



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

Milestone

M15 Report on pre and post-test and focus group

Deliverable Responsible: Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia (UniMoRe)

Deliverable due date: 30/06/2021

Actual submission date: 30/06/2021

Version: 1.0



The project has received the Financial contribution of the *European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme* under the grant agreement No 822400.

Document Control Page

Title	Report on pre and post-test and focus group
Creator	University of Modena
Description	Description of the discussions held within the pre and post-test and focus group
Publisher	Child-Up Consortium
Contributors	All the partners
Creation date	30/06//2021
Type	Report
Language	English
Rights	copyright "Child-Up Consortium"
Audience	<input type="checkbox"/> public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> restricted
Review status	<input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> WP leader accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Manager accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Coordinator accepted
Action requested	<input type="checkbox"/> to be revised by Partners <input type="checkbox"/> for approval by the WP leader <input type="checkbox"/> for approval by the Technical Committee <input type="checkbox"/> for approval by the Project Coordinator
Requested deadline	N. A.

Report on pre and post-test and focus group

1. Introduction

This report describes two types of data of the WP6 - questionnaires and focus groups - in the seven participating countries. The chapter compares the planned and collected data and shows an overview of the data selected for this report. Then, it provides an overview of children who participated in the activities, based on pre-test and post-test questionnaires. Finally, the chapter describes the other data collected through focus groups and questionnaires.

This report is the result of a combination of evaluations based on the analysis of pre-test and post-test questionnaires and focus groups, with the aim of providing a general overview of children's level of appreciation of the activities. This analysis follows the researchers' direct analysis of the activities. Individual perceptions and evaluations do not necessarily correspond to what is a good practice from the point of view of researchers and the necessity of data aggregation, which responds to the necessary respect of ethics regarding sensitive data does not allow more specific and refined analyses of single activities. However, the analysis of aggregated data is important to understand in which way the consortium, and the single partners, were able to intercept classroom activities which were also affective from the children's point of view. An important disclaimer is that school and teachers, educators and facilitators have the final responsibility for enhancing and supporting dialogue and children's agency. However, an evaluation of successful practices necessarily includes the children's point of view, if children's agency is taken seriously.

Pre and post-test questionnaires

In the section on the quantitative observations and evaluations, the data from ISCED 0 are separate from the other data, since they were collected in a different way and with several different, more simplified questions. Moreover, as in the case of the survey (WP4) the data were collected differently, according to different methods in nursery schools, in Germany and Italy. In Germany they were collected individually, while in Italy this was not coherent with this school practices, then they were collected in group. Finally in Belgium, part of the data in ISCED 1 classes/groups were collected through the questionnaire provided for ISCED 0, since teachers evaluated ISCED 1 questionnaires as too difficult for these children. Therefore, part of the Belgian data are treated separately and with less details.

It is also important to remind that the following data exclusively refer to local activities, so that the reference to "countries" should be read as reference to the local contexts, schools and classes/groups in which the activities were realised (see Chapter 2 for more details about this). The

chapter (and report) has no intention to compare “countries”. For this reason, we mention “local contexts” in different countries, although for reasons of simplicity in the tables we use the national reference (BE, DE, IT etc.).

Several other factors suggest being careful about the comparative evaluation of the data between local contexts, including:

1. The different impact of pandemic and voluntary participation of parents, children and teachers in different countries
2. The correlated relevant differences in terms of numbers of participant in different local contexts, ranging from very few to more than 500.
3. Different distribution among types of school and age and different schools’ experiences.
4. The differences between social and cultural local contexts, which can lead to different and sometimes tentative interpretations.
5. Last but not least, the differences between types of activities and teaching/facilitation, which may influence children’s observations.

All these factors are relevant in limiting some interpretations. Nevertheless, hearing the voice of children about the activities is important and this voice cannot be underestimated.

Another important note regards the ways in which several data are presented. We have chosen to present the percentages of “positive” outcomes, rather than all data, for reasons of simplification of the tables, although comments on the negative side are presented when relevant. This percentage is based on two different methods. In the case in which the values are three - “very much”, “not so much” and “not at all” - the positive data has been considered as “very much”, though the middle point cannot be considered as completely positive. In the case in which the values are four – always, often, sometimes, never - the positive value has been considered as the sum of the positive side “always + often”.

Focus groups

Focus groups were not possible in all countries, either for the conditions of access to schools and for other reasons determined by the school constraints. In particular, focus groups were not realised in Poland and Sweden and were not realised for all activities in Belgium and Germany. In Germany, at least a focus group was conducted in each involved class. An important general observation is that children’s assessment of activities, relations and teacher/facilitator way of acting are influenced by the different social and cultural contexts of school experiences. Thus, different forms of teaching may be seen differently in different situations and teacher’s interest in promoting children’s participation may be seen differently in different contexts.

2. General overview on the activities

Table 1 compares the collected data with the collection of data planned in the original CHILD-UP project. The pandemic had a very relevant impact on the quantity of collected data. The big effort of the partners has allowed a very important result in terms of quantity and quality of the collected data. The most relevant difficulty concerned mediation and focus groups, since during the pandemic external professionals were not admitted in several schools, while recordings could be done directly by teachers and facilitators. Despite the frequent closure of schools, complete success in Italy was based on two important presuppositions: (1) schools were strongly committed to collaborate; (2) remote activities were promptly organised and were very effective.

Table 1. Planned and collected data

	Classes	Plan	FG/Interviews	Plan	Tests	Plan	Pre-test	Post-test
Belgium	16	18	6	18	732	720	353	379
Finland	7	30	7	30	22	960	13	9
Germany	10	26	5	24	259	1280	154	154
Italy	33	33	33	33	1072	1400	559	513
Poland	13	10	-	15	285	400	145	140
Sweden	4	12	12	12	62	600	32	30
UK	20	20	20	20	814	1400	428	376
Total	103	147	83	152	3285	6760	1684	1601

3. Background data from pre-test questionnaires

This section describes some general data about the children who participated in the recorded activities (see chapter 1). Table 1 shows numbers and percentages pre-test and post-test questionnaires collected by the partners. The number of participants has been influenced by several factors, including parents' consent and impact of the pandemic. UNIMORE (Italy), UoN (the UK) and ULiege (Belgium) recruited the highest number of participants. In Belgium, participants in the post-test were more numerous than those who compiled the pre-test questionnaire. Moreover, in Belgium, 72 ICED 1 children (more than half of the total) compiled questionnaires prepared for ISCED 0 since they were not considered competent for ISCED 1 questionnaires by the teachers. This limited the possible use of this data. The other partners involved a much lower number of children. In the Finnish case, few activities which could be realised (see section 3) and participating children were few. In Sweden too, few children were involved. Apart from the case of Belgium, participants in post-test were a bit less numerous than in pre-test, in particular in the UK.

Table 1. Participants by Country

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
BE	353**	20,96	379**	23,67
DE	154*	9,14	154*	9,61
FI	13	0,77	9	0,56
IT	559*	33,19	513*	32,04
PL	145	8,61	140	8,74
SW	32	1,90	30	1,87
UK	428	25,41	376	23,48
Total	1684	100	1601	100

* Including ISCED 0

** Including questionnaires ISCED 0 administered to ISCED 1

Table 2 shows that the majority of questionnaires was collected in ISCED 1 classes/groups, while ISCED 0 classes/groups (which were only involved in Germany and Italy) and ISCED 3 classes/groups were less involved. The lower number of ISCED 3 participants is not surprising since in general it is more difficult to involve higher secondary school in activities for migrants. Nevertheless, tables 2.1 and 2.2 show that, in Belgium and Italy, many adolescents were involved. In Belgium, in particular, ISCED 3 participants are the most numerous group. ISCED 2 participants are particularly numerous in Italy and Poland, and the most numerous in Finland and Sweden. In the UK, only ISCED 1 classes/groups were involved. ISCED 1 are also particularly numerous in Italy. Table 2.2 also shows a rather relevant change in the Finnish post-test since, given the restrictions for the pandemic, it was not possible to collect post-test from ISCED 1 children.

Table 2. Participants by ISCED

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
ISCED 0	160	9,50	158	9,86
ISCED 1	786*	46,67	707*	44,15
ISCED 2	422	25,05	435	27,17
ISCED 3	316	18,76	301	18,80
Total	1684	100	1601	100

* Including questionnaires ISCED 0 administered to ISCED 1 in Belgium

Table 2.1. ISCED participants by country (%)

	Pre test				Post test			
	ISCED0	ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3	ISCED0	ISCED 1	ISCED 2	ISCED 3
BE	-	15,39	8,29	62,34	-	15,84	16,09	65,45
DE	41,88	8,39	4,27	0,95	42,41	9,33	4,14	1,00
FI	-	0,63	1,90	-	-	-	2,07	-
IT	58,12	20,35	46,45	34,81	57,59	20,79	41,38	31,56
PL	-	-	34,36	-	-	-	32,18	-
SW	-	0,76	4,74	1,90	-	0,84	4,14	1,99
UK	-	54,45	-	-	-	53,18	-	-
Total	160	786	422	316	158	707	435	301
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2.2. Country participants by ISCED

	Pre test					Post test				
	ISCED0	ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3	Total	ISCED0	ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3	Total
BE	-	34,27	9,91	55,80	100	-	29,55	18,46	51,97	100
DE	43,50	42,85	11,68	1,94	100	43,50	42,85	11,68	1,94	100
FI	-	38,46	61,54	-	100	-	-	100	-	100
IT	16,63	28,62	35,06	19,67	100	17,73	28,65	35,08	18,51	100
PL	-	0,00	100	0,00	100	-	-	100	-	100
SW	-	18,75	62,50	18,75	100	-	20,00	60,00	20,00	100
UK	-	100	-	-	100	-	100	-	-	100

Table 3 shows that females are a bit more numerous than males. In the post-test, the difference between females and males increases, since males decrease. Moreover, 0.8% of respondents in the pre-test and 1.11 % in the post-test declared themselves other than male or female. Table 3.1 shows that the percentage of females is slightly higher in Belgium and Finland and slightly lower in the UK, but these differences are limited. Table 3.1 also shows that the percentage of female respondents is higher for ISCED 2 and ISCED 3 and lower for ISCED 1. Those who did not declare neither females nor males are very few, therefore it is impossible to use this data for the analysis. ISCED 0 is not shown in table 3.1 and in the following tables.

Table 3. Participants in pre-test by GENDER

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
Female	864	51,30	857	53,52
Male	792	47,03	706	44,09
Other	17	1,00	21	1,31
Missing	11	0,65	13	0,81
Total	1684	100	1601	100

Table 3.1 Gender distribution among ISCED (%)

	Pre test			Post test		
	Female	Male	Other	Female	male	other
ISCED 1	47,42	55,93	52,94	45,58	53,05	47,61
ISCED 2	29,25	26,24	17,64	30,90	28,95	33,33
ISCED 3	23,32	17,81	29,41	23,50	17,99	19,04
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3.2 shows that there are not relevant differences among the countries for what concerns gender distribution. The only relevant result is that those who declared themselves other than males or females are almost exclusively in Belgium and Germany in the pre-test, while Italy is added in the post-test.

Table 3.2 Gender Distribution among countries (%)

	Pre test			Post test		
COUNTRY	Female	Male	Other	Female	Male	Other
BE	20,38	18,09	30,77	22,99	21,12	23,53
DE	5,40	5,50	61,54	5,58	6,11	47,06
FI	0,94	0,72	-	0,82	0,17	-
IT	32,79	31,98	7,69	30,75	31,52	29,41
PL	9,72	10,56	-	9,93	11,06	-
SW	2,02	2,46	-	2,04	2,48	-
UK	28,74	30,68	-	27,89	27,56	-
Total	741	691	13	735	606	17
%	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 4 shows that foreign born children are few (15.43% in the pre-test and 13.64% in the post test). The percentage of foreign-born males (pre-test 16.8%; post-test 15,5%) is slightly higher than that of females (pre-test 14%; post-test 12,2%). Table 4.1 shows that the percentage of foreign-born children is higher in ISCED 3 schools (pre-test 19.3%; post-test 18.3%) than in ISCED 1 schools (pre-test 14.8%; post-test 11.2%) and ISCED 2 schools (pre-test 13.5%; post-test 11.2%). Variation in the post-test for ISCED 1 is due to changes in the Finnish context. Very few ISCED 0 children were born out of Germany (6%) and Italy (3.2%), but the large majority of their parents were not born in Italy (69.9%). Few ISCED 0 CMB participated in Germany. ISCED 0 for ISCED 1 in Belgium is not shown in table 4.1 and in the following tables.

Table 4. Origins of participants in pre-test

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
Native	1278	83,85	1223	84,75
Foreign	235	15,41	198	13,72
Non valid	11	0,72	22	1,52
Total	1524	100	1443	100

Table 4.1 Origins by ISCED

	Pre test			Post test		
	ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3	ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3
Native	84,31	85,78	80,06	85,67	85,67	81,40
Foreign	14,85	13,51	19,30	11,18	11,18	18,27
Total	714	422	316	635	635	301
%	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 4.2 shows that foreign born children are particularly numerous in the UK (although a lower percentage participated in the post-test), Belgium and Italy (where instead a higher percentage of foreign children participated in the post-test). They are less numerous in Finland and Germany.

Table 4.2. Origins by country

	Pre test		Post test	
COUNTRY	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign
BE	18,98	21,43	21,43	25,13
DE	6,00	6,25	6,37	6,95
FI	0,58	2,68	0,69	0,53
IT	34,35	20,98	32,36	24,60
PL	9,86	9,82	10,24	10,70
SW	0,99	8,93	1,12	9,09
UK	29,25	29,91	27,80	22,99
Total	1217	224	1162	187
%	100	100	100	100

Table 5 shows that children with at least one foreign born parent are very numerous (45.7% in the pre-test and 44.8% in the post-test). This shows that second generation children are the large majority of children with migrant background (CMB), coherently with what the survey already showed (WP4).

Table 5. Parents' country of birth

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
Both native	773	53,24	736	53,68
One foreign	237	16,32	231	16,85
Both foreign	427	29,41	384	28,01
Non valid/missing	15	1,03	20	1,46
Total	1452	100	1371	100

The result is that CMB are almost half of the total, more males (pre-test 51.6%; post-test 49.7%) than females (pre-test 47.3%; post-test 47,7%). This data shows that the objective of the research, i.e., involving CMB together with native children, has been reached. The percentage of CMB is particularly high in ISCED 3 schools (66.4%), followed by ISCED 1 schools (50.5%) and by ISCED 2 schools, where the percentage is rather low (34.3%). However, since the number of classes/groups involved in the activities is much higher in primary schools, the majority of CMB attend these schools (table 6.1).

Table 6. Children with Migrant Background (CMB)

	Pre test		Post test	
	N.	%	N.	%
CMB	718	49,45	666	48,58
Native	728	50,14	687	50,11
Non valid	6	0,41	18	1,31
Total	1452	100	1371	100

Tab 6.1 Children with migrant background by ISCED (%)

	Pre test	Post test
	CMB	CMB
ISCED 1	50,56	45,35
ISCED 2	20,19	24,62
ISCED 3	29,25	30,03
Total	718	666
%	100	100

Table 6.2 confirms that CMB, as well as foreign born children, were prevalently involved in the UK, Belgium and Italy. Where the number of involved children was low, the percentage of CMB was also

low (particularly in Finland). Table 6.3 shows another part of the whole picture. CMB are a rather low minority in Poland and Germany, they are a numerous minority in Italy, the majority in Belgium and the UK and the totality in Sweden. In Finland, the situation changes from pre-test to post-test, since very few CMB participated in the post-test.

Table 6.2 CMB by country (%)

	Pre test	Post test
	CMB	CMB
BE	26,32	31,23
DE	2,65	2,85
FI	0,84	0,15
IT	26,04	24,92
PL	3,48	3,45
SW	4,46	4,35
UK	36,21	33,03
Total	718	666
%	100	100

Table 6.3 Distribution of CMB inside countries (%)

	Pre test			Post test		
COUNTRY	CMB	Natives	Total	CMB	Natives	Total
BE	67,26	30,96	100	67,75	27,36	100
DE	21,84	77,01	100	21,84	74,71	100
FI	46,15	53,85	100	11,11	88,89	100
IT	40,13	59,87	100	39,34	60,66	100
PL	17,24	82,76	100	16,43	83,57	100
SW	100	0,00	100	96,67	3,33	100
UK	60,75	39,25	100	58,51	41,49	100
Total	718	728	1452	666	687	1371
%	49,45	50,14	100	48,58	50,11	100

4. Objectives and their realisation

4.1 Objectives and their realisation

Each activity was based on several objectives which were chosen by those who proposed and coordinated the activities, i.e., teachers or facilitators. First we provide an analysis of the complete set of objectives simply numbering them in the order they were presented to the children in the questionnaires and asking the children if these objectives fitted in their expectations (very much, not so much, not at all). The number of objectives ranged from one to nine, but only six were frequently proposed (see the total in table 1). In the following tables, the most positive results are in bold, and the most negative results are in red. The other results are not emphasized; they must be considered positive.

Table 1 shows that for the large majority of children (59/69%), expectations were coherent with the six most frequent objectives, and also for the seventh. Expectations are less frequently coherent with objectives 8-9, which are not relevant for the analysis since they concern very few children. For what concerns coherence of expectations, gender differences and differences regarding the ISCED are not relevant.

Table 1. Expectations about objectives of activities (pre-test)

	Very much		Not so much		Not at all		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	908	65,56	387	27,94	90	6,50	1385	100
Objective 2	914	66,28	355	25,74	110	7,98	1379	100
Objective 3	796	59,27	407	30,31	140	10,42	1343	100
Objective 4	833	65,59	354	27,87	83	6,54	1270	100
Objective 5	804	69,37	282	24,33	73	6,30	1159	100
Objective 6	632	65,97	248	25,89	78	8,14	958	100
Objective 7	113	63,48	59	33,15	6	3,37	178	100
Objective 8	70	42,42	74	44,85	21	12,73	165	100
Objective 9	76	47,50	64	40,00	20	12,50	160	100
Total	5146	64,35	2230	27,89	621	7,77	7997	100

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 regard nursery schools in Germany and Italy. Table 1.1. shows that expectations are very differently distributed: in Italy percentages are much higher. However, this can depend on the method of collection of data, which in Italy was collective rather than individual.

Table 1.1. Expectations about objectives of activities for ISCED 0 (%)

Very much	IT	DE
Objective 1	75,27	29,85
Objective 2	89,25	53,73
Objective 3	58,06	11,94
Objective 4	51,61	-
Objective 5	21,51	29,85
Objective 6	16,13	-
Objective 7	9,68	-

Table 1.2 shows children's interest in the future activity. In general, around half of the children show high interest, with less interest in having new ideas. Differences between the two country contexts are few. The most relevant concerns asking, which is much more frequent in Italy. Talking together is also much more frequent in Italy.

Tab 1.2. Expectations about children's involvement for ISCED 0 (%)

Very much	IT	DE
you are looking forward to the activity	53,76	46,27
you would like to have the chance to listen and speak with your classmates and that they listen to you	44,09	50,75
your educator will help if you have problems or questions	46,24	43,28
you will ask, if necessary	81,72	28,36
you will tell, if you don't like something	47,31	41,79
you will tell, if you want something or have an idea	37,63	35,82
you would like to tell what you want to do	43,01	46,27
you would like to chance to talk together with other children	44,09	29,85

The post-test provided knowledge about the effective realization of the objectives. Table 2 shows the level of enjoyment connected to the different objectives, i.e., to the ways in which activities were done according to the objective. The table shows that enjoyment was high for a large majority of children. Percentages of children who did not enjoy the realization of objectives are very low.

Table 2. Enjoyment for realization of objectives

	Very much		Not so much		Not at all		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	1005	75,34	259	19,42	70	5,25	1334	100
Objective 2	859	65,82	344	26,36	102	7,82	1305	100
Objective 3	793	61,62	374	29,06	120	9,32	1287	100
Objective 4	842	69,19	293	24,08	82	6,74	1217	100
Objective 5	693	65,75	264	25,05	97	9,20	1054	100
Objective 6	608	65,66	231	24,95	87	9,40	926	100

Enjoyment was not checked in Germany for ISCED 0 children. In Italy, it was differentiated according to the objectives, ranging from 83.5% to 38.5%.

Table 2.1. Enjoyment for realization of objectives for ISCED 0 (Italian contexts only, %)

Very much	%
Objective 1	72,53
Objective 2	61,54
Objective 3	83,52
Objective 4	38,46

Table 3 shows children's perception of effectiveness of reaching the planned objectives through the activities. Large majority of children also evaluate effectiveness positively. Evaluation of ineffectiveness reaches 10% only for objective 6.

Table 3. Effectiveness in reaching objectives

	Very much		Not so much		Not at all	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	870	66,26	319	24,30	124	9,44
Objective 2	875	66,79	316	24,12	119	9,08
Objective 3	786	60,88	381	29,51	124	9,60
Objective 4	764	64,36	326	27,46	97	8,17
Objective 5	781	69,24	272	24,11	75	6,65
Objective 6	618	65,26	234	24,71	95	10,03

Effectiveness was checked both in Germany and in Italy for ISCED 0 children. Table 3.1 shows that in Italy effectiveness was much more frequently observed by the children.

Table 3.1. Effectiveness in reaching objectives for ISCED 0 (%)

Very much	IT	DE
Objective 1	56,04	25,37
Objective 2	59,34	29,85
Objective 3	47,25	0,00
Objective 4	39,56	13,43

Table 4 shows a substantial equivalence between expectations, enjoyment and effectiveness, although enjoyment is a bit more frequent for two objectives and a bit lower for one. This result shows an interesting continuity between pre-test and post-test.

Table 4. Comparison between expectations, enjoyment and effectiveness

	expectations		Enjoyment		effectiveness	
	Very much		Very much		Very much	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	908	65,56	1005	75,34	870	66,26
Objective 2	914	66,28	859	65,82	875	66,79
Objective 3	796	59,27	793	61,62	786	60,88
Objective 4	833	65,59	842	69,19	764	64,36
Objective 5	804	69,37	693	65,75	781	69,24
Objective 6	632	65,97	608	65,66	618	65,26

Tables 5-7 show the results about expectations, enjoyment and effectiveness by local contexts in different countries. It is once again important to remind that, in these and other tables, the number of respondents is very different in different countries, ranging from high (Italy, Belgium, the UK) low (Germany, Sweden) and very low (Finland).

Table 5 shows that objectives 1-6 are expected more frequently in Swedish and Belgian contexts (in bold), frequently in Italian and UK contexts, rather unfrequently in Finnish, German and Polish contexts.

Table 5. Expectations by local contexts in different country

Very much	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	213	75,80	39	44,83	4	30,77	284	60,94	73	50,34	25	78,13	270	63,08
Objective 2	218	77,58	29	33,33	2	15,38	313	67,17	48	33,10	26	81,25	278	64,95
Objective 3	156	55,52	19	21,84	2	15,38	258	55,36	62	42,76	22	68,75	277	64,72
Objective 4	175	62,28	18	20,69	2	15,38	286	61,37	43	29,66	24	75,00	285	66,59
Objective 5	152	54,09	8	9,20	4	30,77	301	64,59	46	31,72	22	68,75	271	63,32
Objective 6	162	57,65	1	1,15	1	7,69	163	34,98	15	10,34	27	84,38	263	61,45

Table 6 shows that in the German and Finnish contexts, and in some cases in the Polish context, enjoyment is less frequent, while it is very frequent in the Swedish context and for one objective in the Belgian context. In the other local contexts, values are all positive.

Table 6. Enjoyment in local contexts in different countries

Very much	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	281	91,53	31	35,63	4	44,44	300	71,09	115	82,14	24	80,00	250	66,49
Objective 2	213	69,38	20	22,99	2	22,22	286	67,77	88	62,86	22	73,33	228	60,64
Objective 3	212	69,06	19	21,84	2	22,22	208	49,29	93	66,43	28	93,33	231	61,44
Objective 4	209	68,08	6	6,90	3	33,33	277	65,64	78	55,71	25	83,33	244	64,89
Objective 5	226	73,62	0	0	2	22,22	189	44,79	25	17,86	24	80,00	227	60,37
Objective 6	185	60,26	2	2,30	2	22,22	138	32,70	9	6,43	25	83,33	247	65,69

Table 6.1 shows enjoyment in the data regarding the Belgian contexts for ISCED 1 children who filed the ISCED 0 questionnaire. These data are not significantly different from those shown in Table 6 for the Belgian context.

Table 6.1 Enjoyment for realization of objectives (ISCED 1 in the Belgian context, 72 respondents, %)

	Very much
	%
Objective 1	77,78
Objective 2	68,33
Objective 3	85,00

Table 7 shows that effectiveness is also less frequently recognized in the German context and more frequently recognised in the Swedish context (and for objective 1 in the Belgian context). In the other contexts, evaluation is anyway positive.

Table 7. Effectiveness in local contexts in different country

Very much	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	251	81,76	25	28,74	7	77,78	232	54,98	90	64,29	21	70,00	244	64,89
Objective 2	222	72,31	22	25,29	5	55,56	275	65,17	72	51,43	25	83,33	254	67,55
Objective 3	206	67,10	12	13,79	2	22,22	233	55,21	80	57,14	25	83,33	228	60,64
Objective 4	184	59,93	3	3,45	4	44,44	253	59,95	62	44,29	24	80,00	234	62,23
Objective 5	212	69,06	-	-	4	44,44	292	69,19	30	21,43	24	80,00	219	58,24
Objective 6	172	56,03	-	-	3	33,33	149	35,31	21	15,00	25	83,33	248	65,96

In this case, data from the other ISCED 1 children in the Belgian context shows a less frequent evaluation of effectiveness when compared to other Belgian data. However, objectives were only two in this case.

Table 7.1. Effectiveness in reaching objectives (ISCED 1 in the Belgian context, 72 respondents, %)

	Very much
	%
Objective 1	78,75%
Objective 2	58,33%

It is interesting to see the ICSED 1 children enjoined less frequently four activities and ICSED 2 children the other two. In complex, it seems that younger children were less positive than adolescent in this regard. The negative impact of results for ICSED 1 children is much less relevant for effectiveness. In this case, ICSED 2 children are more frequently negative, although differences are not extremely relevant. It is confirmed that adolescents evaluate more positively the activities.

Table 8. Enjoiment and effectiveness by ISCED

	Enjoiment						Effectiveness					
Very much	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3		ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	433	68,19	325	74,71	247	82,06	392	61,73	234	53,79	244	81,06
Objective 2	355	55,91	300	68,97	204	67,77	405	63,78	263	60,46	207	68,77

Objective 3	346	54,49	244	56,09	203	67,44	365	57,48	227	52,18	194	64,45
Objective 4	366	57,64	272	62,53	204	67,77	347	54,65	233	53,56	184	61,13
Objective 5	314	49,45	174	40,00	205	68,11	350	55,12	201	46,21	230	76,41
Objective 6	316	49,76	128	29,43	164	54,49	324	51,02	158	36,32	136	45,18

Table 9 shows that also gender differences almost irrelevant for what concerns enjoyment and effectiveness of activities. For both females and males in three cases effectiveness is lower than enjoyment and in one case it is higher.

Table 9. Enjoyment and effectiveness by gender

	Enjoyment						Effectiveness					
Very much	Female		Male		Other		Female		Male		Other	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	560	76,19	426	70,30	10	58,82	470	63,95	386	63,70	9	52,94
Objective 2	472	64,22	372	61,39	8	47,06	462	62,86	394	65,02	9	52,94
Objective 3	420	57,14	359	59,24	7	41,18	423	57,55	352	58,09	5	29,41
Objective 4	453	61,63	376	62,05	6	35,29	397	54,01	355	58,58	5	29,41
Objective 5	379	51,56	305	50,33	4	23,53	438	59,59	330	54,46	7	41,18
Objective 6	329	44,76	267	44,06	5	29,41	335	45,58	271	44,72	5	29,41

Table 10 shows that expectations are not very different between children with migration background (CMB) and native children. However, all the percentages of CMB who expect the proposed objectives are higher than the percentages of native children (in particular, they are much higher for objective 6). This difference becomes rather relevant for enjoyment and effectiveness. **Success of activities among CMB is thus confirmed.**

Table 10. Expectations, enjoyment and effectiveness by native/migrant condition

	Expectations				Enjoyment				Effectiveness			
Very much	CMB		Natives		CMB		Natives		CMB		Natives	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Objective 1	469	65,32	437	60,03	501	75,23	493	71,76	449	67,42	415	60,41
Objective 2	464	64,62	448	61,54	422	63,36	429	62,45	443	66,52	422	61,43
Objective 3	413	57,52	381	52,34	414	62,16	369	53,71	408	61,26	374	54,44
Objective 4	194	27,02	196	26,92	441	66,22	394	57,35	402	60,36	360	52,40
Objective 5	401	55,85	403	55,36	383	57,51	307	44,69	418	62,76	363	52,84
Objective 6	345	48,05	286	39,29	340	51,05	266	38,72	347	52,10	269	39,16

4.2 Outcomes of the activities

Table 11 shows the outcomes of the activities from the point of view of children. More than 60% of children had fun, learned new things and got easily involved very much during the activities. Almost 60% did something new very much. The negative side is that only 46.5% discovered very much new thing about others and 33.3% about themselves. However, only 14% of children did not discover new things about others at all, and 27% about themselves.

Table 11. Personal outcomes of the activities

	Very much		Not so much		Not at all	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I did something new	767	59,50	408	31,65	114	8,84
I had fun	733	63,14	331	28,51	97	8,35
I learned new things	882	68,96	314	24,55	83	6,49
I discovered new things about others	598	46,50	508	39,50	180	14,00
I discovered new things about myself	428	33,31	509	39,61	348	27,08
It was easy to get involved	826	64,73	354	27,74	96	7,52
Total	4539	54,57	2553	30,70	1225	14,73

In German and Finnish contexts, outcomes are much less positive than in the other local contexts. Fun was not very frequent in the UK context and discovering new things about others was not frequent in the Belgian context. In this case, highest positive results are less evidently linked to the specific contexts: learning from others and getting involved are particularly emphasized in the Polish context, discovering new things in the UK and Swedish contexts.

Table 12. Personal outcomes in local contexts in different countries

Very much	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I did something new	152	49,51	15	17,24	0	0	257	60,90	89	63,57	15	50,00	239	63,56
I had fun	176	57,33	22	25,29	1	11,11	314	74,41	108	77,14	23	76,67	89	23,67
I learned new things	230	74,92	6	6,90	1	11,11	260	61,61	116	82,86	23	76,67	246	65,43
I discovered new things about others	77	25,08	9	10,34	0	0	221	52,37	52	37,14	19	63,33	220	58,51
I discovered new things about myself	59	19,22	7	8,05	0	0	96	22,75	27	19,29	14	46,67	225	59,84
It was easy to get involved	158	51,47	15	17,24	1	11,11	273	64,69	111	79,29	21	70,00	247	65,69

Positive personal outcomes are differentiated among ISCED 1 children. In particular, these children had very rarely fun and learned new things less frequently. However, they also discovered new things much more frequently. Adolescents claimed less frequently that they did something new. It seems that it was more frequently easier to get involved for ISCED 2 children.

Table 13. Personal outcomes by ISCED

Very much	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I did something new	382	60,16	249	57,24	136	45,18
I had fun	244	38,43	305	70,11	184	61,13
I learned new things	376	59,21	294	67,59	212	70,43
I discovered new things about others	324	51,02	163	37,47	111	36,88
I discovered new things about myself	301	47,40	72	16,55	55	18,27
It was easy to get involved	373	58,74	281	64,60	172	57,14

Gender differences are not relevant. A rather limited difference concerns discovering new things about others which is more frequent among males.

Table 14. Personal outcomes by gender

Very much	Female		Male		Other	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I did something new	412	56,05	345	56,93	5	29,41
I had fun	396	53,88	326	53,80	7	41,18
I learned new things	481	65,44	391	64,52	4	23,53
I discovered new things about others	308	41,90	278	45,87	6	35,29
I discovered new things about myself	224	30,48	197	32,51	3	17,65
It was easy to get involved	439	59,73	374	61,72	7	41,18

There are not substantial differences between CMB and native children, with the exception of learning new things and above all discovering new things about themselves; for these two aspects, CMB are more frequently positive. It is interesting the clear higher percentage for “discovering things about myself” which shows the importance of the activities for CMB’s self-awareness in more than one third of cases.

Table 15. Personal outcomes by migrant/native condition

Very much	CMB		Native	
	n.	%	n.	%
I did something new	377	56,61	380	55,31
I had fun	352	52,85	375	54,59
I learned new things	449	67,42	425	61,86
I discovered new things about others	292	43,84	300	43,67
I discovered new things about myself	243	36,49	180	26,20
It was easy to get involved	395	59,31	425	61,86

Pre-test questionnaires were used to show personal involvement and relations in classes/groups participating in the activities, as they were perceived and expected by children. Post-test questionnaires checked personal involvement and relations during the activities. To some extent, these results can be compared, but with several limitations. First, it must be noted that a distinction between relations with classmates and relations with teachers was not proposed, since some partners were worried of the impact of teachers' perception of being evaluated could have on their collaboration in realising of activities.

Table 16 shows children's perception of classroom relations in the school year in which the activities were realised. Rather frequently, children like to talk (always + often: almost 76%). Almost in all these cases, talk means personal expression (71%). However, it is less frequent that children share their opinions and points of view with others (66%), thus also learning from others, that they share their experiences (62%), that they tell their stories (55%) and above all that they share their feelings (49%). Nevertheless, 84% of children declare that they feel well in participating. Moreover, 28% of children perceive frequent problems of participation and only 26% of children perceive of not having problems at all. This picture of children's perception of their own participation shows that the education system is only partially effective in enhancing and supporting effective participation in the classroom, although the majority of children is positive about their participation.

Table 16. Classroom relations in general

	Always		Often		sometimes		Never		missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%		%
I feel well	645	44,42	587	40,43	142	9,78	31	2,13	47	3,24	1452	100
I have some problems	83	5,72	322	22,18	592	40,77	382	26,31	73	5,03	1452	100
I like to talk	645	44,42	455	31,34	235	16,18	45	3,10	72	4,96	1452	100
I share my opinions with others	479	32,99	486	33,47	314	21,63	87	5,99	86	5,92	1452	100
I tell my stories to others	392	27,00	409	28,17	419	28,86	133	9,16	99	6,82	1452	100

I learn from others	431	29,68	537	36,98	307	21,14	95	6,54	82	5,65	1452	100
I can express myself in general	536	36,91	504	34,71	240	16,53	85	5,85	87	5,99	1452	100
I always express my point of view	514	35,40	446	30,72	312	21,49	91	6,27	89	6,13	1452	100
I share my experiences with others	419	28,86	494	34,02	343	23,62	112	7,71	84	5,79	1452	100
I share my feelings with others	358	24,66	364	25,07	437	30,10	210	14,46	83	5,72	1452	100
Total	4502	31,01	4604	31,71	3341	23,01	1271	8,75	802	5,52	14520	100

Table 17 concerns relations during the activities from the point of view of children. Positive relations are very rarely absent, with two exceptions, which probably depend on the type of activities, i.e., telling stories and sharing feelings.

Table 17. Relations during the activities

	Always		Often		Sometimes		Never		Missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%		%
I felt well	737	53,76	445	32,46	114	8,32	19	1,39	56	4,08	1371	100
I had some problems	287	20,93	282	20,57	413	30,12	326	23,78	63	4,60	1371	100
I liked to talk	633	46,17	409	29,83	195	14,22	66	4,81	68	4,96	1371	100
I shared opinions	476	34,72	446	32,53	267	19,47	117	8,53	65	4,74	1371	100
I told stories to others	379	27,64	301	21,95	351	25,60	276	20,13	64	4,67	1371	100
I learned from others	460	33,55	423	30,85	274	19,99	134	9,77	80	5,84	1371	100
I could express myself	523	38,15	393	28,67	177	12,91	61	4,45	217	15,83	1371	100
I could express my point of view	541	39,46	306	22,32	122	8,90	38	2,77	364	26,55	1371	100
I expressed different points of view	505	36,83	383	27,94	245	17,87	118	8,61	120	8,75	1371	100
I shared experiences with others	420	30,63	381	27,79	322	23,49	182	13,27	66	4,81	1371	100
I shared feelings with others	393	28,67	310	22,61	335	24,43	272	19,84	61	4,45	1371	100

Table 18 compares the relational outcomes during the activities and classrooms relations as shown by the pre-test. Relations during the activities concerned a short period of time and it as based on specific objectives, while the pre-test investigated a general classroom condition. Differences between relations during the activities are somewhat relevant in few cases. It is interesting to note that problems were higher during the activities: as we shall see in table 5.2 this result depends on a specific local context. Telling stories, self-expressing and expressing pints of view were also a bit less frequent: also these outcomes depend on some specific local contexts.

Table 18. Comparison of general classroom relations and relations during the activities

	Activities		Pre-test	
	n.	%	n.	%
Always + often				
I felt well	1182	86,22	1232	84,85
I had some problems	569	41,50	405	27,38
I liked to talk	1042	76,00	1100	75,76
I shared opinions	922	67,25	965	66,46
I told stories to others	680	49,59	801	55,7
I learned from others	883	64,40	968	66,66
I could express myself	916	66,82	1040	71,62
I could express my point of view	847	61,78	960	66,12
I expressed different points of view	888	64,77	-	-
I shared experiences with others	801	58,42	913	62,88
I shared feelings with others	703	51,28	722	49,73

A simplified version of relations was presented to ISCED 0 children, as shown in table 18b. It is interesting to see that in the Italian context children very frequently felt fine and learned something new, while in the German context they above all got on well together. Despite values are not very high, in the Italian context children “could say” much more frequently than in the German context.

Tab 18b. Relations during the activities for ISCED 0 (%)

Very much	IT	DE
I felt fine	73,63	56,72
we got on well together	32,97	62,69
I could say, what I want	56,04	35,82
I learned something new	80,22	47,76
I could say, if I did not like something	39,56	11,94

Table 18c shows a specific question about relations for ISCED 0 children. In the German context, it is confirmed the importance of mutual listening, while in the Italian context mutual help, educator's support asking and saying, being together are more frequent. It may be noted, however, that in Italy there is also a more frequent perception of hierarchical relations (educators said what to do).

Table 18c. Relations in ISCED 0 (%)

Very much	IT	DE
we listened to each other	29,67	50,75
we helped each other	45,05	38,81
educator helped me	51,65	43,28
could I ask, if necessary	47,25	37,31
I could say, if I did not want something	60,44	28,36
I could say, if I wanted something or had an idea	29,67	25,37
educators said what to do	48,35	11,94
I liked to be together with the other children	60,44	38,81

Table 19 shows frequent low percentages about participation and sharing in the German context. In this context, however, are less frequent problems. Belgian and Finnish contexts also present low percentages, although less frequently and less intensively. Probably the strong prevalence of adolescents in the Belgian context, the presence of migrant children with language barriers in German and Polish contexts can explain some of these results. On the contrary, the UK and Sweden contexts show much more frequent participation and sharing. Data from the other two contexts (in Italy and Finland) also show positive classroom relations.

Table 19. General classroom relations in local contexts in different countries

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I feel well	239	85,05	56	64,37	12	92,31	429	92,06	112	77,24	30	93,75	354	82,71
I have some problems	104	37,01	3	3,45	3	23,08	117	25,11	20	13,79	6	18,75	152	35,51
I like to talk	168	59,79	32	36,78	10	76,92	386	82,83	120	82,76	23	71,88	361	84,35
I share my opinions with others	157	55,87	21	24,14	10	76,92	336	72,10	81	55,86	22	68,75	338	78,97
I tell my stories to others	106	37,72	20	22,99	9	69,23	239	51,29	63	43,45	15	46,88	349	81,54
I learn from others	179	63,70	17	19,54	8	61,54	323	69,31	54	37,24	28	87,50	359	83,88
I can express myself in general	202	71,89	33	37,93	10	76,92	339	72,75	95	65,52	29	90,63	332	77,57
I always express my point of view	138	49,11	26	29,89	9	69,23	316	67,81	91	62,76	22	68,75	358	83,64
I share my experiences with others	121	43,06	20	22,99	9	69,23	317	68,03	67	46,21	22	68,75	357	83,41

I share my feelings with others	95	33,81	13	14,94	7	53,85	194	41,63	62	42,76	15	46,88	336	78,50
Total	281	100	87	100	13	100	466	100	145	100	32	100	428	100

Table 20 shows frequent relational problems in the UK context (and to some extent from the Polish context). In all other cases, problems are under the level of pre-test. From the point of view of the UK researchers, this may depend on the specific uneasiness of children in talking of themselves and telling stories, which were also very frequent in this context, as the table shows. Thus, very high frequency of self-expression would correspond to very frequent uneasiness. In the Polish context, on the one hand, activities concerned regular lessons, showing some difficulties of children, on the other hand, refugees with low language proficiency were involved. For what concerns other relational outcomes, the German context and to some extent the Finnish and the Belgian contexts, substantially contribute to lower the general relational impact of activities.

Table 20. Relations during the activities in local contexts in different countries

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I felt well	279	90,88	47	54,02	6	66,67	372	88,15	130	92,86	28	93,33	320	85,11
I had some problems	84	27,36	2	2,30	1	11,11	74	17,54	52	37,14	7	23,33	349	92,82
I liked to talk	224	72,96	29	33,33	7	77,78	297	70,38	117	83,57	24	80,00	344	91,49
I shared opinions	171	55,70	21	24,14	7	77,78	268	63,51	92	65,71	25	83,33	338	89,89
I told stories to others	71	23,13	13	14,94	3	33,33	163	38,63	55	39,29	21	70,00	354	94,15
I learned from others	157	51,14	19	21,84	1	11,11	271	64,22	72	51,43	21	70,00	342	90,96
I could express myself	230	74,92	33	37,93	6	66,67	311	73,70	-	-	-	-	336	89,36
I could express my point of view	-	-	28	32,18	5	55,56	322	76,30	112	80,00	27	90,00	353	93,88
I expressed different points of view	165	53,75	1	1,15	0	0	242	57,35	108	77,14	20	66,67	352	93,62
I shared experiences with others	132	43,00	18	20,69	5	55,56	215	50,95	71	50,71	21	70,00	339	90,16
I shared feelings with others	122	39,74	19	21,84	5	55,56	167	39,57	47	33,57	16	53,33	327	86,97

It is not possible to provide a precise comparison between the two types of data collected in Belgium. However, it is clear that while feeling well is aligned, learning and listening are very frequent in the following data and, on the contrary, expressing personally seems more frequent in the following table. Moreover, these data show rather well support by teachers (educators helped me) and children's compliance with teachers' guidance (educators said what to do).

Tab 20b. Relations during the activities (ISCED 1 in the Belgian context, 72 respondents, %)

Very much	BE
I felt fine	88,89
we got on well together	76,12
I could say, what I want	57,35
I learned something new	81,69
I could say, if I did not like something	35,21
we listened to each other	84,62
we helped each other	72,58
educator helped me	81,69
could I ask, if necessary	72,22
I could say, if I did not want something	40,98
I could say, if I wanted something or had an idea	54,84
educators said what to do	97,22
I liked to be together with the other children	87,32

Differences between types of schools are rather interesting for what concerns general classroom relations. Effective relations are more frequent in primary schools (ISCED 1), with the exceptions of feeling well and expressing in general, which is probably more difficult due to lower language competence. This confirms that primary schools are more concerned with relations among children and children's participation. However, few ISCED 2 children declare having problems and many like to talk, although these children less frequently learn from others. ISCED 3 adolescents less frequently express their points of view, share their experiences and above all share their feelings. This confirms that difficulties in participation are higher for adolescents at school.

During the activities, on the one hand, ISCED 1 children had much more frequently problems, when compared with both pre-test and ISCED 2 and ISCED 3. This seems to be linked to the UK context. Moreover, ISCED 1 children did not feel well as the other children as in the pre-test. On the other hand, however, relational outcomes are much more positive among ISCED 1 children. They are also more frequently positive than in classroom relations in general. This shows that these children did not consider these relational outcomes as relevant for enjoying the activities and for their personal outcomes. On the contrary, ISCED 2 children and above all ISCED 3 adolescents, who enjoyed the activities and considered them effective, seemed to have less frequent positive relations during the activities than in the regular classroom context. This result for ISCED 2 and ISCED 3 might be explained with the difference between formal activities and informal classroom relations, since there was not a distinction between peer relations and relations with teachers/facilitators.

Table 21. Relational outcomes of activities and general classroom relations by ISCED

	Activities						Pre-test		
Always + Often	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3		ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	%	%
feeling well	520	81,89	380	87,36	282	93,69	81,93	87,20	88,29
having some problems	402	63,31	112	25,75	55	18,27	31,93	16,11	34,49
liking to talk	504	79,37	320	73,56	218	72,43	76,61	80,57	67,41
sharing opinions	490	77,17	264	60,69	168	55,81	70,03	64,22	61,39
telling stories to others	450	70,87	138	31,72	92	30,56	66,53	46,21	41,46
learning from others	481	75,75	232	53,33	170	56,48	71,01	58,77	67,41
expressing	494	77,80	199	45,75	223	74,09	68,21	73,70	76,58
expressing points of view	495	77,95	272	62,53	80	26,58	70,17	66,59	56,33
expressing different points of view	469	73,86	251	57,70	168	55,81	-	-	-
sharing experiences	471	74,17	196	45,06	134	44,52	71,43	57,82	50,32
sharing feelings	437	68,82	154	35,40	112	37,21	61,90	41,23	33,54

Gender differences in general classroom relations are relevant for only few aspects. However, it is interesting to note that a higher percentage of males perceive their active participation (talking, sharing opinions, telling stories, expressing point of view, sharing experiences). Males also feel well more frequently than females. During the activities, females and males were almost on the same line. Males told stories more frequently and females expressed themselves more frequently, although males expressed more frequently different points of view and shared more frequently their experiences. Comparing relational outcomes and general classroom relations, the picture is not homogeneous. Problems significantly increased during the activities, as we have already seen, for both females and males, but more for males. The same change regards sharing experiences, which was much less frequent during the activities. For other aspects, females were more positive during the activities than in general (liking to talk, sharing opinions). Males were less frequently positive during the activities for other aspects.

Table 22. Relational outcomes of activities and general classroom relations by gender

	Activities						Pre-test		
Always + Often	Female		Male		Other		Female	male	other
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	&	%
feeling well	641	87,21	518	85,48	13	76,47	83,13	86,83	69,23
having some problems	300	40,82	261	43,07	4	23,53	28,74	27,64	-
liking to talk	551	74,97	471	77,72	10	58,82	72,74	79,59	46,15

sharing opinions	490	66,67	413	68,15	9	52,94	63,29	70,04	46,15
telling stories to others	351	47,76	317	52,31	4	23,53	52,50	58,47	30,77
learning from others	467	63,54	401	66,17	7	41,18	66,94	66,57	53,85
expressing	501	68,16	392	64,69	12	70,59	72,06	71,20	53,85
expressing points of view	454	61,77	378	62,38	11	64,71	64,51	68,31	30,77
expressing different points of view	467	63,54	408	67,33	5	29,41	-	-	-
sharing experiences	404	54,97	383	63,20	6	35,29	61,13	65,41	38,46
sharing feelings	371	50,48	320	52,81	6	35,29	49,39	50,51	30,77

Some interesting results concern the difference about general classroom relations between CMB and native children. First, CMB perceive much more frequently problems than native children. However, CMB also tend to talk and share more frequently. In particular, the difference is relevant for telling stories. In general, although with very low, differences CMB perceive more frequently to participate in the classroom for all aspects. Finally, the most relevant difference concerns the high percentage of CMB who declare to learn from others. During the activities, problems increased more or less in the same proportion among CMB and native children. Sharing opinion increased only for native children and sharing feelings increased only for CMB. Telling stories decreased for both, but more significantly for CMB. Learning from others and expressing points of view also decreased among CMB, while sharing experiences decreased among native children. Finally, CMB could more frequently express different points of view. Summing up, during the activities, changes were not homogeneous but, on the whole, the balance can be seen as similar for CMB and native children.

Table 23. Relational outcomes of activities and general classroom relations by CMB/native condition

	Activities				Pre-test	
	CMB		Native		CMB	Native
	n.	%	n.	%	%	%
feeling well	578	86,79	595	86,61	85,24	84,75
having some problems	323	48,50	238	34,64	34,12	21,84
liking to talk	514	77,18	519	75,55	77,02	74,86
sharing opinions	451	67,72	464	67,54	68,52	64,42
telling stories to others	343	51,50	332	48,33	58,36	52,06
learning from others	447	67,12	429	62,45	72,14	61,40
expressing	480	72,07	431	62,74	73,26	70,33
expressing points of view	378	56,76	468	68,12	66,71	65,66
expressing different points of view	448	67,27	433	63,03	-	-

sharing experiences	401	60,21	392	57,06	63,65	62,50
sharing feelings	365	54,80	330	48,03	51,67	48,21

The next tables show the types of others' reactions children perceive when they say something important.

Table 24 shows that between 18% and 23% of children do not feel or feel rarely respected, understood and appreciated in the classroom. Higher percentages of children do not perceive that what they say is shared (27%) and above all it is considered as important (35%). On the other hand, 52% of children perceive of being frequently assessed and only 18% do not perceive any assessment. There are no relevant differences between males and females. This picture is not problematic if these data are considered against the whole number of participating children. However, they show that problems of sharing and consideration concern several children and also problems of respect are rather diffused. Finally, and above all, assessment is obviously diffuse, although it is difficult to know if assessment is attributed to classmates or teachers.

Table 24. Perception of others' reactions in general

	1 Always		2 Often		3 Sometimes		4 Never		missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%		%
Respected	585	40,29	554	38,15	229	15,77	37	2,55	47	3,24	1452	100
Understood	453	31,20	628	43,25	225	15,50	68	4,68	78	5,37	1452	100
Appreciated	410	28,24	673	46,35	265	18,25	41	2,82	63	4,34	1452	100
Considered as important	394	27,13	453	31,20	396	27,27	114	7,85	95	6,54	1452	100
Shared	487	33,54	465	32,02	327	22,52	72	4,96	101	6,96	1452	100
Assessed	450	30,99	311	21,42	342	23,55	258	17,77	91	6,27	1452	100

Table 25 shows the perception of other reactions during the activities and table 26 shows that respect, understanding, appreciation, consideration and sharing were more frequent during the activities than in the classroom in general. Probably, in this case formal activities have an impact on a condition that in general includes informal relations between children.

Tab. 25. Perception of others' reactions during the activities

	Always		Often		Sometimes		Never		missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Respected	763	55,65	411	29,98	112	8,17	27	1,97	58	4,23	1371	100
Understood	593	43,25	531	38,73	153	11,16	27	1,97	67	4,89	1371	100
Appreciated	606	44,20	482	35,16	187	13,64	34	2,48	62	4,52	1371	100

Considered as important	515	37,56	445	32,46	258	18,82	78	5,69	75	5,47	1371	100
Shared	534	38,95	476	34,72	231	16,85	58	4,23	72	5,25	1371	100
Assessed	410	29,91	299	21,81	312	22,76	271	19,77	79	5,76	1371	100
Total	3421	41,59	2644	32,14	1253	15,23	495	6,02	413	5,02	8226	100

Table 26 Comparing perception of others' reactions

Always + often	Activities		pre-test	
	n.	%	n.	%
Respected	1174	85,63	1139	78,44
Understood	1124	81,98	1081	74,45
Appreciated	1088	79,36	1083	74,59
Considered as important	960	70,02	847	58,33
Shared	1010	73,67	952	65,56
Assessed	709	51,72	761	52,41

Table 27 shows general classroom situation in different local contexts in different countries. This table confirms children's problems in the German context, since few children perceive positive reactions to their own actions. Problems are also rather frequent in the Polish context. On the contrary, the UK context seems to be the most favourable in terms of reactions to children's actions. The relevant exception is assessment: in German and Polish contexts, assessment is perceived by few children, maybe because exchanges are rare, while is very frequently perceived in the UK context. It is also interesting to note low perception of assessments in the Italian context.

Table 27. Perception of others' reactions in local contexts in different country (in general)

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Respected	225	80,07	38	43,68	9	69,23	379	81,33	100	68,97	27	84,38	361	84,35
Understood	206	73,31	19	21,84	10	76,92	355	76,18	85	58,62	23	71,88	383	89,49
Appreciated	190	67,62	27	31,03	9	69,23	338	72,53	78	53,79	23	71,88	418	97,66
Considered as important	142	50,53	13	14,94	6	46,15	254	54,51	57	39,31	21	65,63	354	82,71
Shared	174	61,92	15	17,24	6	46,15	284	60,94	64	44,14	22	68,75	387	90,42
Assessed	168	59,79	13	14,94	11	84,62	146	31,33	31	21,38	17	53,13	375	87,62

Table 28 confirms that also during the activities the German context and the Finnish context to some extent, were much less favourable for perception of others' reactions, while the UK context was very favourable. Also, during the activities, the UK context was characterized by frequent assessments, much more than the other local contexts. During the activities, however, assessment was also frequent in the Swedish and the Belgian contexts.

Table 28. Perception of others' reactions in local contexts in different countries during activities

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Respected	274	89,25	39	44,83	5	55,56	365	86,49	116	82,86	26	86,67	349	92,82
Understood	262	85,34	32	36,78	6	66,67	341	80,81	113	80,71	26	86,67	344	91,49
Appreciated	240	78,18	34	39,08	3	33,33	334	79,15	98	70,00	27	90,00	352	93,62
Considered as important	200	65,15	21	24,14	5	55,56	268	63,51	91	65,00	25	83,33	350	93,09
Shared	223	72,64	27	31,03	3	33,33	292	69,19	94	67,14	27	90,00	344	91,49
Assessed	222	72,31	21	24,14	3	33,33	85	20,14	33	23,57	20	66,67	325	86,44

Table 29 shows that, in classrooms in general, difference between types of school and age are rather relevant. ISCED 2 children feel less frequently that their actions are understood, appreciated, considered as important and shared. They also feel less frequently that their actions are assessed. More or less opposite is ISCED 1 children's perception, while it is interesting that for ISCED 3 adolescents the feeling is very frequently of being respected. During the activities, ISCED 1 children were also more frequently positive, but with the exception of assessment. In particular, they felt to be considered and to share rather more frequently than ISCED 2 and ISCED 3, although sharing increased for all children during the activities. ISCED 2 children observed much less frequently assessments, as in general, while respect, understanding and appreciation also increased significantly among ISCED 2 children and ISCED 3 adolescents. Clearly others' reactions to children's actions were perceived much more positively during the activities than in general in the classroom.

Table 29. Perception of others' reactions by ISCED during activities and in general

Always+ Often	Activities						Pre-test		
	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3		ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	%	%
Respected	539	84,88	362	83,22	273	90,70	78,01	76,54	81,96
Understood	524	82,52	350	80,46	250	83,06	77,59	69,19	74,37
Appreciated	526	82,83	326	74,94	236	78,41	81,65	65,88	70,25

Considered as important	490	77,17	277	63,68	193	64,12	65,13	47,87	56,96
Shared	507	79,84	298	68,51	205	68,11	73,67	53,32	63,61
Assessed	401	63,15	139	31,95	169	56,15	64,29	31,75	53,16

Table 30 shows that gender differences are irrelevant both in general classroom conditions and during the activities. This result confirms that from a personal and relational point of view there are not relevant differences between males and females. However, while perception of positive reactions relevantly increased for both females and males during the activities, understanding and appreciation increased more for females than males. This result is probably not sufficient to say that females received more favourable reactions during the activities in general, but certainly it suggests that females can have gained something from the activities.

Table 30. Perception of others' reactions by gender during the activities and in general

Always + Often	Female		Male		Other		Female	Male	Other
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	%	%
Respected	633	86,12	518	85,48	13	76,47	79,08	78,15	61,54
Understood	611	83,13	492	81,19	12	70,59	72,47	76,85	53,85
Appreciated	584	79,46	486	80,20	10	58,82	72,74	76,85	53,85
Considered as important	515	70,07	429	70,79	7	41,18	58,57	58,47	38,46
Shared	549	74,69	441	72,77	11	64,71	66,67	64,69	38,46
Assessed	387	52,65	309	50,99	7	41,18	51,55	52,82	53,85

A very interesting result concerns the difference in reaction of action between CMB and native children. Table 31 clearly shows that higher percentages of CMB perceive all reactions, thus respect, understanding, appreciation, consideration sharing and finally, with a very large difference, assessment. This shows high sensitivity for the interaction both in positive and negative (assessment) terms. During the activities, positive reactions increased for all children, although in more relevant way for native children. This is another interesting result, since advantages increased for the whole classes/groups. Assessment slightly increased for CMB and slightly decreased for native children, maybe as an outcome of second language teaching.

Table 31. Perception of others' reactions by CMB/native condition.

Always + Often	Activities				Pre-test			
	CMB		Natives		CMB		Natives	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Respected	585	87,84	577	83,99	580	80,78	557	76,51
Understood	566	84,98	549	79,91	570	79,39	508	69,78

Appreciated	550	82,58	528	76,86	570	79,39	509	69,92
Considered as important	480	72,07	473	68,85	458	63,79	386	53,02
Shared	521	78,23	481	70,01	508	70,75	442	60,71
Assessed	433	65,02	268	39,01	452	62,95	306	42,03

The next tables show children's reactions of others' self-disclosure. Table 32 shows reactions in the classroom in general. It shows that others' self-disclosure is considered very frequently as nice (82%), interesting (75%), amusing (75%) and trustful (76%), but also boring (only 23% are never bored). Moreover, 46% of children mock those who talk of themselves and 29% feel annoyed. Finally, 70% join them in talking and more than 56% tell of themselves.

Table 32. Reaction to self-disclosure in general

	1 Always		2 Often		3 Sometimes		4 Never		missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%		%
I find that nice	641	44,15	543	37,40	128	8,82	51	3,51	89	6,13	1452	100
I get bored	392	27,00	167	11,50	480	33,06	331	22,80	82	5,65	1452	100
I am amused	634	43,66	460	31,68	199	13,71	68	4,68	91	6,27	1452	100
I mock them	483	33,26	182	12,53	241	16,60	454	31,27	92	6,34	1452	100
I ask questions	542	37,33	442	30,44	294	20,25	78	5,37	96	6,61	1452	100
I tell of myself too	414	28,51	404	27,82	385	26,52	145	9,99	104	7,16	1452	100
I feel annoyed	282	19,42	146	10,06	334	23,00	584	40,22	106	7,30	1452	100
I find their talk interesting	488	33,61	610	42,01	209	14,39	42	2,89	103	7,09	1452	100
I believe them	489	33,68	616	42,42	197	13,57	52	3,58	98	6,75	1452	100
I join them in their talking	550	37,88	465	32,02	262	18,04	83	5,72	92	6,34	1452	100
Total	4915	33,85	4035	27,79	2729	18,79	1888	13,00	953	6,56	14520	100

Table 33 shows that during the activities lack positive reactions is very rare (with partial exceptions of asking questions and telling of themselves), while lack of negative reactions (being bored, mocking, being annoyed) is much more frequent.

Table 33. Reactions to self-disclosure

	Always		Often		Sometimes		Never		Missing		Total	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I found that nice	679	49,53	449	32,75	133	9,70	35	2,55	75	5,47	1371	100
I got bored	271	19,77	240	17,51	396	28,88	392	28,59	72	5,25	1371	100
I was amused	530	38,66	480	35,01	209	15,24	80	5,84	72	5,25	1371	100
I mocked them	295	21,52	190	13,86	241	17,58	564	41,14	81	5,91	1371	100
I asked questions	363	26,48	388	28,30	326	23,78	218	15,90	76	5,54	1371	100
I told of myself too	381	27,79	328	23,92	328	23,92	261	19,04	73	5,32	1371	100
I felt annoyed	292	21,30	170	12,40	201	14,66	626	45,66	82	5,98	1371	100
I found their talk interesting	584	42,60	504	36,76	159	11,60	50	3,65	74	5,40	1371	100
I believed them	614	44,78	474	34,57	154	11,23	52	3,79	77	5,62	1371	100
I joined them in their talking	573	41,79	394	28,74	218	15,90	112	8,17	74	5,40	1371	100

Table 34, shows that there are not very relevant differences between reactions during the activities and reactions in general, with three exceptions: reductions of mocking, asking questions (probably for less relevance of teaching in general) and telling of themselves (probably for the difference between formal and informal situations)

Table 34. Reactions to self-disclosure during activities and in general

	Activities		Pre-test	
	n.	%	n.	%
I found that nice	1128	82,28	1184	81,55
I got bored	511	37,28	559	38,50
I was amused	1010	73,67	1094	75,34
I mocked them	485	35,38	665	45,79
I asked questions	751	54,78	984	67,77
I told of myself too	709	51,71	818	56,33
I felt annoyed	462	33,70	428	29,48
I found their talk interesting	1088	79,36	1098	75,62
I believed them	1088	79,35	1105	76,10

I joined them in their talking	967	70,53	1015	69,90
--------------------------------	-----	-------	------	-------

Table 35 shows that in the German context all percentages are low, both for what concerns positive reactions and for what concerns negative reactions. The opposite situation is visible for the UK context. More contrasted are the Belgian and Polish contexts.

Table 35. Reactions to self-disclosure in local contexts in different countries (in general)

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I find that nice	223	79,36	25	28,74	12	92,31	412	88,41	101	69,66	26	81,25	385	89,95
I get bored	44	15,66	2	2,30	2	15,38	65	13,95	18	12,41	6	18,75	422	98,60
I am amused	180	64,06	14	16,09	10	76,92	391	83,91	52	35,86	28	87,50	419	97,90
I mock them	20	7,12	2	2,30	-	-	210	45,06	9	6,21	3	9,38	421	98,36
I ask questions	155	55,16	13	14,94	9	69,23	294	63,09	78	53,79	18	56,25	417	97,43
I tell of myself too	111	39,50	14	16,09	11	84,62	262	56,22	51	35,17	16	50,00	353	82,48
I feel annoyed	36	12,81	2	2,30	-	-	28	6,01	8	5,52	2	6,25	352	82,24
I find their talk interesting	211	75,09	19	21,84	11	84,62	393	84,33	96	66,21	27	84,38	341	79,67
I believe them	218	77,58	22	25,29	12	92,31	385	82,62	95	65,52	26	81,25	347	81,07
I join them in their talking	149	53,02	18	20,69	10	76,92	373	80,04	90	62,07	25	78,13	350	81,78

During the activities, the German context was also the less favourable to positive reactions, but also to negative reactions. On the contrary, the UK context was the most favourable to both positive and negative reactions. Other local contexts contributed to reduce negative reactions. The Italian and, to less extent, the Swedish contexts were also particularly favourable to positive outcomes.

Table 36. Reactions of self-disclosure in local contexts in different countries

Always + Often	BE		DE		FI		IT		PL		SW		UK	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
I found that nice	257	83,71	30	34,48	5	55,56	342	81,04	124	88,57	26	86,67	344	91,49
I got bored	61	19,87	2	2,30	3	33,33	65	15,40	34	24,29	7	23,33	339	90,16
I was amused	195	63,52	19	21,84	5	55,56	343	81,28	78	55,71	22	73,33	348	92,55
I mocked them	29	9,45	4	4,60	-	-	96	22,75	12	8,57	1	3,33	343	91,22
I asked questions	122	39,74	13	14,94	3	33,33	197	46,68	63	45,00	17	56,67	336	89,36
I told of myself too	103	33,55	9	10,34	3	33,33	189	44,79	41	29,29	12	40,00	352	93,62

I felt annoyed	40	13,03	1	1,15	-	-	46	10,90	23	16,43	1	3,33	351	93,35
I found their talk interesting	218	71,01	30	34,48	6	66,67	359	85,07	115	82,14	22	73,33	338	89,89
I believed them	236	76,87	30	34,48	7	77,78	356	84,36	113	80,71	20	66,67	326	86,70
I joined them in their talking	153	49,84	25	28,74	5	55,56	334	79,15	79	56,43	20	66,67	351	93,35

Table 37 shows that in classroom in general ISCED 1 children get bored, feel annoyed and mock much more frequently when they are involved in interactions with other people in the classroom. This is rather surprising when it is compared with children's positive relations. However, these children more frequently ask questions and tell of themselves. It is interesting to note that while adolescents do not join others in talking very frequently, they find nice to be involved and they believe their interlocutors. During the activities, ISCED 1 children were also much more frequently bored, they much more frequently mocked others and felt much more frequently annoyed. However, boring and mocking decreased during the activities, while annoyance increased, not only in ISCED 1 but also in ISCED 2 and in ISCED 3. Together with negative reactions, however, ISCED 1 children were also much more frequently amused, asked much more frequently questions, while ISCED 2 and ISCED 3 asked questions very rarely, and above all told much more frequently of themselves and joined much more frequently others in talking, while for this last reaction ISCED 2 and ISCED 3 decreased. Summing up, it seems that the activities had positive outcomes for ISCED 1 children but less positive outcomes for ISCED 2 and ISECD 3 children for what concerns reactions to self-disclosure.

Table 37. Reactions to self-disclosure by ISCED during the activities and in general

Always + Often	Activities						Pre-test		
	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3		ISCED1	ISCED2	ISCED3
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	%	%
Finding nice	515	81,10	355	81,61	258	85,71	80,81	79,15	86,39
Getting bored	377	59,37	88	20,23	46	15,28	64,15	13,51	13,92
Being amused	519	81,73	284	65,29	207	68,77	80,53	65,88	76,27
mocking	380	59,84	58	13,33	47	15,61	68,77	24,41	22,47
asking questions	464	73,07	182	41,84	105	34,88	77,59	58,06	58,54
Telling of myself too	457	71,97	144	33,10	108	35,88	66,39	47,39	45,57
Feeling annoyed	373	58,74	55	12,64	34	11,30	52,80	5,69	8,54
Finding talk interesting	519	81,73	342	78,62	227	75,42	72,83	78,20	78,48
Believing	513	80,79	347	79,77	228	75,75	73,25	76,54	81,96
Joining in talking	527	82,99	270	62,07	170	56,48	71,99	71,80	62,66

Table 38 shows some interesting differences regarding gender in general classroom relations. Males are more frequently bored (+5%) and annoyed (+4%), they above all they more frequently mock others (+7.4%). On the contrary, females more frequently find others' talk interesting, believe others and join others in talking, although the differences are low (2/3%). During the activities, however, gender differences were almost irrelevant. However, it is interesting that also during the activities males mocked (and to some extent got bored and annoyed) more frequently than females and females found more frequently self-disclosure nice than males. In particular, females reduced mocking during the activities, while they increased annoyance. Females also increased interest and believing, while joining to talk increased among males and decreased among females. On the whole activities did not change much gender differences, rather there was some redistribution which in any case seems more favourable for females.

Table 38. Reactions to self-disclosure by gender during the activities and in general

Always + Often	Female		Male		Other		Female	Male	Other
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	%	%	%
Finding nice	630	85,71	478	78,88	11	64,71	84,08	79,02	61,54
Getting bored	268	36,46	234	38,61	4	23,53	36,30	41,39	7,69
Being amused	549	74,69	442	72,94	10	58,82	75,30	75,54	53,85
mocking	244	33,20	233	38,45	4	23,53	42,38	49,78	30,77
asking questions	395	53,74	344	56,77	6	35,29	69,37	67,00	23,08
Telling of myself too	374	50,88	327	53,96	4	23,53	57,76	55,14	23,08
Feeling annoyed	237	32,24	220	36,30	1	5,88	27,67	31,55	15,38
Finding talk interesting	602	81,90	467	77,06	10	58,82	76,65	74,82	46,15
Believing	600	81,63	467	77,06	13	76,47	77,60	74,53	61,54
Joining in talking	513	69,80	437	72,11	9	52,94	71,12	68,74	53,85

Table 39 shows that for what concerns reactions to others' self-disclosure in classroom in general, the percentages of CMB are higher for almost all variables. In this case, however, these percentages also show some negative aspects, concerning mocking and above all getting bored and feeling annoyed. On the one hand, CMB confirm their sensitivity for the interaction, on the other hand, this sensitivity does not always lead to positive outcomes. During the activities, the situation does not change much, but getting bored and above all mocking decrease, while annoyance increases above all for CMB. Moreover, asking questions also decreases more for CMB. On the whole, it does not seem that the activities have favoured CMB more than native children. Rather data are nuanced.

Table 39. Reactions to self-disclosure by CMB/native condition during the activities and in general

Always + Often	Activities				Pre-test			
	CMB		Natives		CMB		Natives	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Finding nice	563	84,53	555	80,79	607	84,54	573	78,71
Getting bored	286	42,94	221	32,17	337	46,94	220	30,22
Being amused	503	75,53	498	72,49	569	79,25	522	71,70
mocking	271	40,69	213	31,00	363	50,56	301	41,35
asking questions	386	57,96	359	52,26	525	73,12	458	62,91
Telling of myself too	373	56,01	332	48,33	428	59,61	388	53,30
Feeling annoyed	264	39,64	195	28,38	258	35,93	168	23,08
Finding talk interesting	531	79,73	548	79,77	554	77,16	540	74,18
Believing	525	78,83	553	80,49	564	78,55	538	73,90
Joining in talking	479	71,92	479	69,72	501	69,78	511	70,19

For ISCED 0 children, simplified questions were used to investigate mutual relations. Only very few children answered in the German context, while many more answered in the Italian context with very positive outcomes.

Table 40. Mutual relations for ISCED 0 (%)

	Feeling good when telling			Liking others' telling		
	Very much	Not so much	Not at all	Very much	Not so much	Not at all
Italy	48,35	17,58	1,10	52,75	4,40	1,10
Germany	5,97	5,97	4,48	5,97	1,49	1,49

The final part of this analysis only concerns activities. Table 41 shows that the activities have been most frequently defined by children as dialogic teaching and support of self-expression. Evaluation has been observed by 32% of children.

Table 41. Definition of activities (more answers possible)

	N.	%
Dialoguing teaching	949	69,22
Evaluation of children's tasks	442	32,24
Support of children's expression of experiences, views, feelings	822	59,96
Dialogue	674	49,16
Another way	99	7,22

Differences between local contexts in different countries are rather interesting. In the German context, dialoguing teaching, support of self-expression and dialogue are much less frequent. In Finnish and UK contexts, evaluation is observed very frequently, and, in particular, the impact of the large number of respondents in the UK on this value is relevant. Moreover, in the UK context, dialogic teaching, support of expression and dialogue are also very frequent, while in the Finnish context dialogic teaching is frequently observed. In the Italian context is also very frequent the definition of support of self-expression and to some extent, dialogic teaching.

Table 42. Definition of activities in local contexts in different countries (%)

	Dialoguing teaching	Evaluation	Support of self-expression	Dialogue	Another way
BE	76,87	20,20	33,22	63,52	10,10
DE	39,08	2,30	13,79	18,39	12,64
FI	88,89	88,89	33,33	-	22,22
IT	50,24	17,77	63,74	-	10,43
PL	81,43	22,14	35,00	61,43	7,86
SW	56,67	36,67	43,33	40,00	-
UK	87,23	67,29	99,47	97,07	-

ISCED 1 children give more frequent answers for all variables apart from “another way”. Thus, they more frequently considered activities as dialogic teaching and above all much more frequently as support of their expressions and as dialogue. However, they also considered much more frequently the importance of evaluation, which was observed very rarely by adolescents.

Table 43. Definition if activities by ISCED

	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Dialoguing teaching	455	71,65	298	68,51	196	65,12
Evaluation of tasks	307	48,35	93	21,38	42	13,95
Support of expressions	517	81,42	180	41,38	125	41,53
Dialogue	405	63,78	141	32,41	128	42,52
another way	42	6,61	45	10,34	12	3,99

Gender differences are minimal in defining activities. Only evaluation is more frequently chosen by males than females.

Table 44. Definition of activities by gender

	Female		Male		Other	
	n.	%	n.	%	n.	%
Dialoguing teaching	501	68,16	432	71,29	7	41,18
Evaluation of children's tasks	218	29,66	210	34,65	6	35,29
Support of children's expression of experiences, views, feelings	454	61,77	356	58,75	6	35,29
Dialogue	369	50,20	292	48,18	5	29,41
Another way	46	6,26	48	7,92	2	11,76

Table 45 shows that CMB have chosen less frequently the definitions of activities as dialogic teaching and support of expression, and more frequently the definition of dialogue.

Table 45. Definition of activities by CMB/native condition

	CMB		Natives	
	n.	%	n.	%
Dialoguing teaching	467	63,54	471	77,72
Evaluation of children's tasks	225	30,61	210	34,65
Support of children's expression of experiences, views, feelings	407	55,37	408	67,33
Dialogue	379	51,56	286	47,19
Another way	40	5,44	53	8,75

The final series of tables regards the experience of the whole activities. Table 46 shows that this experience has been defined as positive by 68.8% of children and negative only by 7.5%. A number of children (17.7%) decided to avoid a clear evaluation of their experiences.

Table 46. Experience of activities

	n.	%
Positive	944	68,85
Negative	103	7,51
Neither positive nor negative	243	17,72
Missing	81	5,91
Total	1371	100

The results of the previous tables may explain why positive evaluation was much less frequent in the Finnish and German contexts. However, respondents in these contexts are not very numerous,

they are very few in the Finnish context, so that variations can be more relevant. Moreover, most Finnish children did not answer to this question. Positive experiences were particularly frequent in the (small) Swedish context, in the Polish context and in the very numerous Italian context, but also in the Belgian context. Despite previous positive evaluation, positive experience in the UK context is not very diffuse and 20% of children in this context declared a negative experience. It is interesting to note, that in the Belgian context, children how filled the ISCED 0 questionnaire are more frequently positive than the other children, although the difference is not very relevant. Moreover, ISCED 0 students in the German context are more frequently positive than the other children in the same context. Finally, ISCED 0 children in the Italian context are very frequently positive.

Table 47. Experience in local contexts in different countries (%)

	Positive	Negative	Neither positive nor negative
BE	71,34	2,28	22,48
BE 2*	79,17	.	20,83
DE	45,98	2,30	18,39
DE ISCED 0	56,72	4,48	11,94
FI	11,11	-	-
IT	74,41	3,32	21,33
IT ISCED 0	87,91	5,49	4,40
PL	78,57	2,86	13,57
SW	83,33	-	6,67
UK	62,50	20,21	12,50

* ISCED 1 children who filled the ISCED 0 questionnaire

Experience was more frequently positive for adolescents and less frequently positive for ISCED 1 children who were also much more frequently negative. This evaluation is clearly influenced by the UK context; however, it does not seem that other contexts have a strong positive effect on this.

Table 48. Experience by ISCED

	ISCED1		ISCED2		ISCED3	
Positive	390	61,42	312	71,72	242	80,40
Negative	86	13,54	16	3,68	1	0,33
Neither positive nor negative	108	17,01	85	19,54	50	16,61
Missing	51	8,03	22	5,06	8	2,66
Total	635	100	435	100	301	100

Gender differences are irrelevant in the evaluation of the experience.

Table 49. Experience by gender

	Female		Male		Other	
Positive	518	70,48	413	68,15	7	41,18
Negative	49	6,67	54	8,91	-	-
Neither positive nor negative	124	16,87	108	17,82	8	47,06
Missing	41	5,58	31	5,12	2	11,76
Total	735	100	606	100	17	100

Experience of activities is substantially not different for CMB and native children. CMB declare a bit more positive experience but also a bit more negative.

Table 50. Experience by CMB/native condition.

	CMB		Natives	
	n.	%	n.	%
Positive	467	70,12	474	69,00
Negative	51	7,66	50	7,28
Neither positive nor negative	117	17,57	119	17,32
Missing	31	4,65	44	6,40
Total	666	100	687	100

4.3 Analysis of focus groups

In all focus groups, the very large majority of children declared appreciation for the activities in which they were involved. This shows that in this type of collective sharing of assessments, the majority who considered the activities in a positive way prevails on the small minority, although in some cases, dissonant voices emerged, helping to explain what could not work (above all in Italy and to some extent in Belgium). However, focus groups are important to highlight the reasons for positive and (sometimes) negative assessments of activities provided through the questionnaires. In some countries (Italy, Belgium, and the UK) the report from focus groups is more expanded than in the in Finland and Germany, where focus groups were less numerous. In Poland it was not possible to realise focus groups. In Sweden, groups were only focused on themes that were relevant for WP5.

4.3.1 General level of appreciation of activities

In **Italy**, usefulness of activities was appreciated. The unaccompanied foreign minors very much appreciated learning the language of the country in which they live. In one ISCED 0 group, children appreciated listening to parents speaking different languages and learning thanks to mediators who translated different sounds they did not recognize which have a meaning in their own language. Moreover, the activities were fun and allowed children's learning of new skills and competencies that they did not know to have, children's discovery of something about classmates that they would not have discovered otherwise and that were sometimes surprising. Thus, the activities were also highly appreciated because they generated curiosity. Appreciation mostly concerned knowing classmates better, learning to communicate better with classmates, talking about everybody's ideas, solving conflicts and improving mutual openness and support. This was particularly evident for activities involving children who did not yet know their classmates well, or when prejudices and stereotypes were perceived as an obstacle to mutual understanding.

Some children claimed for some changes: more but shorter meetings, autonomous involvement based on individual research, and better adaptation of activities to their needs, for instance dealing with conflicts and problems between classmates instead of reflecting on abstract examples and cases. Lack of appreciation was rarely expressed during the focus groups. In four ISCED 1 and ISCED 2 classes, at least one child declared that s/he did not appreciate the activities. In particular, in two classes attending the same type of workshop, almost half of children expressed perplexities, since they found the activities boring or embarrassing. In two classes, children also expressed their embarrassment in being videorecorded during the activities. Pre-schoolers did not appreciate sitting for too long and disagreeing with others.

In the **UK**, the positive evaluation of activities was based on three points. First, children appreciated the possibility to share their experiences during the pandemic, a truly shocking time of their lives. Second, children appreciated the opportunity to listen to other children's stories. Third, children appreciated the possibility to observe similarities and differences and to empathise with their classmates, after long and often repeated period of separation. For what concerns the meetings on the pandemic, it needs to be emphasised that its most damaging consequences and its management were not related to learning, albeit difficulties with online schooling were of course mentioned by many children; rather, what the pandemic hit was the network of social relationships in schools. This piece of data aligns with the results of focus groups delivered for WP5, where the same ISCED 1 children point out that the most important variable for their well-being at school is the quality of social relationship and the possibility for personal expression. For what concerns the alternative activity concerning cultural geography, the most appreciated aspect was the possibility to share knowledge with other children.

In **Belgium**, children liked the special classes to improve language. They said they were developing their skills and they appreciated that they could express themselves, joke and laugh. They also liked being free to talk and to make choices during the activity. Some children said that they liked the activity because they could help each other. The children from both focus groups about the activities on the food chain, reported that they wished they could do activities like this more often.

Children also said they liked learning new things and doing different things. Only two children reported not liking the activity, one boy and one girl. The girl said she did not like the activity because she was too shy to ask questions, and the boy said that since he was still learning French so the activity was too difficult for him. He said things went too quickly and he did not understand everything. In another focus group, about the activity on division, many children said the activity was fun and they liked playing games.

In **Finland**, the main reason for enjoying the activities was the use of discussion as the main way of teaching. Pupils felt it gave them a low-threshold opportunity to participate and learn actively. Teaching created a comfortable atmosphere in class which encouraged talking, sharing, and participating. Children felt that there was enough time for learning and there was no hurry.

In **Germany**, children especially liked the activities: (1) when they were able to achieve goals they had set for themselves; for instance, in the form of project work, social factors or learning goals; (2) when they experienced self-efficacy; (3) when they were allowed to decide things themselves and had active opportunities to participate; (4) when group-strengthening games were played; (5) when the teachers were seen as sympathetic.

4.3.2 Ways of talking and expressing

In **Italy**, children were happy to have time to spend talking to each other and to express themselves, their experiences, opinions, emotions and feelings, with both classmates and teachers. They appreciated talking about different things, to tell their stories and opinions, listening to classmates' stories and decentralizing their points of view, through storytelling and reflection on different perspectives or through group activities. This was made possible by the relaxed atmosphere and trust created during the meetings: children felt free to express themselves and felt accepted in all their expressions. Fear of making mistakes in expressing opinions and emotions was reduced. The activities promoted opportunities for sharing experiences, not only with close friends but also with people with whom children were not very familiar. Some children also reported that they liked to listen to their classmates' expressions, rather than actively participate. They claimed they were so involved in discovering others' experiences and new things that they shared less about their own. Even those who did not share much claimed they always felt accepted.

Only in two workshops in one ISCED 1 class, focused on body expression, some children claimed they had not many opportunities to talk about personal experiences. Some children said that they found very difficult to perform the requested body expressions. In another class involved in the same type of activity, some children said that they felt more skilful in expressing themselves with words, and thus they would have liked to talk more frequently rather than using the body. Some other children found difficulties in expressing personal views and stories, or to reflect on the issues they were asked to reflect upon.

In the **UK**, the possibility to express feelings and opinions was the most appreciated characteristic of the activities. It should be noticed that in three ISCED 1 schools out of the participating four, teachers had taken part in a previous experience (the SHARMED Erasmus+ project) of professional

training for the use of facilitation to promote children's self-expression and active participation to the construction of knowledge in the classroom. It was thus not surprising that participants in the focus groups converged in describing the possibility to speak out and sharing experiences as the most positive feature of the activities. Children positioned themselves as competent participants in communication, without any contribution that suggest possible difficulties in contributing to the activities. However, due to the size of the focus groups, some children did not contribute much or did not contribute at all to the discussion. This confirms that some children who did not contribute to the focus groups experienced the activities more negatively. Due to the design of most activities, participation was not restrained by fear of making mistakes or inadequate performances. It is interesting to observe that some children did mention the efforts of teacher in making everyone feel safe and comfortable, for instance by emphasizing that there are not right or wrong stories or that a story, short or long, simple, or richer is valued the same. Interestingly, the focus groups with children in the school that did not take part in the SHARMED project were the ones where children, whilst still appreciating the possibility to speak one freely during the activities, were less forthcoming in describing teachers' strategy to support them.

Across all focus groups, children affirmed that it was easy to share stories, without being preoccupied about sharing personal experiences. The possibility of personal expression is indicated as a feature of positive school experience in the WP5 focus group, thus reinforcing children's comments on the easiness of personal expression during the activities. Taking over each other was described as common, but never prejudicial to the possibility to share stories, as the teachers were able to recreate some interactional order quickly. No difference related to gender or migration background was mentioned by children with regard to participation in the activities, therefore confirming a recurring result of CHILD-UP research in English setting (and previously, a result of SHARMED too): gender and migration background are marginal aspects of children's construction and narration of their experiences at school.

In **Belgium**, it was difficult for the children to answer in regard to their possibility of expression in the specified activities. The activities did not lend themselves well to expressing opinions and feelings. In general, across all of the focus groups, the students said they felt they could express their opinions and speak out during the activities. They also stated that it was not a problem to disagree. Therefore, although none of the activities focused on the sharing of experiences, in general the children said they felt they could express themselves and that they all listened to each other. However, several children – mostly female – stated that they were either too timid to speak out in front of the group, or that they were afraid of being made fun of. When asked why people would make fun of them, they did not have specific responses. Instead, they explained that sometimes there were disputes or someone would make fun of what they said. The rest of the group, in all instances, agreed that it happened sometimes, but they stated that it did not happen often. In one instance, the other children in the focus group encouraged the female child and told her not to worry about it.

In **Finland**, children felt that dialogue gave room for them to express their views and opinions, and, in many cases especially on ISCED2 level, this was a must as there were a lot of activities building on self-expression in pairs or in small groups. Even ISCED 1 pupils did find ways for self-expression

although activities were more teacher-led than on ISCED 2 level. There were several activities that included or even built on talking about subjective experiences and points of view. For example, when ISCED 2 level pupils were studying societal affairs, the starting point was what pupils already know and what they have experienced earlier related to the matter.

In **Germany**, the children felt comfortable when they were appreciated, not only by the teacher, but also by their classmates. This respectful atmosphere allowed the children to speak freely about their opinions and feelings. Some children emphasised that they did not say very much, but that there was the possibility and atmosphere to do so. During the activities, it was important for children from both school and independent children and youth work not to be stressed, but to be able to do things at their own pace and to find tasks and games for themselves in which they were intrinsically motivated and which they could manage. They were able to formulate this point of view and thus clearly verbalise their needs. The activities always gave the children the opportunity to reflect on their own situations. Lesson material was adapted to the children's living environment. Whereas at one school, the subject matter was sought to connect with the children's experiences, at the other school, the subject matter was built up on the basis of the children's interests and experiences. The children appreciated both methods but were more actively involved in the second.

4.3.3 Group work and peer relations

In **Italy**, group work was appreciated, in particular in Genoa, both as an enjoyable activity, and as a new skill. One child in an ISCED 2 class emphasised that group work was a new and important way of talking after the beginning of the pandemic. Moreover, the activity allowed talk on other themes than the pandemic. Activities dealing with cultural diversity were also appreciated since they allowed children's learning on other countries and cultures, differences and similarities. Relationships with peers were evaluated positively in all focus groups, especially because children had fun together and had a chance to listen to each other, although some children liked listening to the facilitator and their classmates more than having an active role and other children struggled to talk, explaining this with character (being shy) or with fear to be judged. In particular, in Genoa, children observed how group work enhanced expression of different perspectives, collaboration and promotion of participation even of those classmates who were shy or were afraid of making mistakes. Some children also said that relationships with classmates varied on the basis of the group. Most groups stated that conflicts were absent during the activities. Conflicts were only on practical issues (e.g., who was supposed to read aloud or to take notes for the whole group). The activities improved peer relationships because they allowed children's engagement in communication with peers and expressions of perspectives in the group.

Some respondents in an ISCED 3 class claimed that in order to maintain a relaxed atmosphere, irony was used during discussions, even if the theme was serious. Other children claimed that the activities improved peer relationships. For instance, the activity on Chinese culture and language in an ISCED 2 school allowed the improvement of relations both with Chinese classmates not yet competent in Italian and with Chinese children of other classes. On the one hand, the activity

allowed a dialogue with those who were not yet competent in Italian. On the other hand, children could know each other and relate to and rely on help and expertise of Chinese children, fostering the establishment of friendly relations, despite the fact that this activity was realized online. In an ISCED3 class, the children knew their classmates better and collaborated and communicated more with each other; however, after the end of the activities, things went back to the way they were before: communication and collaboration decreased, creating a less welcoming climate in the classroom. This clearly shows the impact of facilitation on participation and dialogue.

Some children in an ISCED 1 class found some activities useless because they already knew very well their classmates and they did not know them better. However, there was a polarization based on gender between those who appreciated the activity and those who did not: all girls expressed a positive evaluation and almost all boys a negative one.

In the **UK**, there was a general agreement on the recognition of positive, non-conflictual relationships with classmates during the activities. Incidentally, this aligns with data produced through questionnaires (WP4) and focus groups with children on their school experience (WP5): children in the English settings constructed a positive image of social relationships at school, where conflicts are rare and generally inconsequential. No children expressed discomfort in the participation in the activities due to fear of being mocked, or made fun of, from others.

In **Belgium**, during the focus groups, children appeared to be at ease and willing to share openly in front of each other. It was rare for a child to remain silent for the duration of the meeting and in the cases where children were particularly hesitant to speak out, it tended to be children who did not yet feel comfortable speaking French. Children talked over each other sometimes, but eventually everyone who wanted to speak was able to. They joked with each other and asked one another questions sometimes. There was also no discernible difference between the participation of boys and girls in the focus group despite the fact that girls much more often reported being too timid to speak in class.

Children said that, in general, everyone got along well during the activity. However, as soon as someone spoke up to say they were afraid to speak out during the activity because they might be mocked, others in the group agreed with them. Then the consensus in the groups shifted and children said that mostly they got along, but sometimes people made fun of each other or there were disputes. This occurred in each focus group to some degree. One boy said that sometimes he makes fun of the people who make fun of him first, but that mostly it is not a problem and people do not laugh at each other. The exception to this was another focus group, where the children reported that the class often had disputes. Even the children however said that they could express themselves and say what is bothering them.

In general, children were not worried about making mistakes, because they saw the classroom as a place where it was safe to make mistakes because mistakes were a part of the learning process. In all the focus groups, a major theme was that classmates helped each other, and they enjoyed helping each other. In a focus group, a child (who was not a native speaker of French) said that she and her classmates paid attention to one another to see who did not understand and how they could be helped. She was the same child who said that she hesitated to ask questions because she was afraid the answers will be spoken too quickly for her to follow. Children in another focus group

said that disputes were rare in this class, but that they often had disputes in other classes. When asked why they struggled to answer but said that in this class they generally feel good.

In **Finland**, the groups had already formed well-established relations during the year, and some during the years. They expressed favour for group dynamics as children said they got along well.

In **Germany**, the children stated that they perceived the relationships in their class to be very good and supportive. They especially liked it when they could choose group members for individual activities. In this way, everyone could decide who they preferred to work with in that activity. One class emphasised that the group atmosphere was more difficult on Mondays and became stronger during the week. Especially through class discussions, the children could solve problems and difficulties among themselves and fairly. They had these discussions either alone or together with the whole class and the teacher, also during activities.

4.3.4 Expression of different points of view

In **Italy**, the majority of children observed expression of different views during the activities. While the ISCED 0 groups expressed disappointment for this, in the other focus groups expressing different points of view was considered normal, different opinions were seen as an enrichment, an opportunity for growing and knowing better classmates. Children also expressed their favour of dialogue and choice of a shared solution which did not leave any of the participants disappointed. For some children, the value of different perspective depends on the way they are expressed. For instance, they stressed that different perspectives can be expressed aggressively and offending someone's sensibility. However, different perspectives were mostly expressed and treated with respect, avoiding comments and everyone had a chance to express and compare different views. For this reason, problems were infrequent. However, some children in two classes in Genoa expressed discomfort in group work including conflicts between different perspectives. In the first case, the children expressed frustration for not being able to resolve the conflict, although they stated that a solution had been reached autonomously. In the second case, the children claimed that divergence of opinions between boys and girls was not constructive and did not lead to a shared solution. In the case of a music workshop realized remotely in an ISCED 2 class, some children highlighted a competition since those who performed differently were corrected by peers who pointed out mistakes and taught to perform the task correctly. To sum up, only few children thought that the activities were not positive since there were conflicts, for instance related to gender or difficult negotiations: these children preferred to make their choices autonomously.

In the **UK** children were invited to evaluate activities that were designed to foster active participation of children, which of course make disagreements and conflict more likely. However, children's voices in the focus groups suggest that the possibility to share personal stories did not favour disagreements during the activities. It is possible that the activities were designed to facilitate active participation in the sense of sharing personal stories rather than opinions, thus making conflict and disagreements less relevant. Again, this would be in line with the model of facilitation teachers were exposed to during the SHARMED activities in the classroom and training.

In **Belgium** a technique used by all the teachers was to ask the class if they agreed with a child's answer. The class would then respond as a group or else raise their hands and say why they agreed or disagreed. During the focus groups, the children said it was not a problem to disagree. Most children said they did not hesitate to disagree or speak out. They said that they were in school to learn, so disagreements were normal. One focus group, however, said that disputes often arose in the class. They said that the teacher would intervene in these instances, and that she wanted everyone to calmly listen to everyone else. They reported finding this reassuring.

In **Finland**, interviewees said that differing opinions are a norm in class and that they emerge on a daily basis. Everyone's opinions are heard and respected unless they are offensive to others. The responses showed no variety in terms of gender or cultural background.

In **Germany**, teachers and social workers contributed greatly to whether different opinions could be accepted and discussed in the group. The teachers were mainly divided by the children into nice and stricter. Stricter had no effect on freedom of expression, only on volume tolerance and 'punishments'. In addition, integration staff or extra pedagogical staff in the classroom were particularly appreciated by the children. These helped to ensure that a school could be diverse and colourful and that everyone could get something out of the lessons at their own pace. Children with a migration background and experiencing language difficulties said that they were sometimes not understood properly. If it was a familiar language, such as English, they had the opportunity to ask questions and express difficulties in their own language. With other languages, this was more difficult and so was the expression of opinions.

4.3.5 Evaluation of facilitation

This theme in focus groups is particularly important, since it was not possible to include it in the questionnaire. In **Italy**, children recognised that facilitation made it possible to establish communication rules that encouraged dialogue and mutual listening. They helped to respect turns of talk, rather than talking one over the other. Sometimes the facilitator was seen as a mediator trying to find shared solutions. Especially in Genoa, all facilitators gave voice to different views, allowing children to give reasons and motivations behind their answers. This approach gave children the chance of communicating better with classmates, especially those who were usually more silent because they feared judgments from other children.

The large majority of groups expressed satisfaction about the relations with facilitators. The ability to establish affective relationships, which supported the expression of children who felt free to speak and listened, was emphasised by many children. In Genoa, children felt comfortable and claimed that they did not find it difficult to see teachers in a new role of facilitator. Sympathy as well as explaining things in an effective, fun and playful way, were appreciated by the children who participated in music, cultural and Chinese workshops. Helpfulness, kindness and patience were also stressed by the children who participated in the music workshops.

In few cases, some children reported problems. In the well-being project, children claimed that the facilitator sometimes used terms that they found too difficult. The group that worked remotely

about music stressed the limits of the interaction between the children and the facilitator, in particular highlighted some problems of understanding. Finally, in the theatre workshop, some children stated that the facilitator was sometimes too severe and cold, and some felt too much under control.

In the **UK**, activities in the classrooms were all led by teachers. Across all focus groups, children described their relationship with teachers during the activities as positive and free from conflicts. An important question concerns the difference possibly observed by children between the ordinary instructional activities and activities observed by the CHILD-UP research. Interestingly, children's observation of differences/similarities between ordinary teaching and the activities was complex and multi-layered. As anticipated earlier, children did appreciate the possibility to share personal stories, accessing the role of active contributors to the generation of knowledge. This was signalled by participants in the focus groups as a difference with respect to ordinary teaching. However, when asked about the relationships with teachers, children did not seem to notice a similarly strong difference between "normal" teaching and the activities. During the activities, teachers were still acknowledged by children as the leaders and the managers of communication, introducing topics and managing turn taking. Whilst the opportunity for personal expression was recognised by children, *how* this opportunity was practiced relates to a teacher-centred management of participation. Children were waiting to be selected as speakers, even when interlacing stories to others.

In **Belgium**, children generally reported having good relationships with the teacher and stated that they felt comfortable during the activities and could ask questions. Children appreciated that their teachers corrected them during the activities, let them help each other, and made them feel comfortable to make mistakes. They generally also felt that their teachers listened to them and supported them in instances when someone tried to make fun of them. In one focus group, the children appreciated that the teacher punished people who made fun of others. In another focus group, they said the teacher made them sign contracts with her if they misbehaved. These contracts said that they would behave better in the future and detailed the actions the student and teacher had to take in order to improve the relationship and the student's conduct in the classroom.

The children in a third focus group said that during the activity the teacher yelled less than she normally does. They attributed this to the presence of the researchers. This came as a surprise to the researchers who had both written in their observation notes that the teacher was unusually forceful, and she yelled a great deal to discipline the children. During the activity, there was one child who was not allowed to participate because he was being punished, so he sat on his own writing something and crying. During the course of the activity, the teacher yelled at another child and when he tried to explain himself, she refused to listen to him, continued yelling, and he cried a bit as the activity continued. The children said that the teacher does not often leave them to work on their own like she did today, and that she yells a lot, but it does not usually bother them. They said they felt like they could ask questions, but they hesitated sometimes because the teacher might be annoyed. They know she does not like being asked the same question multiple times. They said they know it is ok to make mistakes, because they learn from their mistakes, but the teacher does not like it when they make the same mistake over and over. They ended the discussion by saying

they felt the teacher worked hard for them, and they thought she had spent a lot of time preparing the games that they enjoyed so much.

In **Finland**, most interviewees across ISCED levels valued the teacher as a responsive, respectful, and an understanding figure who could be easily approached and talked to. There was no fear of giving a “wrong” answer, for example.

In **Germany**, teachers and educators were seen as supporters and companions, especially in independent child and youth work and in the independent school. They are there when you get stuck, have a question or want to try something new. The teachers saw themselves as learning guides. From the children’s point of view, the teachers knew the framework conditions and were responsible for ensuring that they are adhered to. In the public school, the children saw the teachers as mediators of knowledge.

4.3.6 The pandemic

In **Italy**, the influence of the pandemic on the activities was different for those who participated in remote activities and those who participated in activities in presence. According to participants in remote activities, the activities would have been better without the pandemic because there would have been more exchange with peers (ISCED 0) and with facilitators (ISCED 1 and ISCED 2). Moreover, face-to-face workshops would have been more engaging, with the support of objects and the organisation of trips (ISCED 2). Finally, some children did not like the music workshop because of its complexity: the performance of different rhythms and musical sequences was difficult to follow remotely (ISCED 2) also for technical problems and noise.

Among participants in activities in presence, unaccompanied foreign minors pointed out that the Italian L2 school before the pandemic was always open, whereas now it was limited, as well as many other activities and opportunities. Children in ISCED 0 highlighted that the use of the mask was negative since it reduced affective communication. In Genoa, children stressed that, without the pandemic, the activities could have been realised in larger places, such as the gymnasium or the lecture hall. Moreover, children were not able to get closer to each other, to exchange materials, to touch each other and in this way to understand each other better. Masks were seen negatively because they limited non-verbal language and fun. According to some ISCED 2 children in Genoa, however, the pandemic did not affect the activities much because they were able to talk and express their opinions. Finally, a child in Genoa highlighted that although the pandemic did not influence the activity much, it was important to talk about it during the meetings.

In the **UK**, most of the activities consisted in the facilitation of children’s narrative of their experiences during the pandemic. For this reason, the pandemic not only influenced the activities, but it moulded their design. Children did express appreciation for the possibility to share their stories and feelings about current and very poignant experiences.

In **Belgium**, the children said that these were the same kinds of activities they did before the pandemic. Children and teachers mostly did not wear masks or keep distance and the classes from which the participants for these focus groups were drawn were all held in person.

In **Finland**, the pandemic did not influence the activities as such. It did make ISCED 2 pupils wear a mask, but this did not cause problems to carry out activities, either.

In **Germany**, the children said that apart from having to wear masks, there was no change in their classroom activities.

4.4 Conclusions

The combination of questionnaires and focus groups provides children's important point of view on the activities in which they participated. The questionnaire reveals that a large majority of children appreciated the activities and the children with migrant background (CMB) in particular considered them enjoyable and effective. Moreover, there were few differences in participation between boys and girls, although boys more frequently mocked others and were more frequently bored and annoyed. In general, the most positive results seem to regard ISCED 1 children, but for some aspects it is interesting also ISCED 3 adolescents' interest and enjoyment. Although with more oscillations, ISCED 2 children also took advantage from the activities. ISCED 0 children have only been investigated in Germany and Italy and in a simplified form. There are ambivalent, but basically positive, results, above all in Italy where children responded more frequently and CMB were numerous.

Although CMB more frequently enjoyed the activities and considered them effective, few other aspects showed that they took advantages from them if compared to native children. This should not be considered as a problem, since the core of the project was to promote hybrid integration, which means that differences arise from mixing experiences, views and emotions. While emotional expressions seemed to be a weak point of the activities, on the whole, other forms of expression and participation were much more successful for all children, as the focus groups confirmed.

The focus groups confirmed the quantitative data about the importance of dialogue, dialogic teaching and support of personal expression: dialoguing and sharing expressions, both with teachers/facilitators and with classmates, was the basic ingredient of successful activities, as we have also shown in chapters 3-8. This did not always happen, and it did not happen for all children, but it seems clear that this is the indication emerging from the research. In the Italian context, for instance, during the focus groups it was possible to distinguish between many successful and few less successful activities, which probably influenced the very good, but not exceptional, evaluation of activities.

The most intriguing aspect concerns the difference among local contexts in different countries. While in the Italian context, the reason for the result seems clear, in other countries, results are not so clear. The difference between contexts is very clear in the questionnaire and much more nuanced in the focus groups. However, some data seem to lead to a coincidence between analysis of the activities, questionnaires and focus groups. This coincidence is particularly clear in the Belgian

context, where teachers were rather directive, as confirmed by both recordings and focus groups, but children appreciated some improvement of teaching during the recorded activities. This explains the results of the questionnaire, which is partly negative for some aspects but positive for others. Similar considerations can be done for the UK context, where children recognise teachers' superior epistemic authority but appreciate the way in which teachers enhanced and supported their participation. Probably a similar consideration can be done for the Swedish context, although we do not have elements from focus groups, where the recorded method of teaching is rather participative, and questionnaires show children's appreciation.

For what concerns the Finnish context, where results were less positive, a possible explanation is that children already knew each other and were used to work in the same way, so that innovation and change were not seen as relevant. It is also important to acknowledge that respondents in Finland were very few. Finally, the most negative result regards the German context. If we look at the recordings, it seems that many children observed rather negatively forms of participated but also hierarchical teaching, in which teachers upgraded their own epistemic authority, differently from English and Swedish teachers. Thus, if it is true that children did not have particular problems, they also observed few opportunities to enjoy the activities and construct positive relations.