to encourage children to use their native language or other foreign languages in class or in the playground, canteen or other common areas.

The use of translation is also particularly frequent in the **UK,** where the use of native language and multiple languages is absent. Thus, the fundamental aspect related to language use is that education and social work in the contexts of the research seem eminently monolingual by nature.

4.1 Availability of language support in schools

Table 14 shows that more than half of children declare to receive support in native language and that translation is used. As usual, data are different in different countries.

Table 14. Support of native languages in the classroom (according to children having challenges with native language)

Country	Help in native language		Use of translation	
	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	33	29.0	25	21.9
Finland	80	**66.7**	93	**78.2**
Germany	28	50.9	33	61.1
Italy	44	40.0	49	43.8
Poland	101	**69.2**	102	68.9
Sweden	70	59.3	79	68.7
United Kingdom	-	-	1	33.3
Total	356	53.4	382	57.4

In **Belgium**, 71% of migrant children reported that they are not helped in their native language and 78.1% of them reported that translations in their native language are not provided. On the contrary, in **Finland**, almost 70% of pupils with a migrant background report receiving support in their native language and almost 80% of the pupils in translation to their native language. Data in **Poland** are similar to data in Finland, as only one third of children indicate that they cannot ask for language assistance in their native language or for help of an interpreter in the classroom. This could be related to the fact that according to our informants, although hiring an interpreter or mediator by schools in Poland is possible and there are special regulations for that, this form of support for migrant children is still not completely recognized or known about among school directors. In **Sweden** too, even though mostly Swedish seems to be used in class, approximately 70% of all child respondents with a migrant background perceive that they can use translations in their native language in class. At least one third of the children with migrant background do not seem to receive proper language support in class.

The data in **Germany** are near the average, since half of the pupils with migrant background indicate that they have access to sufficient language support in classroom. Within this context, the critical evaluation of second language (L2)-support by teachers, educators and mediators seems to be noticeable (see the country report). In **Italy**, schools support the native language of some 40% of children who need it. This result, which is not astonishing in general, is rather surprising in the local context, since in general schools only support learning of Italian as L2. Moreover, in Italy, translation is not so frequent as expected, although language mediators are frequently available on request (see also table 15).

In the **UK**, it is noted that migrant background does not imply having languages other than English as the first language, due to the global reach of the British imperial heritage. Many migrants from Commonwealth countries are native speakers of English.

Table 15 shows the most important types of initiatives to promote plurilingualism in schools, that is, language and cultural mediation, providing learning in L2 and providing resources to

support learning in migrant children's native languages. This table does not include teachers responding that they do not know if these resources are offered (see the details regarding each country context below).

Table 15 shows that the most frequent initiative to promote languages in schools is providing resources for L2 learning (69.1%), which is not surprising since this is in general the most important strategy for integration in schools. Language and cultural mediation on the one hand (34.9%) and support of learning native languages on the other (34.1%) are much less frequent. It may be noted that there is a very low difference between these two actions in terms of percentage. The powerful instrument of mediation is largely ignored, with the exceptions of Poland (69.7%) and Sweden (59%), while Finland and Sweden offer many resources for native languages.

Table 15. Initiatives to promote languages in class and school (according to teachers)

Country	Language and cultural mediation		Resources for L2 learning		Resources for learning native languages	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	12	41.4	15	53.6	6	24.0
Finland*	1	2.1	58	74.3	33	**70.2**
Germany	11	25.0	24	60.0	1	2.5
Italy	25	30.1	57	68.7	13	15.7
Poland	23	**69.7**	28	84.5	10	31.3
Sweden	23	**59.0**	26	68.4	28	**73.7**
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	95	**34.9**	208	**69.1**	91	**34.1**

* In Finland, multiple answers for resources for L2 learning.

In **Belgium**, the discrepancy between Flanders and Wallonia regions can be noticed through the initiatives to promote languages in class and school. Indeed, in Wallonia, the vast majority of teachers do not know if they have the opportunity to access such language promotion support, while in Flanders, they reported many more initiatives. In sum, mediation is rather widespread when compared to the other countries, while support of native language is signalled only by 24% of teachers.

In **Finland**, all language support services are available in schools, even if teachers do not need the service**.** However, only one teacher reported using interpreting or language mediation in the class. The minority (native) language teaching is legislated and parents have a right to claim teaching in their native language for their children under certain conditions. What it comes to language mediators' work, it seems that in Finnish schools, it is quite multi-faceted since all choices of support were reported. The most commonly used

ways of language support of language mediators in schools is interpreting, providing written translation and supporting pupils, both in their native, and the local language.

In **Germany**, many teachers and educators do not have sufficient information about L2-support and appropriate resources for language support in schools. For instance, 65% report that they do not know whether additional resources are available in order to learn pupils' native languages. L2 learning is rather widespread. In **Italy**, L2 teaching is frequently organised at school level and much more frequently than language mediation. Language mediation is not so frequent as expected, although language mediators are frequently available on request. Teaching children's native language seems to be practised in some schools; this is surprising as in Italy this activity is not usual. This deserves some further investigation. According to mediators, written translation is less frequent than interpreting, which is their most important activity; moreover, about half of the mediators support students, teachers and parents in their languages. In **Poland**, the most recognized and promoted initiatives in class are interpreting or language mediation and, above all, allocation of resources for L2 learning. However, the class initiatives are not common. More common is that teachers rely on school initiatives (it would be interesting and should be researched during the qualitative IDIs and FGIs how it is organized – are there special interclass groups or individual work etc.). What is rather striking and important is that many teachers admit not knowing about any language support initiatives for migrant children. In **Sweden**, rather large proportions of both teachers and mediators do not know if different initiatives are encouraged to promote language support in teaching and learning in their class and schools, which indicates that these initiatives are rather rare. However, the percentage of all types of support is high, if compared with the other countries. In the **UK**, the data confirm that the only language in use is the national language and that no support is given in different languages.

5 School and institutional experience

In general, in all research contexts, majority of the children participating in the survey seem to assess their school experience and skills in positive terms. There were no particular differences between children with and without migration background or between girls' and boys' responses. All groups' responses are mostly in the positive end of the scale. In the tables that follow, the consortium used scales in order to give the respondents the possibility to choose the value which best represented their experience. For reasons of simplification, in what follows, we only present the two positive values, which are grouped together in one single indicator of positive assessment. The level of preciseness is not optimal, but this is a good compromise between the completeness and complexity of the data. The country reports include more details about these data.

Table 16 represents children's perception of their schoolwork. The variables chosen to investigate this perception are listed below:

1 = I like going to school.
2 = I enjoy learning new things.
3 = I understand everything my teachers tell me.
4 = I have good skills for schoolwork.
5 = I can manage school tasks as well as other children do.
6 = The school tasks at home are easy for me.
7 = I can find a solution to each problem.
8 = If I am confronted with something new, I know how to deal with it.

These variables aim to investigate children's perception of school in terms of pleasure (variables 1 and 2), skills in understanding (variable 3), schoolwork (variable 4), school tasks (variables 5 and 6), finding solutions to problems (variable 7) and knowing how to deal with new experiences (variable 8). The final column gives an idea of the level of agreement of the respondents.

Table 16 shows that all responses are rather positive, but there are some interesting differences. Enjoying learning new things is the most agreed feature of the school experience (79.3%), followed by managing school tasks as well as other children (74.1%) and dealing with something new (73.4%). On the opposite side, the less agreed aspect is "like going to school" (62.7%), followed by finding solutions for all problems (63.3%). It is easy to see that more children like what is new than the experience of school in itself and the problems linked to this experience.

Table 16. Children's perception of schoolwork (ISCED 1-3; totally agree and rather agree)

	BEL n.	BEL %	FIN n.	FIN %	GER n.	GER %	ITA n.	ITA %	POL n.	POL %	SWE n.	SWE %	UK n.	UK %	Total n.	Total %
1	204	55.0	366	62.4	234	63.2	436	61.6	331	49.6	115	59.3	522	83.8	2,208	**62.7**
2	317	**84.7**	421	72.0	295	**80.6**	615	**86.7**	451	67.6	162	**84.4**	523	**84.6**	2,784	**79.3**
3	229	61.1	391	67.2	251	69.0	474	67.1	449	67.4	140	72.5	515	83.2	2,449	**69.9**
4	272	73.1	391	67.2	315	85.6	435	62.2	466	69.9	126	65.3	521	83.1	2,526	**72.0**
5	266	72.3	446	76.1	286	78.2	483	69.0	463	69.6	134	69.8	529	**82.8**	2,607	**74.1**
6	228	62.1	437	74.7	244	67.6	518	73.2	365	55.1	123	64.0	527	82.4	2,442	**69.5**
7	176	48.9	330	56.5	239	65.8	434	61.5	378	56.9	127	66.8	537	84.0	2,221	**63.3**
8	264	72.9	397	68.0	250	68.7	531	75.1	473	70.8	131	68.6	534	**83.5**	2,580	**73.4**

Enjoyment in learning something new is particularly agreed with by children in **Italy, Belgium, UK, Sweden** and **Germany** (in this order) and less frequently so in **Poland**. Management of school tasks as well as other children and dealing with something new are particularly agreed with in the **UK**, where children agree very frequently with all statements. Going to school and finding solutions for problems are liked much less frequently in **Poland** and **Belgium**. Interestingly, **Italian and Swedish** children are less confident than other children in their skills (62.2%), followed by **Polish** children, who are also less confident in their ability about school tasks at home (55.1%), followed by Belgian children. In Poland, migrant-background children's perception of schoolwork is more negative than in the other countries.

Table 17 concerns the same variables as table 16, but for migrant-background children only.

Table 17. Migrant background children's perception of schoolwork in different countries (ISCED 1-3; totally agree and rather agree)

	BEL n.	BEL %	FIN n.	FIN %	GER n.	GER %	ITA n.	ITA %	POL n.	POL %	SWE n.	SWE %	UK n.	UK %	Total n.	Total %
1	125	58.1	96	78.4	50	64.1	222	66.5	108	74.5	90	60.8	166	83.4	857	69.1
2	182	83.9	107	88.2	65	83.3	283	84.7	118	81.4	126	86.3	168	83.6	1,049	84.5
3	134	61.7	92	75.0	53	69.7	221	66.4	110	75.9	110	74.8	168	82.3	888	71.4
4	161	73.5	89	73.0	71	92.2	174	52.7	111	76.6	103	69.6	167	83.1	876	70.5
5	151	71.2	79	65.0	60	76.9	211	63.7	106	73.6	106	72.6	170	82.9	883	71.3
6	135	64.3	79	65.0	56	73.7	222	66.7	89	63.1	100	68.5	172	83.9	853	69.2
7	99	48.2	79	65.0	51	65.4	195	58.6	95	65.5	104	71.7	173	84.3	796	64.6
8	122	59.2	81	67.0	51	66.2	235	70.6	94	64.8	101	69.7	173	84.4	857	69.6

What is interesting here is the analysis of possible differences in migrant-background (M-B in the table) children's perception of school experience with respect to the average, rather

than to the absolute data. Table 17a shows that the differences are minimal and migrant-background children's perception is more positive for pleasure in going to school and learning new things, while their perception is less positive for the ability in dealing with something new.

Table 17a. Differences between all children and migrant-background children's perception of schoolwork (ISCED 1-3; totally agree and rather agree)

	Total all children		Total M-B children	
	n.	%	n.	%
1	2,197	62.4	857	**69.1**
2	2,768	78.9	1,049	**84.5**
3	2,433	69.4	888	71.4
4	2,514	71.7	876	70.5
5	2,593	73.7	883	71.3
6	2,423	69.0	853	69.2
7	2,207	62.9	796	64.6
8	2,565	**73.0**	857	69.6

Table 17b concerns differences between all children's and migrant-background children's perception of schoolwork in different countries (relevant differences are highlighted). This table includes some interesting data. First, in the **UK**, there is a different perception for children with a migrant background. Second, the exception of the ability in dealing with something new, shown in table 17a, is influenced strongly by the data in **Belgium, Italy** and **Poland**. Third, it is interesting to note that in **Finland, Poland** and **Sweden**, agreement is generally higher for children with a migrant background, with a few exceptions (ability in dealing with something new in Finland and Poland and finding solutions for all problems in Finland). Conversely, in **Italy**, agreement is generally lower for children with a migrant background, with the exception of interest in going to school. In **Germany**, the data is more nuanced, but it is interesting to note that migrant-background children more frequently agree with the statements that they have good skills and have few difficulties for school tasks at home.

Table 17b. Differences between all children and migrant-background children's perception of schoolwork in different countries (ISCED 1-3; totally agree and rather agree) (%A= all children; %M= migrant-background children)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK	
	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M
1	55.0	58.1	62.4	**78.4**	63.2	64.1	61.6	**66.5**	49.6	**74.5**	59.3	**60.8**	83.8	83.4
2	84.7	83.9	72.0	**88.2**	80.6	83.3	86.7	**84.7**	67.6	**81.4**	84.4	**86.3**	84.6	83.6
3	61.1	61.7	67.2	**75.0**	69.0	69.7	67.1	**66.4**	67.4	**75.9**	72.5	**74.8**	83.2	82.3
4	73.1	73.5	67.2	**73.0**	85.6	**92.2**	62.2	**52.7**	69.9	**76.6**	65.3	**69.6**	83.1	83.1
5	72.3	71.2	76.1	**65.0**	78.2	76.9	69.0	**63.7**	69.6	**73.6**	69.8	**72.6**	82.8	82.9
6	62.1	64.3	74.7	**65.0**	67.6	**73.7**	73.2	**66.7**	55.1	**63.1**	64.0	**68.5**	82.4	83.9
7	48.9	48.2	56.5	**65.0**	65.8	65.4	61.5	**58.6**	56.9	**65.5**	66.8	**71.7**	84.0	84.3
8	72.9	**59.2**	68.0	67.0	68.7	66.2	75.1	**70.6**	70.8	**64.8**	68.6	**69.7**	83.5	84.4

Despite the generally positive responses to school experience, it is obvious that not all children find schoolwork as positive (in general, from 30% to 40% of children do not agree with the proposed statements). In the later section concerning challenges at school (problems at school), the negative aspects of school will be described in more detail.

Table 18 shows parents' perception of schoolwork. The table includes the following variables which follow the variables included in the questionnaire for children but from a different point of view:

1 = My children like going to school.
2 = My children have good relationships with their classmates.
3 = My children enjoy learning new things.
4 = My children enjoy learning new things.
5 = My children can manage school tasks as well as other children do.
6 = The school tasks at home are easy for my children.
7 = My children can find a solution to each problem.
8 = If my children are confronted with something new, they know how to deal with it.

Table 18 shows that parents tend to perceive their children's skills as very positive, in particular with regard to the appreciation of school experience, good relations between classmates and interest in learning new things (over 90%). The lowest agreement concerns the ability in finding solutions to all problems (72.6%), followed by easiness of school tasks (78.7%). More specifically, both these statements are less agreed with in **Belgium** and **Italy,** while the ability in finding solutions is scarcely agreed with in **Poland**. In **Belgium**, parents' agreement is much lower in general than in the other countries. In Italy, it is lower apart from the appreciation of school experience, good relations between classmates and interest in learning new things. Conversely, in the **UK**, agreement is very high for all statements, and in Sweden it is very high for multiple statements (however, the Swedish sample is very small).

Table 18. Parents' perception of schoolwork (totally agree and rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER*		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	101	82.8	98	97.1	266	90.7	733	89.5	509	84.4	18	94.7	389	95.4	2,114	**90.0**
2	94	76.4	91	90.1	271	93.4	740	90.7	515	91.0	17	89.5	388	98.5	2,116	**91.6**
3	96	78.7	92	91.0	280	96.2	738	90.7	524	91.0	19	100	388	98.7	2,137	**92.3**
4	94	76.4	95	95.0	274	93.8	621	79.1	265	79.3	15	78.9	387	98.4	1,751	**85.6**
5	89	75.4	90	89.1	274	93.8	585	73.3	453	83.4	17	100	377	97.2	1,885	**83.7**
6	75	64.6	77	76.3	205	88.7	551	70.3	470	78.5	15	78.9	383	97.5	1,776	**78.7**
7	82	68.9	73	72.3	237	82.3	491	61.6	399	67.4	15	78.9	379	87.3	1,676	**72.6**
8	84	69.4	69	68.3	239	83.0	593	73.3	476	85.6	15	83.3	382	86.9	1,858	**81.2**

Table 19 shows only migrant parents' perception.

Table 19. Migrant parents' perception of schoolwork (totally agree and rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	67	76.1	25	96.1	23	95.8	320	87.7	140	97.9	9	100	156	100	740	91.2
2	64	71.1	24	92.3	24	100	318	88.1	137	98.5	9	100	156	100	732	90.9
3	65	74	23	88.6	23	100	313	87.7	138	95.8	9	100	155	100	726	90.5
4	64	71.9	23	88.6	21	87.5	258	75.2	139	94.5	9	100	154	100	668	84.3
5	60	69.8	29	76.9	21	95.5	271	77.4	122	88.4	9	100	153	98.8	665	83.4
6	53	61.6	19	73	16	76.2	233	68.7	126	82.9	8	88.9	154	100	609	77.4
7	55	64.7	18	69.2	16	72.7	220	63.6	116	85.3	9	100	153	99.4	587	75.4
8	57	65.5	11	42.3	19	86.4	252	71.0	131	92.2	7	77.8	154	98.7	631	79.2

Table 19a shows that there are no relevant differences in what comes to migrant parents' estimation of the situation of their children. This said, it is the case that they are slightly more positive in their estimation of their children's ability in finding solutions for all problems.

Table 19a. Differences between all parents and migrant parents' perception of schoolwork in all countries (ISCED 1–3; totally agree and rather agree)

	All parents		Migrant parents	
	n.	%	n.	%
1	2,114	90.0	740	91.2
2	2,116	91.6	732	90.9
3	2,137	92.3	726	90.5
4	1,751	85.6	668	84.3
5	1,885	83.7	665	83.4
6	1,776	78.7	609	77.4
7	1,676	72.6	587	**75.4**
8	1,858	81.2	631	79.2

Table 19b shows, however, that the level of agreement is rather different in the different countries. In **Belgium**, **Finland** and almost all cases in **Italy**, agreement is lower for migrant parents. Conversely, in **Poland**, **Sweden** and the **UK**, agreement is higher for migrant parents (as it is in Sweden, except for dealing with new situations). In **Germany**, the data are more nuanced, since migrant parents' level of agreement is higher for appreciation of school experience, good relations between classmates and interest in learning new things, and lower for several other factors (however, it must be noted that the subsample of migrant parents in Germany is rather small).

Table 19b. Differences between all parents' and migrant parents' perception of schoolwork in different countries (ISCED 1–3; totally agree and rather agree) (%A= all children parents; %M= migrant parents)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK	
	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M
1	82.8	**76.1**	97.1	96.1	90.7	**95.8**	89.5	**87.7**	84.4	**97.9**	94.7	**100**	95.4	**100**
2	76.4	**71.1**	90.1	92.3	93.4	**100**	90.7	**88.1**	91.0	**98.5**	89.5	**100**	98.5	**100**
3	78.7	**74.0**	91.0	88.6	96.2	**100**	90.7	**87.7**	91.0	**95.8**	100	100	98.7	**100**
4	76.4	**71.9**	95.0	**88.6**	93.8	**87.5**	79.1	**75.2**	79.3	**94.5**	78.9	**100**	98.4	**100**
5	75.4	**69.8**	89.1	**76.9**	93.8	95.5	73.3	**77.4**	83.4	**88.4**	100	100	97.2	**98.8**
6	64.6	**61.6**	76.3	**73.0**	88.7	**76.2**	70.3	**68.7**	78.5	**82.9**	78.9	**88.9**	97.5	**100**
7	68.9	**64.7**	72.3	**69.2**	82.3	**72.7**	61.6	**63.6**	67.4	**85.3**	78.9	**100**	87.3	**99.4**
8	69.4	**65.5**	68.3	**42.3**	83.0	**86.4**	73.3	**71.0**	85.6	**92.2**	83.3	**77.8**	86.9	**98.7**

Table 20 shows teachers' level of satisfaction with their work, which is studied through the following variables:

I am satisfied with…

1 = my occupational situation in general.
2 = my personal work organization.
3 = the performance requirements that I have for pupils.
4 = my relationships with the pupils.
5 = my relationships with the parents.
6 = the reputation of teachers' work in the public.
7 = the school climate.
8 = my relationships with my colleagues.
9 = the shared information in the school/s where I work.
10 = my principal's support.
11 = all in all, I am satisfied with my job.

These variables concern the perception of teaching as a profession (variables 1, 6 and 11), organisation of work (variables 2 and 9), and social relations in the classroom (variables 3 and 4), in school (variables 7, 8 and 10) and with parents (variable 5). The variables intend to give a general picture of the teaching profession.

Table 20 shows that almost all teachers are satisfied with their relationship with pupils and their colleagues, with their job, and also with their relationships with parents. Agreement is very low, however, for the perceived reputation of teachers' work in public (47.1%). Other higher level of disagreement concern shared information in the school (74.5%) and the school climate (77.9%). It seems evident that, in teachers' perception, there is a relevant gap between personal relations and personal work on the one hand and school organisation on the other.

Table 20. Teachers' level of satisfaction with work (totally agree + agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	27	93.1	45	76.3	119	85.6	66	82.5	28	84.8	37	94.9	28	77.8	350	**84.3**
2	27	**93.1**	43	72.9	130	**93.5**	69	84.1	20	**64.5**	29	74.4	24	66.7	342	**82.4**
3	24	82.8	52	88.1	113	82.5	71	87.7	32	**100**	36	**92.3**	27	75.0	356	**86.4**
4	28	100	58	98.3	137	98.6	80	98.8	32	100	38	97.4	36	100	409	**98.8**
5	23	82.1	57	**96.6**	127	93.4	70	85.4	32	**96.9**	33	84.6	33	91.7	373	**90.3**
6	6	21.4	28	48.3	62	44.9	58	**71.6**	31	**96.9**	13	33.3	21	**58.3**	219	**53.1**
7	26	**92.9**	46	78.0	110	79.7	68	**86.1**	6	18.8	23	59.0	20	55.6	299	**72.7**
8	28	**100**	57	**96.6**	128	93.4	74	90.2	27	81.8	36	92.3	30	83.3	380	**92.0**
9	24	**82.8**	41	69.5	111	79.9	54	66.7	31	**93.9**	25	64.1	28	77.8	314	**75.5**
10	29	**100**	44	74.6	120	88.2	66	81.5	27	81.8	31	79.5	33	**91.7**	350	**84.7**
11	28	**96.6**	50	84.7	127	91.4	80	**97.6**	28	84.8	36	92.3	31	86.1	380	**91.1**

Differences between the countries are relevant for several statements, with the exception of assessing relationships with pupils which is positive in all countries. Relationships with colleagues are perceived as positive by all teachers in Belgium and almost all in Finland, while satisfaction with colleagues is lower in Poland. Relationships with parents are more positively assessed in Finland and Poland, and less positively in Belgium, Italy and Sweden.

Satisfaction with job is very high in Belgium and Italy, but less positive in Finland, Poland and the UK. Reputation of teachers' work in public is seen in a very negative way in Belgium and Sweden. The sharing of information is particularly criticised in Sweden and the UK, while it is seen more positively in Belgium and Poland. The school climate is viewed in very positive terms in Belgium, and also in Italy, while it is less positive in Sweden and the UK and very negative in Poland (18.8%; this could be a consequence of a school strike which took place in April 2019).

Less positive outcomes are perceptions of occupational situation in the UK and Finland, personal work organisation in Poland and the UK (and Finland and Sweden). In Poland, all teachers are satisfied with students' performance and their own relationships with pupils. **Sweden** and the **UK** are the two countries in which teachers' perception is more negative in general, while in **Poland** the data is more nuanced and in **Germany** teachers seem to be rather satisfied with all aspects, and with personal work organization in particular.

Table 21. is similar to the previous one but focuses on interpreters/mediators working in schools and having social relations which are similar to those of teachers. The table shows interpreters'/mediators' level of satisfaction with their work, which is checked through the following variables:

I am satisfied with…

1 = my occupational situation in general.
2 = my personal work organization.
3 = the performance requirements that I have for pupils.
4 = my relationships with the pupils.
5 = my relationships with the parents.
6 = the reputation of my organisation work in the public.
7 = the school climate.
8 = my relationships with my colleagues.
9 = the shared information in the school/s where I work.
10 = my manager's support.
11 = all in all, I am satisfied with my job.

Table 21 does not include data from Belgium since it was not possible to find interpreters or mediators working in the selected schools, nor from the UK where interpreters and mediators do not work in schools. Moreover, the meaning of the reputation of one's organisation differs according to the different types of organisations in different countries (e.g. in Poland, the organisation was school and this determined a very low level of satisfaction; this response should be seen in a broader context, as the CHILD-UP survey was carried out when the teachers' strike was organized in Poland). In general, the level of

satisfaction is high for all variables, in particular for relationships with pupils (98.1%), relationships with colleagues (92.4%) and the job itself (92.8%). The lowest level of satisfaction concerns the school climate (80.6%). Against this background, the level of satisfaction is generally lower in **Poland**. For some aspects, in **Germany**, mediators also stress some lower levels of satisfaction (performance requirements, relationships with parents and relationships with colleagues), which may be connected to their fairly poor institutional embeddedness in schools. Swedish mediators, as well as Polish mediators, are less satisfied with the school climate.

Table 21. Mediators/interpreters' level of satisfaction with work (totally agree + agree)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	20	100	13	92.9	27	90.0	8	80.0	31	86.1	99	90.0
2	19	95.0	14	100	25	86.2	9	90.0	33	91.7	100	91.7
3	15	83.4	10	71.4	23	92.0	8	80.0	33	94.3	89	87.3
4	18	100	14	100	27	100	8	80.0	36	100	103	98.1
5	19	100	11	78.5	26	89.7	7	70.0	36	100	99	90.8
6	17	89.5	13	92.9	28	96.6	3	30.0	32	86.5	93	85.3
7	14	82.4	11	84.6	25	96.2	7	70.0	26	70.3	83	80.6
8	19	100	11	78.6	25	96.1	7	70.0	35	97.2	97	92.4
9	15	83.3	11	84.6	23	88.5	7	70.0	33	91.7	89	86.4
10	15	75.0	12	85.7	24	85.7	8	70.0	32	86.5	91	83.5
11	20	100	14	93.4	25	86.2	8	70.0	36	97.3	103	92.8

Table 22 concerns the level of job satisfaction of social workers. The level of satisfaction is investigated through variables that are very similar to those used for teachers and interpreter/mediators, although they are fewer, since social relations are investigated in a less detailed way in this respondent group.

The variables are:

I am satisfied with…

1 = my occupational situation in general.
2 = my personal work organization.
3 = the performance requirements that I have for clients.
4 = my relationships with the clients.
5 = my relationships with the clients' other support network (school, health care etc.).
6 = the collegial support.
7 = my superior's support.
8 = all in all, I am satisfied with my job

Table 22 does not include data from Belgium since it was not possible to involve social workers in the survey. In the case of social workers, there is a general agreement for positive

relations with clients (98.7%), which is lower only in Sweden. Another positive aspect is collegial support (90.8%), shown particularly in Poland and once again less so in Sweden. The less positive aspect concerns superiors' support (74.8%), once again in Sweden but above all in the UK. Another aspect that is more critical, specifically in Germany and Italy, is the relationship with other support networks (such as school). General job satisfaction is lower than among teachers, but in this data the influence of Swedish workers' negative view is very strong. Apart from the perception of (the lack of) superiors' support, the level of satisfaction is in general very positive in the UK, and, apart from the experiences of performance requirements for clients, satisfaction is also very positive in Poland. With some exceptions, the lowest level of satisfaction was found in Sweden.

Table 22. Social workers' level of satisfaction with work (totally agree + agree)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	29	78.4	112	83.6	62	75.6	18	90.0	32	84.2	11	100	264	85.7
2	29	78.4	115	85.8	67	81.7	18	90.0	28	75.7	11	100	268	87.6
3	35	94.6	113	84.3	60	76.1	15	75.0	33	94.3	10	90.9	266	88.1
4	35	94.5	125	93.2	79	98.8	20	100	31	86.1	11	100	301	98.7
5	28	75.6	92	66.6	50	64.9	18	90.0	35	94.6	11	100	234	78.0
6	34	91.9	111	82.8	73	89.0	20	**100**	29	78.4	11	100	278	90.8
7	28	75.6	90	67.1	73	90.2	16	80.0	19	54.3	0	0	226	74.8
8	34	91.9	110	82.1	70	87.6	19	95.0	14	38.9	10	90.9	257	82.1

6 School relations

6.1 Teacher–children relations

Table 23 introduces the point of view of children on classroom relations, in particular on classmates and teachers. The variables are:

1 = I feel close to my classmates.
2 = I like to be together with my classmates.
3 = I have friends in my class.
4 = I feel closer to those who speak my language.
5 = I feel closer to those who are interested in the same things as me.
6 = the teachers in my school treat children fairly.
7 = I feel that my teachers care about me.
8 = I get along with my teachers.

Variables 1–3 define relations with classmates with different levels of commitment and generalisation. With variables 4 and 5, the analysis focuses on two possible reasons of selection of classroom relations (language and interests). The last three variables investigate relations with teachers, as regards fairness, caring attitude and good relations.

Table 23 shows that children apprehend relations with classmates mostly positively (82.9%) and have friends in school (84.3%). In general, relations between children, but also between children and teachers (79.4%), seem to work well, although the perception of teachers' care is less widespread (66.9%) and closeness with classmates is more selective (75.2%). It is also interesting to note that the lowest level of agreement concerns closeness with children who speak the same language (57.3%), followed by closeness with children with the same interests (65.9%).

Table 23. Relations in school as perceived by all children (totally agree + rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	266	70.9	367	63.7	250	69.0	540	**89.9**	485	75.0	149	78.8	456	78.3	2513	75.2
2	282	75.2	419	72.7	286	79.0	581	85.8	536	81.3	153	81.0	581	**99.5**	2838	82.9
3	338	**91.3**	495	85.8	343	**92.5**	604	89.5	580	88.2	172	**90.5**	348	59.7	2880	84.3
4	223	60.6	419	**73.8**	204	59.0	416	**63.4**	355	54.3	120	**63.2**	183	32.1	1920	57.3
5	241	65.1	409	72.0	232	64.8	474	70.4	267	40.6	156	**83.0**	453	**79.3**	2232	65.9
6	230	61.8	437	68.2	251	69.4	504	**75.0**	425	64.7	127	67.6	442	**79.9**	2416	71.2
7	169	46.3	367	63.8	187	53.9	492	**72.8**	438	67.1	133	70.0	471	**82.6**	2257	66.9
8	273	72.4	465	81.3	277	76.5	544	80.2	484	73.6	147	78.2	510	**89.9**	2700	79.4

In the **UK** in particular, children declare very positive relations, but with two interesting exceptions: having friends in the classroom (59.7%) and, above all, feeling closer to those who speak the same language (32.1%). Thus, for many children there is a difference

between appreciation for being together with classmates (99.5%) and being friends, while language is not relevant in schools. Interestingly, in **Finland**, there is a different perception of relations with classmates and friendship: the latter is much more frequent, which may indicate that children have some friends, but they do not always get along with all classmates. In Finland, however, the pupils spent less hours per day in school than in many other countries. A similar result may be observed for **Belgium** and **Sweden**, where friendship with classmates is particularly important. In **Poland**, only a minority of children seem to prefer sharing the same interests (40.6%). Closeness with those who speak the same language is more important in **Finland** (73.8%) and, to a less extent, in **Italy**. In all countries, closeness to classmates seems to depend less on the same language or same interests than on friendship. Relationships with teachers are more problematic in **Belgium** where more than half of the responding children (53.7%) feel that their teachers do not care about them, and in **Germany**, where nearly half of the responding children (totally) disagreed with this statement. Observing complement results for teachers in Germany shows differences according to different school levels. While only 68.9% of the educators and 50% of the ISCED2-teachers agreed with this statement, 78% of ISCED1-teachers and 100% of ISCED3-teachers did. This result indicates different qualities of relationships with children/ students according to school level. In contrast, teachers' care is more frequently observed in Italy (72.8%), as well as in the UK (82.8%). In **Belgium**, more generally, all aspects of relationships with teachers are more problematic.

It is important to keep in mind that, in the UK, data was only collected in primary schools. More generally, younger children assess school relationships to be better. That applies both for relationships with their classmates and with teachers.

It is also interesting to note that in Belgium, males tend to view their relations with their classmates more positively than females, which can then play a role in their capacity to express their agency. In Italy, agreeing with the statement about good relations with teachers is higher for females (83%) than for males (78%).

Table 24 focuses on the view of migrant-background children about school relations, using the same variables than in the previous table:

1 = I feel close to my classmates.
2 = I like to be together with my classmates.
3 = I have friends in my class.
4 = I feel closer to those who speak my language.
5 = I feel closer to those who are interested in the same things as me.
6 = the teachers in my school treat children fairly.
7 = I feel that my teachers care about me.
8 = I get along with my teachers.

Table 24. Relations in school as perceived by children with a migrant background (totally agree + rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	154	71.6	62	50.8	47	61.8	245	77.3	99	73.9	116	85.6	147	77.2	870	72.6
2	163	76.5	76	62.8	55	71.4	268	84.8	96	68.1	120	82.8	177	99.6	955	80.2
3	192	90.5	97	80.2	71	93.4	272	86.3	122	87.2	130	89.7	110	61.1	994	83.6
4	133	63.0	69	57.5	41	55.4	183	59.4	64	46.4	88	60.7	56	31.1	634	53.9
5	144	67.9	89	74.2	47	61.8	220	70.5	71	51.4	120	83.9	146	80.9	837	70.8
6	131	61.2	89	74.2	55	71.4	235	74.6	116	84.0	100	69.9	141	79.2	867	73.0
7	101	48.5	76	62.3	71	93.4	222	70.3	109	80.2	99	68.3	152	84.0	830	70.2
8	161	74.5	99	81.8	41	55.4	245	77.3	121	87.7	111	77.6	164	90.0	942	79.0

Table 24a shows that, while general relations with classmates are a bit less widespread among children with a migrant background, these children seem to be less interested in relations with children who speak the same language. This might depend on the presence of fewer children speaking the same language. However, children with a migrant background are more frequently interested in relations with other children having the same interests, where "same interests" can also be interpreted as based on similar conditions or habits. Moreover, it is important to note that these respondents more frequently agree with the suggestion that their teachers are fair and take care of them.

Table 24a. School relations for all children and migrant background children in all participating countries

	Total children		Migrant background children	
	n.	%	n.	%
1	2,498	74.7	870	72.6
2	2,822	82.5	955	80.2
3	2,863	83.8	994	83.6
4	1,910	57.0	634	53.9
5	2,218	65.5	837	**70.8**
6	2,400	70.8	867	**73.0**
7	2,244	66.5	830	**70.2**
8	2,684	78.9	942	79.0

Table 24b shows the different perceptions of children in different countries. First, in the **UK**, the data show the recurrent similarity between migrant and non-migrant children. The same is true in Sweden, apart from finding pleasure in going to school, which is much higher for

children with a migrant background). Second, in some countries, it is possible to observe more frequent difficulties for migrant children. In **Finland**, relationships with classmates are in general less frequently positive, particularly in terms of closeness. A similar trend is evident in **Germany**, but with fewer differences and apart from friendship. Some difficulties are also evident in **Italy** and **Poland**, while good relations are much more frequent in **Sweden**. Third, there is a certain variability when it comes to relations linked to the same language, which are less frequent in **Finland**, **Germany** and **Italy**. Except for **Germany**, children with a migrant background more frequently prefer relations with children who have the same interests. Finally, relationships with teachers are more frequently positive in **Poland** and **Belgium**, less frequently in **Italy**, while for **Germany** the results are contradictory: teachers frequently care, but migrant children do not get along with them.

In Poland, girls with a migrant background have a slightly better relationship with teachers than boys with a similar background. They also have better emotional and affective relations than boys.

Table 24b. School relations for all children and migrant-background children in different countries

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK	
	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M
1	70.9	71.6	63.7	50.8	69.0	61.8	89.9	77.3	75.0	73.9	78.8	**85.6**	78.3	77.2
2	75.2	76.5	72.7	62.8	79.0	71.4	85.8	84.8	81.3	68.1	81.0	82.8	99.5	99.6
3	91.3	90.5	85.8	80.2	92.5	93.4	89.5	86.3	88.2	87.2	90.5	89.7	59.7	61.1
4	60.6	**63.0**	73.8	57.5	59.0	55.4	63.4	59.4	54.3	46.4	63.2	60.7	32.1	31.1
5	65.1	**67.9**	72.0	**74.2**	64.8	61.8	70.4	70.5	40.6	**51.4**	83.0	83.9	79.3	80.9
6	61.8	61.2	68.2	**74.2**	69.4	71.4	75.0	74.6	64.7	**84.0**	67.6	69.9	79.9	79.2
7	46.3	**48.5**	63.8	62.3	53.9	**93.4**	72.8	70.3	67.1	**80.2**	70.0	68.3	82.6	84.0
8	72.4	74.5	81.3	81.8	76.5	55.4	80.2	77.3	73.6	**87.7**	78.2	77.6	89.9	90.0

Table 25 shows the other side of classroom relations, that is, the point of view of teachers. This exploration partly follows the questions posed to children, but it also concerns relations among teachers.

The variables are:

1 = The pupils in my class feel close to their classmates.
2 = The pupils in my class are closer to those classmates who speak their dialect/language.
3 = The pupils in my class feel closer to those classmates, who are interested in the same things.
4 = I care about my pupils.
5 = I get along with my pupils.
6 = The teachers in my school treat children fairly.
7 = I feel close to my colleagues.
8 = I get along with my colleagues.

The first three questions investigate the relations between children in the classroom, although with fewer details (variables 1–3). Then, the questionnaire focuses on the point of view of teachers about their relations with pupils (variables 4-5) and with colleagues (variables 7-8), also looking at the perception of teachers' fairness towards pupils (variable 6).

Table 25 shows that teachers assess school relations very positively for almost all aspects, with the exception of closeness among children in the class based on the same language (62.4%). This is particularly clear in the UK where the question of language used is not relevant. This result is coherent with the children's view. Almost all teachers declare they get along with their pupils and their colleagues.

Table 25. School relations (according to teachers, totally agree + rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	28	**96.5**	48	81.4	121	**92.8**	62	75.6	28	82.4	31	79.5	34	**94.4**	352	**85.9**
2	21	**72.4**	47	**79.6**	76	58.0	48	58.5	24	**70.6**	26	66.7	14	38.8	256	**62.4**
3	26	90.0	57	**98.2**	117	88.6	70	85.4	34	**100**	37	**94.9**	27	75.0	368	**89.8**
4	28	96.5	59	**100**	92	69.7	81	98.8	34	**100**	39	**100**	36	**100**	369	**89.8**
5	29	100	59	100	135	99.4	80	96.3	34	100	39	100	35	97.5	411	**98.8**
6	22	75.9	56	**94.9**	127	92.7	77	**95.4**	28	82.4	35	89.7	33	89.6	378	**91.3**
7	29	**100**	54	91.5	130	93.6	79	96.3	29	87.8	36	94.7	28	77.8	385	**92.5**
8	29	**100**	58	98.3	133	95.7	80	97.5	33	97.1	38	97.4	36	**100**	407	**97.4**

Differences among countries are limited. Italian and Swedish teachers have a less positive perception of closeness among children in the class. It may also be noted that teachers in the UK feel less close to their colleagues (77.8%). This may depend on the school system, which does not provide collaboration between teachers in the same class. Finally, about 25% of Belgian teachers consider their colleagues not very fair with children. In **Germany**, teachers are more satisfied with relationships in kindergartens than in other school types. However, it is alarming that nearly one third of teachers/educators reported that they do not, more or less, care about their pupils/students. Moreover, only 50% of the ISCED2-teachers agreed that they care about their pupils vs. 78% of ISCED1-teachers. This result indicates a indifferent relationship with children/students, which reduces teaching to doing a job like any other.

In **Belgium**, a major discrepancy may be noticed between teachers and children, as all teachers think that they care about their pupils, while only 46.3% of children feel the same. It is a question that must be explored further during the qualitative fieldwork**.**

6.2 Teacher–parent relations

This section is concerned with another important aspect of school relations, involving parents. Teachers were asked what the main communication channel is that they use to contact parents. As in the previous section, we compare teachers' views with those of parents. First, in table 26, we look at the main way in which teachers communicate with parents, exploring the different options listed below.

1 = A designated web portal for parent – school communication.
2 = Written messages or notebook carried along by children.
3 = Face-to-face meetings with parent/s.
4 = Messages by phone or social media applications.
5 = General meetings or festivities at school.
6 = Other (telephone calls, emails, mediation).

It is important to notice that teachers were instructed to choose only one option.

Table 26 shows that the use of a web portal and face-to-face meetings are the two options that are the most widespread. This shows the co-existence of remote communication and face-to-face interaction. General meetings are the third most popular choice, while written messages or the notebooks carried along by pupils, and text messages and social media are rarely used. However, there is great variability between the participating countries: the use of a web portal ranges from 80% in Poland and 69% in Finland to 3.4% in Belgium and 6.9% in Italy. Conversely, face-to-face interaction ranges from 91.4% in Poland to 12.1% in Finland. The other options also show a very different situation in different countries. For instance, written messages or the notebook carried along by pupils are rather frequently used in Belgium and Poland, never in the UK and very rarely in Finland, Germany, Sweden. (Text) messages are frequently used in Poland and Sweden, and never in Belgium and almost never in Germany. General meetings are absent in Sweden, Finland and Belgium, but highly typical in Poland.

Table 26. Communication channels between teachers and parents, according to teachers

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	1	3.4	40	**69.0**	173	40.4	12	6.9	28	**80.0**	8	20.5	11	30.6	273	**34.1**
2	17	**58.6**	3	5.2	20	4.7	18	10.3	19	54.3	1	2.6	0	0	78	**9.8**
3	11	37.9	7	12.1	107	25.0	73	42.0	32	**91.4**	11	28.2	12	33.3	253	**31.6**
4	0	0	7	12.1	2	0.5	28	16.1	21	**60.0**	15	**38.5**	3	8.3	76	**9.9**
5	0	0	0	0	48	11.2	37	21.3	30	**85.7**	0	0	10	27.8	125	**17.5**
6	0	0	1	1.7	78	18.2	6	3.4	1	2.8	4	10.3	0	0	90	**11.7**

Table 27 shows the same channels of communication from the point of view of parents. Parents were asked what the main communication channel is that they use when contacting teachers. The variables are:

1 = A designated web portal for parent – school communication.
2 = Written messages or notebook carried by children.
3 = Face to face meetings with parent/s.
4 = Messages by phone or social media apps.
5 = General meetings or festivities at school.
6 = Other (telephone calls, emails, mediation).

The use of a web portal and face-to-face meetings are the most frequent choices also for parents. However, the presence of written messages or the notebooks carried along by pupils is more frequent, as well as general meetings. Also, with parents, differences among the countries are great. The use of a web portal is the most general practice in **Poland** and **Finland** and very frequent in the **UK**, but almost absent in **Belgium**, **Germany** and **Italy**. The channel shared in popularity by most countries is face-to-face meetings, except for Finnish parents, who do not actively participate in general meetings, which, again, are very frequent in **Poland**. Interestingly, the use of text messages or social media is referred to by several parents even when teachers deny it (see the case of **Sweden**; however, the number of parents is very small here).

Table 27. Communication channels between teachers and parents, according to parents

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	7	5.5	75	**75.0**	12	4.2	22	4.2	422	**84.4**	5	26.3	181	45.9	724	**37.1**
2	43	**33.8**	2	2.0	125	**43.3**	61	11.7	98	19.6	3	15.8	0	0	332	**17.0**
3	52	40.9	13	13.0	95	32.9	295	**56.7**	196	39.2	10	**52.6**	169	42.9	830	**42.6**
4	6	4.7	9	9.0	9	3.1	26	5.0	135	**27.0**	7	**36.8**	8	2.0	200	**10.3**
5	6	4.7	0	0	20	6.9	100	19.2	336	**67.2**	4	21.1	36	9.1	502	**27.1**
6	3	2.4	1	1	28	9.7	10	1.9	2	0.4	3	**15.8**	0	0	47	**2.4**

It is worth looking in more detail into this important issue of communication channels in the context of different countries.

In **Belgium**, teachers and parents do not seem to be on the same page when it comes to the channels used to communicate. Indeed, most teachers identified the written messages or notebooks carried along by pupils as their main communication tool, whereas parents identified face-to-face meetings as such. Moreover, as shown in the country report, migrant parents experience communication with teachers differently from non-migrant parents. Indeed, migrant parents prefer face-to-face meeting with teachers (see the country report).

In **Finland**, both teachers and parents considered the designated web portal as the main communication channel. Mediators/interpreters considered face-to-face interactions and messages by phone or social media as the main communication channels. Most non-migrant parents rely solely on the web portal, but migrant parents use various channels: face-to-face meetings and phone/social media messages more often than non-migrant parents.

In **Germany**, while teachers mention that they communicate with parents via a web-portal and in face-to-face-meetings, parents report that face-to-face meetings are the most frequent way of interacting with teachers/educators. Only a few mentions that they interact via a web-portal. The perception (and use) of (main) communication channels between teachers and parents obviously differ. Festivities or meetings are less relevant for parents and designated web-portals do not, from their perspective, play an important role. Finally, teachers/educators mark other channels as relevant communication channels significantly more often than parents. These are dialogues at the door, emails, and sometimes, newsletters by the school, kindergarten or parent-teacher -associations. The detected differences in (perception of) the most commonly used communication channels may lead to different evaluations of the quality of teacher-parent-communication from everyone's point of view. In cases when mediators lack institutional embeddedness (for instance not having access to a school web portal), they use face-to-face-meetings with parents as the main communication channel.

In **Italy**, face-to-face interactions are the main communication channel for both teachers and parents. Migrant parents interact less frequently with teachers, while they participate more frequently in general meetings in schools and through written messages on notebooks. Technologies are rarely used according to parents. Migrant parents attend face-to-face meetings less frequently than non-migrant parents do.

In **Sweden**, while the answers from parents are few and difficult to interpret, it seems striking that foreign-born parents include face-to-face meetings to a larger degree than the native-born parents. Teachers seem more prone to include a designated web portal than mediators, while mediators to a larger degree seem to use messages by phone or social media.

In the **UK**, although teachers seem to prefer face-to-face interactions while parents rely on the use of school portals and intranet now available in all educational establishments.

Table 28 shows the assessment of communication from the point of view of both teachers and parents. This assessment is based on three variables showing different levels of assessment: very good, satisfactory and poor.

Table 28 shows that parents' positive assessment of communication with teachers (83.5%) is much more frequent than teachers' positive assessment of communication with parents (56.6%). Teachers' assessment is more nuanced than parents' assessment. This gap between the opinions of these two respondent groups is only filled in **Germany**, while it is very wide in **Belgium** and **Italy**. In Belgium, there is also a rather frequent teachers' negative assessment (17.2%), while parents' negative assessment is more frequent in **Sweden** (10.5%). In Italy, migrant parents more frequently show complete satisfaction than non-migrant parents do. Also, in **Poland**, migrant parents are clearly more positive about those contacts than non-migrant parents.

In **Poland**, migrant parents (67%) are clearly more positive about those contacts (perfectly well) than Polish parents (39%). The most of teachers declare to be quite satisfied with

accessible channels and their use. Only 1/5 assess the communication with parents as sometimes well but also sometimes poor. Asked about communication barriers and challenges they hardly identify any causes. Only few of them suggest lack of an appropriate channel or lack of parental interest. Among other causes, we can find the negative parents' attitude/approach.

Table 28. Satisfaction with teacher-parent communication (according to teachers and parents)

Country	Perfectly or usually well				Sometimes well, sometimes poorly				Usually or always poorly			
	Teachers		Parents		Teachers		Parents		Teachers		Parents	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	12	41.4	105	86.8	12	41.4	14	11.6	5	17.2	2	1.6
Finland	37	63.7	84	84.0	20	34.5	15	15.5	1	1.7	1	1.0
Germany	95	68.8	202	70.4	41	29.7	69	24.0	2	1.4	16	5.5
Italy	21	25.3	607	76.4	59	71.1	177	22.3	3	3.6	11	1.4
Poland	28	80.0	462	92.0	7	20.0	34	6.8	0	0	6	1.2
Sweden	20	51.3	15	78.9	16	41.0	2	10.5	3	7.7	2	10.5
United Kingdom	24	66.7	377	95.7	8	22.2	17	2.0	4	11.1	4	1.0
Total	237	**56.6**	1,852	**83.5**	163	**38.9**	328	**14.8**	18	**4.3**	42	**1.9**

Table 29 shows the reasons for problems in teacher-parent communication from different perspectives. The variables include possible reasons for failure in communication, that is, communication channels, language skills, interest, and resources of time.

Table 29. Barriers/challenges in teacher-parent communication (all countries)

	Teachers		Parents		Migrant parents	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Lack of proper communication channels	89	**18.8**	130	12.8	50	**14.7**
Lack of parents' language skills	104	**21.9**	135	13.3	116	**34.2**
Lack of parental/school interest	114	**24.0**	74	**7.3**	14	**4.1**
Parents' workload	42	**8.9**	348	**34.2**	81	**23.9**
Your own limited resources of time	26	5.5	215	21.1	28	8.3
Other	99	20.9	116	11.4	50	14.7

Table 29 shows that teachers indicate a lack of parents' interest and a lack of parents' language skills as the most frequent reasons. By contrast, parents claim that workload and

limited resources of time are the most important reasons and migrant parents, in particular recognise the lack of language skills as the most important reason, as do teachers. These data show some gaps of representations between teachers and parents, and in particular migrant parents.

These discrepancies are also evident in the country contexts. In **Germany**, for instance, teachers and parents differ in their perception of communication barriers. Thus, some of the difficulties might be rooted in the diverging perception of communication channels on the one hand, in different perceptions of language skills and parents' and teachers' workload and time capacities and of school interest on the other. As to migrant parents, a lack of language capacities from parents' as well as teachers' point of view represents a communication barrier.

In **Poland**, when asked about communication barriers and challenges, teachers identify hardly any causes. Only a few of them suggest a lack of an appropriate communication channel or a lack of parental interest. Among other causes, we can also find a negative attitude/approach of parents. In the case of migrant parents, the most important barriers are the lack of parents' language skills and parents' workload. In the **UK**, as regards to teacher-parent communication, teachers considered the lack of appropriate communication channels, parents' language proficiency and parents' interest as the main communication barriers.

7 Children's agency and the support from professionals

This section presents highly important issues rising from the survey for the CHILD-UP project purposes, investigating children's view of their own agency and the ways in which professionals support (or do not support) children's agency.

7.1 Children's view of agency

The first subsection is about the children's view, which has been investigated through 10 variables, which are listed below.

1 = I listen carefully what my teacher says.
2 = I do the tasks following my teacher's instruction.
3 = I can ask if I don't understand instructions.
4 = I let my teacher know what I need and want.
5 = I collaborate with my classmates.
6 = I listen to my classmates' views and experiences.
7 = I can speak freely what I think about different things.
8 = I can speak freely what I feel, like and dislike.
9 = I can participate in the decisions about school activities.
10 = I can say my ideas about how to design the classroom.

Variables 1–4 concern the way in which children relate to teachers: listening, doing tasks, asking and self-expressing. Only the last one is a real manifestation of agency, while the other three are used to compare agency with obedience. Variables 5–6 concern relations with classmates, as shows especially in collaboration and listening. This is a way of understanding the level of dialogue between classmates, therefore the way in which children are active with other classmates and listen to them. Variables 7–8 concern the general possibility of self-expression in the classroom. Variables 9–10 concern active participation in decisions and planning, which, according to Sociology of Childhood, may be considered the highest level of agency.

Table 30 shows that children's responses provide a rather positive picture of agentic engagement in the classroom. However, there is an important difference between adaptation to hierarchical relations and exercise of agency. Related to this, the more specific responses show that almost all children follow teachers' instructions (86.1%) and ask questions about these instructions (82.3%). Moreover, they have very positive relations with classmates: they collaborate with them (83.5%) and above all they listen to their views and experiences (85.5%). Most of them also feel they can speak freely about what they think (73.7%) and feel, like and dislike (72.8%). A slightly smaller percentage of respondents reported that they feel they can participate in decisions about school activities (67.2%) and that they can express their ideas about the classroom design (61.5%). Thus, (1) interaction with teachers is focused more on pupils' role, schoolwork and lessons than on personal feelings and needs, which constructs the institutional character of school as a place, where

children's participation is limited to some extent, and (2) a large minority of children do not consider themselves as having power to influence the school environment.

Table 30. Children's agency (totally agree + rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	289	76.5	480	81.7	276	74.8	543	77.1	507	76.4	157	**82.2**	524	**84.0**	2,776	**78.9**
2	333	89.0	532	**90.3**	305	83.3	588	83.6	570	86.0	172	**90.1**	506	83.8	3,006	**86.1**
3	325	86.0	518	**88.2**	331	**89.5**	478	68.2	557	84.0	168	87.5	503	82.6	2,880	**82.3**
4	242	64.4	414	70.7	239	65.1	353	50.7	458	69.5	149	**77.6**	511	**82.3**	2,366	**67.7**
5	294	79.2	503	86.0	301	82.9	594	84.8	545	82.5	168	**87.5**	498	82.2	2,903	**83.5**
6	304	81.0	528	**89.9**	314	87.0	568	81.0	575	86.7	166	**87.4**	489	80.7	2,944	**84.5**
7	269	73.3	477	**81.4**	257	70.6	417	59.8	481	72.3	154	**81.5**	499	**83.6**	2,554	**73.7**
8	224	64.2	466	**80.1**	246	67.6	441	63.3	495	74.5	145	77.1	509	**83.4**	2,526	**72.8**
9	235	61.5	270	46.4	287	**78.6**	490	70.2	429	64.7	130	68.4	503	**80.5**	2,344	**67.2**
10	195	52.7	242	41.5	217	60.3	447	63.7	403	61.0	144	75.0	489	**80.3**	2,137	**61.5**

This important topic deserves some more comments concerning the contexts in different countries, since there are some interesting differences between them.

First, in primary schools in the **UK** the level of agency is much higher than in the other countries. However, the coexistence of hierarchical structures and the display of agency is also relevant. A rather generalized ambivalence between adapting to hierarchical relations and expressing agency is also evident in **Italy**. This ambivalence seems more evident for females, as they more frequently follow teachers' instructions (88.2% vs. 80.4%), collaborate with classmates (87.6% vs. 76.9%) and express themselves (68% vs. 58.2%). It would be interesting, in the next step of the research, to investigate a) the ambivalence of following instructions on one hand and active participation in decision-making on the other, and b)how children understand 'decision-making'.

Conversely, there are very low levels of agency that concerns participation in decision making about school activities and saying their ideas about how to design the classroom in **Finland** and, as regards classroom design, in **Belgium.** Possible expression of feelings and assessments is low in Belgium and **Italy**, where also relations with teachers are less frequently positive (however, in Italy the percentage of children in higher secondary schools is rather high). Hierarchical relations with teachers can be observed more frequently in Northern Europe (Sweden and Finland). It was also noticed in some countries that hierarchical structure and active participation varies between schools. Moreover, in **Sweden** positive relations with classmates are perceived very frequently.

In general, with some exceptions (see above for Italy), both girls and boys are almost equally capable of expressing their needs and speaking freely. In **Finland** and **Italy**, the youngest children (ISCED0) had less agency and part of them claimed that they can only sometimes

or never choose activities in the kindergarten. In kindergarten in **Germany** too, children have a strong feeling that educators are listening to them, but feel less positive about expressing their feelings, wishes, or participating in decisions.

There seems to be a gap between taking children as participants in communication processes and/or as social agents.

Table 31 concerns the same type of perception than above but among migrant-background children only. The variables, again, are:

1 = I listen carefully what my teacher says.
2 = I do the tasks following my teacher's instruction.
3 = I can ask if I don't understand instructions.
4 = I let my teacher know what I need and want.
5 = I collaborate with my classmates.
6 = I listen to my classmates' views and experiences.
7 = I can speak freely what I think about different things.
8 = I can speak freely what I feel, like and dislike.
9 = I can participate in the decisions about school activities.
10 = I can say my ideas about how to design the classroom.

Table 31. Migrant background children's agency (totally agree + rather agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	170	78.0	103	80.5	62	79.5	249	75.2	129	**88.9**	121	83.4	173	84.5	1,007	82.6
2	194	**90.2**	111	86.8	64	83.2	275	82.5	123	85.4	130	**89.7**	164	84.7	1,061	87.1
3	193	88.3	109	85.1	75	**96.1**	210	64.2	132	**91.1**	130	89.0	166	83.0	1,015	83.3
4	146	68.2	93	72.7	52	67.6	169	51.7	118	81.4	118	80.8	174	**85.7**	870	72.1
5	175	81.4	99	78.0	63	80.7	265	80.7	115	79.3	128	**87.7**	163	81.7	1,008	82.9
6	171	78.1	105	82.7	68	88.3	256	77.7	125	86.2	126	**87.5**	163	81.3	1,014	83.9
7	155	74.5	96	75.0	52	66.7	174	53.4	113	78.0	122	**85.3**	166	83.5	878	73.3
8	124	59.1	95	74.3	54	69.2	205	62.6	110	75.9	116	**81.7**	170	**84.5**	874	68.7
9	136	65.1	66	51.6	62	**79.5**	230	70.4	89	61.8	104	72.2	164	**80.1**	851	69.0
10	111	52.6	65	51.1	46	62.1	197	59.9	87	60.4	115	**78.8**	155	**76.5**	776	64.1

Considering questions of agency and participation, it is interesting to compare results between children with and without a migration background. Table 31a shows that differences are not very relevant. However, children with a migrant background might be more respectful of hierarchical relations with teachers, since the percentages are higher for all variables representing formal relations with teachers. By contrast, they are slightly less positive about relations with classmates. They seem to meet difficulties in speaking about their feelings

and preferences, but they seem to feel more frequently involved in decision-making and designing the classroom.

Table 31a. Differences between all children and non-migrant children's perceived agency and participation

	Total children		Total migrant background children	
	n.	%	n.	%
1	2,776	78.9	1,007	**82.6**
2	3,006	86.1	1,061	**87.1**
3	2,880	82.3	1,015	**83.3**
4	2,366	67.7	870	**72.1**
5	2,903	83.5	1,008	82.9
6	2,944	84.5	1,014	83.9
7	2,554	73.7	878	73.3
8	2,526	72.8	874	68.7
9	2,344	67.2	851	**69.0**
10	2,137	61.5	776	**64.1**

Table 31b shows that differences between children with and without a migration background are rare in the context of different countries.

The country contexts where the differences are more relevant, in negative terms, are **Finland** and **Italy**. In Finland, children with a migrant background perceive hierarchical relations, relations with classmates, opportunities to express themselves and decisions made more negatively; however, they more frequently perceive the possibility to design the classroom. In Italy, children with a migrant background perceive more negatively the possibility of asking questions to teachers, of expressing their feelings and of making decisions. Conversely, the countries where children with a migrant background perceive relations and agency more positively are **Sweden** and **Poland**. In Sweden, they feel more confident in asking teachers what they need, they perceive the possibility to express themselves more frequently, and they also observe their agency more frequently. In Poland, the data shows a positive sign in terms of hierarchical relations and speaking freely about one's thoughts, while decision-making is a weaker point. As usual, in the **UK** differences are very thin, but in this case, it seems that with a migrant background experience more difficulties in designing the classroom. In **Germany,** children with a migrant background more often report being able to ask when not understanding instructions and listening carefully to what the teachers say. On the other hand, they feel more limited to speak freely about what they think about different things. In **Belgium**, there is a less frequent perception of being able to express one's feelings and preferences and a more frequent perception of participating in decision-making among migrant children.

Table 31b. Differences between all children and non-migrant children's perceived agency and participation in the participating countries

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK	
	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M	%A	%M
1	76.5	78.0	81.7	80.5	74.8	**79.5**	77.1	75.2	76.4	**88.9**	82.2	83.4	84.0	84.5
2	89.0	90.2	90.3	86.8	83.3	83.2	83.6	82.5	86.0	85.4	90.1	89.7	83.8	84.7
3	86.0	88.3	88.2	85.1	89.5	**96.1**	68.2	64.2	84.0	**91.1**	87.5	89.0	82.6	83.0
4	64.4	**68.2**	70.7	72.7	65.1	67.6	50.7	51.7	69.5	**81.4**	77.6	**80.8**	82.3	85.7
5	79.2	81.4	86.0	78.0	82.9	80.7	84.8	80.7	82.5	79.3	87.5	87.7	82.2	81.7
6	81.0	78.1	89.9	82.7	87.0	88.3	81.0	77.7	86.7	86.2	87.4	87.5	80.7	81.3
7	73.3	74.5	81.4	75.0	70.6	66.7	59.8	53.4	72.3	**78.0**	81.5	**85.3**	83.6	83.5
8	64.2	59.1	80.1	74.3	67.6	69.2	63.3	62.6	74.5	75.9	77.1	**81.7**	83.4	84.5
9	61.5	**65.1**	46.4	**51.6**	78.6	79.5	70.2	70.4	64.7	61.8	68.4	**72.2**	80.5	80.1
10	52.7	52.6	41.5	51.1	60.3	62.1	63.7	59.9	61.0	60.4	75.0	**78.8**	80.3	76.5

7.2 Professionals' support for agency

Various professionals work to support children in their growth and education. For the purposes of CHILD-UP, the groups of teachers, language mediators and interpreters as well as social workers are especially important. According to the survey results, these professionals have a rather positive idea about their role and the way they manage to support children's agency. Teachers are mainly confident in their ability to promote agency also in multicultural contexts, supporting positive relationships between children. However, there may be important differences between the countries.

Table 32 shows the support from teachers. The variables used to investigate this support are listed below.

1 = I encourage children to make their opinion clear to adults.
2 = I support children's initiatives that are not connected to my teaching and encourage them to realize them.
3 = I allow children to discuss things/ questions in classroom on their own/ autonomously.
4 = If children make autonomous proposals about initiatives/ activities, I support and coordinate them.
5 = If children have creative, new ideas about teaching or other issues regarding to school, I support and encourage them to implement these ideas.
6 = I allow children to question my thoughts or decisions.
7 = I encourage children to articulate and enforce their interests.
8 = I generally try to enhance children's activities that are not connected to my teaching.

This list deals with support of agency in different ways. Some variables (1 and 6) concern the possibility for personal expression in the company of adults and teachers. Other variables more generally concern possible participation in interaction in the classroom (variables 3, 4, 7). The third, and very important type of variables, concern support of children's initiatives, such as initiatives that are not connected with teaching (variable 2), implementation of creative initiatives (variable 5), and enhancement of children's activities (variable 8).

Table 32 shows that agreement among teachers is high in terms of support of creative new ideas about teaching and encouragement of expressing children's interests and allowing for autonomous discussions (58.5%), followed by encouragement to make opinions clear to adults (57.2%) and allowing children's questioning of teachers' thoughts and decisions (54.5%). Only a few teachers however enhance children's activities that are not connected to teaching (34.5%), and a minority of teachers support children's initiatives that are not connected to teaching and encourage them to realize them, support and coordinate autonomous proposals about initiatives/activities, and support the implementation of creative, new ideas about teaching or other issues regarding to school.

Table 32. Teachers' support of agency (a lot)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	6	20.7	32	55.2	94	**68.1**	26	31.7	22	**66.7**	22	56.4	36	**100**	238	**57.2**
2	2	6.9	18	31.0	78	**57.4**	29	35.4	18	**56.3**	16	41.0	29	**80.6**	190	**46.0**
3	4	13.8	23	39.7	103	**75.7**	47	58.0	24	**75.0**	19	48.7	21	58.3	241	**58.5**
4	0	0	16	27.6	83	**61.0**	27	32.9	24	**72.7**	10	25.6	29	**80.6**	189	**45.7**
5	0	0	20	34.5	87	**64.9**	29	35.8	25	**78.1**	14	35.9	15	41.7	190	**46.3**
6	3	10.7	22	38.6	90	**65.7**	29	36.3	22	**66.7**	22	57.9	35	**97.3**	223	**54.5**
7	4	13.8	28	48.3	89	**64.5**	44	55.7	26	**81.3**	17	43.6	33	**91.7**	241	**58.5**
8	1	3.45	13	22.4	51	39.5	28	35.9	18	**54.5**	13	33.3	15	**41.7**	139	**34.5**

What comes to the differences between countries, the first aspect is that Belgian teachers show a very low level of self-confidence in support of agency. The perceptions of UK teachers are much more positive although weak points concern giving support of creative ideas and enhancement of children's activities which are not connected to teaching. Finnish and Italian teachers also score rather low for many aspects.). Swedish teachers are a bit under the average at many points, with the exception of supporting and coordinating children's autonomous proposals. By contrast, Polish teachers, and to some extent German teachers, seem to be much more supportive of agency. In particular, the large majority of Polish teachers and the majority of German teachers support and encourage children's' creative new ideas about teaching, and the majority of Polish teachers also try to enhance children's' activities that are not connected to teaching, that is, they support agency in the

two areas in which only a few teachers do it in the other countries. In general, the majority of Polish teachers, and also German support all aspects of agency.

To sum up, in **Belgium** teachers do not fully support the autonomy of children, while their assessment of self-efficacy is very low compared to the other responding teachers from the other countries. Teachers' support of agency is much higher in the **UK, Poland** and **Germany**, while teachers in these countries look differently at their capacity to deal with the efficacy concerning cultural differences in professional contexts. School activities seem to set limitations, when few teachers say that they try to enhance children's activities beyond school and teaching.

Table 33 shows interpreters' and mediators' support of children's agency, based on the same type of questions and variables than in the case of teachers above:

1 = I encourage children to make their opinion clear to adults.
2 = I support children's initiatives that are not connected to my teaching and encourage them to realize them.
3 = I allow children to discuss things/ questions in classroom on their own/ autonomously.
4 = If children make autonomous proposals about initiatives/ activities, I support and coordinate them.
5 = If children have creative, new ideas about teaching or other issues regarding to school, I support and encourage them to implement these ideas.
6 = I allow children to question my thoughts or decisions.
7 = I encourage children to articulate and enforce their interests.

8 = I generally try to enhance children's activities that are not connected to my teaching.

The table shows that majority of interpreters/mediators encourage children to make their opinion clear to adults (50.9%) and to articulate and enforce their interests (55.5%). The less frequent support for agency concerns enhancement of children's activities that are not connected to interpreters/mediators' work (only 25.9%) and allowing children to question professionals' thoughts and decisions (33%).

Table 33. Interpreters/mediators' support of agency (a lot)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	9	52.9	7	43.8	14	42.4	5	50.0	22	**61.1**	57	50.9
2	7	41.2	7	43.8	10	32.3	8	**80.0**	14	38.9	46	41.8
3	5	29.4	6	42.9	10	32.3	7	**70.0**	21	58.3	49	44.5
4	6	35.3	8	50.0	7	22.6	7	**70.0**	19	54.3	47	43.1
5	6	35.3	10	**62.5**	9	29.0	6	**60.0**	19	52.8	50	45.5
6	4	23.5	8	**50.0**	10	33.3	4	40.0	10	27.8	36	33.0
7	11	64.7	9	56.3	16	50.0	6	60.0	19	54.3	61	55.5
8	4	23.5	-	-	8	25.8	6	**60.0**	10	29.4	28	25.9

The are some country-specific findings worth looking more closely into. In **Finland**, mediators/interpreters have almost the same confidence in their abilities to support children as teachers. The majority of mediators/interpreters (64.7%) agree that they can do a lot in encouraging children to articulate and enforce their interests. In **Germany**, the results concerning promotion of children's agency might be more related to institutional contexts of mediators' work in school (poor institutional embeddedness), than indicate a lack of consciousness in relation to children's agency. In **Italy**, mediators are much less frequently confident in their ability to promote children's agency than teachers, although the perception of a complete lack of support of agency is not frequent. The survey with language/culture mediators points to interesting findings in **Poland** where they give an overall positive picture of the school environment. They support children's agency, especially children's initiatives that are not connected with their work and encourage children to realize them, allow them to discuss issues autonomously, as well as support and coordinate children's autonomous initiatives. Support of agency is more nuanced in **Sweden**.

Table 34 shows social workers' support of agency. In this case, the variables are slightly different from those of teachers and interpreters/mediators. They are, however, comparable, since the work of social workers does not coincide with schoolwork. The variables are listed below.

1 = I encourage children to make their opinion clear to adults.
2 = I support children's initiatives that are not connected to my work and encourage them to realize them.
3 = I allow children to discuss things/questions on their own/autonomously.
4 = If children make autonomous proposals about initiatives/ activities, I support and coordinate them.
5 = If children have creative, new ideas about social work, I support and encourage them to implement these ideas.
6 = I allow children to question my thoughts or decisions.
7 = I encourage children to articulate and enforce their interests.
8 = I generally try to enhance children's activities that are not connected to my social work.

Table 34 shows that the most frequent type of support is encouragement of children to make their opinion clear to adults (59.6%) and children's articulation and enforcement of their interests (57.3%), followed by allowing autonomous discussion (50.6%). The other aspects concerning support for children's agency are agreed with by a large minority of social workers. Italian social workers seem to be less supportive than social workers in other countries, followed by Polish and Finnish social workers in some aspects. By contrast, English social workers seem to be the most supportive, with some exceptions (supporting initiatives not connected to social work, support of creative new ideas about social work and enhancement of children's activities that are not connected to social work).

Table 34. Social workers' support of agency (a lot)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	29	78.4	89	65.4	28	34.1	6	30.0	27	71.1	11	**100**	190	**59.6**
2	11	30.6	69	**50.7**	28	34.6	4	20.0	17	47.2	4	36.4	133	**42.4**
3	12	32.4	95	69.9	16	19.8	8	40.0	17	47.2	11	**100**	159	**50.6**
4	11	29.7	79	58.1	19	23.5	9	45.0	13	35.1	11	**100**	142	**44.9**
5	12	32.4	85	**62.5**	28	34.5	8	40.0	18	50.0	5	45.4	156	**49.8**
6	11	29.7	79	58.1	9	11.3	7	35.0	15	40.5	11	**100**	132	**42.0**
7	22	59.5	98	**72.1**	27	33.8	6	30.0	16	43.2	11	**100**	180	**57.3**
8	19	52.8	70	51.5	26	31.7	7	35.0	22	**61.1**	4	36.4	148	**47.1**

In **Finland**, social workers feel they are able to encourage children to articulate and enforce their interests. It seems that they are able to support children's agency, but they do not seem to have power to do so as much as teachers and mediators/interpreters. The social workers' positive responses focus more on their ability to encourage children to make their opinion clear to adults and to articulate and enforce their interests, which underlines their professional role. They have an obligation to protect children's rights and to enhance participation and hearing children's opinions and expectations. Also, in **Germany**, most social workers report supporting children's agency, which points to a crucial requirement and a key competence in social work in Germany. Compared to teachers, social workers more often support children's agency according to their interests and activities outside school, which expresses the relevance of lifeworld-oriented professional attitudes of social work. In **Poland**, social workers' most commonly used tools to enhance children's agency were supporting and coordinating children's autonomous proposals; allowing children to discuss things on their own; supporting and encouraging children to implement new ideas.

Table 35 sums up the comparison between teachers, interpreters/mediators and social workers. It is interesting to highlight some (limited) differences between these groups in supporting children's agency. Teachers more frequently support children's initiatives that are not connected to teaching, allow children to discuss issues in classroom autonomously, allow children to question their thoughts or decisions. Social workers more frequently

support children's creative, new ideas and try to enhance children's activities that are not connected to professional work. Interpreters/mediators are frequently less supportive than the other professionals, probably because they have less opportunities of routine relations. In particular, they rarely allow children to question their thoughts or decisions and rarely try to enhance children's activities that are not connected to professional work.

Table 35. Professionals' support of agency (a lot)

	Teachers		Interpreters/ Mediators		Social workers	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	238	57.2	57	50.9	190	59.6
2	190	**46.0**	46	41.8	133	42.4
3	241	**58.5**	49	44.5	159	50.6
4	189	45.7	47	43.1	142	44.9
5	190	46.3	50	45.5	156	**49.8**
6	223	**54.5**	36	33.0	132	42.0
7	241	58.5	61	55.5	180	57.3
8	139	34.5	28	25.9	148	**47.1**

7.3 Professionals' perception of efficacy in their own work

This section investigates professionals' perception of self-efficacy in their own work. This part of the questionnaire adds some elements to understand the ways in which self-efficacy is associated with classroom management for the aspects that are relevant in this project. The variables are listed below.

1 = Cope with the challenges of a classroom.
2 = Adapt to the cultural diversity of students.
3 = Ensure that students with and without a migrant background work together.
4 = Raise awareness for cultural differences amongst students.
5 = Reduce ethnic stereotyping amongst students.

Self-efficacy is linked to the general management of the classroom (variable 1) and more specifically to the conditions of a multicultural classroom: cultural diversity (variable 2), integration (variable 3), encouragement of awareness among children (variable 4), work on stereotypes (variable 5).

An important note is that for this presentation, we have only included the highest value of agreement with the proposed variables (a lot), while for interpreters/mediators and social workers, we have included the two highest values (a lot + a bit). This decision is based on the different importance of different variables for teaching vis-à-vis the work of other professionals.

Table 36 shows teachers' assessment of self-efficacy. It shows that the perception of self-efficacy is very high in general, and particularly for ensuring the possibility of working together for all students, which is the indicator of integration (60.4%), and for coping the challenges in the classroom in general (51.9%). However, the lowest level of efficacy is identified in reducing ethnic stereotypes in the classroom (39.8%) and raising awareness for cultural differences (42%). In particular, the level of self-efficacy perceived in the **UK** is very high for all variables, while in **Belgium** it is very low for all variables. Thus, the difference in perception of efficacy between Belgian teachers and UK teachers is very relevant. In between, there are other important differences, for instance between the two Nordic countries **Finland** and **Sweden**. Finnish teachers are rather positive about their self-efficacy, with the only exceptions of awareness of cultural differences and ensuring work together, for which they score under the mean values. Swedish teachers score under the Finnish teachers for all variables, and, importantly, rarely agree with the idea of self-efficacy However, their feeling of efficacy is not as low as for teachers in **Belgium. Italy** scores after UK as regards the ability to ensure integration of children with a migrant background, and very high for coping with the challenges in the classroom. Italian teachers, however, also experience some difficulties with cultural awareness and stereotypes. The weakest point of **Polish** teachers is coping with challenges in the classroom, followed by ensuring integration, while they report being more frequently at ease with cultural awareness and stereotypes. Finally, **German** teachers are substantially aligned with the mean values.

Table 36. Teachers' assessment of efficacy in teaching (a lot)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	1	3.45	38	**64.4**	68	49.3	50	**61.7**	14	41.2	17	43.6	28	**77.8**	216	**51.9**
2	2	6.9	32	**54.2**	70	50.4	38	47.5	17	50.0	8	20.5	32	**88.9**	199	**47.8**
3	6	20.7	32	54.2	92	66.2	58	**72.5**	17	50.0	13	34.2	32	**88.9**	250	**60.4**
4	2	6.9	20	33.9	57	42.5	30	37.0	18	52.9	13	33.3	33	**91.7**	173	**42.0**
5	1	3.57	27	**45.8**	51	38.3	26	31.7	14	41.2	12	30.8	33	**91.7**	164	**39.8**

Table 37 shows the assessment of self-efficacy by interpreters and mediators. Mediators were not included in the research plan in the UK, since they do not work in schools, nor was it possible to contact them in Belgium. Since the numbers are much lower, in this case the data report the unity in agreeing with the options "a lot" and "quite a bit". The table shows that interpreters and mediators feel the need to be able to cope with multicultural classrooms, although once again the weakest point in their work is reducing ethnic stereotypes. It is remarkable that in this case, the strongest point is adapting to cultural diversity of children, which is particularly weak in Italy (37%). In Italy, mediators are much less frequently confident in their abilities in dealing systematically with multicultural classrooms and agency than teachers are. In Germany and Sweden, almost all respondents assess their efficacy for all aspects very positively. It is interesting to note the difference between Italian (71.4%) and Finnish (47.1%) mediators concerning the efficacy in raising

awareness for cultural diversity, and the Finnish mediators' very low confidence in efficacy in integrating all children in schoolwork.

Table 37. Interpreters'/mediators' assessment of efficacy in their classroom work (a lot + quite a bit)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	10	58.8	12	92.3	16	55.2	7	70	30	81.1	75	70.8
2	11	64.7	14	93.3	21	65.6	8	80	34	91.9	88	79.3
3	6	35.3	14	93.3	18	60.0	9	90	28	82.4	75	70.8
4	8	47.1	15	100	20	71.4	8	80	29	78.4	80	74.8
5	10	58.8	14	87.6	10	37.0	8	80	29	80.6	71	67.0

Table 38 shows social workers' assessment of self-efficacy. In this case, there are some differences with the questionnaires of teachers and interpreters/mediators.

1 = Cope with the challenges in work with clients with a multicultural background.
2 = Adapt to the cultural diversity of clients.
3 = Raise awareness for cultural differences amongst students.
4 = Reduce ethnic stereotyping amongst students.
5 = Cope with the demands that I am facing.
6 = Feel overwhelmed in contact with my clients.
7 = Experience problems as a challenge rather than a burden, as carrying out my profession as a social worker

Apart from the small change in variable 1 (concerning the different work of social workers), and the absence of the question focusing on integration in the classroom, the questionnaire includes some additional questions concerning the specific job of social workers, which is frequently associated with burn-out: coping with demands (variable 5), feeling overwhelmed (variable 6) and ways of experiencing challenges.

Table 38 shows that general data are very positive and rather homogenous. The most problematic outcome is that 40.3% of social workers feel overwhelmed about their contacts with clients. As usual, there are some relevant differences between the countries. Data are less frequently positive in Poland, with the exception of coping with the demands of clients (95.2%). More specifically, 71.4% of social workers feel overwhelmed about their contacts with clients. In the UK and Sweden, by contrast, data are very positive, with the exception of Swedish social workers feeling overwhelmed by clients (59.5%), while in the UK no respondents felt overwhelmed. Also, in Finland, feeling overwhelmed is very frequent (68.6%), in contrast with efficacy in coping with the demands they are facing (all social workers) and experiencing problems as a challenge rather than as a burden (all social workers). In Italy, only 7.4% of social workers feel overwhelmed by clients, but only 60.2% experience problems as a challenge rather than as a burden, in contrast with Finland, Sweden and Germany. In any case, in **Italy**, the majority of social workers trust in their ability

in dealing with intercultural relations and difficult conditions. In sum, social workers are more confident in their abilities than teachers and mediators.

Regarding self-efficacy, female social workers in Germany specifically said they are able to adopt their professional orientations to cultural diversity and to reduce stereotyping, but even vastly more often feel overwhelmed by the contacts with clients. This indicates a significant issue within the practice of social work and the stress female social workers experience. In **Italy** females show a more optimistic and confident attitude than males and are more committed than males to promote children's agency.

Table 38. Social workers' assessment of efficacy in social work (a lot + quite a bit)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	27	79.4	97	71.3	66	79.5	12	57.1	35	**92.1**	11	**100**	248	**77.5**
2	27	79.4	100	73.5	57	71.3	11	52.4	33	**91.7**	11	**100**	239	**75.9**
3	26	74.4	121	88.9	44	57.1	11	52.4	35	**94.6**	11	**100**	248	**79.0**
4	31	91.1	93	68.4	53	66.3	11	52.4	35	**97.2**	11	**100**	234	**74.3**
5	33	**100**	116	85.3	69	84.1	20	**95.2**	37	**97.4**	11	**100**	286	**89.9**
6	24	**68.6**	61	44.8	6	7.4	15	**71.4**	22	**59.5**	0	0	128	**40.3**
7	34	**100**	110	**90.9**	50	60.2	18	85.7	37	**100**	11	**100**	260	**81.8**

8 Children facing challenges

In life, not everything runs smoothly, and difficulties, problems and challenges of many kind are a feature of children's experience whether or not they have a migration background. This chapter is divided in two sections. The former is concerned with the nature of challenges from the point of view of children, parents and professionals. The latter describes the ways of facing challenges as reported by the different respondent groups in the survey.

8.1 Children's challenges

In the survey, children's challenges in school were categorized as new situations, problems at school and difficulties in expressing one's opinion when it differed from that of others.

> Past experiences.
>
> These are some examples of difficult situations that anyone might have experienced.
>
> Please mark how often you have you experienced any of the following situations in your life? (Scale: Many times 1, Once or twice 2, Never 3.)

> 1) New situations and surroundings that you are not familiar with (e.g., changing to a new class/ school; moving to a new country or community)
> 2) Problems at school: Please, tell us, what has been the most challenging situation that you have faced in school so far
> 3) Problems with making your point of view understood or expressing opinions when your classmates or teachers disagree with you.

Table 39 shows that challenges are more frequent in the school context (14.7%) and less frequent for unfamiliar situations (8.5%). However, it is evident that unfamiliar situations are particularly troubling for children with a migrant background (12.9%), while there are no great differences between migrant and non-migrant children's experiences of challenges in school and in expressing opinions. The responses to this question vary between different countries. Challenges are almost absent in the UK for all variables without any specificity for migrant children, as usual in the context of this country. Challenges are, in general, less frequent for Italian children, in particular when it comes to unfamiliar situations and expressing opinion. Challenges for unfamiliar situations are very frequent for migrant children especially in Finland and Germany. Challenges in school are particularly frequent in Germany for all children and in Sweden for all children, although in Sweden migrant children experience problems at school less frequently. Finally, issues with expressing opinions are the most frequent in Belgium.

Table 39. Children's experiences of challenges (ISCED 1-3; many times)

Country	New situations (unfamiliarity)				School				Making points of view understood or expressing opinions			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	37	9.6	25	11.3	72	18.9	44	20.4	81	**21.1**	52	**23.8**
Finland	85	**14.6**	35	**27.6**	102	18.0	26	21.1	85	14.7	18	14.4
Germany	48	13.2	21	**27.6**	95	**28.2**	23	**33.3**	51	15.1	14	17.9
Italy	33	4.7	25	7.5	86	12.3	52	15.8	54	7.8	31	9.5
Poland	40	6.3	27	19.1	78	12.6	10	7.3	98	15.4	18	12.6
Sweden	28	**14.8**	21	14.7	42	**23.7**	26	19.4	23	16.2	16	15.1
United Kingdom	23	3.8	5	2.6	23	3.8	10	5.0	18	2.9	5	2.5
Total	294	8.5	159	**12.9**	498	14.7	191	15.8	410	12.1	154	13.0

Table 39b shows that percentages strongly increase when difficulties are experienced as happening once or twice. In this case, challenges in unfamiliarity raise to 42.7% and the gap between children with and without a migrant background also increases (54% for migrant children). The increase of challenges in school and in expressing opinion is not as big (43.6% and 47.6% respectively). For migrant-background children, the increase in challenges in school is similar to that of all children (43.6%), while it is a little higher for challenges in expressing opinions (50.5%). There are also relevant differences between some local contexts. In Poland, challenges for unfamiliar situations of migrant children raises to 80.8% (against 36.3% of all children), and the large majority of migrant children also experienced difficulties in unfamiliar situations in Finland, Germany and, to a lesser extent, Sweden. In Sweden, however, challenges are less frequent for children with a migrant background. In schools, challenges are very frequent in Germany, above all for children with a migrant background (89.8%). Challenges in expressing opinion are very frequent in Germany, Belgium, Italy and Sweden, but migrant children face these challenges more frequently than their non-migrant peers only in Germany. In Poland, children with a migrant background less frequently experience challenges in school and in expressing opinions than their peers do in the other countries.

Table 39b. Children's experiences of challenges (ISCED 1-3; many times + once or twice)

Country	New situations (unfamiliarity)				School				Making points of view understood or expressing opinions			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	190	49.2	118	53.4	194	51.1	112	51.8	217	56.7	135	61.9
Finland	373	63.9	99	**78.0**	239	51.7	74	60.1	318	54.9	68	54.4
Germany	227	62.4	59	**77.6**	263	78.1	62	**89.8**	198	58.6	51	**69.3**
Italy	240	33.9	164	49.4	351	50.2	162	49.1	398	57.2	197	60.6
Poland	232	36.3	114	**80.8**	241	39.0	38	27.7	333	52.3	66	46.6
Sweden	118	62.4	80	55.9	101	57.0	74	55.2	87	61.3	65	61.3
United Kingdom	105	17.4	34	17.5	88	14.5	29	14.5	62	10.1	17	8.5
Total	1,485	42.7	668	**54.0**	1,477	43.6	551	45.7	1613	47.6	599	**50.5**

Open-ended answers in Finland reveal that school challenges are connected to (1) relationships (including bullying), (2) languages as part of studying, and (3) coping with school activities and subjects. Open answers in Germany highlight that pupils with migrant background fairly often report challenges related to their background, for example, difficulties in language use or in adapting into a new cultural and school environment. A noticeable number of respondents had experienced problems relating to prejudice (cultural stereotypes) and discrimination. There might be a connection with the lack of teachers' training in intercultural issues, as reported by teachers. Therefore, it is a necessity to foster multicultural competence to enhance migrant children's well-being in schools. Younger children (ISCED1) report to face fewer new situations and contexts than the older ones, which might indicate that they feel more secured than older children do with regard to the stability of contexts.

Table 40shows parents' perception of children's challenges (in **Sweden**, however, the answers from parents are difficult to interpret due to the limited number of respondents). The table shows that in general, this perception is more optimistic than that of children, in particular among migrant parents when it comes to challenges in school (7.7%) and in expressing opinion (9.8%). In the UK in particular, parents do not perceive any challenges for children; in general, there seem to be some perception of issues only in Finland and in Germany, although in the latter migrant parents, perception of children's challenges in school is very low, 8.3% against the 33.3% experience of migrant children.

Perception of child's need for parental support.

The following are some examples of difficult situations that anyone might have experienced.

Please mark whether your children have encountered the following situations, and how often.

1) New situations and surroundings, that they are not familiar with (e.g., changing to a new class/ school; moving to a new country or community)
2) Problems at school: Please, tell us, what has been the most challenging situation that your children have faced in school so far?
3) Issues with making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when their classmates or teachers disagree.

Table 40. Parents' perception of children's problems (ISCED 1–3; many times)

Country	New situations (unfamiliarity)				School				making points of view understood or expressing opinions			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	13	10.2	11	11.7	12	9.4	6	6.4	12	9.5	9	9.7
Finland	14	14.0	5	19.2	13	13.3	4	16.7	16	15.8	6	23.1
Germany	25	8.7	2	8.3	64	27.7	2	8.3	49	18.2	5	20.8
Italy	97	12.8	41	12.7	85	11.4	36	11.3	85	11	45	13.4
Poland	21	4.3	17	13.5	86	18.6	9	6.9	59	12	9	6.9
Sweden	3	15.8	1	11.1	3	16.7	1	12.5	2	11.8	1	12.5
United Kingdom	1	0.3	0	0	1	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	174	8.0	77	10.2	264	12.7	58	7.7	223	10.3	75	9.8

Table 40a shows that the situation changes dramatically for unfamiliarity as regards challenges occurring once or twice. It changes much less for school, where only 26.6% of migrant parents perceive children's difficulties. Exceptions for this are migrant parents in Finland (66.7%) and Germany (63.2%), although in Germany the percentage is in any case lower that the general one (81.8%), which shows that, according to parents, almost all children faced Problems at school at least once or twice (while this is true for only 35.9% of parents in Belgium, 33.9% in Italy and 30.9% in Poland).

Table 40a. Parents' perceptions of children's problems (ISCED 1–3; many times + once or twice)

	New situations (unfamiliarity)				School				Making points of view understood or expressing opinions			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	77	60.2	56	59.6	46	35.9	33	35.1	50	39.4	34	36.6
Finland	77	77.0	20	78.0	64	65.3	16	66.7	65	64.3	16	61.5
Germany	213	74.2	18	81.8	189	81.8	12	63.2	180	66.9	11	55.0
Italy	429	56.7	174	54	253	33.9	100	31.3	379	49.2	156	46.6
Poland	177	36.3	94	74.6	143	30.9	25	19.1	202	41.0	27	20.6
Sweden	13	68.4	7	77.8	12	66.7	4	50.0	10	58.8	5	62.5
United Kingdom	30	7.6	14	9.0	23	6.0	9	5.9	11	2.8	4	2.6
Total	1,016	46.8	383	50.8	730	35.2	199	26.6	897	41.3	253	32.9

In general, migrant-background children report experiencing challenging situations more often than their native-born peers, but this difference is not generalised. For instance, in **Sweden** children with a non-migrant background experience challenges to a higher degree than their migrant peers. In the **UK**, children with a migrant background appear more confident than the average. In general, parents seem to overestimate their children's comfort with expressing their opinions, in particular in school. However, it is evident that there is a need for further explication of how the perception of "challenge" is interpreted in different contexts.

Table 41 shows teachers' perception of children's challenges at school identifying the most frequent issues that teachers potentially find in a multicultural classroom. The variables are listed below.

1 = a child who has difficulties with language of instruction.
2 = a child moving from another country or other town.
3 = a child arriving to your class mid-term.
4 = a child facing challenges in initiating contact with others.
5 = a child having serious problems with schoolwork or with social relations. (If you want to specify, please indicate which)
6 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when having difficulties to defend their opinion.
7 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when confronted in conflict situations and telling others what is right.
8 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when they are not feeling well.
9 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when having personal worries.

Variables 1–3 are clearly associated with migration, since they concern challenges related to language and to (more or less sudden) migration of children. Variable 4 may be interpreted in a broader way, since challenges in "initial contact" does not necessarily involve children with a migrant background. Variable 5 concerns general challenges in school experience, in both performance and social relations. Variables 6–9 are all associated with general relational challenges, concerning defencing one's opinions (variable 6), expressing opinions in conflictive situations (variable 7), expressing opinion when feeling bad (variable 8) and expressing opinions in case of personal worries (variable 9). Variables 8 and 9 may also be interpreted as conditions of discomfort.

Table 41 shows that the challenge experienced the most frequently concerns difficulties with language of instruction (60.8%), which confirms that integration of migrant children is considered a major challenge. This is confirmed by the frequently experienced challenges of children arriving into the class mid-term (50.4%) and, only a little less frequently, moving from another country or town (47.1%). The second type of a challenge concerns children making their point of view understood or expressing opinions, both when confronted in conflict situations and telling others what they think is right (55%), when having difficulties to defend their opinion (52.1%), and, to a lesser extent, when they do not feel well (46.8%) and have personal worries (46.5%). Challenges in the classroom are also frequent: social schoolwork and social relations (48.1%) and initiating contacts (45.3%).

Table 41. Specific challenges of children in class (according to teachers, on regular bases + often)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	16	55.8	42	**71.1**	79	57.7	35	44.3	29	**82.9**	34	**89.5**	16	44.4	251	**60.8**
2	6	20.8	40	67.7	30	22.1	44	57.9	26	**74.2**	29	**74.4**	18	50.0	193	**47.1**
3	8	27.6	29	50.0	84	**61.7**	26	32.6	19	54.3	22	57.9	20	55.5	208	**50.4**
4	2	6.9	22	37.2	58	43.0	51	**64.6**	22	**62.9**	14	36.8	17	47.2	186	**45.3**
5	8	27.6	37	**62.7**	52	40.0	35	52.2	13	39.4	29	**78.4**	14	38.9	188	**48.1**
6	14	48.3	22	37.3	85	**65.9**	42	55.2	13	39.4	18	48.6	14	38.9	208	**52.1**
7	10	34.5	26	44.1	96	**73.8**	45	59.2	17	51.5	19	48.7	8	22.2	221	**55.0**
8	7	24.1	28	47.5	72	**55.4**	41	**52.6**	12	36.3	17	45.9	11	25.5	188	**46.8**
9	4	13.8	29	49.2	65	50.0	45	**60.0**	9	27.2	17	44.7	17	47.2	186	**46.5**

There are several differences between different countries. In Belgium, challenges are much less frequently observed than in the other countries as regards both integration and school relations. In **Finland**, challenges concerning expression while defending one's opinions is also less frequent, while more challenging is the language of instruction and schoolwork and social relations. The Finnish teachers seem to be more focused on instruction and the most important challenge with migrant-background children is thus language. In **Germany**, moving from another country or town does not seem a problem as such, while a more

frequently experienced challenge, when compared to the average, is arriving mid-term. Other relevant challenges in Germany concern children's expression of opinions, particularly but not exclusively, in conflict situations. In **Italy**, language of instruction and mid-term arrivals are less relevant than on average. Challenges have more often to do with initial contacts and children not feeling well or having personal problems. By contrast, in **Poland** these two types of challenges are not typical nor are challenges related to defending one's opinions. In this country, challenges more frequently concern the language of instruction, as in Finland, but also national and international migration as well as initial contacts. In addition**,** Polish teachers pointed out bullying, mental disorders, emotional problems and demotivation. Language of instruction and migration movement are also typical challenges in **Sweden**, together with schoolwork and social relations. Finally, in the **UK**, challenges in expression are not considered frequent, apart from challenges in expressing personal worries.

In **Germany**, secondary schools comparatively often face situations with children who have difficulties with the language of instruction and situations where pupils have difficulties in making their point of view understood or in expressing their opinions during conflicts. By contrast, kindergartens very often face children arriving mid-term.

Table 42 concerns children's challenges according to interpreters/mediators (the same variables were used than with teachers).

1 = a child who has difficulties with language of instruction.
2 = a child moving from another country or other town.
3 = a child arriving to your class mid-term.
4 = a child facing challenges in initiating contact with others.
5 = a child having serious problems with schoolwork or with social relations. (If you want to specify, please indicate which)
6 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when having difficulties to defend their opinion.
7 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when confronted in conflict situations and telling others what is right.
8 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when they are not feeling well.
9 = a child having problems in making their point of view understood or expressing opinions when having personal worries.

The table shows that interpreters/mediators emphasise challenges in the language of instruction (69.2%) and in migration movement from other countries or towns (71.2%). In some countries, the number of respondents is low, making it difficult to compare data. In **Italy**, only a few mediators face challenges on a regular basis, probably as their work in schools is not continuous. Most mediators in Italy, as well as in Sweden, observe situations that involve non-native speakers and children coming from other places various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In **Sweden**, mediators, as teachers, experience children's challenges with the language of instruction frequently. However, while almost 80% of the

teachers report that they experience pupils having serious difficulties with schoolwork or with social relations, only approximately half of the mediators report this.

Table 42. Children's specific challenges in class (according to interpreters/mediators, on regular bases + often)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	12	63.2	11	57.9	25	69.4	8	80.0	27	75.0	83	**69.2**
2	8	42.2	10	58.8	25	71.5	8	80.0	33	89.2	84	**71.2**
3	4	21.1	7	38.9	15	45.4	6	60.0	23	63.9	55	**47.4**
4	4	21.1	7	38.9	18	53	6	60.0	17	45.9	52	**44.1**
5	9	53.0	7	41.2	16	55.1	N/A	N/A	16	50.0	48	**50.5**
6	6	33.4	10	55.6	15	44.2	6	60.0	25	69.4	62	**53.9**
7	6	33.4	12	70.5	13	38.2	6	60.0	20	60.6	57	**50.9**
8	5	27.8	8	47.1	17	50.0	7	70.0	10	31.3	47	**42.3**
9	5	27.8	9	52.9	16	50.1	7	70.0	15	46.9	52	**47.7**

8.2 Supporting children facing challenges

In the survey, children were asked to describe who they received help from and collaborate with in troublesome situations. The two questions included the choice among several options, but here we focus on the three most important options (which were chosen most often): family, teachers and friends.

Table 43 shows that family is the context in which children find help the most frequently (44.2%); however, children with a migrant background receive help less frequently than the average (43%).Instead, these children receive help more frequently from friends (35.6%), which is the second most popular category (34.3%) and from teachers (29.4%), which is the third choice (25%).

Some differences between the country contexts are particularly interesting. Help is very rare in **Poland** from family, friends as well as teachers, and rare from teachers and friends in **Italy**. By contrast, in **Sweden** help is frequently received from family and teachers. In **Belgium**, in general, help is frequent from within all categories, and in particular from family and friends. Interestingly, family help is much more frequent in Italy (40.7%) than in Poland (17.7%), two Catholic countries in which the narrative of family is highly valued. As for children with a migrant background, in **Italy** they receive help much less frequently from all categories. In **Poland**, the same trend may only be observed for friends. While other clear differences among countries are not found, family, friends and teachers are particularly important sources of help for children with a migrant background in **Finland** and in **Germany**, and teachers are also important in the UK.

Table 43. Receiving help (children)

Country	Family				Teachers				Friends			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	250	65.0	136	61.2	120	31.2	78	35.3	200	52.3	112	50.7
Finland	300	50.2	59	48.4	151	25.2	47	**38.5**	260	43.5	61	**50.0**
Germany	222	59.7	42	53.8	92	24.7	27	**34.6**	151	40.6	36	**46.2**
Italy	220	40.7	108	21.7	114	21.1	62	12.5	162	29.9	90	18.1
Poland	112	17.7	24	17.1	103	16.3	24	17.1	99	16.0	24	17.9
Sweden	109	62.6	87	65.9	70	40.2	58	43.9	76	43.7	56	42.4
United Kingdom	220	40.8	63	37.0	160	29.7	59	**34.7**	159	29.5	48	28.2
Total	1,433	**44.2**	519	**43.0**	810	**25.0**	355	**29.4**	1107	**34.3**	427	**35.6**

Table 44 concerns collaboration, which implies more reciprocity than 'help' addressed above. Collaboration increases with friends (47.5%), which is more frequent than with family (42.9%), while collaboration with teachers is much less frequent (25%). It is interesting to note that for migrant children, collaboration with family is less frequent than the average for children from all backgrounds (38.2%and with friends (43.7%), while it is slightly higher than average with teachers (25.8%).

Table 44. Collaborating (children)

Country	Family				Teachers				Friends			
	Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant		Total		Migrant	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Belgium	149	38.7	72	32.4	63	16.4	18	8.1	190	49.4	81	36.4
Finland	259	43.3	55	45.0	94	15.7	27	**22.0**	332	55.5	72	59.0
Germany	170	45.7	39	50.0	62	16.7	11	14.1	169	45.4	36	46.2
Italy	145	29.7	71	27.8	87	17.8	47	18.4	209	42.8	109	42.7
Poland	394	62.2	80	57.1	263	41.7	88	**62.9**	332	53.6	59	44.0
Sweden	64	40.0	50	41.0	40	25.0	36	**29.5**	93	58.1	71	58.2
United Kingdom	179	33.1	59	33.3	185	34.2	61	34.4	176	32.5	57	32.2
Total	1,360	**42.9**	426	**38.2**	794	**25.0**	288	**25.8**	1501	**47.5**	485	**43.7**

In general, while family help is more frequent in Italy than in Poland, collaboration with family is particularly frequent in Poland (62.2%) and less frequent in Italy (29.7%). This suggests that in Italy and Poland the relation between children and their families works differently. In Poland, also collaboration with teachers is very frequent, differently from the other countries (the UK is the second one). In Poland, therefore, most of the children choose collaboration

as the best way to overcome challenges. As for friends, collaboration is less frequent in the UK and rather similar in the other countries.

Children with a migrant background collaborate less frequently than the average of all children **Belgium.** Interestingly, in **Poland,** this percentage is lower with family and friends, but much higher with teachers. Collaboration with teachers is also higher than on average in **Finland** and **Sweden**.

It is important to note that in some countries, a great minority of children (**Belgium, Italy, UK**) or a majority (**Finland**) responded that they rather manage alone than collaborate. The number is even bigger among migrant-background children. This can be an indication of a prevailing culture which encourages people to manage their difficulties on their own.

It is worth adding some general observations about individual country contexts here. As we have seen (table 38), in the UK challenges are not a defining characteristic of children's experiences. When difficulties come by, children seem to prefer the family as the first port of call, while teachers are preferred when it comes to collaboration in accomplishing tasks and overcoming challenges. Children with a migrant background seem to prefer teachers' support more than children without a migrant background; however, differences are not large. In **Belgium**, children are more likely to find help from parents, but they seem to collaborate more often with their friends to solve their issues. In **Germany**, children with a migrant background receive help more often from friends and teachers, but not so often from parents. Younger children more often receive help from family and teachers, while older children significantly more often receive help from their friends and tend to receive less help from family and teachers. Children in kindergarten mainly ask their parents for help, the mothers especially. Classmates and other people (e.g. siblings) are also frequently asked. Teachers/educators are a less important source of help and are mentioned the least. This result is quite contradictory to other related findings: for example, in cases of children disliking something, teachers/educators are the most important interlocutors (40.8%), while only 2.3% talk with parents and 6.9% talk with friends about the issue. In **Italy**, the only strong difference among children with a migrant background concerns the lower percentage of receiving help from form the family. However, these children do receive help much more frequently from other adults (19.5%), which shows the existence of social networks in their life. Lack of difference in receiving help from and collaborating with teachers and friends confirms the existence of these networks. Females take friends into account as a source of help more frequently than males (46.5% vs. 39.4%), and females also seek help from family (15.5% vs. 9.4%) and teachers (20.3% vs. 9.7%) more frequently. In **Poland**, most children choose collaborating as the best way to overcome challenges and ask family or friends to cooperate. In most cases, they did receive help from one of these. In **Sweden**, it is striking that from within all three sources of help, children with a migrant background have chosen more options than children with a non-migrant background. Non-migrant children receive support primarily from family and friends, while migrant-background children receive support from various sources. Overall, friends stand out as the most important source of support.

Table 45 shows collaboration in facing challenges from the point of view of teachers. Teachers were asked to choose collaborators from among different actors face children's challenges. One option was not collaborating with anyone. The variables are listed below.

1 = School management.
2 = (Other) teacher(s).
3 = Another member of school staff.
4 = Parent/s.
5 = Other pupil/s.
6 = Professional outside school.
7 = I handled the situation on my own.

Table 45 shows that teachers work together very frequently to solve problems (74.4%), and also collaborate with parents rather frequently (54.3%), - more often than with school management (40.7%) and other school staff (41.1%). Interestingly, in 27.8% of cases, other children are involved in resolving problems. It is not rare that teachers solve problems on their own (33%) while the least frequent source of collaboration is professionals outside school (17.2%), which points to school being rather separated from the broader social context.

Table 45. Collaboration in resolving the situation (according to teachers)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	14	48.3	26	44.1	31	22.3	26	31.0	16	50.0	28	**71.8**	29	**80.6**	170	**40.7**
2	24	**82.8**	46	78.0	93	66.9	65	77.4	25	78.1	27	69.2	31	**86.1**	311	**74.4**
3	13	44.8	39	**66.1**	30	21.6	26	31.0	16	50.0	20	51.3	28	**77.8**	172	**41.1**
4	15	51.7	43	**72.9**	77	55.4	42	50.0	19	59.4	24	61.5	7	19.4	227	**54.3**
5	9	31.1	15	25.4	50	**36.0**	20	23.8	12	**37.5**	6	15.4	4	11.1	116	**27.8**
6	6	20.7	11	18.6	9	6.5	32	**38.1**	6	18.8	6	15.4	2	5.6	72	**17.2**
7	13	**44.8**	22	37.3	59	**42.4**	15	17.9	15	**46.9**	12	30.8	2	5.6	138	**33.0**

Collaboration between teachers is a bit less frequent in Germany and Sweden and more frequent in the UK and Belgium. Collaboration with school management and school staff is infrequent in Germany and Italy. Collaboration with school management is particularly frequent in the UK and Sweden and with other school staff in the UK and Finland. Collaboration with parents is very frequent in Finland and very rare in the UK. Pupils are rarely involved in problem-solving with teachers in the UK and Sweden, and more frequently in Poland and Finland. Other professionals, working outside schools, are almost absent in Germany and the UK, and the most frequently presenting Italy where connection with the social context might be interpreted as working better. Finally, teachers solve problems on their own above all in Poland, Belgium and Germany, but rarely in Italy and very rarely in the UK.

This picture is particularly interesting in highlighting different school cultures in facing challenges. In the **UK**, teachers' representation of children's challenges can be observed as a rare circumstance, usually managed in collaboration with school leadership and colleagues, less often in collaboration with families. This suggests the vision of school as a rather closed system, in contrast with the emphasis on school-family partnership that underpins many educational policies. In **Sweden**, the support structures seen from the teachers' point of view, are not very good but not poor either. Teachers agree that the support structure is relatively good for migrant pupils. They are, however, critical regarding the support structures for children in the categories of low academic achievers, academically gifted, children with behavioural problems, children with special needs, and pupils from socio-economically disadvantaged homes, and refugees. The professional expertise most frequently available at school is, according to teachers, provided by social workers and facilitators, and on request by language mediators and psychologists.

Other school systems are more open to other actors, such as external professionals (Italy) and children (Germany, Poland). The involvement of parents is more nuanced; for instance, Finland involves parents in the school institution, as well as Poland and Italy. In **Italy**, in particular, almost all teachers face challenges in collaboration with other people; collaboration is very important above all inside the school, but in several cases also with parents and external professionals.

In **Poland**, teachers collaborate mostly with colleagues, parents or school management and other members of school staff. The most uncommon situation is looking for help or collaboration outside the school. This solution is chosen in the case of pupil aggressiveness or accidents at school. Teachers do have access to some specialists, psychologists and facilitators and experts of local language teaching. On request they are also supported by social workers, interpreters/language mediators or educators. However, in the case of conflict, mediators' access is difficult, and there are also difficulties in the access of educators and social workers. Among other accessible specialists, teachers list speech therapists and methodological advisers.

Individualism prevails as a form of problem-solving in Belgium, Germany and Poland. In **Germany**, where other teachers and parents are the most important partners in resolving challenging situations, yet teachers are often able to solve the problems on their own or with other children's support.

9 Representations of integration

The final section of the questionnaire concerns the ways in which professionals and parents represent integration, cultural differences and intercultural relations in society. These representations show the ways in which migration impacts the school context and its immediate social environment. The following variables were included in the questionnaire:

1 = This country would be a better place, if members of different groups kept their own way of life alive **(positive cultural variety).**

2 = People who come to this country, should change their way of life to be more like 'us'. **(assimilation to we-identity).**

3 = If the members of different groups want to maintain their own culture, they should keep it to themselves, and not bother other people in this country **(assimilation as privatization of cultural difference).**

4 = It would be good to see, if all the groups in this country retain their cultures. **(support of cultural difference).**

5 = A society, which has a variety of groups, is more able to tackle new problems as they occur **(cultural variety as solution of problems).**

6 = It is best for this country if all immigrants forget their cultural background as soon as possible **(negative representation of cultural difference).**

7 = Mingling different cultures would be the best way of managing differences (**preference for cultural mélange**).

8 = Cultural influences and personal expressions always mingle **(personal and cultural trajectories).**

9 = Culture is not important to explain people's personal behaviour **(primacy of personal trajectories).**

10 = Having many different cultural groups in this country makes it difficult to solve problems (**cultural difference as a problem**).

While these variables are different, they can also be seen as components of different "factors". The first factor is celebration of cultural difference (variables 1, 4, 5). The second factor is ethnocentrism (variables 2, 3, 6, 10). The third factor is hybridity (variables 7 and 8). The fourth factor is cultural irrelevance (variable 9). It might have been expected that respondents choose to agree with the components of one factor, disagreeing with those of the others. The result was something else: contradictions and ambivalences were frequent.

9.1 Professionals' representations of integration

Table 46 shows that the general picture of teachers' representations is very ambivalent. On the one hand, teachers celebrate cultural mélange (81%) and personal and cultural trajectories (79.5%), showing a strong commitment to a "hybrid" conception of society and

integration. On the other hand, they also stress the importance of cultural difference (72.1%), above all as a solution for problems (78.1%). This is coherent with the celebration of cultural variety (59.5%), but not with assimilation to we-identity which is, however, chosen by 49.9% of respondents. However, teachers do not approve assimilation at all as privatization of culture and explicit negative representation of cultural difference, which are coherent with assimilation to we-identity, chosen by half of respondents.

Table 46. Teachers' representations of integration (strongly agree + agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	14	48.3	40	69.0	110	**85.9**	10	15.2	14	43.8	10	27.8	31	**86.0**	229	**59.5**
2	21	**72.4**	24	42.9	89	**69.0**	19	24.1	26	**79.3**	12	32.4	8	22.0	199	**49.9**
3	9	**31.0**	9	16.1	9	7.0	11	14.1	12	**34.8**	6	16.2	4	11.0	60	**15.0**
4	23	79.3	45	77.6	66	51.6	66	**85.7**	32	**94.1**	23	63.9	32	**89.0**	287	**72.1**
5	15	51.7	46	77.8	85	65.9	74	**94.9**	31	**91.2**	27	75.0	35	**87.0**	313	**78.1**
6	3	**10.3**	5	**8.6**	5	3.9	2	2.6	1	2.9	2	5.7	0	0	18	**4.5**
7	24	82.7	41	70.7	103	78.7	70	**89.8**	27	79.4	29	82.9	31	**86.0**	325	**81.0**
8	27	**93.1**	21	36.8	112	87.5	65	86.4	32	**94.1**	22	68.8	32	**89.0**	311	**79.5**
9	11	37.9	34	**58.6**	51	39.0	15	19.2	31	**91.2**	7	20.0	3	8.3	152	**37.9**
10	15	**51.7**	15	26.7	48	36.3	21	26.9	20	**58.8**	11	31.4	5	14.0	135	**33.8**

The choice of pure personal trajectories (37.9%) and the problematic understanding of cultural difference (37.9%) are understandable against the complex background of the so-called "multicultural" societies and "superdiversity".

Contradictions and ambivalence can be partially (but only partially) explained through differences in individual country contexts. For instance, in Italy, Sweden and the UK contradictions are less evident since assimilation and/or personal trajectories contradicting cultural issues are not frequent. In Finland, as well as in Belgium, on the contrary, preference for cultural difference seems less relevant than in other countries. Contradictions are more relevant in Poland. In any case, the ambivalence between relevance of cultural differences and relevance of hybridization is rather widespread.

Table 47 shows the representation of social workers (Belgium is excluded from this table since social workers were not interviewed). The ambivalence is similar to that of teachers, although celebration of cultural variety and cultural diversity as a solution for problems is more frequent (variables 1 and 5). In particular, positive cultural variety is more frequent in Germany (variable 1) and cultural diversity as a solution for problems in Poland and the UK (variable 5). Ethnocentrism is very infrequent among social workers (2.3%), and is absent in the UK, Sweden and Finland. On the other hand, assimilation as privatisation is more frequent than among teachers (29.1%), and this is a heightened divergence among social workers, although the UK and Finland present low frequencies. In the UK, the ambivalence

is very evident since all social workers choose both the value of cultural differences and the importance of hybridization. In Poland, several representations are more frequent than in other countries, which points to contradictions, since they include both positive cultural diversity and ethnocentrism (as well as the relevance of personal trajectories). Other evident contradictions can be seen in Germany, between variable 1 and variable 3.

Table 47. Social workers' representations of integration (strongly agree + agree)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	27	73.0	106	**85.5**	40	50.0	9	45.0	19	54.3	11	**100**	212	**69.3**
2	17	45.9	69	55.6	25	31.3	12	**60.0**	14	38.9	0	0	137	**44.9**
3	3	8.1	56	**45.1**	16	20.2	8	**42.1**	5	13.9	0	0	88	**29.1**
4	31	86.1	68	54.9	64	80.0	18	**90.0**	30	85.7	11	**100**	222	**74.2**
5	32	86.5	98	79.0	73	89.0	20	**100**	33	94.3	11	**100**	267	**88.7**
6	0	0	3	2.4	2	2.6	2	**10.0**	0	0	0	0	7	**2.3**
7	30	81.1	94	75.8	69	88.4	13	65.0	35	**100**	11	**100**	252	**84.8**
8	13	35.1	109	87.9	73	90.1	11	55.0	25	78.1	11	**100**	242	**80.9**
9	20	54.0	41	33.1	9	11.1	18	**90.0**	18	50.0	0	0	106	**34.9**
10	7	18.9	28	22.6	33	40.8	14	**70.0**	12	33.3	0	0	94	**30.8**

Table 48 shows the representation of interpreters/mediators (Belgium is excluded from this table since social workers were not interviewed; the UK did not include interpreters/mediators in the sample). What is interesting here is that variables representing negative aspects of cultural difference and personal trajectories (variables 2, 3, 6, 9, 10) are more frequent than among teachers and social workers. Italy is an exception here since for all these variables, excluding variable 9, percentages are lower than in the other countries, while cultural mélange is almost the norm.

Table 48. Interpreters/mediators' representations of integration (strongly agree + agree)

	FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	17	**85.0**	14	**93.4**	16	59.2	6	60.0	26	74.3	79	**73.8**
2	6	30.0	12	**80.0**	6	21.4	8	**80.0**	20	58.8	52	**48.6**
3	10	50.0	1	6.7	8	28.6	4	40.0	25	**69.4**	48	**44.0**
4	17	85.0	2	21.4	20	80.0	10	**100**	32	**94.1**	81	**78.6**
5	19	**95.0**	10	66.7	23	88.4	8	80.0	31	88.6	91	**85.8**
6	1	5.0	2	14.3	2	6.7	8	**80.0**	3	8.1	16	**14.4**
7	14	70.0	10	66.7	26	**92.8**	8	80.0	34	**94.4**	92	**84.4**
8	9	45.0	13	**86.7**	19	67.8	10	**100**	21	65.6	72	**68.6**
9	12	60.0	6	40.0	12	41.4	8	**80.0**	9	25.7	47	**43.1**
10	5	25.0	6	**40.0**	5	16.6	5	**50.0**	11	32.4	32	**29.4**

9.2 **Parents' representations of integration**

Table 49 shows parents' representation of integration. Among parents, ethnocentrism, assimilation, personal trajectories negating cultural differences and problematic cultural differences (variables 2, 3, 6, 9 and 10) are more frequent than among professionals. Some exceptions concern assimilation as privatisation in Germany, ethnocentrism in Finland, relevance in personal trajectories in Italy, problematic cultural differences in Finland and the UK, which are much less frequent than in the other countries. Once again, contradictions are more relevant in Poland. Moreover, in Sweden celebration of cultural variety and cultural difference, as well as cultural mélange are particularly frequent.

Table 49. Parents' representations of integration (strongly agree + agree)

	BEL		FIN		GER		ITA		POL		SWE		UK		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	77	60.2	50	51.0	220	**79.1**	355	48.6	197	41.1	13	**68.4**	268	**68.0**	912	**52.6**
2	82	64.6	61	61.0	204	73.4	485	65.9	373	77.3	13	68.4	271	69.1	1218	**69.0**
3	53	41.7	35	36.1	31	11.0	473	62.6	350	**71.9**	9	47.4	143	36.3	951	**53.8**
4	85	66.9	65	66.3	141	52.0	578	76.3	424	**87.3**	17	**89.5**	240	61.2	1310	**74.5**
5	92	72.4	69	71.1	204	74.5	532	73.1	395	82.8	13	68.4	299	76.7	1305	**75.8**
6	18	14.2	6	6.2	31	11.2	118	15.7	102	21.3	4	21.1	45	11.5	279	**15.9**
7	97	75.8	71	74.0	214	78.3	586	77.3	280	59.5	17	**89.5**	228	57.8	1265	**72.5**
8	91	71.7	49	52.1	230	**85.2**	541	73.3	406	**86.5**	15	78.9	290	73.6	1332	**77.6**
9	59	46.8	51	52.6	101	36.9	334	45.5	415	**87.2**	10	55.6	203	51.5	970	**56.2**
10	43	33.9	25	25.7	100	36.5	303	40.7	311	**64.5**	9	47.4	109	27.6	791	**45.3**

9.3 Comparison between representations of integration

Table 50 summarises the general data for professionals and parents, highlighting the differences that have been described in the previous tables. Although contradictions and ambivalences characterise the representations of all categories of respondents, table 50 shows that: (1) social workers prefer cultural variety; (2) interpreters/mediators are even more ambivalent than the other professionals, including a more frequent agreement with assimilation and reduction of cultural diversity (despite some differences between countries); (3) parents represent cultural diversity and mélange in more negative terms.

Table 50. Comparison between the representations of integration by parents and different professionals.

	Teachers		Social workers		Mediators		Parents	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
1	229	59.5	212	**69.3**	79	**73.8**	912	52.6
2	199	49.9	137	44.9	52	48.6	1218	**69.0**
3	60	15.0	88	29.1	48	**44.0**	951	**53.8**
4	287	72.1	222	74.2	81	78.6	1310	74.5
5	313	78.1	267	**88.7**	91	**85.8**	1305	75.8
6	18	4.5	7	2.3	16	**14.4**	279	**15.9**
7	325	81.0	252	84.8	92	84.4	1265	72.5
8	311	79.5	242	80.9	72	68.6	1332	77.6
9	152	37.9	106	34.9	47	43.1	970	**56.2**
10	135	33.8	94	30.8	32	29.4	791	**45.3**

As said, these data conceal differences between country contexts, thus it is useful to summarise the representations of integration in different countries.

In **Belgium**, professionals' representations are difficult to interpret at large. A great deal of regional variation was observed on these points, but with only one school representing Flanders, it is hard to say anything decisive about this; perhaps this can be better understood through the qualitative work. Parents tend to be more open to intercultural mixing, favouring keeping one's way of life, and more than half agreeing that different groups' collaborations a good way to face challenges.

In **Finland**, teachers give value to cultural variety. Most teachers agree that a society with a variety of groups is more able to tackle new challenges as they occur, so having various different cultural groups in Finland may help to solve problems. Teachers seem to be supporters of inclusion and identify positively with the sentences that stress the importance of enhancing different ways of life as the key to societal well-being. Social workers identify the strongest with the idea of inclusion as the way of living together in society and are strongly against separation as a strategy. All social workers see assimilation as a negative strategy. Most social workers agree that mingling different cultures would be the best way

of managing differences. Mediators, on their behalf, also give value to cultural variety. They agree that inclusion could be a positive strategy, since majority agreed that it would be if all the groups in Finland retained their own cultures. However, mediators are stronger in opposing assimilation than teachers and social workers. An interesting result is that in relation to separation as a strategy, mediators' opinions are quite diverse: one half of them agree on separation as a good strategy of living together, and the other disagree. Parents had more variation and contradictions in their views compared to the professionals' who mostly resisted assimilation and separation. Most parents agreed that mingling different cultures would be best way of managing differences, but they also quite strongly agreed that it would be good to see if all the groups in Finland retain their cultures.

In **Germany**, the results draw an ambiguous picture. Overall, the respondents agree on inclusion and rather disagree on separation. There are a few differences between the subsamples as well as across items depicting hybridizations, assimilation, inclusion, and separation. Almost all teachers/educators disagree with the statements that it is the best for Germany, if all immigrants forgot their cultural backgrounds and that members of different cultures should keep their own culture to themselves. To some extent also the opposite was found: nearly three quarters of teachers/educators agree that people who come to Germany should change their way of life. Moreover, almost half of the teachers/educators disagree with the statement that it would be good to see if all the different groups in Germany should retain their culture. Social workers strongly agree that Germany would be a better place, if members of different groups kept their own way of living. On the other hand, only half of them agree that it would be good to see if all the groups in Germany retain their culture. This may reflect differentiated views on different cultural backgrounds, which are possibly estimated as more or less close or compatible to the cultural situation in Germany. Along similar lines, nearly half of the social workers agree that members of different groups should not bother other people with their culture. Also, the majority of mediators agree that immigrants should not forget their cultural background; that a variety of groups improves society's capacity to solve problems; that mingling cultures is the best way of managing differences; and that different groups do not make it difficult to solve problems. However, two fifths agree (totally agree or agree) that many different cultural groups makes it difficult to solve problems, and four fifths of them (totally) agree that people, who come to Germany, should change their way of life, and the same share disagrees that all groups in Germany should retain their culture. Finally, there are seemingly opposite views on integration and assimilation, where almost all agree to integration, but also the agreement to assimilation is comparably high across all respondent groups. Thus, this is an ambivalent issue.

As in the case of professionals, ambiguity also shows in parents' representations of integration in Germany. Parents agree on inclusion and rather disagree on separation, but also the agreement to assimilation is high. As to parents with a migrant background, they more often than native German parents agree that members of different groups should not bother other people with their culture on the one hand and that it would be good to see all different groups in Germany retaining their cultures on the other. This may indicate inconsistencies in migrants' perception and experiences of the social and societal climate in Germany. As to native German parents, they agree that culture is not important to explain

people's personal behaviour, and almost all parents rejected the statement that immigrants should give up their culture. Nevertheless, characteristic of the ambiguity in the data, three quarters of native German parents agreed that immigrants should adapt to German culture.

In **Italy**, teachers and, to a lesser extent, social workers give value to both cultural variety and cultural mélange, which are considered relevant and compatible as the two sides of the same coin. Mixing personal expressions and cultural influences is considered a third relevant aspect linked to the previous two. The fourth most popular opinion is more ambiguous: it would be good to see, if all the groups retained their cultures. This choice can indicate either expression of positive variety or expression of cultural essentialism. These choices show the mix of importance of mélange and cultural belonging, which sounds paradoxical, but perfectly understandable given the present diffuse narrative of cultural difference and intercultural contact. Two further choices deserve a comment. Most teachers and social workers disagree with the statement that culture is irrelevant to explain people's personal behaviour. This choice can be interpreted either as giving value to individuals or as dismissing the value of culture. Only a minority of teachers and social workers disagree that it is difficult to solve intercultural problems. This can be interpreted as either observation of what is happening or as an opinion. Moreover, disagreement with irrelevance of culture and agreement with the difficulty of solving intercultural problems are more frequent among social workers. These choices deserve further investigation. All choices concerning assimilation and separation are rejected by teachers. The most relevant difference between social workers and teachers relates to relative separation (it would be better if members of different groups kept their own way of life), which is agreed by half of social workers. This result deserves further investigation through qualitative analysis, to understand how social workers understand this form of "multiculturalism". Multiculturalism is an important option for a relatively high percentage of mediators, while mélange is less frequently chosen. Among mediators, disagreement is very frequent for manifestations of assimilation, absence of relevance of culture in explaining individual behaviours and the idea that cultural difference creates problems. Thus, mediators seem more interested in cultural differences and less interested in mélange, if compared to teachers and social workers. This can depend on their own origins and/or on the type of their work. Certainly, this may influence collaboration between different professionals. This aspect deserves further investigation.

Although parents share with professionals the rejection of strong assimilation and ethnocentrism, their interest in cultural essentialism is much more frequent and their observation of melange is weaker. This shows that among the general population, essentialism is more widespread than among professionals.

In the case of professionals in **Poland**, teachers' attitude towards immigration, inclusion and multiculturalism can be described as ambiguous. On the one hand, they accept diversity and cultural differences and consider the individual approach as the best. On the other hand, they are influenced by the public xenophobic rhetoric and expect cultural adjustment (which cannot, however, be defined as an assimilation attitude). In Poland, most parents are in favour of assimilation. Mixed feelings are displayed towards the view that "mingling different cultures would be the best way of managing differences." It may be pointed out that such a

level of approval goes into the direction of recognising the hybridization of cultures. As to migrant respondents, their views resemble to a great extent the views of all respondents. However, many migrants adopting such attitudes display a more restrictive approach, contrary to the process of inclusion that is appropriate for many countries. In their declarations the migrants would therefore seem to support adjustment to the mainstream native culture (the first, third, and the tenth statement).

The parents surveyed most often expressed their disapproval of the statement that "it would be good if different groups kept their own way of life". This means that there is no consent for manifesting cultural differences, which stems from the strict Polish state policy towards migration and foreigners. Such a position would constitute evidence of reluctance to integrate people from different cultures.

To the statement that **Sweden** would be a better place if members of different groups kept their own way of life alive, almost three quarters of the teachers answer that they disagree or strongly disagree, while only one quarter of the mediators answer this. Less than half of the social workers answer this. Contrastingly, more than half of the teachers and the social workers disagree or strongly disagree to the statement, that new arrivals should change their way of living to become more like 'us', while less than half of the mediators answer this. To the statement that members of different groups should keep their culture to themselves, a vast majority of the Swedish teachers and social workers disagree or strongly disagree, while the vast majority of the mediators agree or strongly agree. Otherwise there is a large agreement between the professional groups, meaning that there are agreements that all groups in Sweden should retain their cultures and that immigrants should not forget about their cultural background. There is also, which is of interest for this project, an agreement that mingling cultures is the best way of managing differences.

In the **UK**, educational professionals, as well as social workers, positively value both cultural variety and cultural mélange. Mixing personal expressions and cultural influences is considered a third relevant aspect linked to the previous two. Both assimilation and separation are firmly rejected by educational professionals and social workers. A more ambivalent position is the one taken by parents, and in particular by parents with a migrant background who seem to combine some form of preference for cultural assimilation with a positive evaluation of cultural diversity, although in a much-reduced extent than among professionals and also among parents without a migrant background. As for many other interesting findings, the support of qualitative research instruments would provide further data to allow the interpretation of a complex set of representations and narratives suggested in the survey findings.

10 Highlights

The survey has highlighted some key issues that will be explored further in the next phase of qualitative research.

10.1 Professionals

It is important to pay attention to teachers' awareness of the migrant children's background that can have consequences for learning and participation. More specifically, the survey has highlighted that, in the local situational contexts of the research:

1. The availability of language support services varies a lot, from almost non-existent to fairly good. School initiatives above all concern L2 learning, while language and intercultural mediation and support of native language are much less frequent. It is important to understand how much support and what kind(s) of resources teachers receive and are able (or willing) to use if they like to promote such initiatives.

2. The lack of language support and a monolingual approach in schools and classrooms may have consequences for pupils' opportunities to participate in different activities and therefore may hinder their learning and agency. Considering multilingualism as a resource and not a deficit in class, may contribute to pupils forming identities as involved? learners with agency. Based on these findings, the availability of language support services needs to be further explored, since they vary in the local situational contexts of the research.

3. There are differences in professionals' actual possibilities to access multicultural training. Thus, it is useful to further explore the professionals' actual possibilities to access multicultural training, and discuss the issue further in communication with authorities, employers and different professional groups in the next research phase. In addition, qualitative research could assess the actual scope, content and scale of the training.

4. It is important to investigate if and how teachers notice the situations of cultural stereotyping or discrimination among children in school and how they enhance sensitivity on these topics, since the survey revealed problems in dealing with these issues.

Professionals are fairly satisfied with their occupational situation. Teachers especially seem quite satisfied with their work overall. However, a significant exception is the perceived reputation of professionals' work in public: apart from mediators, professionals report disagreement with the idea that the reputation is good. It appears that the contradiction between the general content that both pupils and teachers express concerning schoolwork, and the negative publicity in the media, is disturbing for the teachers. When the school is in the news, there is usually a negative perspective. The media tend to highlight problems in schools, even if research proves that schoolwork is mainly quite positive. This is an area

that CHILD-UP should address and present the positive research results and advertise the compiled good practices found in schools by effective dissemination activities.

10.2 Children

It is important to pay attention to children's experience of school, in particular to the experiences of children with a migrant background. Most children are quite positive about their competences; for instance, most of them believe they understand teachers, have good skills for schoolwork or can manage school tasks as well as other children do. In general, when comparing children with and without a migration background, they tend to answer along similar lines. Children with a migration background are in many cases slightly more positive in their general feeling towards school and slightly less confident with their skills when compared with non-migrant children. The data on this, however, varies between different countries, which means that attention must be paid to national contexts in European countries. Problems seem to be more frequently perceived (or at least declared) in Italy and less frequently in Finland, Poland and Sweden.

Despite these generally positive responses to school experience, not all children find schoolwork positive: in general, 30% to 40% of children do not agree with this assessment. Thus, it is important to seek the best practices that enhance all children's participation and support everyone's agency.

The data about agency lead to two important results: (1) there are differences and relations between children's autonomy on the one hand, and collaboration and help from parents, teachers and peers on the other; (2) professionals' support of agency is mixed with the traditional ways of teaching.

Professionals claim that they are able to support children's agency and to face children's challenges. However, the important differences concerning situations in which agency is exercised and problems are faced requires further investigation, specifically as regards children's opportunities for personal expression and participation in decision-making.

Some challenges are particularly central issues for children with a migrant background. Findings about children's challenges highlight the necessity of reflecting on unfamiliar situations for migrant-background children and of creating a school environment where children feel safe and are able to express themselves. This suggests that both migrant and non-migrant children benefit from dialogic learning practices that can help all children in the classroom to be heard better. more heard. This can also point to a lack of communication between parents and children about children's everyday school experiences, and to deficient parental involvement in children's education (as seen in the WP3 practice analysis).

It is thus worth addressing how schools manage the various challenges that pupils experience, especially the linkages between challenges, gender and migrant background. Data about children's management of challenges lead to question the interrelations between autonomy, collaboration and help, which is another important issue for qualitative research. To sum up, results concerning children's school experience, children's challenges and

children's agency indicate the necessity to increase dialogue in the classroom, a core objective of the CHILD-UP project.

10.3 Parents

The experience of parents is also relevant, in two aspects. First, their perception of children's experience is more positive than that of children, thus showing that communication between children and parents, on the one hand, and between parents and teachers on the other, is not optimized.

Second, the perception of parents and teachers about the functioning of teacher-parent communication is rather different, which once again indicates some challenges in communication between teachers and parents. To guarantee smooth communication between parents and teachers, a variety of channels would be welcome, but above all exchanging views about their differing attitudes seems to be an important way of enhancing collaboration.

10.4 Cultural differences

There are important results concerning the representation of cultural differences, intercultural relations and inclusion, and in particular the differences between professionals (teachers, social workers, mediators), professionals and parents, national research contexts. In general, these representations show ambivalence and disorientation between representations of hybridization, the celebration of cultural differences, the observation of problems related to intercultural differences and situation, and, to a lesser extent, assimilation. In particular, there are important differences in views between professionals (e.g. between teachers and interpreters/mediators working in schools) and between professionals and parents (who seem more frequently interested in assimilation), as well as differences between country contexts, which reveal different attitudes of teachers facing integration.

Thus, in the participating European countries, it is possible to see different results and assessments of integration and awareness of hybrid integration, which needs to be improved for the benefit of inclusion of children with a migrant background. In particular, it is important to investigate if and how professionals (above all teachers) notice intercultural problems and problems of integration, what meanings they give to these problems, how they can enhance sensitivity towards cultural stereotyping or discrimination among children in school, and how they can intervene to create the hybrid conditions of integration .

10.5 Conclusion

Overall, these results indicate the necessity to increase children's agency and dialogue in the classroom, dialogue between schools and parents, awareness of the opportunities and risks of hybrid integration. The conditions of agency, dialogue and awareness of hybrid

integration are investigated in the second phase of research, including interviews, focus groups and observation of educational activities.